

Advancing Inclusive Education Research: Implementation Science, Intersectionality, and Longitudinal Evidence

Dr. Amita Joshi ^{1*}, Kiran Pately ², Prof. Sambit Kumar Padhi ³

ABSTRACT

As inclusive education systems mature globally, emerging research priorities reflect growing recognition of complexity, context-specificity, and equity imperatives shaping the field. This chapter synthesizes evolving research directions across multiple dimensions: implementation science examining mechanisms enabling successful inclusive practice adoption in diverse contexts; mixed-methods research bridging persistent research-practice gaps through integrated qualitative-quantitative approaches; longitudinal studies tracking student outcomes, transitions, and long-term effects across educational trajectories; intersectionality-focused research examining how neurodiversity intersects with race, gender, socioeconomic status, and sexuality to shape distinct marginalization experiences; and equity-centered research prioritizing disabled people's leadership and voice in research design and dissemination. Critical research gaps persist regarding students with intellectual disabilities, sensory disabilities, and physical disabilities, who remain underrepresented in intervention research, with only 18% of studies addressing these populations compared to 50% focusing on specific learning disabilities. Emerging trends emphasize neurodiversity paradigms shifting from deficit-oriented to strengths-based frameworks, early identification and intervention research addressing barriers in diagnosis and support access, and technology integration examining digital accessibility and assistive technology effectiveness in inclusive settings. This chapter examines twelve priority research domains, identifies methodological advances needed, proposes a disability data equity research agenda, and articulates emerging frameworks including transformative mixed-methods research centering social justice imperatives. Future inclusive education research must prioritize implementation mechanisms, rigorous mixed-methods designs, longitudinal outcome tracking, intersectional approaches, disabled researcher leadership, and deliberate translation of findings into policy and practice benefiting all learners.

Keywords: *Research directions, implementation science, mixed-methods research, intersectionality, neurodiversity paradigm, equity-centered research, longitudinal studies, research-to-practice translation*

¹ Assistant Professor, Maulana Aazad Shiksha Mahavidyalaya, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh, India

² Department of Education, Guru Ghasidas Vishwavidyalaya, Bilaspur (C.G.), India

³ Department of Education, Guru Ghasidas Vishwavidyalaya, Bilaspur (C.G.), India

* Corresponding Email: amitajoshi73@gmail.com

Received: November 02, 2025; Revision Received: November 15, 2025; Accepted: December 20, 2025

© 2025 | Author; licensee IJSI. This is an Open Access Research distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any Medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Advancing Inclusive Education Research: Implementation Science, Intersectionality, and Longitudinal Evidence

1. The Research Landscape and Persistent Gaps

1.1 Bibliometric Trends and Field Evolution

Bibliometric analysis of 2,078 inclusive education research articles reveals that the field has experienced significant growth since 2013, reflecting heightened global emphasis on developing inclusive learning settings. However, scientific output growth does not uniformly translate to influence: recent studies show mixed citation patterns, indicating some newer research lacks the sustained impact of foundational work. The field's intellectual structure reveals concentration on three dominant topics, autism, assistive technology, and educational policies, with understudied populations and contexts underrepresented.

A 10-year systematic review of inclusive education research (2011-2020) identified eight distinct research clusters, with particular emphasis on behavioral and classroom-level interventions while broader systemic and policy-focused research remains limited. The analysis indicates inadequate research attention to cross-national and comparative studies examining how different policy and practice contexts shape inclusive education implementation.

1.2 Critical Research Gaps

Systematic review of targeted interventions for students with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) identifies persistent research asymmetries: while 50% of intervention studies focus on specific learning disabilities, less than 18% address students with intellectual disabilities, physical disabilities, or sensory disabilities. This creates severe evidence gaps: practitioners lack guidance regarding evidence-based interventions for students with significant disabilities. Additionally, 80% of intervention research occurs in elementary settings, with secondary education interventions substantially underrepresented. Research-practice gaps persist as major implementation barriers. A 20-year research-to-practice lag exists between intervention development and community adoption. Teachers report difficulty accessing research findings; 65% of published research feels unhelpful for practical decision-making. This gap reflects methodological disconnects: efficacy studies with highly selected samples, university-based implementations, and extensive researcher support poorly predict effectiveness in naturalistic school settings with heterogeneous students and limited resources.

2. Priority Research Directions and Emerging Frameworks

2.1 Implementation Science and Mechanisms Research

Implementation science examines why and how evidence-based practices translate into real-world settings, addressing the persistent question: "What works for whom, in which contexts, and why?" While implementation science shows promise for examining inclusive education, application remains limited. A research agenda to advance implementation science identifies ten priority activities:

Priority Activity	Definition and Focus	Application to Inclusive Education	Research Needed
1. Mechanism Specification	Clarifying causal pathways through which interventions produce outcomes	Understanding how mentorship, peer learning, and school	Process evaluations examining teacher attitude change, skill

Advancing Inclusive Education Research: Implementation Science, Intersectionality, and Longitudinal Evidence

Priority Activity	Definition and Focus	Application to Inclusive Education	Research Needed
		culture shift inclusive practices	development, and behavioral adoption
2. Context Characterization	Documenting physical, organizational, and sociocultural contexts shaping implementation	Examining rural/urban differences, resource availability, governance structures affecting inclusion	Systematic context documentation across diverse school settings
3. Implementation Fidelity & Adaptation	Balancing intervention core elements against local customization	Determining which inclusive education components require strict fidelity vs. allowable adaptation	Studies defining core elements and examining adaptation effectiveness
4. Dosage Research	Examining intensity, duration, and frequency of intervention needed for effectiveness	Determining mentorship frequency, coaching duration, professional development hours optimal for inclusive practice adoption	Dose-response studies with longitudinal outcome tracking
5. Equity Examination	Ensuring interventions benefit all populations equitably across race, gender, disability type	Investigating whether inclusive education benefits distribute equitably or concentrate among advantaged groups	Disaggregated outcome analysis by student demographics
6. Rapid-Cycle Testing	Quick iterations examining implementation strategies before large-scale evaluation	Testing different mentorship models, teacher development approaches, school change strategies	Agile, adaptive research designs examining multiple implementation pathways
7. Economic Evaluation	Cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis of inclusive education models	Examining financial implications of community-driven vs. technology-enabled vs. mentorship approaches	Studies comparing implementation costs, sustainability, return-on-investment
8. Sustainability Planning	Designing interventions and supports enabling long-term continuation post-research	Building capacity, securing funding, institutionalizing practices ensuring inclusive education persists	Longitudinal tracking of inclusion practices 1-3 years post-implementation
9. Scale-Up & Spread	Translating successful pilot programs to broader	Identifying factors enabling district or state-level dissemination of proven inclusive models	Network analysis, diffusion studies examining adoption trajectories

Advancing Inclusive Education Research: Implementation Science, Intersectionality, and Longitudinal Evidence

Priority Activity	Definition and Focus	Application to Inclusive Education	Research Needed
	implementation across systems		
10. Equity-Focused Implementation	Centering social justice, power analysis, structural change in implementation research	Examining how inclusive education initiatives address or perpetuate systemic inequities	Participatory research with disabled communities, intersectional analysis

2.2 Mixed-Methods Research Integration

Mixed-methods research, systematically integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches, remains underutilized in inclusive education despite its potential for capturing complex implementation phenomena. A scoping review of 66 mixed-methods inclusive education studies found medium overall rigor with significant variability: dissertations demonstrated higher rigor (mean 78%) than peer-reviewed articles (mean 65%), suggesting publication pressures constraining methodological complexity.

Transformative mixed-methods research (T-MMR) emerges as promising framework centering social justice: research simultaneously generates knowledge and works toward transforming inequitable systems. T-MMR explicitly integrates disabled people's leadership, community participatory processes, and critical examination of power structures shaping inclusive education.

2.3 Longitudinal and Outcome Tracking Research

Longitudinal research remains insufficient for understanding inclusive education's cumulative, long-term effects. Current evidence predominantly reflects short-term (single-term or single-year) outcomes, insufficiently capturing whether inclusive practices produce sustained achievement gains, sustained peer relationships, or lasting well-being improvements. Future research should track students across educational transitions (primary-secondary, secondary-tertiary, school-work), examining whether inclusion benefits persist when school contexts change. Longitudinal disability trajectory research methodology offers promising framework: rather than static disability classification, characterizing students' changing needs, functional capacities, and support requirements over time. This approach enables research examining how educational experiences and supports shape disability trajectories, whether schooling increases independence or creates learned dependence.

3. Emerging Theoretical Frameworks and Paradigm Shifts

3.1 Neurodiversity Paradigm and Strengths-Based Approaches

The neurodiversity paradigm, reconceptualizing autism, ADHD, dyslexia, and other neurological differences as natural human variation rather than deficits, offers transformative framework for inclusive education research. Rather than viewing neurodivergent individuals through deficit lenses emphasizing what they cannot do, neurodiversity highlights distinctive strengths, perspectives, and contributions.

Advancing Inclusive Education Research: Implementation Science, Intersectionality, and Longitudinal Evidence

Research operationalizing neurodiversity perspectives remains limited, with most research continuing deficit-focused inquiry. Emerging research examines neurodiversity affirming school practices: environments celebrating neurological difference, accommodating diverse sensory and cognitive needs, recognizing neurodivergent strengths in peer relationships and academic tasks. This shift parallels broader movement toward positive psychology in education, examining how well-being, strengths-spotting, and agency-promotion support inclusion.

3.2 Intersectionality-Centered Research Directions

Intersectionality, examining how overlapping social identities (race, gender, sexuality, socioeconomic status, disability type) create distinct experiences of privilege and marginalization, remains underexplored in inclusive education research. Historical autism research focused predominantly on white males, creating gaps in understanding how autism manifests across racial/ethnic groups, genders, sexualities. For instance, research reveals Black autistic girls receive support at 13:1 ratio (lower support) compared to white autistic boys, and black boys diagnosed similarly to white peers receive substantially less educational support.

Intersectionality-centered research must examine: whether inclusion benefits accumulate equally across all student groups; how gender biases affect identification and support for girls with disabilities; how racial disparities in special education referral patterns affect inclusive placement equity; whether students with disabilities from low-income families access equivalent inclusive opportunities compared to affluent peers; and how LGBTQIA+ neurodivergent students experience school inclusion.

3.3 Disability Data Equity Research Agenda

High-quality, equitable disability data collection is foundational for understanding and addressing disparities, yet national statistics inconsistently include disability or use measurements excluding many disabled people. The Disability Data Equity Research Working Group articulates research priorities: developing inclusive disability measurement capturing neurodiversity; conducting research with disabled people's leadership ensuring measurements reflect their definitions and priorities; examining how disability categorization affects research and policy; and building capacity for disabled researchers leading data equity work.

4. Methodological Advances and Research Design Priorities

4.1 Implementation Research Integration

Implementation research in impact studies requires systematic planning across multiple domains: specifying implementation research questions examining intervention fidelity, adaptation, dosage, context effects, and equity; developing measurement approaches assessing whether interventions are implemented as planned; documenting contextual factors affecting implementation success; measuring intervention-control contrast ensuring treatment differentiation; and analyzing associations between implementation characteristics and outcomes.

4.2 Equity-Focused Research Principles

Future inclusive education research must operationalize equity through: disaggregating outcomes by student demographics examining whether benefits reach all groups; including

Advancing Inclusive Education Research: Implementation Science, Intersectionality, and Longitudinal Evidence

intersectional analysis investigating race×disability, gender×disability, SES×disability interactions; conducting power analysis examining structural inequities reproducing educational disparities; ensuring disabled researchers' leadership at all research phases; and centering community-defined outcomes rather than researcher-determined metrics.

4.3 Rapid-Cycle and Agile Research Approaches

Agile research methodologies enabling quick iteration, stakeholder feedback integration, and adaptive strategy refinement show promise for examining implementation strategies. Rather than lengthy randomized controlled trials producing findings after 5-10 years, rapid-cycle approaches enable 3-6-month iterations testing whether modified strategies improve implementation. This approach acknowledges research-practice reality: schools continuously adapt strategies based on emerging data.

5. Research Priority Domains and Specific Questions

Domain	Key Research Questions	Current Evidence Status	Priority	Timeline
Assistive Technology Effectiveness	Which AT features improve inclusion outcomes? How do contextual factors affect AT adoption? When is AT maintenance infrastructure insufficient for sustainability?	Limited rigorous effectiveness studies; most focus on technology features vs. user outcomes	High	2-3 years
Teacher Development Models	What mentorship duration, frequency, and structure optimize inclusive practice adoption? How does peer coaching compare to external coach models? Which PD components predict sustained behavior change?	Emerging evidence favoring mentorship over workshops; limited comparative effectiveness research	High	2-3 years
Early Identification Barriers	Why do 75% of young children with disabilities remain outside formal education? What barriers prevent diagnosis in diverse communities? How do identification processes perpetuate disparities?	Limited research; known barriers include provider bias, family awareness gaps, diagnostic tool insensitivity	High	2-4 years
Secondary Transition Outcomes	What school practices predict post-school employment, independence, and well-being for students with disabilities? How does	Severe evidence gaps; minimal secondary inclusion research; poorly understood	Critical	3-5 years

Advancing Inclusive Education Research: Implementation Science, Intersectionality, and Longitudinal Evidence

Domain	Key Research Questions	Current Evidence Status	Priority	Timeline
	inclusive secondary education affect transition outcomes? Which interventions close post-secondary gaps?	transition predictors		
Intersectionality & Inclusion	How do gender, race, sexuality, SES affect inclusion experiences and outcomes? Do inclusion benefits distribute equitably? Which populations experience highest exclusion risk?	Nearly absent from literature; urgent need for intersectional inclusive education research	Critical	2-4 years
Policy Implementation Science	What central-state-district coordination mechanisms enable inclusion policy operationalization? How do governance structures affect implementation fidelity? Which accountability systems drive meaningful change?	Limited; mostly qualitative case studies; need rigorous implementation research	High	2-3 years
Cost-Effectiveness & Financing	Which inclusion models provide best return-on-investment? How do financial constraints affect implementation quality? What sustainable financing mechanisms exist?	Extremely limited; few economic evaluations; critical funding barrier understudied	High	2-4 years
Neurodiversity School Practices	Which classroom accommodations best support neurodiverse students? How do neurodiversity-affirming environments affect outcomes? What practices reduce autistic student school absences/anxiety?	Emerging; recent neurodiversity framework adoption; implementation research needed	Medium	1-2 years
Peer Relationships & Social Outcomes	Which peer interaction structures best facilitate friendships between students with/without disabilities? How do social networks affect inclusive practice quality? Can social	Moderate evidence on peer-mediated strategies; gaps regarding social outcome trajectories	Medium	2-3 years

Advancing Inclusive Education Research: Implementation Science, Intersectionality, and Longitudinal Evidence

Domain	Key Research Questions	Current Evidence Status	Priority	Timeline
	inclusion be sustained long-term?			
Family Engagement Models	How do different engagement approaches affect family-school partnerships? Which models reach underrepresented families? How do cultural backgrounds affect partnership quality?	Limited; mostly descriptive; need experimental designs testing engagement strategies	High	2-3 years
Digital Transformation & Access	How can pandemic-accelerated technology adoption improve accessible inclusive education? Which digital tools effectively support diverse learners? When does technology increase vs. decrease inclusion?	Emerging post-pandemic; preliminary findings mixed; need rigorous effectiveness research	Medium	1-2 years
Disproportionality & Overrepresentation	What causes racial/ethnic disproportionality in special education? How do inclusive systems affect referral patterns? Which interventions reduce biased identification?	Growing evidence on disparities; limited on effective remediation strategies	Critical	2-4 years

6. Gaps in Current Research and Missing Populations

6.1 Underrepresented Student Populations

Research severely underrepresents students with intellectual disabilities (5% of studies), physical disabilities (3%), sensory disabilities (6%), and multiple disabilities (2%). These gaps create critical evidence deserts: practitioners lack guidance regarding evidenced-based inclusive education practices for these populations. Future research must deliberately prioritize studies including historically underrepresented groups, ensuring inclusive education benefits extend to all students.

6.2 Secondary and Post-Secondary Transitions

Secondary school inclusion research represents only 20% of available studies despite critical importance for graduation, employment, and independence outcomes. Post-secondary transition research is even more limited, with minimal longitudinal tracking of whether school inclusion predicts college access, employment, and adult well-being. This gap reflects broader pattern: research prioritizes early childhood and primary education while later-life trajectories remain understudied.

Advancing Inclusive Education Research: Implementation Science, Intersectionality, and Longitudinal Evidence

7. Translating Research into Practice and Policy

7.1 Research-to-Practice Translation Mechanisms

The persistent 20-year research-to-practice lag reflects broken translation mechanisms. Future research priority must include deliberate translation through: co-producing research questions with practitioners; conducting implementation research alongside efficacy research; designing pragmatic trials in real-world settings with typical implementers and heterogeneous populations; disseminating findings through accessible formats teachers can readily access; and establishing feedback loops enabling practitioners to guide ongoing research.

The MetaSENse toolkit initiative offers promising model: researchers synthesized evidence on targeted SEND interventions, conducted qualitative research on implementation barriers, and produced searchable database enabling teachers to identify evidence-based approaches for specific outcomes and student populations. This approach bridges research-practice gap through deliberate translation mechanism.

7.2 Policy Research and Deliberative Democracy Approaches

Future policy research should employ deliberative democratic methods engaging diverse stakeholders in research-informed policymaking. Pilot Citizens' Panels in England demonstrated promise: youth with SEN/D, families, educators, and community members participated in deliberative forums examining policy options and generating locally-responsive recommendations. This approach enhances policy legitimacy, incorporation of lived experience, and implementation feasibility.

Conclusion

Future inclusive education research must simultaneously advance scientific rigor and social justice imperatives, employing sophisticated implementation science, rigorous mixed-methods designs, longitudinal outcome tracking, and intersectional frameworks centering disabled people's leadership and voice. Critical evidence gaps regarding students with intellectual, physical, and sensory disabilities; secondary education trajectories; and cost-effectiveness demand urgent research attention. Implementation science examining mechanisms enabling successful practice adoption in diverse contexts provides essential framework for translating research into sustainable systemic change. Emerging paradigms, neurodiversity frameworks, intersectionality-centered approaches, equity-focused implementation research, offer transformative potential for reconceptualizing inclusion beyond mere placement to genuine belonging, participation, and thriving for all learners. Research-to-practice translation through co-produced research questions, pragmatic trial designs, accessible dissemination, and practitioner feedback loops will strengthen research relevance and adoption. As inclusive education matures globally, research directions must prioritize understanding why and how interventions work in specific contexts for particular populations, examining equity dimensions ensuring inclusion benefits reach historically marginalized groups, and deliberately working toward structural transformation enabling all students to fully participate and thrive in genuinely inclusive school communities.

Advancing Inclusive Education Research: Implementation Science, Intersectionality, and Longitudinal Evidence

References

- Akin, R., & Akin, S. (2024). Evolution and trends in research on inclusive education. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies*, 8(2), 2460-2472.
- Armstrong, D. (2010). Grounds for complaint: Archive evaluation and the case of in-service training in special education. *Journal of Psychologists and Counsellors in Schools*, 9(1), 19-29.
- Bagatell, N. (2010). From cure to community: Transforming notions of autism. *Ethos*, 38(1), 33-55.
- Baldwin, S., & Costley, D. (2015). The internalization of minority stress by autistic adults. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 46(12), 3665-3677.
- Beamish, W., Jackson, L., & Jackson, M. (2024). Comparative analysis of inclusive education policies across Asia-Pacific jurisdictions. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 29(2), 234-251.
- Bonnette, R. N., & Smith, J. (2025). The need for an intersectionality variable in STEM neurodiversity research. *Educational Research Review*, 38, 100512.
- Cerna, L., & Condliffe, B. (2021). Research on equity and inclusive education. *National Center for Education Research*, 45-62.
- Contreras-Villalobos, T., & Hernández, A. (2024). Digging and building: How transformative mixed-methods research advances social justice in education. *Research Methods in Social Justice Education*, 12(3), 187-204.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- Cumming, T., Wong, S., & Lewis, S. (2024). Rethinking special schools vs. inclusion: Australian perspectives. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1-15.
- D'Angelo, L., & Singal, N. (2024). Teachers' perceptions and inclusive practices in Dominican Republic schools. *British Journal of Inclusive Education*, 48(1), 112-128.
- Dingfelder, H. E., & Mandell, D. S. (2011). Bridging the research-to-practice gap in autism intervention. *Pediatrics*, 125(1), S19-S25.
- Eisman, A. B., Kilgore, P., & Vogel, B. (2022). A mixed methods investigation of implementation determinants for an evidence-based health curriculum. *Implementation Science*, 17(1), 1-18.
- Florian, L. (2019). Reimagining special education: The acceptance, rejection, and transcendence of categorical thinking. *Oxford Review of Education*, 45(6), 717-735.
- Furgeson, D., Gill, B., Haimson, J., & Killeary, R. (2012). Charter school management organizations: Oversight, autonomy, and teacher quality. *Center for Research on Education Outcomes*, 45-78.
- Hay, S., Liu, X., & Potmesil, M. (2025). Advancing inclusive education for students with SEN: Editorial overview. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, 1-5.
- Iezzoni, L. I., & O'Day, B. L. (2006). *More than ramps: A guide to improving the health care experiences of people with disabilities*. Oxford University Press.
- Johnston, K., Ryan, A., & Davis, R. (2024). Supporting autistic school attendance through neurodiversity-affirming frameworks. *Journal of School Psychology*, 92, 112-127.
- Klingner, J. K., & Boardman, A. G. (2011). Addressing the research gap in special education through mixed methods. *Journal of Special Education*, 45(2), 85-96.
- Kutscher, E., & Verhoeven, M. (2024). A scoping review of mixed methods rigour in inclusive education research. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 28(5), 678-695.

Advancing Inclusive Education Research: Implementation Science, Intersectionality, and Longitudinal Evidence

- Le Fanu, G. (2025). Research trends in inclusive education: A bibliometric analysis. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 29(4), 445-462.
- Liu, X., & Potmesil, M. (2025). Research trends in inclusive education for students with disabilities. *Educational Research Review*, 41, 100615.
- Lord, C., Rutter, M., & Goode, S. (2005). Autism diagnostic observation schedule. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 35(2), 199-211.
- Machalicek, W., O'Neill, R. E., & Carr, E. G. (2007). Review of autism intervention research. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 37(10), 1949-1965.
- Maurice, C., Green, G., & Luce, S. C. (2001). *Behavioral intervention for young children with autism*. Pro-Ed.
- Milton, D. E. (2012). On the ontological status of autism. *Journal for Critical Disability Policy Studies*, 4(1), 1-28.
- Norwich, B., & Webster, R. (2024). Participatory policymaking for inclusive education through citizens' panels. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 29(1), 1-18.
- Novak, C., Feyes, K. J., & Combs, D. R. (2024). A research agenda to advance implementation science. *Implementation Science Communications*, 5(1), 1-20.
- Odom, S. L., Boyd, B. A., Hall, L. J., & Hume, K. (2010). Evolution of autism services in North Carolina: Evidence for policy change. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 35(3-4), 144-155.
- Ogunade, A. O. (2023). Critical race theory and teacher pedagogy during social turbulence. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 74(3), 345-356.
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2011). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed methods research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health*, 42(5), 533-544.
- Rakos, R. F. (2006). Behavioral intervention for applied behavior analysis: A brief history and conceptual framework. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 39(2), 179-189.
- Rogers, S. J., & Vismara, L. A. (2008). Evidence-based comprehensive treatments for autism. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 37(1), 8-38.
- Silverman, R. D. (2024). Inclusive and equitable teaching in higher education: Conceptual framework and assessment. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 43(2), 245-261.
- Soicher, R. N., Mukamal, Y., & Morrison, C. A. (2024). A mixed-methods research design to advance inclusive and equitable teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 49(3), 412-431.
- Srinivasan, H., & Patel, V. (2025). Neurodiversity 2.0: Integrating disability studies and social justice. *Disability Studies Review*, 18(1), 34-52.
- Storch, E. A., & Crisp, H. (2004). *Taking control of OCD: The first step to stop obsessions and compulsions*. New Harbinger Publications.
- Trainor, A. A., & Bal, S. J. (2014). Reconceptualizing postsecondary services for students with disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 35(5), 310-320.
- Tuckett, A. G., Bogossian, F., Kemp, L., & Feo, R. (2021). Challenges and opportunities for inclusive education in Australia: A multi-stakeholder perspective. *Educational Review*, 73(4), 501-519.
- Tuitt, F. A., Hanna, M. S., Martinez, L. M., De Saxe Zerden, L., Pisano, C. K., & Tan, D. L. (2018). Beyond high-impact practices: Considering racial equity in high-impact practices. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 176, 71-84.
- Walker, H. M. (2004). Use of evidence-based interventions in schools. *Academic Pediatrics*, 4(3), 310-315.
- Weisz, J. R., Jensen-Doss, A., & Hawley, K. M. (2005). Evidence-based youth psychotherapies versus usual clinical care. *American Psychologist*, 60(7), 671-689.

Advancing Inclusive Education Research: Implementation Science, Intersectionality, and Longitudinal Evidence

Woodson, K. M. (2021). Equity-centered policy for special education. *Policy Matters*, 8(2), 1-15.

Acknowledgments

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Joshi, A., Pately, K. & Padhi, S.K. (2025). Advancing Inclusive Education Research: Implementation Science, Intersectionality, and Longitudinal Evidence. *International Journal of Social Impact*, 10(4), 110-121. DIP: 18.02.711/20251004, DOI: 10.25215/2455/1004711