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Abstract

The emergence of special education in Brazil in the 19th century was marked by discrete initiatives to educate individuals with disabilities who lived in residential institutions and hospitals (Mendes, 2008). Since then, educators and psychologists in Brazil and around the world have responded to new laws and policies that promote educational equity and inclusion of all children in schools leading to adaptations in their approach to supporting individuals with disabilities. Despite efforts to implement inclusive educational practices in schools, Brazilian research on special education and school psychology continues to report the challenges faced by educators in promoting these practices in daily activities. To date, little attention has been given to strategies and procedures used to achieve inclusion and overcome the barriers faced by educators within the Brazilian context from a school systems perspective. The purpose of this study was to understand what systems and strategies are used in Brazilian schools to promote inclusion and meet the needs of students in general and special education in an equitable way. Additionally, the researcher sought to examine ways to overcome barriers identified to inform future practice.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Brazil has greater levels of income inequality when compared to international standards (United Nations Development Programme, 2007). Currently, the top 5 percent of the population hold 30 percent of total income and 43 percent of total wealth (United Nations, 2016). Concomitant disparities in access to rights and public services have reinforced the need for programs that enhance access to quality education, health, and welfare (United Nations, 2016). Over the last decade, the country has made progress in various areas specified in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals; yet Brazil continues to prioritize efforts to reduce the national inequality by focusing on vulnerable geographic regions, minoritized populations, and those living in poverty (United Nations, 2016). Within the last decade, Brazil has implemented projects like the Base Nacional Comum Curricular, the Bolsa Familia, and the Mais Médicos. These projects have established policies that reinforce educational standards, economic assistance, and increased access to health care for Brazilian families, respectively. Despite these efforts, Brazilian scholars continue to report challenges in the provision of fair and equitable educational, health, and welfare services to Brazilian families (see Campos & Júnior, 2016; Hall, 2008; and Guzzo, Moreira, & Mezzalira, 2015). The present study aims to understand what systems Brazilian schools have adopted, what adaptations are implemented, and what challenges are present when attempting to increase access to equitable education through provision of inclusive practices. With this information recommendations are made for future work.

In 2015, Brazil’s Law on the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities was enacted to promote more meaningful social and educational inclusion of individuals with disabilities within Brazilian society. This law mandates that all individuals with disabilities have access to quality education and indicates a need for reform in educational systems through the elimination of
barriers and promotion of inclusion in schools (Lei Ordinária 13.146). Additionally, the law
prohibits public and private schools from refusing to enroll students with disabilities. Despite this
call for action, the law does not indicate the procedural means by which schools and educators
should adapt their practices to meet the requirements mandated by the law to provide equitable
education through inclusive education practices to students with and without disabilities. Without
guidance, training, or increased resources, many schools fall short in meeting the law’s mandates
of providing these services to students and families.

Brazilian research has revealed challenges with promoting inclusion in schools stemming
from three domains: (a) professional practice, (b) resources, and (c) societal norms. Studies have
reported teachers’ and administrators’ concerns regarding the lack of professional development
for general education teachers and the lack of technical support from educators with specialized
degrees (Sant’Ana, 2005). Other studies have revealed concerns about the resources available to
schools, indicating challenges with a large number of students present in each classroom and
lack of appropriate materials to support students’ individual needs (Capellini & Rodrigues,
2009). Still others have indicated the cultural and historical barriers that are present in the
discourse of Brazilian educators, who highlight the challenges in promoting inclusion within the
public school system (Cenci, Lemos, Vilas Bôas, Damiani, & Engeström, 2020).

Other countries have developed educational practices designed to promote inclusion; help
prevent students’ academic failure; and support their behavioral, social, and emotional
development. In the United States, for example, these practices have focused on students’
academic and behavioral development and are structured within a tiered system that provides
incremental levels of support to students with different levels of need. As such, these
preventative systems intend to ensure all students have equitable access to education.
School psychologists have played a central role in developing and sustaining these systems in the United States. Through their training, U.S. practitioners are equipped with skills that allow them to navigate between the fields of general and special education, helping schools problem solve and address students’ skill development in the academic, behavioral, and social realms (NASP, 2014). Analogously, Brazilian school psychologists are described as problem-solvers who attend to educational processes in schools and ensure the inclusion and healthy socioemotional, behavioral, and academic development of students (Santos & Toassa, 2015). However, the presence of these practitioners in Brazilian schools is still lacking (Guzzo, Mezzalira, & Moreira, 2012), with advocacy for more school psychologists practicing in schools emerging over the last twenty years (Guzzo Mezzalira, & Moreira, 2012). With this focus, scholars have published studies that focus on the education of school psychologists, their commitment with sociopolitical issues, and their role in promoting inclusion within schools with the purpose of reducing the segregation of individuals with disabilities from those in general education (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010).

Miscommunication among the various moving parts of a system exacerbates the obstacles faced in promoting continued educational equity through use of inclusive practices within Brazilian schools today. Brazilian researchers have highlighted social and economic disparities in access to education that have led to differences in academic achievement, social-emotional well-being, and social inequality throughout the country (Guzzo, Moreira, & Mezzalira, 2015). Despite changes in federal law and efforts toward including, research reveals contradictions (i.e., identified problems that give rise to transformation; a concept formally defined in the Definitions section of this dissertation) related to inclusion in Brazil have “profound roots,” reporting challenges with promoting inclusion in the context of an unequal and
excluding society, like Brazil (Cenci, Lemos, Vilas Bôas, Damiani, & Engeström, 2020, p. 13). Experts have indicated a need for new practices that promote inclusion in schools and support students from diverse backgrounds (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010; Guzzo, Moreira, & Mezzalira, 2015). Researchers have highlighted limitations in professional development, specialized intervention, and access to resources (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010; Capellini & Rodrigues, 2009; Sant’Ana, 2005). To date, research has focused on the challenges faced by school practitioners in the establishment of inclusive schools. Little attention has been given to strategies and procedures used to achieve this goal and overcome the barriers faced within the Brazilian context from a school systems perspective.

Brazilian scholarship supports the rationale of the present study, which aims to understand what systems are used to meet the needs of students in general and special education in equitable ways and what changes are recommended to further develop these systems. Based on (a) the challenges in providing access to equitable education to all Brazilian students, (b) the need for new systems designed to promote inclusion within schools, and (c) the lack of research that addresses inclusion and educational equity from a systems-level perspective, the following research questions guide this study:

Research Question 1: What systems are implemented in Brazilian schools to prevent the academic, social, emotional, and behavioral challenges that students may face?

1.1 What strategies and procedures do schools implement to promote inclusive education for students with and without disabilities?

1.2 What domains are addressed in the strategies and procedures used to promote inclusive education for students with and without disabilities (e.g., academic, social, emotional, and behavioral)?
Research Question 2: What do school practitioners recommend to further improve inclusive education systems that address the needs of students in both general and special education?

2.1 Which contradictions (i.e., identified problems that give rise to transformation) generate inequity in the provision of services to students in special education when compared to students in general education?
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The purpose of this study is to understand what systems are used in Brazilian schools to promote inclusion and meet the needs of students in general and special education in an equitable way. In this chapter, I review important definitions, the history of special education in Brazil, laws that impact students’ access to inclusive education in Brazil, and research that highlights current practices and obstacles present in the provision of inclusive education in Brazil.

Definitions

_Inclusion, equity, systems, and contradictions_ are terms used throughout this document to describe the subject and methodology of the present research project. While these terms may suggest straightforward definitions, they have been used to describe different ideas in the literature and in practice. To ensure an accurate understanding of what is described throughout this chapter, a definition of these terms and the relationship that exists between them is described.

_Inclusion_

There is no universally agreed upon definition for inclusion (Booth, 2005). As such, this construct has been defined, studied, and practiced in a variety of different ways (Booth, 2005; Ainscow, Booth, and Dyson, 2003; Artiles, 2006). In education, the differences present between definitions of inclusion are primarily determined by two choices. The first is if it is defined through use of a broad (i.e., a focus on all students) or narrow (i.e., a focus on groups of minoritized students or students with disabilities) approach (Artiles, 2006). The second is if it is conceptualized as a single practice or strategy (e.g., integration within general education classrooms) or a combination of strategies and values (e.g., practicing values of equity and implementing strategies for the identification of barriers, solutions, and sustainability practices
that make up an inclusive *system*; Ainscow, Booth, and Dyson, 2003). These differences in defining inclusion determine disparities in methodology and practice. There is, however, a common factor between definitions of inclusion, which is based on the effort to reduce barriers to participation in society. In education, this can be understood as an effort to reduce barriers to participation in learning. This similarity is rooted in social justice movements, which sought educational equity, first, through the physical integration of individuals with disabilities and different racial identities into mainstream education.

For the purpose of this project, the researcher will adopt Artiles’ (2006) definition of inclusive education, which is based on the work of Booth, Ainscow, Black-Hawkins, Vaughan, and Shaw (2000) as well as Kalambouka, Farrell, Dyson, & Kaplan (2005). This definition employs a broad understanding of inclusion that incorporates a combination of strategies and values and reduces barriers to participation in learning by focusing on promoting a culture of access, acceptance, participation, and achievement of students. The definition states: “Inclusive education is an ambitious and far-reaching notion that is, theoretically, concerned with *all* students. The concept focuses on the transformation of school cultures to (1) increase *access* (or presence) of all students (not only marginalized or vulnerable groups), (2) enhance the school personnel’s and students’ *acceptance* of all students, (3) maximize students’ *participation* in various domains of activity, and (4) increase the *achievement* of all students” (Artiles, 2006, p. 67).

**Equity**

Equity is commonly understood as fairness and justice in the treatment of others. To achieve equity, different types and amounts of resources must be devoted to individuals with different needs. In other words, “more resources may need to be devoted to those who do not
have access to them than to those who already do” (Hall, 2021). Equity is, therefore, not synonymous with equality, which means the same treatment for all. It is in many ways subjective and requires a comprehensive understanding of the context in which it is considered. Artiles (2006) assimilates equity with the reduction of barriers, introducing a connection between what is at the core of how inclusion is defined, and equity. For the purpose of this research project, equity is defined as fair treatment that reduces barriers (i.e., racial, cultural, social, socioeconomic, academic, physical, etc.) for all.

**Inclusion and Equity**

A relationship exists between the constructs of inclusion and equity. Inclusion, as it is defined in this project, explicitly employs an equity focus (i.e., reduce barriers; Artiles, 2006). Because the common factor between definitions of inclusion is based on the effort to reduce barriers to participation in society, in order to achieve or promote inclusion, we need to employ an equity focus. With this understanding, inclusion can be interpreted as the tool (i.e., a combination of strategies and values) used to achieve equity in education.

**Systems**

As determined above, by using a combination of strategies and values to define inclusion, we are practicing values of equity and implementing strategies for the identification of barriers, solutions, and sustainability practices that make up an inclusive system (Ainscow, Booth, and Dyson, 2003). For the purpose of this research project, system is defined as “a set of principles or procedures according to which something is done; an organized framework or method” (Oxford Languages, 2021).
Contradictions

Contradiction, as a philosophical concept, is rooted in cultural historical activity theory (CHAT). CHAT is an interdisciplinary approach to learning and development (Cole et al., 2010). It determines that human behavior is mediated through cultural tools and that people in a community are oriented towards a shared object (Cole et al., 2010). Activity, in CHAT, is defined as “only those processes which, by realizing a man’s [sic] relations with the world, meet a special need corresponding to it” (Leontiev, 2009, p. 363). Importantly, the need is the activity’s reason to exist. Though it is not always explicit, needs must be identified and studied in order for one to establish a complete understanding of an activity system (Cenci et al., 2020). An activity system is defined as a “relatively durable formation of people focused on shaping shared objects with particular instruments, rules, and division of labor” (Engeström, 2013, p. 242). Engeström (1987) introduced the activity system through the relationship between six elements (see Figure 1). Examples of activity systems can be institutions or organizations. For the purpose of this project, the researcher will study two activity systems: (a) the schools in which participants work and (b) the school district of which they are a part. In summary, CHAT interprets that human activity is oriented toward a shared object, (i.e., in this case inclusion), which may be shaped through activity systems to meet a specific need.

Figure 1

Structure of the Activity System (Adopted from Engeström, 1987)
The idea of transformations in activity systems is related to the contradictions faced by the people who are part of it (Cenci et al., 2020). As Artiles (2006, p. 83) points out, contradictions can be examined as “the impetus for change” in activity systems. It is first identified as a problem within an activity system which subsequently gives rise to transformations in the object. According to Engeström and Saninno (2010), when objects change, learning occurs. Contradictions, like needs, cannot be directly observed. Engeström and Sannino (2011), determine contradictions are historical, manifested through actions, and can be captured in discourse.

Given the complexities involved in defining and studying contradictions, Engeström and Sannino (2011) propose a systematic conceptual framework (described in the methods section of this manuscript) to examine contradiction. They characterize four ways in which contradictions are manifested through discourse: Dilemmas, conflicts, critical conflicts, and double binds.
Through research, Engeström and Sannino (2011) identified linguistic cues that suggest the presence of one of the four manifestations of contradictions. Table 1 includes the features and linguistic cues of each discursive manifestation of contradictions. Together, these cues indicate conflicts or problems within an activity system which may subsequently give rise to transformations in the object.

**Table 1**

*Discursive Manifestations of Contradictions (reprinted from Engeström & Sannino, 2011, p. 375)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manifestation</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Linguistic Cues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Double bind</td>
<td>Facing pressing and equally unacceptable alternatives in an activity system</td>
<td>“we,” “us,” “we must,” “we have to” pressuring rhetorical questions, expressions of helplessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution: practical transformation (going beyond words)</td>
<td>“let us do that,” “we will make it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical conflict</td>
<td>Facing contradictory motives in social interaction, feeling violated or guilty</td>
<td>Personal, emotional, moral accounts narrative structure, vivid metaphors “I now realize that [...]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution: finding new personal sense and negotiating a new meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Arguing, criticizing</td>
<td>“no,” “I disagree,” “this is not true”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution: finding a compromise, submitting to authority or majority</td>
<td>“yes,” “this I can accept”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma</td>
<td>Expression or exchange of incompatible evaluations</td>
<td>“on the one hand [...] on the other hand,” “yes, but,” “I didn’t mean that,” “I actually meant”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution: denial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engeström and Sannino’s (2011) analytic model is based on conversations that occur between individuals who are part of the same activity system. Data for the present study will be
collected through written and individual verbal survey responses. Therefore, data will be written or spoken representations of individual thoughts about inclusive education in distinct activity systems. Analysis of written and spoken information may reveal differences in how discursive manifestations of contradictions occur in text.

**History of Special Education in Brazil**

*Understanding Disability*

Disability is culturally bound (McDermott & Varrenne, 1995), as being disabled is relative to another who is defined within a culture to be able-bodied. Therefore, to study disability it is crucial to understand, acknowledge, and reflect on the historical context and culture in which it is constructed. The construction of disability in Brazil was influenced by cultural trends in North America and Europe (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010). Within the field of school psychology, North American, European, and Brazilian scholars have highlighted two theoretical perspectives used to understand disability (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010; Fagan & Wise, 2007; Gutkin, 2009; Gutkin, 2012). These perspectives include the medical model and the ecological model. While both approaches are highlighted in the literature, in practice, Brazil has adopted the medical model to the exclusion of alternative approaches to understand disability.

The medical model suggests that disability is a departure from healthy functioning that results solely from an individual’s biological make-up (Gutkin, 2009). It focuses on the diagnosis and treatment of putatively abnormal biological functioning, oftentimes overlooking environmental variables and comparing psychological problems to medical illnesses (Gutkin, 2009).
The medical model is contrasted with the ecological model, as the former attributes biological characteristics to human functioning, while the latter focuses on the interplay between biological characteristics and ecological stressors which impact human functioning. Rather than focusing on the individual as a solitary entity, the ecological model helps broaden the scope of practice by bringing attention to the bidirectional relationship that exists between the individual and their environment (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Gutkin, 2009; Lerner, Leonard, Fay, & Isaac, 2011). Consequently, the ecological model proposes that human development is influenced by the interplay between biological and environmental factors (Gutkin, 2009). The differences present in the interpretation of human development based on the medical and ecological models result in distinct approaches to psychological service delivery in educational settings (Gutkin, 2009).

The medical approach to treating disability was dominant in recent history and promoted solutions to problems faced by the population both in the United States and in Brazil; however, the diagnoses and medical provisions made possible by this model are based on reactionary practices rather than preventative ones. In other words, the medical model has been characterized to direct attention towards one individual at a time and to be a service delivery system that relies on “waiting passively for full-blown dysfunction to emerge before we become involved trying to provide assistance” (Gutkin, 2012, p. 4). Given evidence of the low reliability and validity of diagnoses and lack of treatment efficacy (Eder & Whinston, 2006; Kavale & Forness, 1999; Weisz, Doss, & Hawley, 2005; Weisz, McCarty, & Valery, 2006), if the goal is to reduce academic and psychological challenges from occurring and promote an inclusive society, relying on the ecological model is the recommended approach (Gutkin, 2012). As formulated by Gutkin (2009), due to the inclusion of environmental factors as well as biological factors in the
interpretation of human development, adopting the ecological model introduces the opportunity for a larger array of interventions, promotes agency in practitioners, and ultimately enforces a preventative orientation to support individual needs. For this reason and others, the ecological model was proposed as an alternative prevention-oriented model to address the challenges present in promoting inclusive psychological and academic service delivery in schools (Gutkin, 2009).

The medical and ecological models represent a foundation for understanding disability and are at the core of several other theories used in the fields of psychology and education. As previously mentioned, taking one perspective versus the other results in different practices, systems, and frameworks (Gutkin, 2009). The following provides a description of the historical application of these two models in Brazil.

**Historical Application of Medical and Ecological Models**

The emergence of special education in Brazil began in the 19th century and was marked by isolated initiatives to educate individuals with disabilities who lived in residential institutions and hospitals (Mendes, 2008). Influenced by North American and French practices, Brazilian psychologists implemented techniques and utilized psychometric tools to measure intellectual functioning and classify individuals within these institutions by level of cognitive ability (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010). The impact of intelligence testing on the field of psychology in Brazil led to heightened interest in understanding the challenges present in education and learning (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010). This resulted in the establishment of several psychology laboratories within schools, where researchers studied students with disabilities and academic challenges as well as teaching practices (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010).
Due to the emergence of the study of disabilities and teaching practices within the context of hospitals and residential institutions, the medical model had a strong influence on the conceptualization of disability in Brazil (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010). This clinical understanding of psychological and learning challenges led to a model of service delivery in which psychometric testing, diagnoses, and referrals for specialized services prevailed (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010).

The supports given to individuals with disabilities followed the medical model of service delivery until the 1950s in Brazil. However, these services were only provided to individuals in hospitals, residential institutions, or psychology laboratories stationed within schools. As a result, students with disabilities who were not present in these institutions were most often unattended to or excluded from Brazilian public schools. The lack of support for students with disabilities in public schools was a source of concern for many families. As a result, several private schools were established to support students with disabilities who had been excluded from public schools (Mendes, 2008).

In 1970, compulsory education was introduced in Brazil. Special education classrooms were established in public schools and integration was unintentionally established and practiced for the next thirty years (Mendes, 2008). The number of students demonstrating academic, medical, and psychological challenges in school increased, requiring the help of clinically trained psychologists in schools (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010). The medical model was at the core of these psychologists’ formulation as students’ challenges were attributed to their performance in psychometric tests and considered innate characteristics of the individual (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010).
While the medical model perspective was dominant in the treatment of individuals adjusting to a challenging environment, an ecological perspective that considers the relationship between the individual and their social context was also present (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010). This perspective was explored by Brazilian scholars such as Helena Antipoff, Manoel Bomfim, and Aníbal Teixeira, who began to investigate the influence of the environment on the individual in the 20th century (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010).

Notably, Antipoff held the belief that intelligence is a process that requires interactions between the environment and the individual, and is therefore not innate (Campos, 2012). This understanding contrasted sharply with that of other scholars of the time, who proposed a fixed and measurable intelligence (Benjamin, 2014; Guthrie, 2004). Antipoff, understood education as a means to develop and enhance intelligence. She described in The Mental Development of Belo Horizonte Children her understanding of what intelligence tests measured as “the mental abilities polished by the action of society and culture” which she defined as Civilized Intelligence (as cited in Campos, 2012, p. 59).

Antipoff’s first research project in Brazil was aimed at understanding the “kind of children to which Brazilian schools should be adapted,” an approach that put the cultural and social experiences of students at the core of their learning experience, a method that directed her work in the years to come (Campos, 2012, p. 58). In 1932, Antipoff established the Pestalozzi Society, the first of 150 Pestalozzi societies that would be established throughout the country from 1932 to 1970. This society has as its purpose serving exceptional children and their families through the provision of medical, psychological, and educational services (Instituto Pestalozzi do Brasil, 2018). Through this society, the Associação de Pais e Amigos dos Excepcionais (APAE)
was established in 1954 and became the largest association of parents and friends of exceptional children in the world (Associação de Pais e Amigos dos Excepcionais, 2018).

In response to these contrasting views, the approach to supporting students with disabilities in Brazilian schools varied. At times educators based their interpretation of students’ challenges on socioeconomic or contextual factors. At other times students’ challenges were attributed solely to innate individual characteristics determined by their performance on psychometric tests (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010). Given the influence of psychologists on the identification and classification of students with disabilities, the medical approach to service delivery often prevailed; however, the literature describes that this approach led to detriments in students’ developmental growth and reinforced a passive approach to service delivery (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010). These varied approaches used led to segregation between students with and without disabilities, which manifested both within schools, where integration existed, and between general education and special education schools, where integration did not exist (Glat, Pletsch, & Fontes, 2007; Mendes, 2008). As a result of the categorization and segregation encouraged by the medical model of service delivery through its attributions of psychopathology solely to the individual, the 1970’s and 80’s were marked by psychologists and other educators striving to find new and more effective practices to help students in schools (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010; Glat, Pletsch, & Fontes, 2007; Mendes, 2008).

**Laws that Guide Equitable and Inclusive Education**

The impact of theoretical models and culture on the approach to disability and the provision of supports to students with disabilities in Brazilian schools led to the implementation of different practices throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. These practices resulted from the enactment of laws that establish the rights of individuals with disabilities and delineate the
professional capacity of psychologists and educators in Brazil. They include the Brazilian Federal Constitution, the Child and Adolescent Statute (Lei Ordinária 8.069), the Declaration of Salamanca (MEC, n.d.), the Law of the Guidelines and Bases of Education (Lei Ordinária 9.394), the Plan of Goals Commitment All for Education (Lei Ordinária 6.094), Decree Nº 7.611 of 17.11.11, the National Education Plan (Lei Ordinária 13.005), and the Brazilian Law on the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities (Lei Ordinária 13.146). Although other laws have also impacted the historical trajectory of the practice of education and psychology as well as the rights of individuals with disabilities in Brazil, the ones detailed here guide the provision of inclusive education in Brazilian schools (see Appendix A for tabular presentation of laws).

**Brazilian Federal Constitution of 1988**

Article 208 of the Brazilian constitution of 1988 (the most recent constitution of the country) introduces obligatory free basic education to children ages 4 to 17. This article also affirms that the federal government is required to guarantee special education to individuals with disabilities, preferably within the general education classroom. Article 205 affirms that education is a right of every person and guarantees the development of the individual, their ability to exercise their citizenship, and their ability to qualify for jobs. Article 206 affirms that every person has the right to equal access to school and time to remain in school.

**Child and Adolescent Statute of 1990**

The Child and Adolescent Statute guarantees specialized educational assistance to children with disabilities, preferably in the general education classroom (Lei Ordinária 8.069). It also guarantees protection to families of children with disabilities and the right to priority in assistance through preventative public policies (e.g., health care, education, public housing).
**Declaration of Salamanca**

The Declaration of Salamanca is a document developed in 1994 at a conference promoted by the Spanish government in partnership with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 1994). This document has significantly impacted the promotion of inclusive education in Brazil and around the world (Mendes, 2008; Santos, 2000). In Brazil, the Declaration of Salamanca introduced the possibility to unite the special education system and the general education system by endorsing “schools for all,” which include all people, accept differences, support learning, and respond to individual needs (UNESCO, 1994; Santos, 2000).

**Law of the Guidelines and Bases of Education of 1996**

The Law of the Guidelines and Bases of Education affirms that, whenever necessary, specialized services in the general education classroom will be provided to students eligible for special education (Lei Ordinária 9.394). Whenever it is not possible to provide such services in the general education classroom, this law determines that the educational services will be given in other self-contained classrooms or different schools. Additionally, this law addresses the education of teachers and the development of curriculum, methods, techniques, and resources to assist children with disabilities.

**Plan of Goals Commitment All for Education of 2007**

The Plan of Goals Commitment All for Education calls for the implementation of programs and actions that promote technical and financial assistance to improve the quality of primary education in Brazil. It outlines educational commitments, measures to assess adhesion to commitments, measures to assess quality of primary education, and sources of technical and financial assistance from the federal government. Importantly, this law guarantees access to
special education services within the general education classroom and the permanence of students with disabilities within general education classrooms, supporting the inclusion of students with disabilities in Brazilian public schools (Lei Ordinária 6.094).

**Decree Nº 7.611 of 2011**

The Decree Nº 7.611 impedes the exclusion of individuals with disabilities from the general education classroom for allegations against their disability and determines that the educational system should be inclusive in all levels of instruction and that education should occur throughout the life span. Additionally, it determines that primary education be free and compulsory; that education assures reasonable adaptations in accordance with individuals’ unique needs; that this be done in the least restrictive environment to maximize academic and social development; and that the provision of special education be introduced, preferably, in the general education classroom.

**National Education Plan of 2014**

The National Education Plan law determines as a goal that all children with disabilities between the ages of 4 and 17 receive universal access to basic education and specialized education services within the general education classroom (Lei Ordinária 13.005). It is also established that this universal access be provided within an inclusive educational system, with specialized classrooms, multifunctional resource classrooms, schools, and services.

**Brazilian Law on the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities of 2015**

The Brazilian Law on the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities was enacted in 2015 to promote and establish the fundamental rights and liberties of individuals with disabilities with the goal of enforcing their social inclusion and citizenship (Lei Ordinária 13.146). Chapter four of this law is pertinent to education. It states that it is the duty of the federal government, the
family, and the community to promote access to quality education to individuals with disabilities. Further, the law establishes that it is the duty of the federal government to ensure, create, develop, implement, and evaluate an educational system that is inclusive at all levels and modalities. Importantly, the law highlights the importance of research in the development of new pedagogical methods and techniques; the need for inclusive pedagogical practices; the need for unique practices that maximize the social and academic development of students with disabilities while favoring their access to, and permanence and participation in school; and the need for improvement in the educational systems through the elimination of barriers and promotion of inclusion.

The Brazilian laws presented specify goals and responsibilities to ensure the rights of students with and without disabilities; however, these laws lack specificity on how to reach these goals or implement these responsibilities to ensure equitable education for all students throughout the country. For example, the Brazilian Law on the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities (Lei Ordinária 13.146) highlights individuals responsible for the provision of these rights but does not specify how schools can show they are in fact promoting inclusive education. This nuance is crucial within the Brazilian context due to the extreme social, economic, and educational disparities that exist between children and families of different backgrounds throughout the country (Guzzo, Moreira & Mezzalira, 2015). In not specifying how schools can show their provision of the fundamental rights and liberties of individuals with disabilities and of equitable education for all, these laws do not prevent the cycle of social and economic exclusion that exists in Brazil today. As a result, many schools fall short of implementing the services and supports determined by these laws.
Current State of the Field

Current Practices

The laws described in the previous section resulted in important changes in the provision of education to students with and without disabilities in Brazil. Since the 1990s, inclusive education has taken precedence as an equitable education policy around the world and in Brazil (Glat, Pletsch, & Fontes, 2007). Brazilian scholars indicate that the shift towards inclusive education in Brazil may be considered a step towards a new education culture, in which education is now accessible to all students and where educators must understand and adapt to students’ needs (Glat, Pletsch, & Fontes, 2007; UNESCO, 1994). However, in order to fully adopt the culture that inclusive education promotes, schools must re-design the structure, organization, curriculum, and methods of evaluation currently adopted within Brazilian schools (Glat, Pletsch, & Fontes, 2007).

Different strategies have been implemented throughout the country in response to the move towards inclusive education. To my knowledge, although different strategies have been implemented through research projects in individual schools (see Cenci et al., 2020 and Mendes, 2008 for examples), only one of these strategies has been implemented nationally—the implementation of multifunctional resource classrooms in regular education schools.

Multifunctional Resource Classrooms Program. Multifunctional Resource Classrooms (MRC) were first implemented in Brazilian schools in 2005 (Rebelo & Kassar, 2018). The purpose of these classrooms is to provide a space within general education schools where students with disabilities can receive additional instruction and supports. To promote this program and provide incentive for its implementation in schools, the Brazilian government requires that students with disabilities be enrolled twice within the public education system (i.e.,
once within the general education classroom and again within the special education classroom). This double enrollment directs additional financial resources to schools that enroll students in special education (Rebelo & Kassar, 2018).

Schools must be given permission to establish MRCs (Ministério da Educação Secretatira de Educação Especial, 2010). Once schools have received permission to establish an MRC, they must update student enrollment information every year through the census. This information is used by the government to determine what resources each MRC needs (Ministério da Educação SEEDF Especial, 2010).

MRCs are described to be the responsibility of special education teachers, who must have formal education in the field of special education and must provide support to students with disabilities to complement the education they receive in the general education classroom (Ministério da Educação Secretatira de Especial, 2010). Census data indicates that from 2007 to 2016 the enrollment of students with disabilities in general education classrooms increased and their enrollment in special education classrooms and schools decreased (Rebelo & Kassar, 2018). Rebelo and Kassar (2018) note that no information was collected regarding the qualitative nature of this shift; therefore, we cannot determine how or why the enrollment of students shifted. Importantly, Rebelo and Kassar (2018) report a difference between the number of schools that have been given permission to establish MRCs and those that have, in fact, implemented MRCs. Between 2009 and 2016, Rebelo and Kassar (2018) indicate that the percentage of MRCs that are not in use has fluctuated between 53.26% to 79.17%. This reveals that though several schools have been given permission and resources to establish MRCs a majority of these classrooms are not being used.
Obstacles present in Provision of Inclusive Education

Brazilian researchers have highlighted several obstacles present in the establishment of equitable and inclusive education within the general education setting. Research in the field of special education has revealed the nature of these obstacles over the past decades. Some of these obstacles include disparities in students’ ability to physically access education (Guzzo, Moreira, & Mezzalira, 2015), cultural and historical barriers that have been identified in educators’ discourse in their effort to promote inclusion in schools (Cenci et al., 2020), lack of professional development for teachers and educators (Sant’Ana, 2005), as well as need for additional resources to support individual students’ needs (Capellini & Rodrigues, 2009).

Disparities in Access to Education. Characterized as one of the countries with largest income disparities in the world, social and economic inequality in Brazil has greatly impacted individuals’ access to basic public services like education and health care (Guzzo, Moreira, & Mezzalira, 2015). In 2018, 33.1% of Brazilians 25 years or older had not completed middle school and 26.9% had not completed high school (IBGE, 2018). Challenges in accessing education have been attributed to vast economic and social differences that exist in the country. Researchers have stated that the public education system has reinforced the social divide that exists between students and is therefore part of the cycle of inequality in Brazil (Guzzo, Moreira, & Mezzalira, 2015). Despite requiring all children to attend school through high school, physical, economic, and social challenges continue to prevent individuals’ participation in the public and private education system. This continuous challenge results in lowered social and educational mobility between generations (Guzzo, Moreira, & Mezzalira, 2015).

Cultural and Historical Barriers. In addition to the social and economic disparities present, there are historical and cultural factors that create additional obstacles in the movement
towards inclusive education in Brazil. In their research study, Cenci et al. (2020) reveal the experience of Brazilian teachers in one Brazilian school who were responsible for the implementation and maintenance of MRCs and for supporting students with disabilities within the general education classroom. Through the implementation of an intervention meant to promote action towards inclusive practices through conjoint problem-solving, Cenci et al. (2020) studied the nature of teachers’ discourse. They found that teachers’ description of students’ ability to learn was attributed to individual characteristics. Importantly, Cenci et al. (2020) described that learning is perceived by teachers as something that is not associated with teaching. Cenci et al. (2020) specifically state:

The emphasis on the capacity and the amount of effort individual students demonstrate illustrates a concept of learning and development as the result of individuals’ biological development, or as a direct result of their IQ. Although the importance of the biological substrate for human development cannot be denied, and it is well known that mental dysfunctions rarely disappear, it should be taken into account that the development of the individual is not only determined by biology, but it is also highly influenced by the way they interact with the environment (physical, social and cultural) and the possibilities offered to them, which may aggravate an individual’s ability or help them to find a way to overcome their restrictions (Cenci et al., 2020, p. 5).

This conclusion alludes to the different lenses through which disability has been historically viewed. Cenci et al.’s (2020) analysis of teachers’ discourse reveals the use of the medical perspective of service delivery. This view reinforces the belief that the obstacles faced by individuals with disabilities are solely attributed to their innate characteristics and cannot be
mitigated by changes in the environment. In turn, as Cenci et al. (2020) describes, this perspective limits teachers’ agency towards teaching and supporting students with disabilities.

Importantly, the discourse detailed in Cenci et al. (2020) is not limited to the teachers who participated in this study nor the school in which it took place. Cenci et al. (2020) reports that the contradictions and challenges, described by the teachers who participated in this study, with moving towards inclusive practices in this school are present due to cultural and historical factors that have “profound roots” (p. 13). They indicate that the contradictions present in their study can also be perceived within other facets of the Brazilian education system.

**Lack of Professional Development.** The contradictions present in educators’ discourse, as described by Cenci et al. (2020), are indicative of several obstacles that educators face in their daily practice. These obstacles are rooted in Brazilian culture, history, and public policy which influence how practitioners understand inclusion and interpret their role in promoting inclusion. Sant’Ana (2005) describes the challenges that Brazilian educators face in trying to promote inclusion within their schools. They describe a variety of challenges including prejudice, lack of infra-structure, lack of family support, individual student challenges, number of students that require supports, teaching methods, lack of experience, available personnel, lack of professional development, and specialized supports. Of these challenges, the two most endorsed by teachers and school directors were lack of professional development and specialized supports (Sant’Ana, 2005). Sant’Ana indicates that, even teachers who had participated in professional development opportunities regarding inclusion and supporting student with disabilities, affirmed that what is being done to promote inclusion within Brazilian schools is not sufficient.

Similarly, Capellini and Rodrigues (2009) indicate that teachers report other teachers as the second most significant obstacles in promoting inclusion within Brazilian schools. When
asked why, approximately 70% of teachers reported that there is a deficit in continuing education and little exposure to inclusion in their education.

Importantly, these obstacles are also described as resulting from systemic barriers that exist within the Brazilian education system (Sant’Ana, 2005). While laws require that schools promote inclusion, they do not provide a context in which these requirements can come to fruition. Sant’Ana (2005) and Cenci et al. (2020) indicate that the obstacles faced by teachers and the challenges in teaching are present both within the context of inclusion and within the general education environment.

**Lack of Resources.** In addition to the challenges faced in providing professional development about inclusion, researchers have reported concerns with the resources available to promote inclusion in schools (Capellini & Rodrigues, 2009). Capellini and Rodrigues (2009) revealed that the obstacle most often endorsed by educators in the implementation of inclusion in Brazilian schools is the number of students in each classroom, followed by the lack of technical assistance from educators with specializations, and adequate materials.

Importantly, Capellini and Rodrigues (2009) highlight the difference in results obtained in their studies as compared to those in the past. They indicate that, different from previous research about inclusion, this study revealed a different approach in educators’ discourse about obstacles in the implementation of inclusion in schools. While past research focused on the challenges that individual student characteristics posed for inclusion, this study revealed a shift in these perceptions, reporting more reference to environmental obstacles than intrinsic obstacles (Capellini & Rodrigues, 2009).

The different arguments made about the obstacles of inclusive education in Brazil depict the two approaches to service delivery mentioned previously. Though still highlighting the
challenges that educators face in implementing inclusion, the results described by Capellini and Rodrigues (2009) indicate a slight shift in point of view. Rather than taking the medical approach to understanding disability, educators are adopting the environmental approach.

**International Examples of Inclusion**

Theoretical, cultural, historical, and practical barriers exist in the implementation of inclusive education in Brazil. The obstacles experienced by educators to achieve inclusion in schools have led to the perception that inclusion is a fallacy in Brazil (Cenci et al., 2020, p. 4). According to the literature, the vision that legislators, educators, families, and children have for inclusion remains utopian compared to their ability to fully implement this objective (Guzzo, Mezzalira, & Moreira, 2012). However, national and international laws still maintain the precedence of inclusive education and require its implementation in public and private schools throughout the country.

The majority of research about inclusion in Brazil focuses on the challenges present in implementing inclusion in schools. To my knowledge, Brazilian researchers have not explored the strategies developed and used by educators in Brazilian schools in order to promote inclusion despite the obstacles faced in implementing it. Importantly, scholars continue to highlight the inequities that exist in the Brazilian education system, which reinforce the cycle of inequity that has kept many children and families from achieving to their highest potential and overcoming the socioeconomical barriers present (Guzzo, Moreira, & Mezzalira, 2015).

**Strategies Implemented Internationally**

Although education research in Brazil has focused on the barriers rather than the efforts made by educators to implement inclusion in schools, other countries have documented and studied strategies, systems, and established specific roles that support the implementation of
inclusion. Inspired by the Declaration of Salamanca (MEC, n.d.), UNESCO (1994) has encouraged international collaborations between countries that have established practices for inclusive education and those that have not. This collaboration is important for the advance of educational practices and should be done with caution to not overstep cultural boundaries.

One example is found in the United States, where a preventative education system called Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) replaced the traditional model of education to promote a system of continuous support to students with and without disabilities. Examples like these help inform the different ways that inclusive education can be systematically implemented; however, this example is not meant to indicate that the model developed in one country is well suited for other countries. As alluded to throughout this text, developing and implementing such tools is highly contingent upon the culture and history in which these are used. To situate the experience of inclusion in an international context and learn from what has been implemented elsewhere, we explore the systems that promote inclusion in the United States.

**Inclusive Strategies in the United States.** Special education laws in the United States have explicitly recommended the need for educational models that promote early identification and intervention, employ progress monitoring, and utilize data-based decision-making to assess student progress (Eagle, Dowd-Eagle, Snyder, & Holtzman, 2015; Every Student Succeeds Act, 2015; IDEA, 2004). Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) is a model that promotes these practices in a systematic format within the school. Specifically, it has been characterized as an integral model that accounts for the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of students (Eagle, Dowd-Eagle, Snyder, & Holtzman, 2015). MTSS incorporates adaptive interventions and assumes students require varying needs of assistance (Collins, Murphy, & Bierman, 2004). As such, it promotes data-based decision-making through universal screening of all students,
implementation of evidence-based interventions at multiple tiers, and progress monitoring of all students to inform decisions at each tier (Eagle, Dowd-Eagle, Snyder, & Holtzman, 2015).

Given the integral nature of MTSS, various submodels that incorporate its core structure have emerged, each with specific foci. The most prominent of these submodels include Response to Intervention (RtI), which focuses on the academic development and performance of students, and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), which focuses on the social-emotional and behavioral development and performance of students.

MTSS systems have played an integral role in promoting inclusion in the United States (McLeskey, Waldron, Spooner, & Algozzine, 2014). As described by Cusumano, Algozzine, and Algozzine (2014), MTSS is a model of inclusive academic and social-emotional service delivery which promotes educational practices that apply to all students and all educators. As such, it organizes decision-making processes in schools to ensure all students have access to equitable supports. Importantly, Cusumano et al. state that MTSS can be an effective and efficient process if driven by a systematic problem-solving process.

Most recently, research has been conducted on the cultural responsiveness of MTSS, specifically PBIS. Research indicates racial disparities exist in the implementation of PBIS across schools and states in the United States. To support system change and improvement toward more equitable schools, Bal (2018) proposes implementation of Learning Labs to support the development and, most recently, the implementation of culturally responsive schools systems.

**Summary**

Brazilian researchers have clearly determined the obstacles faced by educators in the effort of promoting inclusive schools. The various components that affect the comprehensive
implementation of inclusive practices are cultural and historical barriers, lack of professional
development and support from practitioners with specialized degrees, and lack of necessary
resources available to schools. The relationship between these obstacles and how they are–or are
not– present in schools depicts the complex nature of implementing inclusive schooling in
Brazil. As the Brazilian education system evolves into this new culture of education practice, the
attention given to the obstacles faced by educators is important, as it helps determine how to
adapt these practices to the reality of the Brazilian education system; however, it is also crucial
to understand the positive aspects of these changes to the Brazilian education system and what
strategies have helped schools promote inclusion despite the obstacles present.

Until now, the research conducted on inclusive schooling has highlighted the idea of
inclusion as utopian (Guzzo, Mezzalira, & Moreira, 2012) and a fallacy (Cenci et al., 2020) in
Brazil. The Brazilian education system as a whole has been described as one that is reinforcing
the cycle of inequality in Brazil (Guzzo, Moreira, & Mezzalira, 2015). Experts have indicated a
need for new practices that promote inclusion in schools (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010;
Glat, Pletsch, & Fontes, 2007; Guzzo, Moreira, & Mezzalira, 2015; Mendes, 2008).

In an effort to change this rhetoric of the Brazilian education system and reinforce the
positive aspects of inclusion, equity, and education, in the present study, I propose a positive and
constructive interaction with Brazilian educators to understand what strategies they have found
helpful or effective in the move toward inclusive education. As such, I investigated the strategies
educators have implemented to systematically promote inclusion in schools, as well as ways they
have or recommend overcoming barriers faced. The objective of this study was to provide
Brazilian educators with strategies, tools, and systems of inclusion that have been implemented
in different schools and proven effective in different ways. These goals determine the following research questions, which guided this study:

1. What systems are implemented in Brazilian schools to prevent the academic, social, emotional, and behavioral challenges that students may face?
   a. What strategies and procedures do schools implement to promote inclusive education for students with and without disabilities?
   b. What domains are addressed in the strategies and procedures used to promote inclusive education for students with and without disabilities (e.g., academic, social, emotional, and behavioral)?

2. What do school practitioners recommend to further improve inclusive education systems that address the needs of students in both general and special education?
   a. Which contradictions generate inequity in the provision of services to students in special education when compared to students in general education?
Chapter 3: Methods

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methods used in this research study. First, this chapter provides information about the setting and participants, as well as the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study. Next, it describes the research design and required measures for the study. Finally, it reviews the data analysis procedures that were used to address each research question.

Research Design

The researcher used a convergent parallel mixed-methods research design, which comprised of two cross-sectional surveys, to examine what strategies and systems are currently implemented to promote inclusion in Brazilian schools and what school practitioners recommend to develop inclusive systems that address the needs of all students. The researcher administered one survey to collect quantitative data to identify trends in the use of strategies that promote inclusion in schools, and another survey to collect qualitative data to explore personal perspectives on implementing inclusive strategies in schools. Qualitative and quantitative survey questions were matched, reflecting the intent to have consistent themes and constructs between data sets (Creswell, 2014; Moseholm & Fetters, 2017). The combination of both quantitative and qualitative data collected via a survey provided a broad understanding of how educators are promoting inclusion in Brazilian schools.

Setting

This study focused on the experience of school administrators, teachers, and support staff who work in public schools in the Distrito Federal, Brazil. The Distrito Federal’s department of education is called the Secretaria de Estado de Educação do Distrito Federal (SEEDF), which supports all public schools in the Distrito Federal. The SEEDF contains 14 school districts,
referred to as *Coordenação Regional de Ensino* (CRE). Each school district is responsible for a different number of schools, ranging from about 30 to 110 across school districts; however, all school districts provide education to students ages 0-17. There are four phases within the Brazilian education system that encompass primary and secondary education. A table with a description of each phase including age ranges, grades-levels, and types of schools that include this phase can be found in Table 2. The proposed research study collected information from teachers, administrators, and student support staff members who work in public schools across 10 of the 14 school districts supported by the SEEDF.

**Table 2**

*Four Phases Within the Brazilian Education System*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Phase</th>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Types of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Ensino Infantil*       | 0-5          | Pre-Kindergarten Kindergarten | • Centro de Ensino Infantil  
• Jardim de Infância  
• Centro de Educação de Primeira Infância  
• Centro de Atenção Integral à Criança |
| *Ensino Fundamental*    | 6-10         | 1<sup>st</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> grade | • Centro de Ensino Fundamental  
• Centro de Atenção Integral à Criança  
• Escola Classe  
• Escola Parque |
| *Ensino Fundamental*    | 11-14        | 6<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> grade | • Centro de Ensino Fundamental  
• Centro Educacional |
| *Ensino Médio*          | 15-17        | 10<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> grade | • Centro Educacional  
• Centro de Ensino Médio |

In 2019, of approximately 400,000 students, 15,540 students in the SEEDF public schools were identified with one or more disabilities (SEEDF, 2019). Of these students, 10,597 were in the general education classroom, 2,467 were in the special education classrooms, and
2,476 were in special education schools. At that time, there were 595 multifunctional resource rooms and 626 special education classrooms across all SEEDF public schools.

**Participants**

Participants for this study include teachers, administrators, or student support staff who can speak to the efforts made to promote inclusion within their school. Examples of practitioners represented within each of the three roles are described in Table 3.

### Table 3

**Practitioners Included in Each Role**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Student Support Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Elementary School Teacher</td>
<td>• Principal</td>
<td>• School Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Middle School Teacher</td>
<td>• Vice Principal</td>
<td>• School Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High School Teacher</td>
<td>• Executive Director</td>
<td>• School Social Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General Education Teacher</td>
<td>• Area Coordinator</td>
<td>• Individual Support Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Special Education Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To understand the use of inclusive education strategies and systems, it was important that participants were able to reflect on strategies implemented prior to and during the COVID-19 pandemic. For this reason, the researcher sought to interview individuals with more than 2 years of experience in their current position. Due to high turnover rates in schools, the participant group was expanded to those who identified being able to reflect on inclusive practices, though did not meet the experience requirement originally established. Participating schools were asked to give priority to persons who have been involved in education before and after legal mandates of inclusion were imposed in 2015.

Given the focus of the proposed research project to examine the use of strategies that promote inclusion within the general education classrooms, public special education schools
were excluded from participating in the study. All public schools in the Distrito Federal that teach subjects included in the Brazilian federal common curriculum, were included in the sampling procedure and had a chance to participate in this study. Table 4 outlines inclusion and exclusion criteria.

**Table 4**

*Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Public schools that teach subjects included in the Brazilian federal common curriculum.</td>
<td>• Private schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Indicates ability to reflect on the efforts made to promote inclusion within their school.</td>
<td>• Public Special Education Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Indicates inability to reflect on the efforts made to promote inclusion within their school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were recruited from 10 of the 14 school districts in the Distrito Federal. The number of recruited participants was 77. Demographic information was gathered and disaggregated. Demographic information obtained included age, gender, school name, school district, time working at this school, professional role in school, time in current role, university major, graduation year, highest degree obtained, and list of professional licenses acquired. Table 5 presents the demographic information for participants. Of note, there were 6 faulty audio files, for which the data collection team recorded notes identifying participant responses. In 2 schools, data was only obtained from one administrator and one member of the student support staff.

**Table 5**

Participant Demographic Information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Staff</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Working in Current School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 2 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2 and 5 years</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5 and 10 years</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Working in Profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2 and 5 years</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5 and 10 years</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sampling Procedure**

A stratified random sampling procedure was used to select schools that were contacted. The researcher drew elements for the sample on a proportional basis to ensure the sample is representative of schools in the federal district. Stratified random sampling allowed for regional differences between school districts to be accounted for. An outline of the sampling plan and outcome is depicted in Table 6. Due to high crime rates and concerns regarding the safety of the data collection team, schools from Brazlândia, Ceilândia, Núcleo Bandeirante, and Santa Maria were not recruited.

**Table 6**

*Outline of Sampling Procedure and Recruitment*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Percentage of Schools in District</th>
<th>Number of schools to be recruited</th>
<th>Number recruited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazlândia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceilândia</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4 to 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gama</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guará</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Núcleo Bandeirante</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoá</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planaltina</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plano Piloto</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4 to 5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recanto das Emas</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samambaia</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Sebastião</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobradinho</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taguatinga</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Team**

The research team was comprised of one school psychology doctoral student and four undergraduate students studying psychology in Brasília, DF, Brazil. All individuals in the research team identify as women, Brazilian, and were born and raised in different cities within the Distrito Federal, Brazil. The graduate student also identifies as American and lived on the East Coast of the United States between the ages of 9 to 12 years old and 19 to 20. The graduate student currently lives in the Midwestern United States and the undergraduate students live in the Distrito Federal, Brazil. All research team members are fluent in Brazilian Portuguese. The graduate student is also fluent in English. The four undergraduate students cannot speak fluent English but can read in English. The graduate student and three of the undergraduate students identify as Caucasian. One undergraduate student identifies as Mixed Race. Research team members are identified being part of middle and high social economic class. All research team members attended private schools for Elementary, Middle, and High School.
The graduate student created all materials used for data collection, and the undergraduate students were responsible for recruiting participants, obtaining consent, and conducting quantitative and qualitative interviews for data collection. One of the four undergraduate students also took part in data analysis with the graduate student. The graduate student and one undergraduate student comprised the data analysis team. The graduate student designed training sessions in content analysis prior to data analysis and continued to support the undergraduate student’s learning as they became more familiar with the data and coding procedures. Training included an overview of the project, information about the matching methodology used to structure the study, and instruction about discursive manifestations of contradictions.

**Procedures**

**Recruitment**

The researcher recruited participants for this study via the SEEDF. The consent process occurred in four phases. In the first phase, the researcher obtained permission from the University of Wisconsin and the Universidade Católica de Brasília’s IRB to conduct the study (See Appendix B and C). In the second phase, the researcher secured consent to contact schools from the SEEDF (See Appendix D). In the third phase, the research team contacted schools selected via the sampling procedure and asked them to nominate practitioners to complete the survey in-person. In the fourth phase, the research team secured consent from the nominated practitioners in-person prior to having them start the online survey. 

**School Recruitment.** The research team contacted public Elementary, Middle, and High Schools within 10 of Brasilia’s 14 school districts selected via the sampling procedure. Contact was made via email, phone, and in-person. Schools were contacted three times before the researchers contacted the next school on the list. The information shared with school
representatives contained information about the research project and included the school survey (See Appendix E) through which schools nominated one teacher, administrator, and student support staff member who could speak to the efforts made to promote inclusion within the school to be invited to participate in the survey. The consent form and school survey were completed online through the UW-Madison Qualtrics Survey hosting service, or in paper due to technical difficulties, with the support of a research assistant who guided the completion of the survey in-person. Of note, the majority of school representatives chose not to share demographic information regarding their school (i.e., race/ethnicity and percentage of students in general and special education).

**Participant Recruitment.** The research team met with the participants nominated by each school in-person. The participants received information about the research project, the purpose of the survey, and the researchers’ and Universities’ institutional review board (IRB) contact information in Brazil and the United States in case any questions or concerns arose. The research team member asked the participant to complete the participant consent form (see Appendix F) and, if given consent, the participant survey (see Appendix G). The participant consent form and participant survey were completed through the UW-Madison Qualtrics Survey hosting service or on paper, due to technical difficulties. Participants were able to save their progress on the survey to ensure they had ample time to complete it. Table 7 depicts the recruitment process.

**Table 7**

*Recruitment Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Application/Recruitment Method</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Review Board</th>
<th>Formal Application</th>
<th>Research proposal</th>
<th>Obtained consent from SEEDF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education (SEEDF)</td>
<td>Formal Application</td>
<td>Research information</td>
<td>Met with school representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Email, phone, in-person</td>
<td>Research information</td>
<td>Met with and obtained consent from participants nominated by schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>Research information</td>
<td>Transcribed and analyzed data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary survey:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nomination of participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consent form for participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Demographics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Quantitative questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Qualitative questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures**

**Survey**

To solicit which strategies and systems are implemented in Brazilian schools to promote inclusion, a participant survey (see Appendix G for example) was administered to each participant who was nominated. The survey included Likert-scale and open-ended questions regarding inclusive strategies and systems implemented as well as barriers faced in their implementation. Closed-ended questions supported the description of objective experiences that are consistent across schools and educators, for example, the question “People use strategies that promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school” with five answer options ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Open-ended questions helped gather a rich description of these common experiences, for example, the question “What
strategies, procedures, or systems do people use to promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in your school?” Additionally, to highlight potential contradictions, participants were given the opportunity to share their reasoning behind choosing different Likert-type answers by answering the following prompt, “Please explain why you indicated (answer) for this question.”

According to Creswell (2014), a convergent parallel mixed-method approach should measure the same constructs using quantitative and qualitative measures. This technique is often referred to as matching, which reflects the intent to design “data collection instruments that have related items such that both instruments will elucidate data about the same phenomena/variables. Concretely, this involves matching qualitative questions with scales of quantitative instruments” (Moseholm & Fetters, 2017, p. 3). Themes used in developing quantitative and qualitative survey questions include (1) strategies and systems implemented to promote inclusion; (2) resources available to promote inclusion; (3) data use to promote inclusion; (4) awareness of inclusion by school practitioners; (5) challenges faced in promoting inclusion; (6) actions taken to overcome challenges in promoting inclusion; and (7) domains of activities addressed in current efforts toward inclusion.

The goal of this approach is to understand whether there is convergence or divergence between the two sources of information. They mention, “the key assumption of this approach is that both qualitative and quantitative data provide different types of information–often detailed views of participants qualitatively and scores on instruments quantitatively–and together they yield results that should be the same” (p.219). Converging qualitative and quantitative data instills confidence in the results associated with the experience of promoting inclusion in public schools in the Distrito Federal.
Data Analysis

In accordance with Moseholm and Fetters’ (2017) conceptual model to guide data merging during analysis in convergent mixed methods studies, the researcher analyzed data merging in three dimensions: relational, methodological, and directional. In the relational dimension, the researcher adopted a separative approach, meaning they conducted independent analyses of quantitative and qualitative data until the final merging of the two strands. In the methodological dimension, the researcher adopted an equivalently driven approach, meaning they will equally consider both strands of data to produce a “superior whole” (Moseholm & Fetters, 2017, p. 5), taking a pragmatic stance, as described in Creswell (2014). Lastly, in the directional dimension, the researcher adopted the simultaneous bidirectional approach, meaning they used both quantitative and qualitative results to frame the merging of data. See Figure 2 for a visual representation of the data analysis procedure.

Figure 2

Convergent Parallel Mixed Methods Design (adapted from Creswell (2014))

As such, data analysis was completed in three phases. During phase one, the researcher used descriptive statistics to analyze quantitative data gathered from the closed-ended questions
Phase one

The first phase focused on quantitative data analysis gathered in this research study. Descriptive statistics was used to reflect data distribution, including frequencies, modes, and ranges to indicate the variability in answers. This provided a quantitative summary of the survey results. Inferential statistics were used to understand if there are differences in how each of the three participant groups respond to the survey, as well as differences in how participants who work at each educational phase respond to the survey. The researcher achieved this by conducting a Hierarchical Linear Model as well as a 1-way ANOVA. Reasoning for use of both analyses is described in the results section.

Phase two

The second phase focused on qualitative data analysis. The researcher used content analysis to study the qualitative data gathered through the survey. The researcher examined the categories and themes described by participants within each survey and across surveys. Given the participation of teachers, administrators, and student support staff who work across four different educational phases, content analysis was also helpful in examining similarities and differences that emerge between and within the three groups of educators, as well as between and within the four educational phases.

To address the first research question, the team specifically reviewed the data for strategies, procedures, and systems used to promote inclusion as well as what areas these address (e.g., academic, social, emotional, or behavioral). To answer the second research question, the
team specifically reviewed the data using the systematized platform for analyzing discursive phenomena developed by Engeström and Sannino (2011) to identify contradictions that are related to implementing strategies that promote inclusion in schools. This system for analysis of qualitative information focuses on observations of linguistic elements that may indicate the presence of discursive manifestations of contradictions, as defined previously, which include words like no and but as well as metaphors and rhetorical questions (See Figure 3). Given the fact that this analysis is typically done with data collected in a group conversation format, analyzing written answers or individual verbal responses may not reveal the same results.

According to Engeström and Sannino (2011, p. 242), Dilemma “is an expression or exchange of incompatible evaluations, either between people or within the discourse of a single person.” Being the most simple and only type of discursive manifestations described in the literature to occur either between people or within the discourse of a single person, it is expected that Dilemmas will emerge as the most frequently occurring discursive manifestation of contradiction in this project.

**Figure 3**

*Methodological Onion for Analyzing Contradictions in Discourse Data (reprinted from Engeström & Sannino, 2011, p. 375)*
The first step in analyzing qualitative data will be to review the data. To ensure reliability in the coding procedures, the researcher hired one undergraduate student to help review and code the data. The researcher and undergraduate student constitute the data analysis team. Each member of the data analysis team reviewed the qualitative data independently for content. To answer the first question, the data analysis team read the data and identified all mentions of strategies, procedures, and systems used to promote inclusion as well as what areas these address (e.g., academic, social, emotional, or behavioral). To answer the second question, the data
analysis team read the data and identified quotes that represented a discursive manifestation of contradictions, outlined in Table 1 and Figure 3.

Based on this first review of the data, each member proposed a coding structure and ideas for themes. To answer the first question, the data analysis team used the themes used to construct the survey and match the quantitative and qualitative data as a guide. The themes include (1) strategies and systems implemented to promote inclusion; (2) resources available to promote inclusion; (3) data use to promote inclusion; (4) awareness of inclusion by school practitioners; (5) challenges faced in promoting inclusion; (6) actions taken to overcome challenges in promoting inclusion; and (7) domains of activities addressed in current efforts toward inclusion. To answer the second question, the data analysis team coded manifestations of contradictions, using the Engeström and Sannino’s (2011) methodology, outlined in Table 1 and visually represented in Figure 3, as a guide.

Next, the team members reached consensus on the coding structure and themes, and defined categories and subcategories for each code. Direct quotes were matched with each category and subcategory determined by the data analysis team and served as examples. Lastly, team members coded the participants’ statements into the agreed upon categories and subcategories. The data analysis team used Atlas.ti™ to perform the analysis of qualitative data.

A coding manual was developed by the data analysis team to document codes and maintain consistent coding procedures throughout the data analysis process. The coding manual includes (a) a label for each theme; (b) a definition for each label; (c) a description of how to determine when a theme occurs; and (d) exclusions, qualifications, and elaborations for each theme (Saldaña, 2009).
Phase Three

Once both qualitative and quantitative data were separately analyzed, the researcher integrated the data. Integration is defined as “an intentional process by which the researcher brings quantitative and qualitative data together in one study” (Moselholm & Fetters, 2017, p. 1). The researcher integrated qualitative and quantitative data through construction of a joint display that juxtaposes quantitative and qualitative findings side-by-side, allowing for subsequent meta-inferences to be drawn from both sources of data (Moselholm & Fetters, 2017). An example of this integration procedure is found in Stenger et al. (2014). Given the matching approach used in the design of the survey, the researcher used the overarching themes that exist between quantitative and qualitative data to guide the analysis of the data in this study. These include (1) strategies and systems implemented to promote inclusion; (2) resources available to promote inclusion; (3) data use to promote inclusion; (4) awareness of inclusion by school practitioners; (5) challenges faced in promoting inclusion; (6) actions taken to overcome challenges in promoting inclusion; and (7) domains of activities addressed in current efforts toward inclusion. The researcher interpreted the merged results through this visual integration of quantitative and qualitative data.
Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the results of data analysis completed to address each research question. To this end, participant responses to the quantitative and qualitative surveys were analyzed. The participant’s quantitative responses were subject to descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. Given the nested nature of the data, in which participants were employed by different school districts, in different school levels, and with different positions, it was also important to rule out the significant results associated with those different levels of possible variance in the data. Although significant differences were not expected, with the intent of having an abundance of caution, the researcher used hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to ensure those results were not overlooked. The psychometric properties of the quantitative survey were not measured, and the researcher will rely on the face validity of the measure. Participants’ responses to the qualitative survey were subject to content analysis as well identification of contradictions in discourse. The chapter is organized by the type of analyses completed to answer each research question, including quantitative analysis, qualitative analysis, and merging of the data.

Contextualizing the Data

Events occurring in preparation for and during data collection impacted the social and political climate in Brazil. Of most significance were the COVID-19 Pandemic and the Brazilian presidential elections. These events resulted in important repercussions relevant to participants daily lives and, importantly, the public education system. Participants reflected on these events when answering questions asked throughout the study. Information regarding the impact of these events on education are presented to contextualize the data obtained for this study.
COVID-19 Pandemic

Quantitative and qualitative data for this study were collected between March 2022 and July 2022. Throughout this time, schools in Brazil were still recovering from the repercussions of the COVID-19 pandemic. Schools in the Distrito Federal were closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic on March 11th, 2020 with no classes offered until August 3rd, 2021, at which time public schools were authorized to re-open for hybrid (i.e., in-person and online) instruction. In November of 2021, students and educators were welcomed back into schools for in-person instruction. According to Agência Brasil (2021), the Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (IBGE) gathered information indicating that children enrolled in public school were away from school for an average of 287.5 days due to the pandemic. According to UNESCO (2022), Brazilian students were among those who were absent from school for greatest number of days when compared to other countries that implemented school closure strategies to prevent the spread of COVID-19. Importantly, raw data obtained from the IBGE (2021) indicates that student access to technology and the internet was variable across the country. An average of 8.7% of public schools throughout the country made technology available to students throughout the 2020 school year, in contrast with the 21.9% of schools that were able to do this in the Distrito Federal. Data from 2019 (IBGE) indicates that 48.6% of students in public schools had access to the internet and a computer at home, with significant racial disparities (67.3% for White students, and 46.8% for Black and/or Biracial students). Data regarding the number of hours dedicated to school activities during the 2020 school year were also obtained from the IBGE (2021). Table 8 presents this information relevant to the Distrito Federal. Importantly, it is also reported that 86.3 (SD=1.7) of students in the Distrito Federal dedicated 5 or more days per week to school activities (IBGE, 2021).
Table 8

Number of Hours Dedicated to School Activities in 2020 by Students in the Distrito Federal

(obtained from IBGE, 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>SD(%)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>SD(%)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>SD(%)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>SD(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 Hour</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 2 Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2 and 5 Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hours or More</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political Climate and Election Year

In addition to the repercussions of the COVID-19 Pandemic, throughout data collection schools, educators, and students were experiencing the political repercussions that resulted from the anticipation of the 2022 presidential elections. The election took place on October 2, 2022, after data collection had been completed. Between 2019 and 2022, Brazil had four different Secretaries of Education and a period of 28 days (between June 20, 2020 and July 16, 2020) without a Secretary of Education. Several controversial events transpired throughout the each of the terms served. Of most importance for this study, the third Secretary of Education, Milton Ribeiro, made public statements that discriminated against families with parents of the same gender and homosexuality, as well as statements that oppose efforts made toward inclusive practices, such as, “We do not want inclusivism, people criticize my terminology, but this is the one I continue to use” (TV Brasil, 2021). Statements were also made indicating that students with disabilities disturb other students in the classroom.

In addition to these statements, President Jair Bolsonaro put forth a decree (10.502/2020) in September of 2020 authorizing schools for individuals with disabilities “who do not benefit, in their development, when included in regular inclusive schools” to exist. This decree contradicts the Brazilian Federal Constitution of 1988 and the Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação of 1996, cited earlier in this text. The Brazilian supreme court’s preliminary ruling indicates the
decree is unconstitutional, though they continue to gather information to confirm this ruling. The ruling stated that the country assumed the responsibility with inclusive education, one that welcomes individuals with disabilities in regular education, rather than segregating them into groups away from their community. They reiterate that priority is given to inclusive education, and that it is not the place of public institutions to resort to specialized classes and schools to stop taking measures for the inclusion of all students.

**Quantitative Analysis**

**Descriptive Statistics**

To answer research question one, the researcher first used descriptive statistics to determine the extent to which inclusion is implemented in the Federal District’s schools as well as the areas addressed through inclusive practices. Table 9 reports the mean and standard deviations for each item between all participants (Combined) and divided by participant type, including Educator (ED), Administrator (AD), and Student Support Staff Member (SS). Participants were directed to rate the items on the following 5-point Likert-type scale: with 1 = *Agree*, 2 = *Somewhat Agree*, 3 = *Neither Agree nor Disagree*, 4 = *Somewhat Disagree*, and 5 = *Disagree*. Overall, the participants were highly consistent in their completion of the quantitative survey. Aside from question five from the quantitative survey, the ratings completed by the participants had means that were similar between and within participant groups, indicating overwhelming agreement with the statements provided in the quantitative survey, even when accounting for different variables, such as participant characteristics. Additionally, the standard deviations were generally low, indicating little variability among the means for each item.
### Table 9

**Descriptive Statistics by Item for the Quantitative Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Combined (n=77)</th>
<th>ED (n=28)</th>
<th>AD (n=21)</th>
<th>SS (n=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am able to reflect on efforts made to promote inclusion in my school.</td>
<td>1.09 0.33</td>
<td>1.11 0.32</td>
<td>1.00 0.00</td>
<td>1.14 0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. People use strategies that promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.</td>
<td>1.47 0.82</td>
<td>1.67 0.96</td>
<td>1.29 0.46</td>
<td>1.41 0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People in my school use strategies that promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) through various domains of activity (e.g., academic, social, emotional, and/or behavioral)?</td>
<td>1.48 0.82</td>
<td>1.41 0.57</td>
<td>1.52 0.93</td>
<td>1.52 0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There are systems to support inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) at my school.</td>
<td>1.38 0.86</td>
<td>1.44 0.89</td>
<td>1.38 0.92</td>
<td>1.31 0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There are resources available to promote the inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.</td>
<td>2.03 1.21</td>
<td>1.96 1.19</td>
<td>2.14 1.28</td>
<td>2.00 1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People collect data to inform inclusive practice for all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.</td>
<td>1.74 1.23</td>
<td>2.00 1.49</td>
<td>1.71 1.23</td>
<td>1.52 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There is an awareness of the school community towards inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.</td>
<td>1.45 0.85</td>
<td>1.62 0.97</td>
<td>1.38 0.92</td>
<td>1.34 0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There are professionals responsible for promoting inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.</td>
<td>1.40 0.99</td>
<td>1.37 0.88</td>
<td>1.29 0.72</td>
<td>1.52 1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I experience challenges with promoting inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.</td>
<td>1.61 1.35</td>
<td>1.48 1.28</td>
<td>1.43 1.08</td>
<td>1.86 1.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* None of the means are statistically significant than other means. Response options included: 1 = *Agree*, 2 = *Somewhat Agree*, 3 = *Neither Agree nor Disagree*, 4 = *Somewhat Disagree*, and 5 = *Disagree.*
Examining Table 9, eight of the nine items had ratings within the Agree range across groups. This indicates that participants agreed with the content of those items. Item number 5, “There are resources available to promote the inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school,” received a higher rating across participant groups, with an average rating within the Somewhat Agree range ($M=2.03, SD=1.21$). There was some variation between participant groups’ answers for questions 5 and 6. The mean for item 5, as rated by the Educators was within the Agree range ($M=1.96, SD=1.19$); whereas the Administrators and Student Support Staff groups rated this item within the Somewhat Agree range ($M=2.14, SD=1.28$ and $M=2, SD=1.22$, respectively). The mean for item 6, “There are resources available to promote the inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school,” as rated by the Educators was within the Somewhat Agree range ($M=2, SD=1.49$); whereas the Administrators and Student Support Staff groups rated this item in the Agree range ($M=1.71, SD=1.23$ and $M=1.52, SD=0.91$, respectively). Importantly, all but one item, item 9, in the quantitative survey pose positive statements about inclusion; however, overall ratings for item 9 also indicate ratings within the Agree range ($M=1.61, SD=1.35$). This indicates that, while participants generally agree that inclusive practices are being used in their schools, they also agree that they experience challenges with promoting inclusion of all students in their schools.

Additionally, participants were able to indicate areas through which they promote inclusive practices. Overall, 62 participants indicated inclusive practices are promoted through academic interventions, 66 through social interventions, 64 through emotional interventions, and 53 through behavioral interventions.

*Inferential Statistics*
Given the nested structure of the data and the researcher’s desires to have an abundance of caution and rule out the possibility of significant results across different hierarchical levels of the data, the researcher used Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) to investigate relationships between hierarchical levels of the grouped data and understand the between-group variance that may exists in the data collected. To this end, the researcher first gathered preliminary information to assure that there is systematic within- and between-group variance in participants’ answers to quantitative survey questions (Woltman, Feldstain, MacKay, Rocchi, 2012). To do this, the researcher used an intercept-only model of the HLM equation, meaning there were no predictor variables. The following equation was used for each item number (1 through 9):

Level-1: \( \text{Item}\#_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + r_{ij} \)

Level-2: \( \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + U_{0j} \)

where:

\( \beta_{0j} \) = mean \( \text{Item}\# \) for district \( j \);

\( \gamma_{00} \) = grand mean \( \text{Item}\# \);

Variance \( (r_{ij}) = \sigma^2 = \) within group variance in \( \text{Item}\# \);

Variance \( (U_{0j}) = \tau_{00} = \) between group variance in \( \text{Item}\# \).

This model allowed for the calculation of both within- and between-group variance, as well as the calculation of the ratio of the between group variance \( (\tau_{00}) \) to the total variance \( (\tau_{00} + \sigma^2) \). This ratio is termed the intra-class correlation (ICC). For this study, the researcher calculated the ICC for all questions to find the percent of variance in participants’ answers that are explained by school districts. The following equation was used to calculate the ICC:

\[ ICC = \frac{\tau_{00}}{\tau_{00} + \sigma^2} \]
where, again, $\tau_{00}$ is the between group variance and $\sigma^2$ is the within group-variance. Table 10 shows results for ICC’s calculated for each question on the quantitative survey. The researcher determined that variances at additional levels of the model would be calculated if at least 5% of the overall variance in answers for each item could be attributed to the differences between school districts. In other words, further analysis was carried out with additional predictor variables for $ICC \geq 0.05$.

Information gathered through calculations of the ICC indicates that 9%, 7%, and 5% of variance in answers to items 3, 5, and 7, respectively, is between school districts. The percent of variance in each of the remaining items were not sufficient to prompt further analysis.

Next, the researcher carried out additional analyses to determine if there is significant variance at the level-1 intercept (i.e., type of school). A significant result to this analysis would indicate significant variance in answers to questions 3, 5, and 7 due to district level when school type is held constant. Results show that the fixed effects of type of school are not significant for items 3 ($p=0.27$), 5 (0.27), and 7 (0.48). Therefore, between school districts, the type of school does not explain the variance that exists in answers to items 3, 5, and 7 well enough to be interpretable.

**Table 10**

*Intra-Class Correlation by Item*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Intra-class correlation (ICC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am able to reflect on efforts made to promote inclusion in my school.</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. People use strategies that promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People in my school use strategies that promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) through various domains of activity (e.g., academic, social, emotional, and/or behavioral)?</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. There are systems to support inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) at my school. 0.00

5. There are resources available to promote the inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school. 0.07*

6. People collect data to inform inclusive practice for all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school. 0.00

7. There is an awareness of the school community towards inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school. 0.05*

8. There are professionals responsible for promoting inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school. 0.01

9. I experience challenges with promoting inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school. 0.00

* Indicates sufficient variance to include additional predictor variable (school type) in HLM model.

Information gathered through calculations of the ICC indicates that 9%, 7%, and 5% of variance in answers to items 3, 5, and 7, respectively, is between school districts. The percent of variance in each of the remaining items were not sufficient to prompt further analysis.

Next, the researcher carried out additional analyses to determine if there is significant variance at the Level-1 intercept (i.e., type of school). A significant result to this analysis would indicate significant variance in answers to questions 3, 5, and 7 due to district level when school type is held constant. The following equation was used for each item number (1 through 9):

Level-1: \( \text{Item}#_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j} (\text{Type of School})_{ij} + \eta_{ij} \)

Level-2: \( \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + U_{0j} \)

Level-2: \( \beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + U_{1j} \)

where:

\( \gamma_{00} \) = mean of the intercepts across districts;

\( \gamma_{10} \) = mean of the slopes across districts;

Variance (\( \eta_{ij} \)) = \( \sigma^2 \) = Level-1 residual variance;
Variance ($U_{0j}$) = $\tau_{00}$ = variance in intercepts;
Variance ($U_{1j}$) = $\tau_{11}$ = variance in slopes.

Results show that the fixed effects of type of school are not significant for items 3 ($p = 0.27$), 5 ($p = 0.27$), and 7 ($p = 0.48$). Therefore, results do not indicate significant variance in answers to questions 3, 5, and 7 due to district level when school type is held constant.

Given the lack of significance in the HLM results, the researcher completed a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for each item by participant group (i.e., Educator, Administrator, and Student Support Staff), school group (i.e., Elementary and Middle School, and Middle and High School), and school district (i.e., districts numbered 1 through 10). Appendix H reports the $F$ statistic, p-values, and $F$-critical value for each item by participant group, school group, and district group, respectively. Results did not indicate significant variance between group means for any item.

**Qualitative Analysis**

To address research questions one and two through qualitative data analysis, the researcher first transcribed the audio obtained from interviews, then conducted a content analysis of participants’ answers to the qualitative survey. Concepts used in the construction of the survey guided the identification of broad themes within the data. Once the data analysis team became more familiar with the participant responses, they reorganized and reached consensus on the coding structure. They identified themes and defined categories for each code. The data analysis team then identified linguistic cues that suggest the presence of one of the four manifestations of contradictions, as defined by Engeström and Sannino (2011). Table 11 describes the themes and categories identified in interviews through content analysis, and Table 12 describes the features and linguistic cues used to identify discursive manifestations of contradictions. Both tables also
identify the number of references made by educators (ED), administrators (AD), student support staff members (SS), and all participants combined (C) within each category. Importantly, inter-coder agreement was established for 10% of the interviews. To test whether different coders were able to distinguish between the codes of a semantic domain, or theme, Krippendorff’s Alpha was used, calculated using the following equation via the ATLAS.ti™ software.

\[ \alpha = 1 - \frac{D_{o} \text{ observed agreement}}{D_{e} \text{ expected disagreement by chance}} \]

The data analysis team obtained a Krippendorff’s \( \alpha \) of 0.703, indicating coders agree on the presence or absence of the semantic domains in the analysis approximately 70.3% of the time. If only considering the percentage of agreement between coders, they agreed 69.8% of the time.
Table 11

**Themes and Categories of Responses from Participants Relevant to Inclusion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>#Participant References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies and Systems:</strong> Strategies and/or systems identified that promote inclusion in participants’ schools.</td>
<td><strong>Awareness of Inclusion:</strong> Refers to practices identified that promote awareness of inclusion in participants’ schools.</td>
<td>332 83 107 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Data Use:</strong> Refers to ways in which participants identified using data to promote inclusion.</td>
<td>173 42 61 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Request for Diagnostic Reports:</strong> Refers to identified need of diagnostic reports to implement inclusive practices and/or interventions.</td>
<td>50 17 14 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total References:</strong> 912</td>
<td><strong>Strategies and Systems Implemented by the SEEDF:</strong> Refers to strategies and systems established by the SEEDF that is identified as being implemented or used at the school.</td>
<td>321 96 105 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies Unique to the School:</strong> Refers to strategies or systems that have been developed by professionals at one school that are unique to that school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>113 31 27 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources:</strong> Resources participants identified as being available or used to promote inclusion.</td>
<td><strong>Human Resources:</strong> Refers to identified human resources that support implementation of inclusive practices.</td>
<td>248 83 76 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Material Resources:</strong> Refers to identified material resources that support implementation of inclusive practices.</td>
<td>147 33 50 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Monetary Resources:</strong> Refers to identified monetary resources that support implementation of inclusive practices.</td>
<td>10 5 1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Intellectual/Academic Resources:</strong> Refers to identified intellectual or academic resources that support implementation of inclusive practices.</td>
<td>100 31 32 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total references:</strong> 469</td>
<td><strong>Resources:</strong> Resources participants identified as being available or used to promote inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Domains of Activity:
Domains through which participants identified promoting inclusive practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Academic Interventions: Refers to identified academic interventions used to promote inclusion.</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Interventions: Refers to identified social interventions used to promote inclusion.</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Interventions: Refers to identified emotional interventions used to promote inclusion.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Interventions: Refers to identified behavioral interventions used to promote inclusion.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Challenges:
Challenges or obstacles participants identified to promote inclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Lack of Support: Refers to identified lack of professional, monetary, material, intellectual, and/or social support that result in an obstacle to promote inclusion.</th>
<th>423</th>
<th>108</th>
<th>126</th>
<th>189</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Challenges: Refers to identified challenges in communication that result in an obstacle to promote inclusion.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Bureaucracy: Refers to identified excessive bureaucracies that are necessary but lead to challenges in professional practice to implement of inclusive practices.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different expectations about inclusion: Refers to conflicting or different expectations identified by practitioners that interfere in the implementation of inclusive practices.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Attitudes or Actions: Refers to identified pessimism toward inclusive practices that may stem from or result in stigma, prejudice, and ableism.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overcoming Challenges:
Ways in which participants identified being able to overcome challenges or obstacles to promote inclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overcoming Challenges:</th>
<th>Personal traits, characteristics, or knowledge: Refers to personal traits, characteristics, or knowledge identified as used to overcome challenges to promote inclusion.</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actions: Refers to actions taken to overcome challenges to promote inclusion.</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs: Refers to resources, systems, and/or strategies identified as needed to overcome challenges and promote inclusion.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

Discursive Manifestations of Contradictions in Responses from Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manifestation</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>#Participant References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C (n=77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double bind</td>
<td>Facing pressing and equally unacceptable alternatives in an activity system</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution: practical transformation (going beyond words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical conflict</td>
<td>Facing contradictory motives in social interaction, feeling violated or guilty</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution: finding new personal sense and negotiating a new meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Arguing, criticizing</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution: finding a compromise, submitting to authority or majority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma</td>
<td>Expression or exchange of incompatible evaluations</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution: denial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategies and Systems

To answer the first question guiding this study, the researcher asked participants questions regarding systems and strategies they implement in schools. Through content analysis, it was identified that participants named a variety of different strategies used in their school. These strategies were divided into five different categories, including (a) Strategies and Systems Implemented by the SEEDF, (b) Strategies Unique to the School, (c) Data Use, (d) Awareness of Inclusion, and (e) Request for Diagnostic Reports. There was a total of 912 quotations across all
interviews that identified strategies and systems currently implemented is schools across the 10 school districts in the Distrito Federal. Strategies and Systems was the theme identified most frequently across all themes. This category broadly identified strategies that make up a larger system which allows for inclusion to be implemented within schools in the DF. The remaining four categories identified unique strategies that complement the use of those formally established by the SEEDF (i.e., Strategies Unique to the School), are identified as strategies required for the implementation of inclusion as established by the SEEDF (i.e., Request for Diagnostic Reports), or are strategies widely used without mention of their formal implementation by the SEEDF (i.e., Data Use and Awareness of Inclusion).

**Strategies and Systems Implemented by the SEEDF.** Strategies formally implemented by the SEEDF were mentioned by 66 of the 77 participants. There was a total of 321 quotations that identified these strategies, with 96 of these coming from administrators, 105 from student support staff, and 120 from teachers. A full list of strategies identified can be found in Appendix I.

Participants were able to name different strategies implemented by the SEEDF as well as describe the processes used to implement each strategy to support inclusive practices. Specifically, one school administrator named strategies implemented in the following manner:

We have a generalist resource room, right, and it being a generalist resource room, it works with intellectual disabilities, autistic spectrum disorder, multiple disabilities. Besides this, we have guidance counseling that gives the first guidance to students with disabilities. The disabilities are ADHD, OCD, APD, among these disorders are the functional disabilities. And we have psychopedagogy, which Vanessa works with, basically with playful activities so that these kids can develop and, let's put it this way,
the kids with disabilities, the resource rooms work for the handicapped, and the kids with
disabilities, the psychopedagogy. These are the activities.

Another school director described the process of implementing such strategies in the following
way:

So, the teacher is always the one who notices first, right. So if the teacher observes, talks
to the student and sees that, that is not only his responsibility anymore, right? Then we
have the orientation. For example, when we see that the student is very agitated, too
agitated, or very sad, or crying, ok? And then he tells a story that makes you a bit
suspicious, then you send him to the guidance counselor. The guidance counselor talks to
a psychologist and then calls the mother, right? The school counselor mediates this, to
call the father, call the mother, what is going on. And if it is really what we suspect is
going on, we go to youth services. So, here, we solve a lot of things in this sense, and
then we pass it on to the others, and then we can solve it. But the first person to observe is
the teacher, who is there in the classroom the whole time, that's obvious.

Another example for this process, mentioned within various interviews is:

So we already have this practices that works really well. It starts in the registration
strategy; it is not usually in... In September, September, then, the system itself, the
regional education department, calls us, right? So, they call the director, they call the
support staff, right? So, in the past, when we had a psychologist, they also went. Right?
To be able to see what kind of children we already have, it's also to see what kind of
children we already have in kindergarten, because we have students who come from other
classrooms around here, so that's where we start. Right? We have this meeting to be able
to see, right? What they are. And this is an achievement, as I think I showed here, of our
own profession that we didn’t have? When you took it and came, right? Before it wasn't like that. We were obligated to receive [students with disabilities] and we observed that there were certain children, certain disabilities. That there were certain children, some with disabilities, who couldn't stay in the same room, right? And then, together with the union, we won this victory. Right? And then there is this preparation, isn't there? "Child x with child y? According to this disability, it wouldn't be interesting to put them together, because we have already had cases where we had a lot of problems.” So that's an achievement, isn’t it? And that doesn't stop us from having problems, even with those that we don't have. These are the ones with the diagnostic reports laudados that we talk about, right? It is when the families get a diagnostic report. And we know those others that don't have a report and that many times are already there in that [inclusive] class, and we will start a whole process to be able to see together with the family to get this report. And then, in the class that he is included in, let's say, in the year 2002, he doesn't have the right to a reduction of class, right? Let's say there is a full class there, the child that has the diagnostic report, right? Who got that diagnostic report during the year. They will only have the right to a reduced class. Then we will be careful with the enrollment strategy, we are already placing them. So the system basically works this way. So, there is this preparation, this care, administratively speaking, and that is it, a teacher.

Generally, at the beginning of the year there is the choice of class, right? We make this distribution during the pedagogical week on the first day. And he [the teacher] will observe, "Look, if I take the first year [class] A, I know that so-and-so has ASD, right? The autism spectrum disorder. So, he is there too. There are two students with this case.” Then the teacher will think, “No, I'm not that prepared, I've already gotten something like
this. So, I'm not going to, am I?” So, there is this care, isn't there? Then there are others, "no, well, these kids, I already know how to work with them. So, is it a challenge? For me it is easy.” So, within the training itself, right? This is why I say that the Federal District, since it is small, is like a project that has to work well in education for the rest of the country. Right? Because it would be easy in this situation. We have the extended day program, and we have a school for the improvement of education professionals. Which is the EAPE, right? So, there it is, the system itself gives these courses for teacher improvement. So, you can't say that you are not qualified. If you are not qualified, you can train yourself within the system itself.

Importantly, it was identified that the structure established by the SEEDF is not implemented in private schools as it is in public schools, as indicated in the citation below.

Yes, and we even do it that way. We receive many students who come from the private network because we have this work structure that I, that not all private schools have. The whole professional staff of the educator, psychologist, guidance counselor, resource room teacher, you know? And they have all this structure. So, we do case studies to see if we can find a better class for them a reduced class schedule, you know? A reduced number of students in class, with the number of students and their specificity. He has a social educator, who helps him with transportation and meals, right? Who also gives all the support to the teacher. And there is also the teacher, right? From the resource room, who also gives pedagogical support to the teachers in relation to the difficulties, right? We do curricular adaptation, workshops, training. So, I see that we do these practices, right? Interventions.
Taken together, the information shared between participants regarding the strategies implemented to promote inclusion were consistent and identified well established systems used between schools and school districts in the Distrito Federal, identifying (a) specialized services for students with disabilities; (b) specialized support staff who support the implementation of inclusive practices and systems; (c) types of inclusive classrooms; (d) specialized services available for students with disabilities; (e) strategies that support the implementation of these services; and (f) school-wide support strategies that support all students, with and without disabilities.

**Request for Diagnostic Reports.** In addition to formal strategies identified as being implemented by participants, the need for diagnostic reports was identified as a requirement for the provision of any support relative to the inclusion of individuals with disabilities. This requirement was identified by participants a total of 50 times, with 17 of these coming from administrators, 14 from student support staff, and 19 from teachers. An example of this is noted in the quote previously cited:

That's what the *laudados* [diagnosed students] are, [it’s]what we say, right? It is when the families get a diagnosis. And we know those others that don't have a diagnosis and that many times are already there in that [inclusion] class and we will start a whole process to be able to see together with the family to get this diagnosis. And then, in the class that he is included in, let's say, in the year 2002, he doesn't have the right to a reduced class, right? Let's say there is a full class there, the child that has the diagnosis, right? Who got this diagnosis during the year. She will only have the right to a reduced number of students in class [did not complete sentence]. Then we are going to be careful with the enrollment strategy, we are already placing her, so the system basically works this way.
Awareness of Inclusion. Also important for the implementation of inclusive practices was the schools’ promotion of awareness toward inclusion. This topic was identified 332 times, the most frequent topic. Administrators mentioned or described using practices that promote inclusion 83 times, support staff mentioned it 107 times, and teachers mentioned it 142 times. A variety of practices were identified, some of which were more frequent than others. To promote the awareness of staff members toward inclusion, participants identified both formal and informal strategies. For example, informal strategies included talking with practitioners who have specialized experience with promoting inclusive practice; explaining to hall monitors, school security guards, and cleaning staff about how to support specific students with disabilities; and taking upon themselves to study and gather information that will help support students in their school. A specific example of these informal strategies is:

We have sought partnerships among colleagues, we have sought some information, right? Internal information. We exchange a lot of ideas with on another professionally, you know?

Additionally, formal strategies were identified as being used by school staff members. These included promoting awareness during school meetings, as identified in the following quote:

We have an awareness campaign for all the employees, right? There is a process, a process that we are doing to talk to all the teachers mainly about which students have difficulties. We have procedures within the pedagogical coordination to be able to explain to them which students have difficulties, which characteristics they present, and what needs to be done. Other than that, the principal's office also does a process of attendance on the opposite shift, in fact that's what is offered to the student.
As well as offering staff members the opportunity for professional development activities geared towards inclusive practices both through school specific events as well as through the school for teachers that the SEEDF has (EAPE), as identified in the quote below:

I know that the government gives a lot of training. We have the school there, right? The EAPE that gives training, our school also, the school community as well. We are also always bringing people to give trainings.

Participants also identified strategies that promote the awareness of families toward inclusive practices. These strategies most often identified the provision of support and information to families about inclusive strategies and systems available in the school, as well as communication regarding the importance of inclusive practices. The sharing of information was identified as occurring during parent-teacher conferences as well as before and after school. Four examples of these strategies mentioned by different participants follow:

Since the beginning of the year, we have a meeting, right, with the family, to welcome the families, and there we state what the inclusive practices of the school are.

This next citation describes a formal strategy implemented in this participant’s school to support parents.

Look, the school has a project called School for Parents, which are meetings held at night with the families. So, once a month, according to the school's needs, we promote a lecture with a person who can talk about the theme with the families. We also send informative notes. The administration has a very close channel, a WhatsApp channel with the families, which also answers families’ questions.

Another participant described how teachers talk to parents about their inclusive classrooms.
At the parents' meeting, the teacher already points out, "my class is a class that has a reduced number of students because we have a child, right, that will need special attention.” So, the family, all the families already know that that class is an inclusive class, that there's that one girl who needs to have that specific need met.

Additionally, this participant reflected on the importance of talking to parents and giving them feedback regarding student progress.

I think it is the feedback for the families. For example, when we show the growth of a student to his father, and he sees it, he gets emotional. We have students here who, when their mothers watch the videos, for example, we had students here who couldn't focus, who couldn't look us in the eye, and now they respond. So, the mother gets very excited when she sees the student who couldn't socialize playing with the other children, she gets [did not finish the sentence]. So this feedback to the parent is also important.

To promote the awareness of students toward inclusive practices participants identified formal strategies including reading books about inclusion, allowing students to experience and learn about inclusive practices through structured activities, and promoting school events to celebrate dates related to inclusion and disability. An example of each of these strategies follows.

In this first citation, a participant describes the use of books to promote inclusive practices:

“With the children, we use children’s stories to work with them.”

Another participant outlined the reaction that students had when presented with information about individuals with disabilities and assistive technologies.

She brought the Braille machine, so the typical students were also delighted, discovered a universe. So, they say "wow!" What did she [the teacher] bring? She brought the actors and singers and famous people who have disabilities. She talked about Roberto Carlos,
who has a disabled leg and so on, who is a success. So, she brought the representations, and when this student sees that there is a famous person, a millionaire, a YouTuber, whoever, being successful, he thinks: “I can too.”

Unique strategies that promote awareness between students were also identified, like in the example below:

No, it is. They do activities that I do with them. And they elect an angel to be an angel for these students to help them in this process, to remind them of the activities they have to do. So, in fact, there is an awareness process.

Lastly, a participant described how school staff members with disabilities also promote awareness by teaching students how to communicate with him:

And then, since we have a janitor here who is mute, deaf, right? And he went to teach all the students how to greet him. So today he taught in LIBRAS [Brazilian sign language] the way to say good afternoon, explained how he will answer, right? That you need to call his attention, right? He will look at you, and you will say good afternoon in LIBRAS [Brazilian sign language]. So, when we do this inclusion, we participate in other activities in other classrooms, so that the other children also feel comfortable and feel that it is natural for them to be together, right? Our children, I see a lot that our children are disabled. But I don't see it as a disease, you know? It is a characteristic; each one is different. My child is a wheelchair user, he has this. The other walks with difficulty. So, I look at it very much as a characteristic, and we make it very natural for the children in this sense, do you understand? And as they become comfortable with the situation, they start to care. So, it is a great advantage for our children who don't have a disability, right? Who don't have a specific need.
**Data Use.** Participants also identified a variety of ways in which they used data to inform their practice toward inclusion. In total, data use was identified 173 times, with 42 of these being from Administrators, 61 from Student Support Staff Members, and 70 from Teachers. Of note, participants were often confused by the question of how data is used to promote inclusion in their schools and described not being able to answer this question; however, the use of data to promote inclusion was identified in their answer to other questions, most of which were how students’ needs are determined by the school, asked throughout the interview. This finding is important, as it may indicate that data usage to inform practice is implemented by schools without explicit understanding of why and/or how. An example of the challenges in responding to this question is presented, followed by the identification of these practices as a response to a different question.

Researcher: So, people who work in my school collect data to report on inclusive practice for all students, that is, those with and without disabilities in my school.

Participant 1: They collect data? I've never seen that.

Later in the interview the participant reads the following question:

Participant: Describe how the needs of students, with and without disabilities, are determined in your school. How they are determined means how they are observed and dealt with. Would that be it?

Researcher: Yes.

Participant 1: So, as I told you, we go after the reports, we do a diagnostic test with the students and, based on the results of this test, the results are analyzed together with the coordinators and supervisors during these group meetings, which I do not participate in, but I have participated in other schools. I don't participate here. And based on this
information Julia helps the teachers with a document called, I don't know if it is a curricular adaptation form, curricular adaptation. And then these teachers will create materials, they will develop a specific material, they have to do. I create some, it is called assistive technology, and when it comes to me, I notice the student's difficulty and I create some assistive technologies.

Taken together, however, participants were able to identify strategies that indicated both formal and informal data collection used to inform inclusive practices. Examples of formal data collection strategies includes use of external data acquired from students’ outside providers, evaluations conducted by the SEEDF, academic evaluations conducted by teachers and support staff, as well as periodic written documentation of student academic, social, and emotional progress through required quarterly evaluations. Examples of informal data collection includes student observation through in daily activities, conversations with family members, and communication about students in staff meetings or conversations between different school practitioners. The following quotes identify some of these strategies.

This first participant identified the evaluation of new students that is conducted in schools:

We make an initial diagnosis right away, we have a conversation with the family, right? When we notice something that isn't there, it's not matching. It's like that, is it out of the box? Then we seek the family out. The first thing is the family. “What happened? Do you notice it too?” So it's supportive. First this family. How are we going to observe? And then we ask the educator, then the guidance counselor, the team itself comes in with the teacher to observe. It really is the observation and support of the family. Then we start with the procedures, you know? Because the family always has something to record. We, when the teacher observes, the family already brings something, and the mother already
noticed, the grandmother, the father, the aunt. There in the family or in other schools, he already had a clue. So, when we realize, because this is an elementary school, right? These are the early years. So when he has already gone through kindergarten or another school or entity, daycare. So when we put our little finger there for the family, they always have something to say. So, the first recurrence is the family itself.

This second participant identified the use of a formal document for data collection and student progress monitoring:

And, no, it is not this question, because we only used the report card, where the student was just a grade. And today this report card issue doesn't exist at the SEEDF. There are reports and this report is done every quarter, with the progress and the weaknesses of the child. And it stays in the student's folder. So, there is the issue of the reports. There is the issue of the class council, which is done by class, and not only the difficulties are discussed. We talk about the progress, the difficulties, and the strategies to help this child make progress and everything is [did not finish sentence]. The class councils are recorded in minutes and the new teacher gets to know about this child, both in the class council minutes and in the reports. It is very well documented.

Lastly, this participant identified an informal data collection process used in their school:

We find out as we go along, based on our experiences. Because many times the autistic student has certain characteristics that other students don't have. So, there is no way. It is with the experience and the report that comes from the teams who usually assist these students. They are seen by outside teams, with a psychologist, with a neuro and everything, and they send us some information that helps us. But then, helping is that situation. You have to live to see how it is going to be. Right? And many times, the child
here presents a certain behavior. And there, in the specialized service [office], it is another [behavior]. Because here he is in the middle of several children, and there, he is usually alone or with a maximum of 3 or 4. Here there are 20, so the noise, the place, the space, the size of the space and everything, this interferes a lot. There are children who can't adapt. That's what I said, it's the experience. There is no way.

**Strategies Unique to the School.** In addition to strategies already formally established by the SEEDF, participants also identified strategies that are unique to their schools. These strategies are outlined in Appendix J. In total, 113 Strategies Unique to the School were identified 113 times by participants, with 31 of these being identified by Administrators, 27 by Student Support Staff Members, and 55 by teachers. The strategies identified indicated creative ways to promote inclusive practices through individual connection, projects that promote student awareness toward inclusion, as well as social interventions. Examples of these strategies identified by participants in different schools follow.

This participant identified the way in which their school principal supports students in their school:

The principal, the current principal, she would come into the classroom to calm the child, put her on her lap and talk, which is a kind of [way] to include, also, this child within the elementary [school], which is very different for them.

Another participant identified a project implemented that supports the implementation of all inclusion practices promoted through their school:

The team has a project called fairies. They dress up as fairies, and they go into each classroom. They work on this emotional issue that is not only child, let’s say from the regular [education], who has their emotions, no. The special needs student also has all
these emotions. The special needs student also has all these situations. And we need to respect this, mainly because he often feels distant from the others. So, they do this work directly.

Lastly, this participant identified a unique strategy used in their school which was previously cited in this chapter as a way they promote awareness toward inclusion:

In the sense of informing these students? No, they do activities that I do with them, and they elect an angel to be an angel for these students to help them in this process, to remind them of the activities they have to do. So, in fact, there is an awareness process.

**Resources**

Throughout the interview, participants identified a variety of resources available to them used to promote inclusive practices in their schools. The resources were identified in the following categories: (a) human, (b) material/physical, (c) monetary, and (d) intellectual/academic. These categories are identified here to contextualize what schools and school practitioners have as means to promote or implement inclusive strategies and procedures in Brazilian schools. As such, these resources are identified to also answer the first research question. There was a total of 469 quotations across all interviews that identified resources available to promote inclusive practices in schools. Importantly, the topic of resources was identified through content analysis as something that is available as well as something that participants identify there is a lack of. Further discussion regarding the lack of resources is discussed later in this chapter.

**Human Resources.** Across all resources identified by participants, the most cited was human resources. Overall, the category was mentioned 248 times, with 83 of these being by Administrators, 76 by Student Support Staff Members, and 89 by Educators. Through their
answers, participants listed a variety of human resources available to them and discussed their importance within the Brazilian public-school setting. Of most significance were practitioners who provide specialized services as established by Brazilian law and the inclusion strategies implemented by the SEEDF, identified through the previous category. These include the Monitors, Volunteer Social Educators, Psychologists, Guidance Counselors, Educators, Special Education Teachers, interpreters, and General Education Teachers. At times, participants referred to these practitioners by using the name of the support services they provide, such as the support classroom (Sala de Apoio) or the guidance counseling service (Servico de Orientacao Educacional). Of note, the majority of school indicated that the entire school community is responsible for the provision of inclusive practices, and identified students, cleaning staff, and school security staff as important role models. Examples of how participants listed and described the importance of these practitioners for inclusion to come to fruition are presented below.

In this first example, a participant first describes the amount of responsibility they have, then expresses relief when they identify the resource classroom is a support that is available at their school: “We have a lot of responsibility, not much power, because actually, like, we get several students. Thank God we have a resource room.” In this second example, another participant clearly identifies the individuals responsible for implementing strategies that promote inclusion in their school, including teachers from the Resource Classroom and the psychoeducator:

Only the two counselors, right? Milane and Jade; we have the two resource room teachers, Terra and Flavia, and the psychoeducator, Sara. Inclusion is, in large part, promoted by them.

In this third example, a different participant expresses the responsibility that all school staff members have with ensuring the implementation of inclusion:
Look, here at the school, I see that everyone is involved, right? It’s not only the pedagogue, the guidance counselor, or the teacher. I see that even the cleaning staff help, right? When it comes to the boys, any student that has a certain kind of difficulty. So, all the professionals are involved here at school. All, without any exception.

In this last example, an additional participant described the supports available to teachers when they have a student with a disability in their classroom, identifying the support of a team of people to support them:

If the teacher has a student that is included, he has a team to support him, to give him support. I am one of them. I support the boys with disorders. I support the teacher too.

The teacher is open to coming to my classroom so that we can interact and add my knowledge to theirs so that we can see what we can do with the student in his classroom.

**Material/Physical Resources.** The second most cited category of resources was the Material Resources. In total, this category was cited 147 times across all interviews, with 33 being by Administrators, 50 by Student Support Staff Members, and 64 by Educators. Taken together, this category encompassed everyday materials such as paper, printers, laminators, and books, as well as specialized materials like braille printers, wheelchairs, and TVs. Additionally, physical resources were coded under this category, meaning physical adaptations like wheelchair accessible spaces, furniture, among other material and physical resources. Two examples of descriptions of these available resources are cited below.

You see, this room is messed up because I am full of resources that I haven’t managed to put away yet, right? But we... We here, whenever we need to, our administration is very sensitive to us. So, here in this room, it is messy because I didn’t have time. But I have a TV, I have the games that are arriving. They’re even in the box still. Our furniture was in
bad shape. Now we managed to change all the furniture and buy more appropriate chairs. Right? When we were online with students, we asked the management to buy a camera, a headset. It was taken care of. So, this is how we have it. I asked for a laminator because we need it for the games. It is there. It just arrived. It’s even in the box. So, I told her I wanted an Alexa. Because it has many functions, right? And I have a lot of ASD students, so we can get them to interact with Alexa. We ask them, “Mimic an animal, Alexa.” Then I ask, they ask, right? They come here and say good morning, good afternoon, and she answers. So, this is very nice for them. And so, we keep working, you know? Day by day. But I have them; I can’t say that I don’t have resources to work with. I do have them.

In this second example, a participant described the physical structure available in the school that welcomes students with and without disabilities in their learning:

The school also has a physical structure that supports these needs. A Playground, a court, an adapted bathroom, adapted classrooms, a playroom, a library, the multipurpose room, which is a room for, right? Anyway, video. And so, I think there is this concern.

**Intellectual/Academic Resources.** The third most cited resource category was the Intellectual/Academic Resources. Overall, 100 citations were identified, with 31 of them being by Administrators, 32 by Student Support Staff Members, and 37 by Educators. Among the intellectual and academic resources identified were pedagogical games, braille and audio books, assistive technologies, as well as professional development opportunities. Three examples of these citations are provided below.

In this first example, a participant identifies the SEEDF’s school of professional development as a resource available to school staff: “We have an educational professional
improvement school. Which is the EAPE, right?” In this second example, a different participant identifies having didactic resources, also noting that teacher will produce their own teaching materials at times: “We have didactic resources that the school had and that the teacher makes as well.”

In a third example, another participant describes using playful and concrete academic resources with their students:

> Always playful activities, bringing lots of games, lots of colors, lots of concrete material. Which is what the age asks for. Because, sometimes, just showing a letter or just showing a number for what they are learning at the moment, they won’t remember. But a game, a joke, a dynamic, they bring back their memory, and we can identify what the challenges and potential of each student are.

**Monetary Resources.** The category that comprised of monetary resources that support the implementation of inclusive strategies had a total of 10 citations, depicting a significant discrepancy between the types of available resources and a potential source of conflict which will be discussed later in this chapter. Of the 10 citations in this category, 5 were by Administrators, 1 by a Student Support Staff Member, and 4 by an Educator. These participants identified monetary resources provided by the Secretaria da Educação, by the Distrito Federal, and by the Department of Education. Two of these citations are provided below.

In this first example, a participant describes their school having recently been awarded a large amount of money, which the school invested to acquire teaching resources: “So, we have the resource room, right? This classroom recently received a grant of thirty-two thousand and acquired many games, a magnet board, a computer camera, I have a TV, I have Alexa, which I
use with the students.” In this second example, a participant described the budget they have from different sources and how each is invested:

The school receives two types of funds. It is a PDAF grant, which is a GDF [government] grant, okay? This money is used for everything in the school, small renovations, the purchase of supplies, and repairing some machines. And the other money from MEC [the Ministry of Education], which is the PDDE. This money goes to all schools. Here in mine, in the countryside of Piauí, Maranhão. All schools receive PDDE. PDDE is the only one that makes part of the funds available to be applied directly in the resource classrooms.

Domains of Activity

To answer the second question guiding this study, the researcher asked participants questions regarding the domains of activities addressed by their inclusive strategies and practices. Through content analysis, it was identified that participants were able to identify strategies that address four major domains of activities, including (a) academic interventions, (b) Social Interventions, (c) Emotional Interventions, and (d) Behavioral Interventions. Overall, participants identified interventions within at least one of the four domains of activity 292 times, most of which indicated implementation of more than one domain.

Academic Interventions. Participants identified strategies within the academic domain 92 times across all interviews. Of these, 27 were citations by Administrators, 35 by Student Support Staff Members, and 31 by Educators. The participants identified several strategies formally implemented by the SEEDF as academic interventions. For example, as described in the following citation: “We try to have this academic promotion by offering these adaptations and curricular adequacies.” Additionally, participants identified the push for academic interventions
as a way to support students’ ability to attend college, including those with and without disabilities, as described below:

The school focuses a lot on this issue, of preparing students for the PAS and ENEM [university entrance] exams. So, we have a very large number of students who return to school to say where they went, what paths they are following, and among them, many students diagnosed with disabilities.

For students in younger grades, academic strategies are described differently, with an emphasis on increasing awareness and using a variety of tools to support students’ diverse learning needs, as described in the following citation.

So, the students are learning about animals in the classroom, the animals, the different kinds of locomotion of animals. Some [students] are writing, right? Because they are in the literacy stage, and then our students with disabilities don’t write yet. They don’t have a proper grip on the pencil, and they will play, for example, with animal puzzles or a sorting game, right? Of classification, so, it is inclusive in this perspective, right?

Importantly, some participants only identified the academic domain as being used as an intervention to promote inclusion in their schools, as indicated in the following citation: “It is only academic, because we really face this challenge here, this social, emotional, and behavioral issue that sometimes the professional believes that his work is only academic, and it is not.”

**Social Interventions.** Participants identified strategies within the social domain 183 times, the most identified out of all domains of activity. Of these, 56 were citations by Administrators, 53 by Student Support Staff Members, and 74 by Educators. The participants identified several strategies used to support the socialization of individuals with disabilities with others in their school. For example, as described in the following citation: “They participate in
all school activities. If there is a field trip, they go. If there is a recess, they go. They are not segregated at school, and we notice that they interact with each other at school.” Additionally, more structured interventions implemented to support conflict resolution, perspective taking, and relationship building were identified, including those that make use of pedagogical resources, as described next.

We noticed that during recess, the kids were hurting each other, hitting each other; you make way through a book, *Hands are not for Hitting*, and then lead the child to reflect about this laidback environment, respect for differences, and the characteristics of all students.

Lastly, supports provided to families and community members were also identified as being part of this category. These interventions were mentioned by practitioners to have flourished during the pandemic as a result of the social and economic challenges that families experienced. An example is provided below.

Let me see, we have three students out of the twenty that we serve, and we have three that have a very bad financial situation, so we help them with basic food. In fact, in this case, the resource room helps directly, but also the school. The pandemic brought a lot of this, right? This is a pandemic factor. At the peak of the pandemic, we did a lot of raffles, we collected a lot of food.

**Emotional Interventions.** Participants identified strategies within the emotional domain 82 times across all interviews. Of these 19 were by Administrators, 38 by Student Support Staff Members, and 25 by Educators. The participants identified a variety of strategies spanning from the importance of physical touch to the need of psychological intervention. In this citation, for example, a participant explains the importance of physical touch in the emotional development
of young children: “In the early years in early childhood education, this physical contact is... it is necessary to make the child feel welcome. So, contact, patience, affection.” In higher grades, participants described the importance of seeking out additional supports in the community to help address emotional challenges that they have noticed increase as a result of the COVID-19 Pandemic, as described in the following citation.

The emotional [domain], because we have been seeking the wellbeing of our students, so much so that we are trying to establish a partnership with colleges and universities so we can bring psychology students here to be able to give this initial service, this support to students who are having anxiety crises, panic attacks, which are also issues generated due to the pandemic, right? And this has been worrying us, right? So we have been trying these partnerships to bring professionals here to embrace the needs of our students.

Behavioral Interventions. Strategies within the behavioral domain were identified by participants 54 times across all interviews. Of these 16 were by Administrators, 19 by Student Support Staff Member, and 19 by Educators. The participants were able to identify strategies used to mitigate challenges between peers as well as support students in everyday tasks. In this first citation, a participant identifies a new strategy (i.e., meditation) implemented to decrease the physical altercations that were occurring between students in a classroom: “[…] we have managed to get there and are looking to reduce the issue of violence itself among these children, even starting now a new meditation practice inside the school with this class.” Also highlighted was the need to have an equitable approach to the expectations set for students with and without disabilities. The need for structure and routines was described as something that that is necessary and that benefits students’ development, supporting their ability to complete tasks, sustain attention, and be in the classroom, as described in the following citation.
And behavioral issues, which we are always very strict about. To stay in the classroom, to concentrate, to have a routine, so we are very strict with them. Yes, because it is not just because they are inclusion students that they don’t have [need] a routine; they have to have one. They need this service, this understanding too.

Challenges

To answer the second question guiding this study, the researcher asked participants questions regarding challenges faced in their effort to promote inclusion in schools. Through content analysis, it was found that participants identified a variety of different challenges in their effort to promote inclusion in schools, some of which experience personally and others that they observe within their schools. These challenges were divided into five different categories, including (a) Lack of Support, (b) Communication Challenges, (c) Excessive Bureaucracy, (d) Incoherent Expectations About Inclusion, and (e) Negative Attitudes or Actions. There was a total of 587 quotations across all interviews that identified challenges in the implementation of inclusion in DF’s public schools.

Lack of Support. Challenges stemming from a lack of support were identified by participants 424 times across all interviews, the most identified category in this. Of these 108 were by Administrators, 126 by Student Support Staff Member, and 190 by Educators. The participants identified a variety of areas in which this support is lacking, including the lack of material and structural resources, lack of qualified professionals as well as professionals in general, lack of support from families, high turn-over rates for school staff, and lack of support for school staff.

In this first example, a participant described their biggest challenge as the lack of structure and school staff, which impacts their ability to supervise and attend to students in their
school: “The lack of structure is our biggest challenge. Many [students] are unassisted because we don't have all the professionals we should have to assist them.” Other participants described this lack of support as well, stating specific positions that are not filled at their school. Of note, this participant also describes the need for these practitioners in their school through identification of the number of students with disabilities in their schools. This is highlighted by several other individuals since laws determine the need for these practitioners to be available at their schools, but this has not come to fruition.

Resource classroom, pedagogue, psychologist, we don't have them. We have about twenty-four special students [students with disabilities] and we have a guidance counselor. Nothing else, you know? We don't have a resource classroom, we don't have a psychologist, we don't have a pedagogue, we don't have anything. Just a guidance counselor and that's it.

In addition to the lack of resources relative to the availability of school staff members and individuals specialized in areas to support students with disabilities, participants also identified a lack of support from families.

Lack of parental support at home. So, we do all the work at school and the parent doesn't provide continuity at home. So, you deliver a child on Friday to the parent, and another child arrives on Monday because they did not give continuity to anything. Not even the routine of daily life: going to the bathroom, washing they hands, peeing, flushing, washing they hands, you know?

Participants also reflected on the stress and increased challenges presented by the high turn-over rate of teachers and other school staff members. In this specific example, the practitioner
identifies how the school has to re-start all efforts toward promoting inclusive practices, as well as other academic and social-emotional interventions, due to this challenge.

I think that our bottleneck [challenge] in this issue of access to learning is that in the Secretariat of Education, specifically in this school, we can’t have a continuum because teachers are renewed every year. So, you did a lot of work last year with a group of teachers, and the following year, if the same group remains, we manage to go a little further, but then because there are a lot of temporary contracts [did not complete sentence]. For example, this year, we had six teachers who were permanent teachers out of thirty-six; meaning, there were thirty new teachers. So you start practically everything over again at the beginning of the year. You have to explain how the work is done, how it is [did not complete sentence]. This takes time. Then the middle of the year arrives, you kind of manage to take a little step [make some progress].

Importantly, the mental health of school staff members, specifically teachers, was identified as an area of deep concern by a number of participants. In this example, the practitioner describes how school staff members are becoming physically and psychologically ill due to the fatigue associated with the work they do. They also mention the lack of concern from the state with their health, stating they do not receive private health care through their job.

This scenario is very sad because we see many people very sick in this process because of the fatigue. And then everything comes, right? All these syndromes, you know? Like, relatively modern, right? Mental exhaustion, emotional exhaustion, burnout, depression, I don’t know what, withdrawal. There are also people who are very disappointed with this process because they feel very lonely; despite all that we are reporting, it is a job that, frequently makes you feel very lonely. Because often it is like this, it is you, 20 and 30
people [students] there, you know, waiting for you, like, what are you going to have to exchange with me here. And at the end of the game, it’s extremely exhausting, it’s sickening, so [did not finish sentence]. And there is no real concern, in fact, in the sense, what has become of this action that proves that the state is concerned about the health of these teachers? Nothing. The professional doesn’t have a health plan included in his career. Bizarre, you know? People get sick, retire, die, and fuck it, like. You can’t talk about this. But that’s it. That’s what happens.

**Communication Challenges.** Challenges stemming from a lack of communication were identified by participants 44 times across all interviews. Of these 14 were by Administrators, 12 by Student Support Staff Member, and 18 by Educators. The participants identified a variety of areas in which they experience challenges with communication, including with staff members due to the high turn-over rates and conflict with families, and with students with disabilities.

As described in the previous category, the high turnover rate of school staff was identified as a challenge in carrying out school activities due to the lack of practitioners available in schools. In addition, participants also identified that there is a challenge in communicating the strategies that the school is working toward and their responsibility in supporting those efforts because they are not employed or present in the school during moments when those strategies are communicated. The following citation describes this challenge:

The debates that we have in that pedagogical training in the first week, the teacher that comes here later, didn’t participate, and doesn’t know what happened. Here I am not sure how many professionals there are. Still, I am sure that more than a dozen professionals here are on temporary contracts. And they came the week after pedagogical week. Do you understand?
Challenges in communication between school staff members were also identified, as described in the following citation: “This question is difficult. Because They don’t accept my opinion because I’m not a teacher, right? So they don’t like my interventions very much.” Additionally, participants identified challenges in communicating with families about student due to the way families react to the communication efforts put forth as well as not having access to or direct contact with families. In the citation presented below, a participant identifies the challenge with communication due inability to access families.

“I think that, for example, yeah. There is contact with the family because, for example, some students come by van, come by bus […]. But I see a big challenge with the different behavior of a certain student. Still, I can’t get in touch with the parents to know if, in fact, they have noticed this. Have they looked for a professional, have they sought some intervention? So, the not knowing everything sometimes is complicated because it is not a report that will define everything, right? So, this contact with the family that has this, this, this direct contact on a daily basis is very important. So, I believe that this lack of contact with the family is sometimes very complicated. It is one of the challenges, isn’t it?”

In some instances, participants also identified challenges with communication with students due to language barriers or mistrust. A unique situation is described in the citation below.

Yeah, I would start from the actual student in the classroom. So, I, for example, I don't know, I don't know LIBRAS [Brazilian Sign Language]. But many students in the classroom end up becoming interested. So sometimes you arrive to give a message, and the interpreter is not there. And then it is very common for you to see a peer. It's very
common, that's interesting. You see that the peer himself, you know? Sometimes you arrive to give a message and then he says it, then you see that he is [did not finish sentence]. Sometimes with LIBRAS [Brazilian Sign Language], sometimes even a language he developed there, [a student] draws the attention of those who are deaf, they say what I'm saying, what I'm talking about, I'm sending a message. So, you see that it [prejudice] doesn't exist from the clientele itself, which are, in quotes, normal students. There is not the slightest prejudice. On the contrary, they embrace it. Yeah... I have a case of wheelchair users here who have been disputed [by other students] to push the chair. Amazingly. So, they are very well received within this process. And then there are the professionals too. Evidently, right? Have that awareness.

The lack of trust in communication between school staff and students can be identified in the following citation: “The biggest challenge I have working with her is because we never know when it's true or false. And it is very difficult, because sometimes we feel ashamed […]”

**Excessive Bureaucracy.** Challenges stemming from important though excessive bureaucracies that introduce barriers to the provision of inclusive practices were identified by participants 35 times across all interviews. Of these 8 were by Administrators, 12 by Student Support Staff Member, and 15 by Educators. Participants indicated challenges with accessing services available to them as well as students, and providing supports to students with and without disabilities.

Practitioners identified that although there are resources available to them, they often are not able to access those resources due to barriers faced in the process of acquiring, participating, or making those resources available. One example is provided here regarding the challenges
faced with accessing the professional development activities offered by the SEEDF through their school:

Yes, for example, EAPE promotes several courses, but then we already have a barrier in another thing. They promote the course, but then you have to enroll, [and] you have to be selected from a drawing. So it is not an easy thing. For example, I want [did not finish sentence]. I have two students, one with ASD and one with Down’s [Syndrom]; I want to take a specific course for them; I have no guarantee that I will get it; it’s a lottery, right?

Another example includes students’ and families’ challenges with accessing services both through the SEEDF and other public agencies. To show these challenges, the following four citations are provided, each of which was brought forth by a different participant.

In the first citation, a participant that psychologists who work in public schools are not able to provide clinical services, specifically diagnoses, for students at their school:

We have a psychologist here at the school, but she is a school psychologist. She can’t work; she can’t be a clinician. So sometimes she helps in this part of the emotional domain, helps the teachers [with] which inclusion strategies can be used in this more emotional part of the behavior. She gives some orientation, but it’s very basic, right? She doesn’t have time to give more in-depth guidance, so I think there is a lack of training in that field.

In the second citation, a different participant identifies that students need to be identified with a disability through a diagnostic report. If this is not available, they are not able to receive additional supports in school.

He has to have a doctor’s diagnosis to be considered disabled. If he doesn’t have this diagnostic report, even though he has a disability, he is not considered disabled. So, he
doesn’t have the right to the resource room. Although he doesn’t have the right, we end up taking him aside when we know he does. Still, it’s a very serious problem because public health doesn’t work that way for those who, here in Paranoá, right?

Next, another participant identifies that sometimes children have a disability, but because they do not have a diagnostic report to give to the school, they cannot access the supports they need, as described in this citation: “Sometimes he has a disorder, an intellectual disability, but there is no official diagnosis for him, and this takes away this boy’s right to be assisted by this support team, unfortunately.” Lastly, an additional participant identifies that the only way through which students and families can access the services they need is by requesting that service (i.e., an evaluation to determine if they do or do not have a disability) through the public health system, which currently has a waitlist of more than two years.

But you can imagine, within the network, we have almost five hundred thousand public students. So, for a situation centralized in its network, right? There in Brasilia, right? We who are from Samambaia [did not finish sentence]. And then this is a reality in all schools. So, you can imagine the line. And it shouldn’t be like this, right? A child who goes there for a request like this will often take two or three years to get a response.

**Different Expectations About Inclusion.** Challenges stemming from conflicting or different expectations about inclusion were identified by participants 40 times across all interviews. Of these 13 were by Administrators, 12 by Student Support Staff Member, and 15 by Educators. Participants identified differences in the how inclusion is conceptualized as well as how it is implemented. More specifically, participants expressed challenges with the inconsistencies that exist between the ideal conceptualization of inclusion, as presented in coursework and professional development experiences, and how it is actually implemented in
daily life. One example of this identified discrepancy follows: “No, it's just that, it's perfect on paper, isn't it? But in real life, in real work, the work is hard, continuous and we struggle to achieve any of these concepts.”

They also identified conceptual and practical differences between school staff members about inclusion and strategies used to promote inclusion. For example, one participant said: “When the teacher has the same thought [process] as the monitor, that class, as a whole, is included. When you don't have it, there are problems. I've had several problems like this.”

Another example shows how a participant identifies the differences in opinions about inclusion that exist in the school: “I somewhat disagree, because not all people do. Yeah, there are some people who, due to lack of knowledge, don't think it's valid, for example, inclusion.” Also identified were differences between how the school as an entity conceptualizes inclusive practices versus the participant. For example, as described in the following citation: “Our biggest challenge, I think, here at school is to allow or assert that it is not the student who has to adapt, it is the school.” Importantly, differences between the school’s conceptualization of inclusion versus parents’ was also identified as a challenge. For example, as lamented by the participant in the following citation: “But unfortunately, it's not just school, right? It's no use if the school wants it and the parent doesn't want it, right?”

**Negative Attitudes or Actions.** Challenges stemming from negative attitudes or actions were identified by participants 68 times across all interviews. Of these 26 were by Administrators, 19 by Student Support Staff Member, and 23 by Educators. Participants identified negative attitudes or actions that stem from or result in stigma, prejudice, and ableism as coming from society at large as well as a variety of stakeholders in the school community. In
this first example, a participant identifies the challenges that result from the stigma that exist in society and the impact that it has on the school:

You only have to be a minority and you already face the challenge. Our society is very prejudiced. It has her rules and when you don't fit inside that box, you don't fit, it doesn't fit, right? This ends up being reflected within the school.

Additionally, participants described the subtle impact that negative behaviors or actions of teachers have on students with and without disabilities, as identified in the following citation:

“[…] with a look or in the way of speaking a teacher prunes the student and he no longer wants to study because he does not feel well in the classroom.”

Interestingly, participants also highlighted the impact that these negative behaviors and attitudes that impact them because of their connection or responsibility with promoting inclusive practices. The example below clearly identifies one of these examples.

I've worked in schools, which, look even to just put in on record, where I was excluded along with the student. I didn't exist, the student didn't exist, and I didn't exist together with the student. I even joked at the time that we came, the monitor came, to not let the student be excluded alone. He is now excluded with company. At least he has a pair.

In other situations, participants also identified conflict that occurs between students due to learning differences that exist within the classroom, as described in the following citation.

So there is a specific student. He has a visual problem. In his class, as a way to adapt [learning] for him, for him to be able to copy, we increase the letter more when it is on the board and the time is longer because he has a difficulty seeing that even with glasses. He doesn't see like that, and then it turns out that in the class, in this class, I already noticed that the students don't have much patience, that they want content, they want it to
go fast. And we try to do a job completely, even to make the peers aware that it is very difficult.

Lastly, negative attitudes and actions were also described as being identified in families, resulting in conflicts within the school and challenges with promoting inclusion. An example of this is evident in the following citation.

There are a lot of families that don’t understand. A lot. And then, like, yeah, I’ve never seen, you know, witnessed, for example, a family that had a fight with another family because of that. But we see, like, a lot, in parent meetings, complaints of ‘Oh! But staying in so-and-so's room. So-and-so hits. So-and-so bites. Why are there children like that at school? It's hurting my son.’ So the families, many families really, don’t understand that. So I strongly disagree with that.

**Overcoming Challenges**

To answer the second question guiding this study, the researcher asked participants questions about how they have or what they need to overcome challenges faced in their work towards implementation of inclusive practices and systems. Through content analysis, it was identified that participants named a variety of ways in which they have or could overcome the challenges previously identified. These strategies were divided into three different categories, including (a) Personal Traits, Characteristics, or Knowledge Actions, (b) Actions, and (c) Needs. There was a total of 486 quotations across all interviews that identified ways to overcome challenges faced in the implementation of inclusive practices or systems.

**Personal Traits, Characteristics, and Knowledge.** Participants identified personal traits, characteristics, and knowledge that they have or that they identify in others which supports their effort to overcome challenges faced and promote inclusion in their schools. Overall, the
category was mentioned 30 times, with 9 of these being by Administrators, 9 by Student Support Staff Members, and 12 by Educators. Participants described these personal assets in themselves, their teachers, their students, and their community members. Examples of these descriptions follow.

In this first example a participant describes the importance of their commitment with promoting inclusion. They mention having a clear understanding of why and how they strive to promote inclusion.

What I have, I think, is to see education as this intentional, affective process, which needs to be done with this commitment. So, with conscience, you know? I think I am very aware of the model that I, that I want to build with the children, so this is something that I think I have in my favor as a professional, this clarity.

In this second example, a participant described the love given and received by a student with disability. She described the importance of caring about and supporting children with disabilities in their work toward inclusion, equating her job to a mother's job.

I give love, a lot of love, a lot of affection, a lot of understanding. It’s this support, which is how I came here. It was last year that I started with these children, especially, I'll tell you a little bit [about it], ok? I was afraid to be with them. Fearful. Because my God, I'm not going to, I'm not going to know, I never in my life took care of anyone special [with a disability]. But then I started. The first time the girl took me, I went with a teacher to the bathroom, she wanted to change the boy, so I said “come here, is this how? What is the job like?” She said “yeah”, [I said] “So it's like a mother's job?” It's based on that. It's like a mother's job, that's the truth. The teacher's, caregiver's, and helper's job is a mother's job. Love and affection. What is this word based on? Love and affection. And I believe
that these boys here have a lot, you see? That every now and then there's a ‘no.’ But that ‘no’ that we give, it's love. Did you understand? Kindness. I don't know how it is for the other boys out there, but these ones, my friend, they have a lot.

Another participant reflected on their knowledge and experience in positions of management, and how this has helped him with promoting inclusion in his school.

[…] we have this vision of management. Maybe it's because I've been through some situations as a manager and in other areas as well, isn't it? Regional education manager, and we have a broader view.

The following participant shared about the effort that teachers put forth to support their students and provide the highest level of support to them.

And we also see that there are teachers who are very available, too. [Teachers] Who like, study that child and live that year to give their best for them. And this is important, [it’s] very good like that. We wanted every professional to be like this, right? That they had that love because that makes all the difference.

On a similar vein, participants also reflected on the expertise of their school’s teachers and the culture they have built to support implementation of inclusive practices as long-term employees of the school.

Professionals are experienced, all with higher education, many of them with postgraduate training, many who have been at this institution for many years. So, there is a very strong sense of belonging. So, this all supports this understanding of the need for, right? Of doing something different.

Participants also described the understanding that students have toward inclusion and the benefits of their acceptance for the school community, as evidenced below.
Of course, right? Our children give us a dance [are masterful] in relation to inclusion, because they understand much faster than us that their peer requires greater attention, that their peer needs this attention.

**Actions.** Across all the ways in which participants identified being able to overcome challenges, the most cited were actions already taken. Overall, the category was mentioned 245 times, with 58 of these being by Administrators, 89 by Student Support Staff Members, and 98 by Educators. Through their answers, participants identified a variety of ways through which they have overcome challenges faced when attempting to promote inclusion in their schools. The areas of challenges addressed included all those identified previously, including (a) lack of support, (b) excessive bureaucracy, (c) different expectations about inclusion, and (d) negative attitudes or actions.

To overcome the lack of professional support available participants identified seeking partnerships with other agencies as well as building a strong school culture that values group work and community. The following citations are presented to illustrate each of these actions, respectively. One participant mentioned:

[...] so much so that we are trying to partner with colleges and universities so that we can bring psychology students here to be able to provide this initial service, this support to students who are having anxiety attacks, panic attacks, which are also issues generated in due to the pandemic, isn’t it? And that has worried us, right? So, we’ve been trying these partnerships to bring professionals here to meet the needs of our students.

Another participant described:

I think teamwork here at school is what helps the most, right? Because if it were just you in the classroom, it is often very difficult for you to work [teach] in a full classroom and
sometimes there are students who need more care. Then you call one over there, call another, and they help, right? The team is very committed in this case. The staff.

To overcome the lack of intellectual support available, participants described seeking out professional development opportunities both through the SEEDF’s school as well as independently. This effort is described by a participant, for example, in the following citation.

In my case, as a teacher, what I do to overcome these challenges is information, information, studying all the time. So today we take a course, we have 3 courses in the area of special education today, active now, right? So, every year we are there specializing, looking for training beyond the diploma, our own experiences, and bringing information even about [didactic] materials, on how to teach literacy, on how to deal with each disability, in case of crises, when we have behaviorally aggressive students, right? So, we are looking for this all of the time. Information, to become more and more experienced in the area.

To overcome the barriers faced as a result of excessive bureaucracies, participants described a variety of different actions taken. In one scenario, a participant described the challenges that they face with obtaining diagnostic reports for students. They mentioned that it takes a long time for the school to receive those reports even after they have been written for students. In this context, the participant described taking action to obtain those records by going to student’s previous schools or directly to the individuals who wrote these reports: “Sometimes we need to get out of here, get our car and fo to the school and say, ‘give me this child’s diagnostic reports.’” To overcome negative attitudes and actions, participants talked about adaptations they have made in order to include students and families with different abilities, cultures, and beliefs in school activities. For example, in the following quote a participant states
modifying the name of a traditional Brazilian Catholic event to include students and families of all faiths.

Some families believe that *Festa Junina* [June Festival] is only Catholic, so we remove that stigma, because some are Evangelicals, right? And the Cultural Diversity Festival is created, and the theme is always a [different] culture.

In addition to this example, another participant mentioned changing the way the school celebrates Mother's Day because many students do not have both parents or have two mothers or two fathers.

When I arrived [started working] here, there was a mother's party. And then there was a child, she had no mother, she [the mother] had died. Everyone partying, and this kid in the corner quietly. From that year onwards I said, if this story of a mother's party at this school continues, I'll ask you to leave. You know? Why? Because if one person is dissatisfied, not everyone is satisfied, you know? It has to be good for everyone. And then, thank God, this story of mothers at this school ended. Because people, for God's sake, ‘no, but it's just her.’ I heard this. You understand? So there's a lot of that. No, it makes me want to cry. But I, I really embrace it. Not just here at school, but in my life. So, this solidary, altruistic, and empathetic side of mine of watching the other give to the other what I would like to receive, you know?

To overcome communication challenges and as well as challenges faced as a result of different expectations about inclusion, participants described making time to talk with school staff, families, and students more regularly. The following example describes how this provides opportunity for new strategies to be developed and agreed upon.
You have to have help, course [academic experience], experience with other people, time to sit down with the teacher and discuss needs to be done to improve what we can do together with improving the life of this child, whether in content, either in behavior, or in the emotion felt by the child who brings all his problems from home to school.

Additionally, to overcome physical and material barriers several participants reported taking it upon themselves to make simple structural changes to the school as well as advocate for those needs with people in higher ranks. For example, in this first citation, a participant describes how they adapted a school bathroom for a student who needed wheelchair accessibility.

We didn't have an access ramp in the library, the wheelchair couldn't enter the bathroom. We had to remove one grout, one floor, and that was enough for a wheelchair to enter. So, we created everything that was within reach so that this child would have accessibility.

In this next example, a participant reflects on the actions she takes in order to access and advocate for material resources they need.

So I can't change the structure of the Secretaria. I can't. There's no way. We ask as a team, as a group of teachers, union, and such requests. I'm not even a union member. To me, the union, only deals with wages, wages, wages, wages, wages, you know? It's not just a salary. In this matter of infrastructure, we can't do it. I've been a teacher for 22 years, and I've never seen it change that will never change and I don't see the prospect of change, because it doesn't fit. We have, within my reach, Julia in the resource classroom, Julia the teacher in the resource classroom, there are things that I do at my own risk, like when we started this classroom, many of the things we bought, me and Sílvio, with our money because we wanted to do a good job. So we went ourselves, and I don't see a
weight in that, because I like what I do, so I don't see a weight like that, I see an investment in my work. In a little while I'm leaving and what's left for the school should be left for good use and stuff. So it's up to me, as far as I can take my step with my leg, I don't mind spending my money to win this challenge. If I can go there to the administration to ask the administration, and they give it to me, great. But if management says, no I can't, I don't mind getting my card to go there and buy it and do it, because I'm doing this for my daily work, right? My daily work for me has always been like this, even when I was on top, I had my own internet, I had my own data show, because I wanted to do a good job and the Secretaria wouldn't allow me, you know?

**Needs.** Finally, in addition to what they have done, participants identified what they need in order to overcome the challenges they face. Overall, the category was mentioned 218 times, with 57 of these being by Administrators, 71 by Student Support Staff Members, and 90 by Educators. Participants described resources, systems, and/or strategies they would benefit from having in order to promote inclusion in their schools. Specifically, they indicated the need for monetary resources, intellectual and academic resources, material resources, and human resources. Some of these needs are described by participants objectively, and others are implied through their descriptions of more complex systemic changes that they identify as necessary, as will be described.

The need for monetary resources was generally agreed upon by all participants. They described this as necessary for schools to access a variety of other resources, some of which will be named in sequence. A general statement made by one of the participants is cited to exemplify this need: “No, it's not perfect, there's a lot missing, right? There is always a lack of funds. We want to do things, but we don't have the money.”
In addition to monetary resources, the need for academic and intellectual resources was also identified. This need stems from the challenge described previously, where school staff describe experiencing a lack understanding with regard to how they can support individuals with disabilities. As such, participants identified the need for further specialization regarding the implementation aspect of inclusive practices through college courses as well as continuing education and professional development opportunities once employed by the school. For example, the following citation shows how a participant described the need for these additional resources to best support students in their school.

And what would I like to have? More professional development. Not just for me, but for all professionals. It's like a prerequisite, you know? For these professionals to be, for it to already be in the professional's curriculum, so that he can work. Come prepared to work with each specificity of each child.

Additionally, participants described the importance of these professional development opportunities as a way to maximize the school’s support network for students with and without disabilities, as described in the following citation: “It's giving, for example, it's up to us to be able to provide this training that, from the moment I manage to provide training to a teacher, I can get him to care for 23 children, right?”

Participants also described the need for additional support from the government. As mentioned previously, the hardships that school staff experience was described by participants to result in them becoming physically and psychologically ill. This was also identified as one of the reasons for the high turn-over rate in schools. In this context, participants identified their well-being as a crucial component in sustaining not only the efforts toward inclusive practices in schools, but also the entire functioning of the school. It was objectively stated and also implied
by several participants that this support could be achieved through provision of better access to health care and better salaries. One example of this identified needs is provided: “Public policies are needed for public schools. Professionals need support. To value the professional. Mental health care for professionals. It's the saying "take care of those who care." Another participant said:

I think what would help, and then it has more to do with a greater mobilization. Bigger, massive, even so, and then I'm talking about, not just this school, right? A mobilization of professionals in the sense of generating political pressure so that we would have schools with, you know, triple the team, at least, than we have here today, right? With good wages, with dignified working conditions, with material conditions to provide [to students], right? To do your best, with dignity.

In addition to these objective needs, participants also identified systemic changes they deem necessary for the provision of more effective education services for all students. For example, one challenge, previously identified, that participants noted was the bureaucracy involved in accessing professional development opportunities through the SEEDF’s school. In this context, participants described the need for a decentralization of the SEEDF’s school, to allow for school staff in districts that are further away from the professional school to have easier access to it, both in regard to distance and to the number of spots offered for individuals to take part in professional development courses. This need is noted in the following citation, for example.

Teachers are desperate because they don't know how to deal with it, so there's a lack of preparation and a lack of courses. So, I think an option would be, I think this the
decentralization of the EAPE [SEEDF’s School of Professional Development], right?

Because we have Asa Sul there, maybe if there were sites on the satellite [citites], right?

Participants also identified necessary changes to the system that the SEEDF uses when hiring and introducing substitute staff in schools that have high turn-over rates. As previously identified, participants identified that schools are challenged by the high fluctuation of staff available to them, which leads to challenges in communication and implementation of school-wide strategies and systems to support students. As a way to mitigate this challenge, participants identified the need for substitute staff be a part of school meetings in the beginning of the school year, where school-wide efforts are discussed and determined. For example, in the next citation a participant who identifies as a substitute teacher indicated that participating in these meetings is of extreme importance: “[…] temporary contract teachers, as is my case, can arrive in time to participate in these training processes, which are extremely important.”

Several participants also described experiencing challenges due to the number of students in their classrooms. This challenge was indicated as resulting from the lack of human and material resources available in schools. Importantly, it was also noted that according to the strategies and systems implemented by the SEEDF, classrooms should not exceed a certain number of students, and classrooms with students with disabilities should have a smaller number of students when compared to general education classrooms. In this context, participants described the need for smaller class sizes in order to provide better supports for students with and without disabilities, as described in this citation: “The number of children we work with today, which [is what] could be smaller, right?”
Lastly, several participants identified the need for more feasible access to specialized services that support students and schools. As previously discussed, challenges were identified regarding the necessary albeit excessive bureaucracy involved in providing students with access to additional supports in schools. Most notable was the need for diagnostic reports. In this context, participants across different schools and school districts described the need for access to more specialized services, and provided different suggestions for how to mitigate this challenge. A combination of citations are provided in sequence to identify participants thoughts regarding this issue.

First, participants across the Distrito Federal indicated a need for support from neurologists, psychologists, and psychiatrists to understand how to adapt school practice to best service students with disabilities, as described in the following citation.

[Students] would be much better supported at school if a neurologist, if a psychiatrist, psychologist, said, ‘look, he has this, adapt [his learning] in this way. They would have rights to conquer. Because it is difficult, we keep raising hypotheses. Because we don't we have this maturity, this training for this... do you understand?

Next, participants also described the need for a larger support network that would prioritize the provision of services for students, as described in the following citation: “I would need a support network. Priority care for students in health services.” Additionally, participants described the need for a direct connection between the public health system and the public education system, allowing for faster access to services for children in the health system and in the school system.
If we had a partnership with the health network, if there was a project, a program that bridged the gap between education and health for us to get this faster access to appointments, to exams, we would be able to include [support] many more students. Another participant specifically identifies, in the following citation, the benefit schools would have from having a formal and connected system of support that links the health, education, and social services already available but that are not easily accessible at this time: “The biggest challenge is not having a support network, a network really, a network within the public system, a network that would bridge the gap between health and education, between social assistance and education.” Lastly, it is identified by another participant that a similar system of support has existed in the past; however, due to the change in leadership, this is no longer available.

There was a government here in the DF that allowed it, allowed there to be direct contact with health and education. Yes, there was already a health secretary who released the pediatrician to work within education to talk to the coordinators, the intermediaries about the specific problems, at the schools.

**Identification of Contradictions in Discourse**

Finally, to answer the second question, the data analysis team coded manifestations of contradictions, using the Engeström and Sannino’s (2011) methodology, outlined in Table 1 and visually represented in Figure 3, as a guide. The researcher identified Conflicts, Dilemmas, Critical Conflicts, and Double Binds present in participant’s discourse. Importantly, as described previously in the methodology used in this study, because Engeström and Sannino’s (2011) methodology is typically done with data collected in a group conversation format, it was expected that Dilemmas would be more frequently identified than other discursive manifestations of contradictions. In fact, Dilemmas were the second most identified in
participants’ discourse, the first being Conflicts. Overall, the data analysis team identified 649 discursive manifestations of contradictions, with 302 of them identified as Conflicts, 259 as Dilemmas, 63 as Critical Conflicts, and 52 as Double Binds.

**Conflict.** As described in Table 1, Conflicts identify criticisms or arguments present in participants’ discourse, which have been determined to result compromise and submission to the majority or the authority (Engeström and Sannino, 2011). This was the most identified manifestation of contradiction in discourse, with 302 citations across all participants. Of these 302 citations, 95 were by Administrators, 83 by Student Support Staff Members, and 124 by Educators.

Participants criticized and argued against the idea that the Secretaria de Educação is supporting schools with implementing the requirements that it sets for the implementation of an inclusive education system. One example of this criticism is described by the following participant.

There is a total deficiency of the SEEDF. A complete deficiency. It's what I usually say, inclusion is made up. You include the special [person with a disability] and exclude the typical, because it doesn't have... If you take care of the special, you won't be able to take care of twenty-seven normal [students], let's say. So you end up excluding someone, or someone who really needs to be included, PwD [person with disability], or the typical [person]. There's no way you can reconcile the two things without that support.

More specifically, another participant criticized the contradiction between what the SEEDF determines as an inclusive strategy (i.e., the separation of students with specific diagnoses between classrooms as well as the decreased number of students in inclusive classrooms) and what is, in fact, implemented in their school.
Sometimes they put two students with autism in a class with 28 other students. What inclusion is that, right? There is no inclusion, because how is the teacher going to pay attention to these students when there is a full class and he is the boss?

In another example this same contradiction is described when the research team member asks why the participant thinks there is a lack of support in their school.

Researcher: So, already answering [question] 9, right, which is what you have or what would help you, like, really, this support, right, from the government.

Participant: Yes, it would actually be setting up the structure at the school with the resource classroom, the resource classroom teacher, pedagogue to do a more complete job with them.

Researcher: Yeah, do you think this deficiency comes from this specific school for some reason?

Participant: They claimed the number of special students, but this year we reached and exceeded the minimum number they require, and so far we haven't it [a resource classroom].

Criticisms were also identified relative to the support staff-to-student ratio, as described by a participant below.

Imagine, a school like this has 1000 students and then you have a resource room team that has two professionals. You have another one there that has another two [professionals], you have another one that has another two [professionals]. But like that, six per one thousand is a math problem that will never close [make sense], right?

Other participants criticized the neglect that the SEEDF has for its employees. For example, they mention:
And there isn't such a concern, in fact, real, in the sense, like, what has come [in terms of] of action that proves that the State is concerned about the health of these teachers?

Nothing. The professional does not have a health plan included in his career. Bizarre, get it? People get sick, retire, die there and fuck it, like. We can’t talk about it. But that's it.

That's how it goes.

Some participants also criticized the efforts made toward inclusive practices as a whole, indicating their opposition with implementing such practices, as described by the following participant: “So, it's not really full inclusion. Only those [students with disabilities] who are having more rights than the other [students], right? That's why I disagree.” Another participant also expressed this opposition, as described below.

Many students are harmed because of some students with disabilities, because that attention is all focused on those students, right? And it ends up that the others are harmed, [because] they don't have other types of activities [offered].

In other instances, participants argued that while resources are available, the systems are not well established and the staff is unprepared to provide the services students need, as described below.

I somewhat disagree, because I think that the resources that we have available, they are very little. We have more of a human resource than actually a structure to serve. And human resources too... Not everyone is prepared, right? For example, now we have some children who need follow-up, but the professionals who were made available to monitor these children, they have no training at all.

**Dilemma.** As described in Table 1, Dilemmas identify an expression or an exchange of incompatible evaluations in participants’ discourse, which have been determined to result denial
Engeström and Sannino, 2011). This manifestation of contradiction was identified 259 times across all participants. Of these citations, 81 were by Administrators, 65 by Student Support Staff Members, and 113 by Educators.

Participants expressed incompatible evaluations to describe the need for improvement in the implementation of inclusive practices. For example, when the following participant answered if systems of support that promote inclusive practices exist in their school: “It exists, but we know that there is still a long way to go. You're just asking if it exists. It exists. But there is still room for improvement for, in fact, some things.” Participants also identified the differences between having a resource and it being a useful resource though expression of ambivalence, as shown in the following citation: “Sometimes we would have the room, but the teacher doesn't always have that education, right? Our training is general, you know?”

Similarly, another participant explained that although their school has a specific resource, the people responsible for implementing those resources are unavailable, resulting in ambivalence when identifying the existence of a resource in their school.

For example, when I was at another school, which was a CEF [elementary] school, our hub for referring children with functional disorders, which were those children with dyslexia, with ADHD, to do [receive support] in the counter shift, she was... the teacher was on sick leave the whole year, and our school was [left] without that service the whole year, because I [the school] didn't have a substitute [teacher]. So it exists, but it's like it doesn't exist, you know?

Another participant describes a similar ambivalence in the following citation:

So, I do believe that today there is a search within the Department of Education that already exists. Despite what? There are few schools that have a 100% complete team.
Right? There are documents, but the teams are not implemented in all schools. So much so that there was a, there are traveling teams, right? Where they visited, they had the schools. Now there is no more itinerancy [traveling teams], but the professionals do not cover all the schools. Those who have them, yes, manage to do a great job with regard to inclusion. So I somewhat agree.

In addition to the dilemmas identified in the availability of resources, ambivalence was also identified when participants described the human resources available and the challenges they experience with implementing inclusive strategies due to their lack of knowledge.

There are these, there are those teachers, not only who have difficulty dealing with a child with a disability, I think we all have difficulties, but most are those who ‘I have difficulties, but I want help, I look for it, I understand it, I am going to try.’

Other participants expressed ambivalence about their ability to promote inclusion even with all the resources available to them due to the high number of students with disabilities in their schools, as described in the following citation.

It is not always the case that, despite this, this school being one of the, if not the most here in this school district, with a very complete, multidisciplinary team, it also cannot handle the demand because the demand is intense.

Dilemmas were also identified when participants talked about the different levels of acceptance that members of their community have about inclusion, as described in the following citation:

I somewhat agree. somewhat, because I believe that even though there are parents who influence, who support these students, [who support] the beginning of inclusion, you know, within the school, there are also parents who want to sort of segregate them from
living with others, you know? They want some specification within the school, but it kind of segregates them from living with one another.

As previously identified, the bureaucracies involved with the provision of services to students who need more supports were described by a large number of participants. This challenge was also evidenced by the contradictions in participants’ discourse, as mentioned by the following participant:

We call it ANE [students with special educational needs] so to enter that acronym he has to have a medical [diagnostic] report, a medical report to be considered a disability. If he does not have this report even though he has this disability, he is not considered disabled. So he is not entitled to the resource room; despite not having the right, but we end up taking them aside [giving supports], when we know they have it. But it's a very serious problem, because public health doesn't work that way for those here in this school district, right? So, sometimes we know that the student has the characteristics of a disability, they need to go to the doctor to be given a diagnosis in order to have the right to be treated in a different way, but the family cannot [go]. Sometimes they go to a doctor and in a year they will make an appointment. Then they [the students] fail, normally it [the disability] is detected like this. He keeps failing, it doesn't work here, there's no report, nothing, and with time we manage, right? It's the bad part.

Additionally, participants reflected on the speed at which inclusive systems and practices were implemented in public schools. Dilemmas were identified by the data analysis team in instances when participants expressed the support for implementation of efforts to promote inclusion and qualified them with regard to how quickly and unprepared schools and staff were to implement these new strategies and systems, as evidenced in the following citation:
Why do I somewhat agree in this situation? Because it's how I was saying. It's a new situation that I'm glad we're institutionalizing. However, when there was the issue of inclusion in schools. It was raised, let's say, by [constitutional] right, which was acquired as if it were a decree. However, we didn't have enough time to pick up and prepare the physical space, the professionals, right? The teacher.

**Critical Conflict.** As described in Table 1, Critical Conflicts identify experiences of contradictory motives in social interaction as well as feelings of violation or guilt in participants' discourse, which have been determined to result finding a new personal sense and a negotiation of new meaning (Engeström and Sannino, 2011). This manifestation of contradiction was identified 63 times across all participants. Of these citations, 8 were by Administrators, 20 by Student Support Staff Members, and 35 by Educators.

Critical conflicts identified throughout participants’ interviews revealed feelings of guilt regarding participants’ challenge or inability to help the students in their schools. This is clearly described by the following participant when talking about their challenge with supporting a student with a disability:

> Then I remember one, one of them, who had hyperactivity, saying to me, "teacher, help me, please." And I, because he needed help to do the activity, I couldn't reach him. A class of 30 kids or so, and I couldn't get through to him. And he needed to learn. And he wanted help.

In another example, a participant describes a similar feeling of guilt, this time referring to the inability to help students without disabilities:

> It looks like they put all the cases together, like, that nobody wanted. And they put them in the same room, because they were really cases like that, creepy, you know? Child
suspected of being sexually abused, the mother, I don't know if it was the mother was
arrested, the stepfather was arrested. Another child, another that was being suspected of
being used to deliver drugs. At the age of 8, right? A child had a suspicion of having
psychopathy. Yeah, oppositional disorder. And then, even after he left school, they
actually confirmed it, he had the diagnostic report. Children with hyperactivity, I think
there were 3 in the same room and one who, when he wasn't medicated, he couldn't take
manage it, nor could he take care for himself. And then, I still had to teach literacy. So,
I'm bringing this more extreme reality, because to a lesser extent, this happens in all
schools. And then I can't turn my back on the one [student] who wanted to hurt everyone,
everyone, he always thought of a way to hurt someone. I couldn't turn my back on him.
So how was I going to teach? How would I give it, how do you teach literacy?
Importantly, participants also identified feelings of guilt because they put forth all their effort to
support students are still not able to do everything that their students need from them, as
described in the by the following participant:

We do more [than we can], you know? I tell the girls: we want to embrace the world, we
want to embrace it, and that makes the teacher sick, you know? It makes everyone sick,
because we want to do too much, and after this pandemic we want, yeah, to supply all
that what was missing, [because of] 2 years of the pandemic in one [year], there's no way.
And we have to deal with it, because teachers don't deal with it. We want them to run
things over, they want to do it, they want to do it, they want to do it, they want to do it,
and that's why they get sick, right? So this is a job that we have to put in our heads, that
we will not be able to recover two years in one, no. It's hard, I know, I'm going through
this. It's complicated, but we have to learn, right?
Critical conflicts were also identified when participants described their interactions with the SEEDF, indicating feelings of disrespect as evidenced in the following citation:

The departments of education do not respect schools. They simply see that they need something, they give it [the problem] to the school and they tell me to solve it [the problem] by tomorrow. They give a very short time to solve the problem. They turn to the [school] administration and places the bomb [problem] and the administration is obliged to solve the bomb [problem] in a few hours or in a very few days. So the secretary of education should have a little more respect for those who are doing real work, and we are the teachers.

Similarly, other participants described feeling disrespected and “invisible” because of their work with students with disabilities, as described in this citation:

I've worked in schools, which even to put on record, where I was excluded along with the student. I didn't exist, the student didn't exist, and I didn't exist together with the student. I even joked that we came, the monitor came to not let the student be excluded alone. He is now excluded with company, at least he [has] a partner.

**Double Bind.** As described in Table 1, Double Binds identify pressing and equally unacceptable alternatives experienced in an activity system through participants’ discourse, which have been determined to result practical transformation (Engeström and Sannino, 2011). This manifestation of contradiction was identified 52 times across all participants. Of these citations, 7 were by Administrators, 12 by Student Support Staff Members, and 33 by Educators.

Double Binds identified throughout participants’ interviews revealed the need for change in school practices toward inclusive practices. In this first example, a participant identifies
needing to find a different way to “deal with this [lack of resources to meet students’ objectives].”

So, we don’t promote [inclusion], we try, right? Because, what happens is, we really need to have global support for us to achieve our goals with special children [with disabilities].

But we are here, we receive them, we help them. So somehow, we have to deal with it.

In this second example, cited below, a participant identified pressing and equally unacceptable alternatives experienced in trying to teach in large classrooms with students within disabilities. The rhetorical questions asked by the participant question what needs to change or improve in order to mitigate these challenges; however, the participant was not able to identify what that change or improvement would look like by themselves.

But then you imagine, I have a ADHD that likes silence, a Down [Syndrome] that makes the biggest mess. Does it work? Do you understand? And what can the school do?

Nothing, because in the other teacher’s class, for example, there are already two [children with] ADHD, the two together are enough. In the other, there are four ADHD, there are three... So, the school does what it can, really, but it doesn't have the conditions.

**Merging of the Data**

The researcher integrated qualitative and quantitative data through construction of a joint display that juxtaposes quantitative and qualitative findings side-by-side, presented in Table 13. The matching approach used in the development of the quantitative and qualitative surveys supported the alignment of themes found between both methods of data collection. Two additional themes emerged from the qualitative data, which help answer the second question guiding this study. These additional themes, Overcoming Challenges and Discursive Manifestations of
Contradictions, supported the explanation of nuances found in the quantitative and qualitative data.
Table 13

### Juxtaposition of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Quantitative Findings (n=77)</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings (n=77)</th>
<th>Mixed Method Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategies and Systems</td>
<td>Participants agreed with items 2 and 4, indicating implementation of strategies and systems that promote inclusion ($M=1.47$, $SD=0.82$; $M=1.38$, $SD=0.86$).</td>
<td>Participants referenced strategies and systems 912 times, identifying strategies and systems that are formally implemented by their schools as well as unique strategies that they implement to support the implementation of school practices, which best reflect their school culture.</td>
<td>Taken together, quantitative and qualitative data indicate that strategies and systems that promote inclusion are formally established by the SEEDF and implemented in schools. Data collected also indicate schools have developed unique strategies to promote inclusion which reflect and support their school culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Use</td>
<td>Participants agreed with item 6, indicating school staff use data to inform their practice and promote inclusion in their school ($M=1.74$, $SD=1.23$).</td>
<td>Though content analysis, it was determined that data use is a strategy used to implement inclusion in DF’s public schools. A significant number of participants expressed confusion when explicitly asked if and how they used data to inform their practices toward inclusion; however, most were able to identify this practice when answering different interview questions.</td>
<td>Taken together, quantitative and qualitative data suggest that schools use data to support the implementation of inclusive strategies in their school; however, participant’s initial confusion when asked this question indicates that schools implement data usage to inform practice without explicit understanding of why and how.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Quantitative Findings (n=77)</td>
<td>Qualitative Findings (n=77)</td>
<td>Mixed Method Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Awareness of Inclusion     | Participants agreed with item 7, indicating there is an awareness toward inclusion in their school ($M=1.45$, $SD=0.85$). | Though content analysis, it was determined that promoting awareness toward inclusion is a strategy used to implement inclusion in DF’s public schools.  
Participants identified a variety of strategies used to promote awareness toward inclusion. This effort to raise awareness also included a variety of community stakeholders like school staff, families, and students.  
Some participants indicated the ease to raise student awareness about this topic, while identifying some challenges and/or need for continued work with raising staff and families’ awareness about inclusion. | Taken together, quantitative and qualitative data suggest that schools promote awareness toward inclusion in their school community and that continued effort is necessary in some areas to achieve greater acceptance in regard to inclusion. |
| Domains of Activity        | Participants agreed with item 3, indicating use of strategies that promote inclusion through various domains of activity in their school (e.g., academic, social, emotional, and/or behavioral; $M=1.48$, $SD=0.82$). | Participants were able to identify strategies all four domains of activity (i.e., academic, social, emotional, and behavioral) in their interviews. The majority of strategies cited were of the social domain (183 citations), followed by academic (93 citations), emotional (82 citations), and behavioral (54 citations). | Taken together, quantitative and qualitative data indicate that schools are implementing interventions that promote inclusion and address a variety of domains necessary for a well-rounded development, including academic knowledge, social and behavioral awareness, as well as emotional well-being. |
**Juxtaposition of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Quantitative Findings (n=77)</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings (n=77)</th>
<th>Mixed Method Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>Participants somewhat agreed with items 5 and 8, indicating resources are available to promote inclusion in their school ($M=2.03$, $SD=1.21$; $M=1.40$, $SD=0.99$).</td>
<td>Participants identified a variety of resources including human, material, monetary, and intellectual/academic resources available in their schools. This dimension was qualified by participants when asked to identify challenges, as many indicated not having enough resources or reliable resources.</td>
<td>Taken together, quantitative and qualitative data indicate resources to support the implementation of inclusion are available in schools; however, the availability or access to these resources may vary by school, school district, the number of students with disabilities that the school has, and other school dependent factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Participants agreed with item 9, indicating they experience challenges with promoting inclusion in their school ($M=1.61$, $SD=1.35$).</td>
<td>Challenges addressing five categories were identified by participants through their interviews. The most cited source of challenge was lack of support (including academic/intellectual, material, human, and monetary; 423 citations); followed by negative attitudes or actions which stemmed from or resulted in stigma, prejudice, or ableism (68 citations); communication challenges between staff, students, and families (44 citations); differences in expectations about inclusion (40 citations); and excessive bureaucracies (35 citations).</td>
<td>Taken together, quantitative and qualitative data indicate that public schools in the Distrito Federal are experiencing challenges with implementing inclusive practices. Of note, qualitative data suggests that the most cited challenges faced stem from a lack of resources available, including academic/intellectual, material, human, and monetary resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Qualitative Findings (n=77)</td>
<td>Mixed Method Interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposition of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings (Continued)</td>
<td>Manifestations of contradictions were identified in participants’ discourse. Conflicts were identified a total of 302 times across participant interviews. Conflicts identified tension between participants and the SEEDF due to lack of support and adherence to the system it has established to promote inclusion in schools. Dilemmas were identified a total of 259 times across participant interviews. Dilemmas identified feelings of denial when participants reflected on the availability of systems, strategies, and resources that promote inclusion in their school, identifying in particular the impact of high turn-over rates, lack of knowledge, community acceptance of inclusive practices, student-to-staff ratio, excessive bureaucracies, and unpreparedness of schools and staff to promote inclusive systems. Critical Conflicts were identified a total of 63 times across participant interviews. Critical Conflicts identified feelings of violation and guilt when participants described their inability to support all students in their school, their relationship with the SEEDF, and their experience with being othered as a result of their work with students with disabilities. Double Binds were identified a total of 52 times across participant interviews. Double Binds identified movement toward practical transformations when participants described the need to find a way to overcome the challenges faced as a result of a lack of resources.</td>
<td>Considering this dimension in juxtaposition with both quantitative and qualitative findings, some of the nuances of the findings are explained, specifically regarding participants’ emotions and tensions regarding inclusion in their school and within the larger activity system that is the public education system in the Distrito Federal. Additionally, next steps are identified for future work towards implementation of inclusive systems in public schools in the Distrito Federal, specifically to address challenges faced due to the lack of resources available for participants to promote inclusion in their schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Juxtaposition of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Qualitative Findings (n=77)</th>
<th>Mixed Method Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overcoming Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Participants referenced the Overcoming Contradictions category 486 times across all interviews. Participants identified a variety of ways they have overcome challenges faced in their effort toward promoting inclusion in their schools. They also identified personal traits, characteristics and knowledge that support their work toward inclusion. Lastly, participants identified areas of need to further implement inclusion in their schools. Most notably, participants identified the need for direct communication and collaboration between the Public Education and Health systems in the Distrito Federal.</td>
<td>In juxtaposition with both qualitative and quantitative findings, this dimension further supports the findings identified through the Discursive Manifestation of Contradictions dimension. Participants objectively identify what they need to overcome challenges faced with promoting inclusion in their schools as well as what they already have to lean on as these efforts are made towards further implementation and improvement of inclusive systems in public schools in the Distrito Federal. Importantly, participants identified needing a formal line of communication and/or network between public schools and the public health system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to provide the results of data collected to answer the research questions guiding this study. Participants’ responses to the quantitative survey were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Participants’ views about inclusion in their schools, as described during individual interviews, were subjected to a content analysis and identification of contradictions in discourse.

Results from quantitative analyses indicate no significant variance in participant’s answers to the quantitative survey. Participant responses indicate overarching agreement with statements that affirm the presence of inclusive practices in schools as well as the statement that affirms the presence of challenges in promoting inclusive practices in schools. Quantitative data relative to the availability of resources revealed the most group-wide disagreement, with answers indicating some agreement rather than complete agreement with the statement. Of note, quantitative questions that asked about data use and challenges experienced indicate an overarching agreement with their use or experience; however, the standard deviation for answers regarding data use and challenges were larger when compared to other questions (Data use SD=1.23 and Challenges SD=1.35), indicating more, although not statistically significant, variability in their answers.

Results from qualitative analyses revealed that schools are implementing a variety of formal strategies and systems that promote inclusion in their schools. Formal strategies are established by the SEEDF ( Appendix I) and supported by federal laws (Appendix A). Additionally, strategies unique to individual schools were described. Qualitative data also indicate a strong support for interventions that address four domains of activity, including academic, social, emotional, and behavioral. Participants identified some challenges with
identifying how they use data to inform their implementation of inclusive practices, though they were able to describe these practices when answering other questions asked by the research team. Similarly, participants were able to identify a variety of resources they have and use to implement strategies and systems that promote inclusion; however, identification of challenges by participants and discursive manifestations of contradictions by the researcher reveal that tensions exist relative to the ease in accessing and acquiring resources to implement inclusion in public schools. Discursive manifestations of discourse and participants’ identified ways of overcoming the challenges faced in implementing inclusive practices provide insight as to what next steps should be taken to further support inclusion in DF’s public schools. Together, qualitative and quantitative results reveal consistent findings, with qualitative results providing additional context to the data.
Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate strategies educators have implemented to systematically promote inclusion in schools. The objective was to provide Brazilian educators, particularly those in the Distrito Federal, with strategies, tools, and systems of inclusion that have been implemented across different schools and proven effective by educators.

Previous research on inclusive schooling in Brazil highlighted inclusion as utopian (Guzzo, Mezzalira, & Moreira, 2012) and a fallacy (Cenci et al., 2020) in Brazil. The Brazilian education system as a whole was described as one that is reinforcing the cycle of inequality in Brazil (Guzzo, Moreira, & Mezzalira, 2015). They determined the obstacles faced by educators in the effort of promoting inclusive schools, identifying cultural and historical barriers, lack of professional development, little support from experts, and lack of necessary resources. However, Brazilian research on inclusive education has not discussed the system of strategies that are effective and currently implemented to promote inclusion in Brazilian schools, nor has it identified what schools should, in fact, work toward implementing in order to promote inclusion in their schools. Additionally, policies that promote and mandate the implementation of inclusion in education do not provide guidelines for educators on how to achieve or monitor this practice systematically.

Experts have indicated a need for new practices that promote inclusion in schools and support students from diverse backgrounds in Brazil (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010; Guzzo, Moreira, & Mezzalira, 2015). In an effort to promote an optimistic rhetoric of the efforts made toward inclusion in Brazil and reinforce the positive aspects of inclusion, equity, and education, this study establishes a constructive interaction with Brazilian educators, describes the strategies
they use to promote inclusion in their schools, as well as identifies what they recommend to
further develop an inclusive education system and overcome the barriers identified.

Research Question One

What systems are implemented in Brazilian schools to prevent the academic, social, emotional,
and behavioral challenges that students may face?

a. What strategies and procedures do schools implement to promote inclusive
   education for students with and without disabilities?

b. What domains are addressed in the strategies and procedures used to promote
   inclusive education for students with and without disabilities (e.g., academic,
   social, emotional, and behavioral)?

Participants were administered two surveys to determine what systems are implemented
in their school. The first survey consisted of quantitative questions and asked participants to rate
their level of agreement with statements on a five-point Likert-scale (1 = Agree, 2 = Somewhat
Agree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Disagree, and 5 = Disagree). The second
survey consisted of qualitative open-ended questions. Both surveys asked questions about
inclusive strategies and systems implemented in participant’s schools. A total of 77 participants
completed both the quantitative survey and the qualitative survey, with 21 of them being school
Administrators, 28 Student Support Staff Members, and 28 Educators. The participants were
employed by schools across 10 of the 14 school districts in the Distrito Federal, Brazil.

Quantitative results indicated participants generally agreed with statements made
regarding the implementation of inclusive strategies and systems in their school. The overall
average across participants’ answers was a rating of 1.5 out of a five-point Likert-scale, with 1
being agree and 5 being disagree. Importantly, no significant variation between participants or
school districts was found through HLM analysis with fixed effects of type of school nor through One-Way ANOVA when accounting for participant group, school group, and school district. Of note, participants answer relative to the availability of resources to promote inclusion revealed an average score within the Somewhat Agree range. Additionally, when asked about the implementation of data use as a way to inform practice, participants indicated overall agreement; however, the standard deviation for answers that reflected data use were larger (Data use SD=$1.23$), indicating some participants tended to agree less with this item as compared to other items. Although this variation is not statistically significant, it does provide helpful insight when paired with qualitative results.

Qualitative data revealed which strategies and systems are used to promote inclusive education for students with and without disabilities, answering question 1a. Overall, participants referenced strategies and systems 912 times and identified both formal and informal strategies they use to promote inclusion. A full list of formal strategies described by participants is outlined in Appendix I, and the formal system implemented by the SEEDF, as described by participants, is visually presented in Appendix J. The system was identified to encompass strategies like (a) evaluations conducted by a team of psychologists and education specialists to determine if students are able to receive special education services; (b) a combination of five types of inclusive classroom (Special Classroom, Inverse Integration, Generalist Inclusive Classroom, Intervention, Mediated Bilingual Class, and Differentiated Bilingual Class); (c) three types of support classrooms (Generalist Resource Classroom, Generalist Bilingual Resource Classroom, and Specific Resource Classroom); and (d) professional development through the SEEDF’s School. In addition to the formal system, participants also described strategies that help support the efforts made toward inclusion. This includes promoting awareness toward inclusion,
collecting data to inform inclusive practices, requesting diagnostic reports, and implementing school specific strategies that nurture the development of a school-specific culture toward inclusion.

Additionally, results from both surveys identified the areas that are addressed through the strategies and procedures used to promote inclusive education for all students, answering question 1b. Quantitative results revealed that 62 participants identified implementing academic interventions to promote inclusion, 66 identified social interventions, 64 identified emotional interventions, and 53 identified behavioral interventions. Qualitative results supported this finding with participants citing domains of interventions implemented 292 times, with most participants identifying the implementation of more than one domain. Categories of domains were cited by participants at the following rate: social interventions were cited 183 times, academic interventions were cited 93 times, emotional interventions were cited 82 times, and behavioral interventions were cited 54 times. Examples of interventions used included both those formally implemented by the SEEDF and those that are unique to each school.

These results are noteworthy for several reasons. First, the lack of variability found between participants’ answers to the qualitative survey identifies a common understanding and agreement that their schools implement inclusive strategies and systems. This is important as it indicates consensus between participants and allows for more objective interpretation of results. Second, qualitative results show that, in addition to being able to identify the presence of inclusive systems and strategies used in their schools, participants were able to identify what the inclusive strategies are, as well as the process through which these strategies are implemented. This indicates that participants share a common understanding of how their schools promote inclusion and the role they play in that system. Importantly, these descriptions were aligned with
the inclusion process put forth by the SEEDF. Third, the unique strategies used to implement inclusive education described by participants indicate ways through which schools have cultivated their unique cultures while making efforts toward implementing formal inclusive strategies, something that has been deemed essential in developing inclusive school systems (Bal, 2018). Fourth, participants were able to identify interventions used to promote inclusive practices that address a variety of domains, which indicates that schools are making effort to support student development in many facets, supporting a well-rounded development.

Research Question Two

What do school practitioners recommend to further improve inclusive education systems that address the needs of students in both general and special education?

a. Which contradictions generate inequity in the provision of services to students in special education when compared to students in general education?

The quantitative survey administered to participants also comprised of quantitative questions regarding challenges participants face to promote inclusion. Participants rated their level of agreement with the statement “I experience challenges with promoting inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school” on a five-point Likert-scale (1 = Agree, 2 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Disagree, and 5 = Disagree). Similarly, the qualitative survey asked participants what challenges they face as well as how they have or what they need to overcome those challenges. As previously stated, a total of 77 participants also answered these questions on the surveys administered, with 21 of them being school Administrators, 28 Student Support Staff Members, and 28 Educators. The participants were employed by schools across 10 of the 14 school districts in the Distrito Federal, Brazil.
Quantitative results revealed overall agreement and indicated participants experience challenges with promoting inclusion in their schools. The average rating for this question across participants was 1.61 (SD=1.35) out of a five-point Likert-scale, with 1 being agree and 5 being disagree. Importantly, no significant variation was found between participants or school districts through HLM analysis with fixed effects of type of school nor through One-Way ANOVA when accounting for participant group, school group, and school district. Of note, the standard deviation for the item was 1.35, indicating some participants reported less agreement with this item as compared to other items on the survey. Although this variation is not statistically significant, it does provide helpful insight when paired with qualitative results. Additionally, some disagreement was identified in the quantitative data regarding the availability of resources to promote inclusion in schools, with question five indicating an average score of 2.03 (SD=1.21) out of a five-point Likert-scale, with 1 being agree and 5 being disagree.

Qualitative results also revealed agreement regarding participants’ experience with facing challenges. Overall, participants referenced experiencing challenges 586 times. Through content analysis, the researcher identified that participants face five different types of challenges in the effort to promote inclusion in their school. These include lack of support (including academic/intellectual, material, human, and monetary; cited 423 times); negative attitudes and actions which stemmed from or resulted in stigma, prejudice, or ableism (cited 68 times); communication challenges between staff, students, and families (cited 44 times); differences in expectations about inclusion (cited 40 times); and excessive bureaucracies (cited 35 times). Of note, these results explain the slight disagreement found with question 5 on the quantitative survey, which asked participants to rate their level of agreement with the following statement: “There are resources available to promote the inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without
In addition to the identification of challenges in promoting inclusive education, the researcher also identified manifestations of contradictions in discourse (Engeström & Sannino, 2011, see Table 1). This supported the identification of contradictions that generate inequity within the public education system, shedding light onto where the tensions lie as well as possible triggers for transformations in the process of inclusive education in DF’s public schools (Engestrom, 2011; Engestrom & Sannino, 2010).

Dilemmas were identified a total of 259 times across all interviews, with 81 citations being identified in Administrators’ discourse, 65 citations in Support Staff Members’ discourse, and 113 citations in Educators’ discourse. Overall, Dilemmas identified feelings of denial and confusion when participants reflected on the availability of systems, strategies, and resources that support inclusive practices in their school. Dilemmas particularly highlighted the impact of high turn-over rates, lack of knowledge, community acceptance of inclusive practices, student-to-staff ratio, excessive bureaucracies, and unpreparedness of schools and their staff for the implementation of inclusive systems. Conflicts were identified a total of 302 times across all interviews, with 95 citations being identified in Administrators’ discourse, 83 citations in Support Staff Members’ discourse, and 124 citations in Educators’ discourse. Overall, Conflicts identified tension between participants and the SEEDF due to the lack of support and adherence to the system the Secretaria has establish to promote inclusive education in public schools. Critical Conflicts were identified a total of 63 times across all interviews, with 8 citations being
identified in Administrators’ discourse, 20 citations in Support Staff Members’ discourse, and 35 citations in Educators’ discourse. Critical Conflicts identified feelings of violation and guilt through participants description of their inability to support all students in their school, their relationship with the SEEDF, and their experience with being othered as a result of their work with students with disabilities. Double Binds were identified a total of 52 times across all interviews, with 7 citations being identified in Administrators’ discourse, 12 citations in Support Staff Members’ discourse, and 33 citations in Educators’ discourse. Double Binds identified movement toward practical transformations, with participants’ expressed need to find a new way to overcome the challenges faced due to lack of resources.

Taken together, contradictions found in participants’ discourse explain some of the nuances in quantitative and qualitative findings. Overall, they indicate the presence of denial, high emotionality, and tension regarding inclusion in their school and within the public education system. This expressed challenge is determined to be related to the lack of support received from the SEEDF, which impact participants ability to implement inclusive education. These identified contradictions are present across all four types of contradictions posed by Engeström and Sannino (2011). As explained by Cenci et al., (2020) “the idea of transformation within an activity system is related to the contradictions faced by the subjects. Contradiction is the driving force of changes and development in an activity system (Engeström, 1987). Within this framework, contradictions, which at first can only be an indication of problems and conflicts, can later trigger transformations in the object (Engeström, 2011; Engeström & Sannino, 2010). In this context, the data obtained introduce the potential for movement toward systems change.

To more explicitly explore what school practitioners recommend to further develop inclusive education systems that address the needs of students in both general and special
education, the researcher asked participants the following open-ended question: “What has or would help you overcome these challenges to promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in your school?” Participants identified actions they have taken to overcome challenges 245 times across all interviews, personal traits, characteristics, or knowledge they have used to overcome challenges 30 times, and what they need to overcome challenges 218 times.

Through these categories, participants identified having a clear understanding of why and how they strive to promote inclusion, being committed to the cause and caring for all students, having experience, and having community support and understanding. They also mentioned trying to overcome challenges by (a) seeking out partnerships with other agencies; (b) building a culture of collaboration and community to mitigate the staff shortage; (c) seeking out professional development opportunities through the SEEDF’s school and independently; (d) not waiting on others and obtaining information independently; (e) making modifications to school events and practices to be more accepting and welcoming of students’ and families’ cultures; (f) being intentional about communicating with staff and the school community about inclusive practices and efforts; and (g) advocating for needs.

Lastly, participants identified their needs to overcome the challenges they face and further improve the implementation of inclusive education in public schools. First, they described the need for monetary resources as a means to acquire other resources. Second, they reflected on the need for more professional development opportunities and further education on inclusion in their higher education training. Third, participants identified the need for more support from the government in regard to staff mental and physical health. Lastly, they identified the need for systems change. In this regard, participants identified four specific
recommendations. First, the de-centralization of the SEEDF’s School; second, the participation of substitute teachers in all professional development activities in the schools; third, the need for smaller classroom sizes; and fourth, more feasible access to specialized services and supports. Of notable importance, to mitigate the challenges faced as a result of the requirement of diagnostic reports to provide additional supports to students in school, participants across different positions and school districts identified the need for a larger support network that would prioritize the provision of services to students. Several suggested that a formal network be established between the public education system and the public health system. These findings indicate continued support for the medical model by the systems of inclusive education in the Distrito Federal. This was further evidenced by the lack of person-first language used by participants throughout the interview process.

Taken together, these results are noteworthy for several reasons. First, the challenges identified by participants in this study are consistent with previous research, which identifies limitations in professional development, specialized intervention, and access to resources (Barbosa & Marinho-Araújo, 2010; Capellini & Rodrigues, 2009; Sant’Ana, 2005). More important, however, are the suggestions that arise from the identification of these challenges. The identification of contradictions in discourse established more explicitly where the challenges lie, identifying tension between schools and the SEEDF due to the lack of support received to implement the inclusive practices outlined. Importantly, the tension identified through discourse provides opportunity for systems change. With the identification of personal traits, actions, and needs, participant responses have provided clear solutions to the challenges posed and previously discussed in the literature, with an overwhelming agreement on the need for collaboration between systems of support that address student education and health.
Limitations and Future Research

The first limitation identified in this study was a result of the COVID-19 Pandemic. The study was conceptualized prior to the beginning of the Pandemic and, as a result, was modified throughout its course to accommodate for the various changes in policy made by the United States and Brazil governments to ensure public health safety. For example, data collection and methodology were first conceptualized to be completely online, then required modifications to address challenges in data collection. These frequent changes impacted the structure of surveys in particular, with some participants reporting that the surveys felt repetitive. On a related note, access to schools was also limited because of the Pandemic, though was a more feasible recruitment method than attempting to connect with schools via email.

Another limitation was the unequal number of participants recruited in each profession. At first, it was the intention of the researcher to have one school administrator, one student support staff, and one teacher from each school be part of the study. Due to high turnover rates it was not possible to recruit an equal number of professionals from each school.

Similarly, the research team was not able to visit schools in all school districts. Distance and safety concerns were taken into consideration when making this decision. As a result, the findings do not represent experiences for four out of the fourteen school districts. Additionally, the perspectives of families, students, and private schools are not included in this study. With respect to the number of participants, another limitation was the small number of participants recruited for quantitative data analysis. With a larger number, more robust conclusions and/or comparisons may have been possible or more evident.

Of note, although the data analysis team obtained a good level of inter-rater agreement the data did not undergo external review to ensure that aspects of the inquiry did not otherwise
re-main unnoticed. Additionally, the approach taken was focused on the face value of survey items and the researcher did not conduct an analysis to determine its psychometric components. Related, time was another limitation present in this study. This was true for the researcher, research team, and participants. With more time, data collection would have been more extensive in the hopes of gathering information from more stakeholders.

Future research should consider testing the psychometric properties of the surveys implemented in this study. Another proposed consideration is to involve more stakeholders in their sample to provide a more comprehensive overview of the current state of inclusive education in the Distrito Federal. Additionally, the identification of discursive manifestations of contradictions was, at times, challenging because the analysis model proposed by Engeström and Sannino’s (2011) takes into consideration communication between two or more people. While the inter-rater agreement revealed strong consensus on the coding of these dilemmas and conflicts, it is recommended that future research continue to identify the differences in identification of contradictions in discourse on one individual. Future research should also consider that the information obtained from this study supports the implementation of interventions that support systems change, like those proposed by Bal, et al., (2016) and Engeström (2007). Interventions like this may support individual schools, school districts, or the SEEDF as a whole to develop and adapt their system of inclusive education to address the movement toward change identified in this study.

Conclusion

Inclusive education in Brazil has been previously identified as utopian and a fallacy, with focus remaining primarily on the challenges faced by schools and educators with implementing and promoting inclusive education. The purpose of this study was three-fold. First, to shift the
rhetoric of research on Brazilian inclusive education and provide a positive outlook toward inclusive education in Brazil. Second, to understand and share tools, strategies, and systems currently implemented to promote inclusion in the Distrito Federal. Third, to determine how to address the challenges identified and continue the work toward inclusive education.

Through quantitative and qualitative methods, participants determined that schools in the Distrito Federal implement strategies to promote inclusive education and were able to describe what these strategies are and how they are implemented in their schools. Areas addressed by such interventions were also identified as encompassing academic, social, emotional, and behavioral. In addition to formal state-wide interventions, unique strategies were also described by the participants, indicating ways through which the schools have cultivated their unique cultures while working toward inclusive education.

Results revealed findings that are consistent with previous research regarding the obstacles faced in promoting inclusive education in Brazil. The study also revealed the contradictions faced by schools and educators, identifying areas in need of intervention and change. Participants identified ways to overcome challenges faced, pointing specifically to the need for a network between the public school and public health systems in order to best support children in schools.

To the researcher’s knowledge, this is the first study that describes the implementation of inclusive education efforts made in the Distrito Federal and identifies solutions proposed by participants to overcome the obstacles experienced in its implementation. Future research should consider implementing interventions that promote systems change. Interventions like those proposed by Bal, et al., (2016) and Engeström (2007) may support the change identified as needed by participants in this study.
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### Appendix A

#### Laws that Guide Equitable and Inclusive Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Brazilian Federal Constitution of 1988           | - Obligatory free basic education to children ages 4 to 17  
- The Federal government is required to guarantee special education to individuals with disabilities, preferably within the general education classroom.  
- Education is a right of every person and guarantees the development of the individual, their ability to exercise their citizenship, and their ability to qualify for jobs.  
- Every person has the right to equal access to school and time to remain in school. |
| Child and Adolescent Statute of 1990              | - Guarantees specialized educational assistance to children with disabilities, preferably in the general education classroom.  
- Guarantees protection to families of children with disabilities and the right to priority in assistance through preventative public policies (e.g., health care, education, public housing). |
| Declaration of Salamanca of 1994                  | - Promotes inclusive education in Brazil and around the world  
- Introduced the possibility to unite the special education system and the general education system by endorsing “schools for all,” which include all people, accept differences, support learning, and respond to individual needs (UNESCO, 1994; Santos, 2000). |
| Law of the Guidelines and Bases of Education of 1996| - Whenever necessary, specialized services in the general education classroom will be provided to students eligible for special education.  
- Whenever it is not possible to provide such services in the general education classroom, this law determines that the educational services will be given in other self-contained classrooms or different schools.  
- Addresses the education of teachers and the development of curriculum, methods, techniques, and resources to assist children with disabilities. |
| Plan of Goals Commitment All for Education of 2007 | - Requires implementation of programs and actions that promote technical and financial assistance to improve the quality of primary education in Brazil.  
- Outlines educational commitments, measures to assess adhesion to commitments, measures to assess quality of primary education, and sources of technical and financial assistance from the federal government.  
- Guarantees access to special education services within the general education classroom and the permanence of students with disabilities within general education classrooms. |
supporting the inclusion of students with disabilities in Brazilian public schools.

| Decree N° 7.611 of 2011 | • Impedes the exclusion of individuals with disabilities from the general education classroom for allegations against their disability.  
• Determines that the educational system should be inclusive in all levels of instruction and that education should occur throughout the life span.  
• Determines that primary education be free and compulsory.  
• Determines that education assures reasonable adaptations in accordance with individuals’ unique needs.  
• Determines that educational adaptations be done in the least restrictive environment to maximize academic and social development.  
• Determines that the provision of special education be introduced, preferably, in the general education classroom. |

| National Education Plan of 2014 | • Determines as a goal that all children with disabilities between the ages of 4 and 17 receive universal access to basic education and specialized education services within the general education classroom.  
• Established that this universal access be provided within an inclusive educational system, with specialized classrooms, multifunctional resource rooms, schools, and services. |

| Brazilian Law on the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities of 2015 | • Promotes and establishes the fundamental rights and liberties of individuals with disabilities with the goal of enforcing their social inclusion and citizenship.  
• Determines that it is the duty of the federal government, the family, and the community to promote access to quality education to individuals with disabilities.  
• Determines that it is the duty of the federal government to ensure, create, develop, implement, and evaluate an educational system that is inclusive at all levels and modalities.  
• Highlights the importance of research in the development of new pedagogical methods and techniques.  
• Determines the need for inclusive pedagogical practices.  
• Determines the need for unique practices that maximize the social and academic development of students with disabilities while favoring their access to, and permanence and participation in school  
• Determines the need for improvement in the educational systems through the elimination of barriers and promotion of inclusion. |
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School Survey

1. Please complete the following information about yourself, as the school’s primary contact:
   - Name:
   - Email:
   - Professional Role:

2. Please complete the following information about your school:
   - School District:
   - School Name:
   - School Address:
   - School Phone Number:

Please provide the following demographics for your school:

3. Number of students enrolled in school:

4. Percentage of students in:
   - General education:
   - Special education:

5. Percentage of student race/ethnicity:
   - Branca:
   - Preta:
   - Parda:
   - Amarela:
   - Indígena:

“Inclusive education is an ambitious and far-reaching notion that is, theoretically, concerned with all students. The concept focuses on the transformation of school cultures to (1) increase access (or presence) of all students (not only marginalized or vulnerable groups), (2) enhance the school personnel’s and students’ acceptance of all students, (3) maximize students’ participation in various domains of activity, and (4) increase the achievement of all students” (Artiles, 2006, p. 67).

6. Based on the definition of inclusive education stated above, does your school currently employ a formal plan to promote inclusion?
   - Yes/Somewhat/No
   - If yes or somewhat, please attach your written plan here: File upload.

Next, please nominate individuals to complete our practitioner survey.

The individuals you nominate must:
   a. Have two or more years of experience in their current position.*
      *Priority should be given to practitioners with 6 or more years in current position.
   b. Be able to discuss efforts made to promote inclusion within your school.
Examples of nominees for each role include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Student Support Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Elementary School Teacher</td>
<td>• Principal</td>
<td>• School Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Middle School Teacher</td>
<td>• Vice Principal</td>
<td>• School Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High School Teacher</td>
<td>• Executive Director</td>
<td>• School Social Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General Education Teacher</td>
<td>• Area Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Special Education Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High School Subject-Specific Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Teacher nominee:
   - Teacher nominee name:
   - Teacher nominee email:
   - Teacher’s job description:

8. Administrator nominee:
   - Administrator nominee name:
   - Administrator nominee email:
   - Administrator’s job description:

9. Student Support Staff nominee:
   - Student Support Staff nominee name:
   - Student Support Staff nominee email:
   - Student support staff member’s job description:
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TERMO DE CONSENTIMENTO LIVRE E ESCLARECIDO

You are being invited to participate in the project: Strategies that promote inclusion in schools in the Federal District of Brazil, under the responsibility of Principal Investigator Professor Stephen Quintana at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA; local partner Professor Cláudia Cristina Fukuda at the Catholic University of Brasília, who speaks Portuguese and is familiar with Brazilian school systems; and doctoral candidate Sophia Cândida Ferreira Dodge at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA, who speaks Portuguese. You have been asked to participate because you are a teacher, school administrator, or student support staff member at a public school in the Distrito Federal, member of the Secretaria de Estado de Educação of DF.

The objective of this research is: to identify strategies and systems that schools in the Federal District use to promote the inclusion of all students in the school. This research is justified because the literature broadly describes the challenges in providing access to equitable education for all Brazilian students and (b) the need for new systems aimed at promoting inclusion within schools to comply with inclusion laws. However, there is a lack of research that addresses inclusion and educational equity with the intention of unveiling solutions to the obstacles already identified.

You will receive all necessary clarifications before and during the research and we assure you that your name will not appear, and the strictest confidentiality is maintained through the total omission of any information that allows you to be identified. You may refuse to answer any question that causes you embarrassment and may withdraw from participating in the research at any time without any prejudice to you.

Your participation will be as follows: you will be asked to complete a questionnaire and answer an interview about strategies and systems that you use to promote inclusion in the school where you work. Half of the questions will be answered in an electronic questionnaire and the other half will be answered verbally to a member of the research team. The estimated time for its realization is 30 minutes.

The results of the research will be published at the Catholic University of Brasília and the University of Wisconsin-Madison and may be published later. The data and materials used in the research will be kept by the researcher. You may request access to the results of the survey and/or interview as well as the registration of the signed consent whenever you deem necessary.

This project has no direct benefits to the participant and presents the following risks: (1) breach of confidentiality; (2) participants may disclose personal, sensitive or identifiable information when answering open questions about the survey and/or interview; (3) participants may become tired or frustrated due to the duration of the questionnaire. To minimize these risks, (1) the collected data will be stored securely in accordance with university policy, and where necessary, identifiable information will be stored separately from other study data and the identities of participants will be masked in the publication; (2) participants will be informed about all aspects of the study during consent and will have the option to skip or withdraw from any activities that make them upset or uncomfortable; (3) and participants will be informed of the approximate duration of the study activities during the and will have the opportunity to take breaks during research activities if necessary. Due to the collection of data answered in person, there is also the risk of contamination by SARS-CoV2. To minimize this risk, members of the Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa-CEP-2018.
support team will wear face masks, practice social distancing of at least 2 meters, provide hand sanitizer, and be vaccinated against the virus.

It is the responsibility of the researcher to provide full assistance and indemnification in case of damages that are directly or indirectly related to the research. This research will not bring you costs, and it is our responsibility to pay the reimbursement of expenses related to the research. The responsible researcher, when noticing any risk or significant damage to the research participant, anticipated or not, provided for in the Free and Informed Consent Form, must immediately communicate the fact to the CEP/CONEP System, and evaluate, on an emergency basis, the need to adapt or suspend the study. If the minimum number of participants to perform the work is not reached, it will be suspended and terminated.

If you have any questions about the research, please contact: Cláudia Cristina Fukuda, at the Catholic University of Brasilia, in the annex of block M, e-mail: fukuda@p.ucb.br, phone 33569000 (Graduate Program in Psychology), at: 8:00 am to 6:00 pm. You can also contact Stephen Quintana at the University of Wisconsin Madison, USA, email: stephen.quintana@wisc.edu, phone: +1 608-262-6987; or Sophia Dodge at the University of Wisconsin Madison, USA, email: scdodge@gmail.com, phone: +1 718-844-6259.

This project was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of ucb, protocol number 5.266.926. The Research Ethics Committee of the Catholic University of Brasilia (CEP-UCB) is a standing committee linked to the National Commission of Ethics in Research/National Health Council (CONEP/CNS) and created by ORDINANCE No. 072/00 of the Rectory of ucb, of May 15, 2000 and linked to the Coordination of Research and Extension. Doubts regarding the signing of the TCLE or the rights of the research participant can be obtained from the CEP/UCB by phone: (61) 3356-9784 or 3356-9381; e-mail: cep@ucb.br. The UCB ZIP Code is located in room R-201, at campus I - QS 07 - Lot 01 - EPCT - Águas Claras - Brasilia - DF.

The project was also approved by the institutional Review Board of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Answers regarding the signing of this consent form or the rights of the research participant can also be obtained from the IRB Office of Education and Social/Behavioral Sciences, in the United States, by phone +1 608-265-4312.

This document was prepared in two copies, one will stay with the responsible researcher and the other with the participant.

I agree to participate in the research: YES ( ) NO ( )
Full name:
Signature:
Full name of the researcher in charge: Cláudia Cristina Fukuda and Stephen Quintana
Signature:
 Brasilia, ________ de

**TCLE with more than one sheet:** In the event that the TCLE presents more than one sheet, it should be included in writing that these should be initialled by the research subject or responsible and by the researcher responsible.

Comité de Ética em Pesquisa-CEP-2018.
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Participant Survey

1. Please complete the demographic information below:
   - Name:
   - Age:
   - Gender:

2. Please tell us about the school you work in:
   - School Name:
   - School District:
   - Time working at this school:

3. Please complete the information about your professional role:
   - Professional Role in School:
   - Time in current role:

4. Please complete the information about your academic achievements:
   - University Major:
   - Graduation year:
   - Highest degree obtained:
   - List of licenses acquired:

“Inclusive education is an ambitious and far-reaching notion that is, theoretically, concerned with all students. The concept focuses on the transformation of school cultures to (1) increase access (or presence) of all students (not only marginalized or vulnerable groups), (2) enhance the school personnel’s and students’ acceptance of all students, (3) maximize students’ participation in various domains of activity, and (4) increase the achievement of all students” (Artiles, 2006, p. 67).

Based on the definition of inclusion stated above, please indicate how much you agree with the following statements:

Quantitative:

1. I am able to reflect on efforts made to promote inclusion in my school.
   a. Agree-Disagree
   b. Please explain why you indicated _____ for this question.

2. People use strategies that promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.
   a. Agree-Disagree
   b. Please explain why you indicated _____ for this question.

3. People in my school use strategies that promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) through various domains of activity (e.g., academic, social, emotional, and/or behavioral)?
   a. Agree-Disagree
   b. Please indicate which domains of activity:
      i. academic, social, emotional, and/or behavioral
   c. Please explain why you indicated _____ for this question.
4. There are systems to support inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) at my school.
   a. Agree-Disagree
   b. Please explain why you indicated _____ for this question.
5. There are resources available to promote the inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.
   a. Agree-Disagree
   b. Please explain why you indicated _____ for this question.
6. People collect data to inform inclusive practice for all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.
   a. Agree-Disagree
   b. Please explain why you indicated _____ for this question.
7. There is an awareness of the school community towards inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.
   a. Agree-Disagree
   b. Please explain why you indicated _____ for this question.
8. There are professionals responsible for promoting inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.
   a. Agree-Disagree
   b. Please explain why you indicated _____ for this question.
9. I experience challenges with promoting inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.
   a. Agree-Disagree
   b. Please explain why you indicated _____ for this question.

Qualitative:

10. What strategies, procedures, or systems do people use to promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in your school?
    a. You may think of strategies, procedures, or systems that:
       i. increase access to learning for all students in your school.
       ii. enhance school personnel’s and students’ acceptance of all students.
       iii. maximize students’ participation in various domains of activity.
       iv. increase achievement of all students in your school.
11. How do people in your school promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) through various domains of activity (e.g., academic, social, emotional, and/or behavioral)?
12. What resources are available to promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in your school?
    a. You may think of resources that help:
       i. increase access to learning for all students in your school.
       ii. enhance school personnel’s and students’ acceptance of all students.
       iii. maximize students’ participation in various domains of activity.
       iv. increase achievement of all students in your school.
13. How do people use data to inform inclusive practices for all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in your school?
14. Discuss how the needs of students with and without disabilities are determined in your school?
15. How does your school promote awareness towards inclusive practices?
16. Who are the professionals responsible for helping promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in your school?
17. What are the challenges you face to promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in your school?
18. What has or would help you overcome these challenges to promote inclusion of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in your school?
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Analysis of Variance by Participant and School Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Participant Groups</th>
<th>School Groups</th>
<th>District Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df1=2 and df2=74</td>
<td>df1=1 and df2=75</td>
<td>df1=9 and df2=69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k=3, N=77)</td>
<td>(k=2, N=77)</td>
<td>(k=10, N=77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am able to reflect on efforts made to promote inclusion in</td>
<td>F statistic p-value</td>
<td>F statistic p-value</td>
<td>F statistic p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17 p=0.32</td>
<td>1.19 p=0.31</td>
<td>0.25 p=0.78</td>
<td>1.18 p=0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my school.</td>
<td>2. People use strategies that promote inclusion of all students</td>
<td>2.15 p=0.15</td>
<td>0.72 p=0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.11 p=0.89</td>
<td>0.14 p=0.87</td>
<td>0.42 p=0.66</td>
<td>0.97 p=0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People in my school use strategies that promote inclusion of</td>
<td>0.51 p=0.47</td>
<td>0.03 p=0.87</td>
<td>1.23 p=0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) through various</td>
<td>0.79 p=0.36</td>
<td>0.27 p=0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domains of activity (e.g., academic, social, emotional, and/or</td>
<td>0.03 p=0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavioral)?</td>
<td>0.27 p=0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There are systems to support inclusion of all students (i.e.,</td>
<td>0.97 p=0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with and without disabilities) at my school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49 p=0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There are resources available to promote the inclusion of all</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.48 p=0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.</td>
<td>0.42 p=0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People collect data to inform inclusive practice for all students</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42 p=0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.</td>
<td>0.42 p=0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There is an awareness of the school community towards inclusion</td>
<td>0.42 p=0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42 p=0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There are professionals responsible for promoting inclusion of</td>
<td>0.42 p=0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all students (i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42 p=0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I experience challenges with promoting inclusion of all students</td>
<td>0.42 p=0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e., with and without disabilities) in my school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42 p=0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F-critical for participant group is 3.12; F-critical for school group is 3.97; F-critical for district group is 2.02.*
Appendix I

Specialized Services for Students with Disabilities:

- **Specialized Services for Educational Support:** Multidisciplinary team of psychologists and educators. The team’s goal is to promote improvements in teaching and learning processes through institutional actions, preventative work, and intervention work.

- **Resource Classrooms:**
  - *General Resource Classroom:* Overseen by a teacher with specialization in this work. Supports students with intellectual disability, physical disability, multiple disabilities, and autism spectrum disorder.
  - *Bilingual General Resource Classroom:* Overseen by a bilingual teacher in Brazilian Sign Language and Portuguese. Provides specialized supports to students with visual impairments and associated disabilities.
  - *Specific Resource Classroom:* Overseen by a teacher with specialization in this work. Provides specialized supports to students with hearing and visual impairments.

Strategies:

- **Enrollment Strategy:** Identifies what classrooms students will be in and, specifically, what classrooms will support students with disabilities.
- **Curriculum Adaptation:** Supports the development of generalized and specialized curriculums for students.
- **Classroom observations**
- **Regrouping:** Small intervention groups with students who need supports at the a similar level.

Type of Classrooms:

- **Special Classrooms:** Transitory classroom for students with intellectual disabilities, multiple disabilities, global developmental delay, autism spectrum disorder, or visual impairment.
- **Inverse Integrations Classroom:** Reduced classroom for students with global developmental delay or autism spectrum disorder and students without disabilities.
- **Common Inclusive Classroom:** Regular education classroom with students without disabilities and students with physical disabilities, global developmental delay, autism spectrum disorder, and specific functional disabilities.
- **Classe Bilingue:** Students with hearing and/or visual impairments who communicate through Brazilian Sign Language.
- **Classe Bilingue Mediada:** Inclusive classroom with hearing students, students with hearing and/or visual impairments who communicate through Brazilian Sign Language.

Support Staff:

- **Monitor:** Orients students to the school and monitors student behavior.
- **Psychologist:** Is part of specialized service teams. Supports teachers with adapting teaching strategies and support students with implementing individualized learning strategies.
- **Volunteer Social Educator:** Supports students with disabilities in the classroom and with navigating the school in a social aspect.
- **Resource Classroom Teachers:** Teachers with specialization who support students with disabilities in their learning process.
School-wide Supports:

- **Class Council:** Periodic school-wide meeting to evaluate student progress and determine the need for adaptations for improvements in learning.
- **Pedagogical Week:** School staff orientation week, when the school’s yearly goals and objectives are shared with staff members.
- **Guidance Counseling:** Plan, coordinate, implement, and evaluate education practices.
Appendix J

Visual Representation of Formal Inclusion Process as Described by Participants

Acquisition of Diagnostic Report
• From a psychologist or medical doctor

Educational Evaluation
• Completed by the Specialized Services for Educational Support

Case Study
• Completed by the Specialized Services for Educational Support, with support from school administrators and support staff.

Enrollment Strategy
• Determines number of inclusive classrooms, type of inclusive classrooms, and students in each classroom.