



Teacher education is a deeply pedagogical process rooted in values, ethics, and the social purpose of schooling. Globally, it sits at the core of educational quality and fairness, as research in comparative and international education demonstrates: the training of teachers directly influences students' learning chances, social inclusion, and the democratic aims of schools. Teachers are not simply transmitters of curricula, but active professionals whose convictions, reflective skills, and ability to manage the complexities of classroom life give shape and substance to the educational experience itself.

The pedagogical dimension of teacher education frames teaching as a relational, context-aware, and ethically grounded profession rather than just a set of procedural skills. From a research perspective, this demands robust research methodologies that can critically examine the complex realities of schools and inform evidence-based policies. Equally important is the connection between theory and practice, which helps to bridge the persistent gap between universities and schools.

The contributions gathered in this volume reflect the richness and diversity of experiences showcased during the ATEE Spring Conference 2024, held at the University of Bergamo from May 29 to June 1, 2024. The volume presents 70 selected papers out of more than 300 presented by researchers representing over 40 countries.

This broad spectrum of studies highlights promising directions that can inspire renewed inquiry and concrete proposals aimed at improving contemporary educational systems.

**FRANCESCO MAGNI** is an Associate Professor of General and Social Pedagogy (PAED-01/A) at the Department of Human and Social Sciences, University of Bergamo, Italy. He is a member of the board and Deputy Director of CQIIA (Center for the Quality of Teaching, Didactic Innovation, and Learning). He is also a member of the ATEE - Association for Teacher Education in Europe.

**NICOLE BIANQUIN** is an Associate Professor of Didactics and Special Education (PAED-02/A) at the Department of Human and Social Sciences, University of the Aosta Valley, Aosta, Italy. She is a member of the ATEE - Association for Teacher Education in Europe.

ATEE Spring Conference 2024

## ATEE Spring Conference 2024

### Teacher education research in Europe: trends, challenges, practices and perspectives

May 29<sup>th</sup> – June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024  
S. Agostino, Bergamo



Edited by Nicole Bianquin and Francesco Magni





UNIVERSITÀ  
DEGLI STUDI  
DI BERGAMO | Dipartimento  
di Scienze Umane  
e Sociali



**CQIA**

Centro per la Qualità dell'Insegnamento,  
dell'Innovazione Didattica e dell'Apprendimento  
UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI  
DI BERGAMO



# BOOK OF PROCEEDINGS

## ATEE Spring Conference 2024

Teacher education research in Europe:  
trends, challenges, practices and perspectives

**May 29<sup>th</sup> – June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024**

**S. Agostino, 2 - Bergamo, Italy**

**Edited by Nicole Bianquin and Francesco Magni**



---

Università degli studi di Bergamo

2025

**BOOK OF PROCEEDINGS ATEE Spring Conference 2024. Teacher education research in Europe: trends, challenges, practices and perspectives / Nicole Bianquin, Francesco Magni (edited by) - Bergamo: Università degli studi di Bergamo, 2025**

ISBN: **978-88-97253-27-3**

DOI: [10.62336/unibg.978-88-97253-27-3](https://doi.org/10.62336/unibg.978-88-97253-27-3)

This publication is released under the Creative Commons  
[Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives license \(CC BY-NC-ND 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)



© 2025 The Authors

<https://aisberg.unibg.it/handle/10446/309209>

An event organised by:

Dipartimento di Scienze Umane e Sociali, University of Bergamo // [www.dsus.unibg.it](http://www.dsus.unibg.it)

CQIIA – Centro per la Qualità dell’Insegnamento, dell’Innovazione didattica e dell’Apprendimento, University of Bergamo // [www.cqia.unibg.it](http://www.cqia.unibg.it)

ATEE – Association for Teacher Education in Europe // [www.atee.education](http://www.atee.education)

In collaboration with:

**Siped**  
Società Italiana di Pedagogia  
fondata nel 1989

**SIPED**  
Società Italiana di  
Pedagogia

**BAUHAUS4EU**  
European University Alliance

**Bahuhus4EU**  
European University  
Alliance



**CIRSE**  
Centro italiano per la  
ricerca storico  
educativa

**SIRD**  
Società Italiana di Ricerca Didattica

**SIRD**  
Società Italiana di Ricerca  
Didattica

**SIPSE**  
SOCIETÀ ITALIANA  
PER LO STUDIO DEL  
PATRIMONIO  
STORICO-EDUCATIVO

**SIPSE**  
Società Italiana per lo  
Studio del Patrimonio  
Storico-Educativo

**COMENIUS  
ASSOCIATION  
COMENIUS**

**Comenius Association**  
European Higher Education  
Network of Teacher and  
Social Education

**sipeges**  
Associazione italiana di pedagogia generale e sociale

**SIPeGeS**  
Società Italiana di  
Pedagogia Generale e  
Sociale

**EFVET**  
European Forum  
of Technical  
and Vocational  
Education and Training

**EfVET**  
European forum of  
Technical and Vocational  
Education and Training

**SIPeS**  
Società Italiana  
di Pedagogia  
speciale

**SIPeS**  
Società Italiana di  
Pedagogia Speciale

**ETF**  
Working Together  
Learning for All  
European Training Foundation

**ETF**  
European Training  
Foundation

**C.I.R.PED**  
Centro  
Italiano di  
Ricerca  
Pedagogica

**C.I.R.PED**  
Centro Italiano di  
Ricerca Pedagogica

**INVALSI**

**INVALSI**  
Istituto nazionale per  
la valutazione del  
sistema educativo di  
istruzione e di  
formazione

**SIREF**  
Società Italiana di Ricerca Educativa e Formativa

**SIREF**  
Società Italiana di  
Ricerca Educativa e  
Formativa

**Ufficio  
Scolastico  
Territoriale  
di Bergamo**

**Ufficio Scolastico  
Territoriale di Bergamo**

## Conference Chair

**Nicole Bianquin**, associate professor in Special Education, University of the Aosta Valley, ATEE member;

**Francesco Magni**, associate professor in Education, University of Bergamo, ATEE member.

## Scientific committee

**Adolfo Scotto Di Luzio**, Vice-Rector for Didactics, Guidance and Placement, University of Bergamo, Italy

**Marco Lazzari**, Head of the Department of Human and Social Sciences, University of Bergamo, Italy (until September 2024).

**Anna Maria Falzoni**, Director of CQIIA - Centre for Teaching Quality, Teaching Innovation and Learning, University of Bergamo, Italy

**Maria Assunção Flores**, University of Minho, Portugal

**Joanne Banks**, Trinity College of Dublin, Ireland

**Federica Baroni**, University of Bergamo, Italy

**Tore Bernt Sorensen**, University of Glasgow,

**Scotland (UK)**

**Paolo Bertuletti**, University of Bergamo, Italy

**Serenella Besio**, University of Bergamo, Italy

**Antonio Borgogni**, University of Bergamo, Italy

**T.J. Ó Ceallaigh**, University College Cork, Ireland;

**ATEE AC member**

**Monica Crotti**, University of Bergamo, Italy

**Linda Daniela**, University of Latvia, Latvia

**Dietmar Frommberger**, University of Osnabrück,

**Germany**

**Paola Gandolfi**, University of Bergamo, Italy

**Mabel Giraldo**, University of Bergamo, Italy

**Etti Gordon Ginzburg**, Oranim College of Education,

**Israel**

**Michiel Heijnen**, Marnix Academy, Netherlands; ATEE

**AC President**

**Erika Kopp**, Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary;

**ATEE AC member**

**Marta Kowalczyk-Walędziak**, University of Białystok,

**Poland**

**Anna Lazzarini**, University of Bergamo, Italy

**Hagen Lehmann**, University of Bergamo, Italy

**Nicola Lovecchio**, University of Bergamo, Italy

**Gale MacLeod**, University of Edinburgh, Scotland

**(UK)**

**Fernando Marhuenda Fluixá**, Universitat de València, Spain

**Alessandra Mazzini**, University of Bergamo, Italy

**Sara Nijs**, Leuven University, Belgium,

**Katrin Poom-Valickis**, University of Tallinn, Estonia

**Andrea Potestio**, University of Bergamo, Italy

**Evelina Scaglia**, University of Bergamo, Italy

**Johannes Karl Schmees**, Norwegian University of

**Science and Technology (NTNU), Norway**

**Leah Shagrir**, Levinsky College of Education, Israel;

**ATEE AC member**

**Olena Shyyann**, Lviv State University of Physical

**Culture, Ukraine; ATEE AC member**

**Vasileios Symeonidis**, Pädagogische Hochschule

**Freiburg, Germany**

**Ronny Smet**, Karel de Grote University of Applied

**Science and Arts, Belgium; RDCs Coordinator of**

**ATEE**

**Agnieszka Szplit**, Jan Kochanowski University of

**Kielce, Poland; ATEE AC Vice-President**

**Elena Theodoropoulou**, University of the Aegean,

**Greece**

**Philippe Tremblay**, Université de Laval, Québec

**Vidmantas Tūtlys**, Academy of Education, Vytautas

**Magnus University, Lithuania**

**Wieland Wermke**, Stockholm University, Sweden

**Mara Westling Allodi**, Stockholm University, Sweden

**Jenny Wilder**, Stockholm University, Sweden

**Rano Zakirova Engstrand**, Stockholm University,

**Sweden**

## Organizing committee

**Virginia Capriotti**, University of Bergamo

**Sara Cecchetti**, University of Bergamo

**Federico Chiappetta**, University of Bergamo

**Emilio Conte**, University of Bergamo

**Ester Guerini**, University of Bergamo

**Paolo Lazzaroni**, University of Bergamo

**Alice Locatelli**, University of Bergamo

**Isabel Maggiarra**, University of Bergamo

**Fabio Sacchi**, University of Bergamo

**Arianna Taravella**, University of Bergamo



# Table of contents

## Introduction

Francesco Magni, Nicole Bianquin, *Back to the Core: Rediscovering the Power of Teacher Education Research* 7

## Teacher education and pedagogical perspective in uncertain times: history, theory, policies and practices

Brigitta Bekesi, Eva Ulbrich, Tony Houghton, Jana Trgalova & Zsolt Lavicza, *The Reflected Double Tetrahedron Model: Project-based learning in teacher training* 11

Andrea Dessardo, «*The Italian didactic secret*». *Teachers' education according to Giuseppe Lombardo-Radice's thought* 19

Ylenia Falzone & Alessandra La Marca, *Lifelong Learning for Mongolia: Occupational Health & Safety project (3L4MHOS)* 25

Ylenia Falzone, Benedetta Miro & Elif Gülbay, *Teachers and Artificial Intelligence: Developing Digital Citizenship Skills* 31

Eleonora Florio, Tanu Biswas, Ilaria Castelli & Letizia Caso, *Bleak Pedagogy: A new term unveiled from research on Adultcentrism* 38

Deirdre Harvey & Maria Campbell, *Promoting and supporting learner resilience in the hospital school* 44

Aggelos Kavasakalis & Angeliki-Despoina Varouxi, *Reasons and beliefs of (Greek) teachers for participating in an MSc relevant to their profession* 54

Semih Kaygisiz & Hanife Akar, *Challenges Head to Train Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teachers* 62

Sabina Leoncini, *Gender Stereotypes between School and Guidance: A Look at European Regulations and Vocational Education in Italy* 69

Silvia Maggiolini & Elena Zanfroni, *Emergency and people with intellectual disabilities. Teachers' training in the LEBEL proposal* 77

Cristina Miralles-Cardona, María C. Cardona-Moltó & José M. Esteve-Faubel, <i>Gender-responsive teaching: What strategies are teacher educators using for gender mainstreaming implementation?</i>	83
Benedetta Miro & Alessandra La Marca, <i>Service Learning in teacher education for soft skills development</i>	93
Georgia Natsiou & Melpomeni Tsitouridou, <i>Reflecting together online and offline: A systematic review on the types of peer reflection activities in teacher education</i>	102
Laura Parigi & Maria Elisabetta Cicognini, <i>Exploring the Transformative Impact of Teacher Professional Development on Student-Centered Assessment Approaches</i>	109
Francesca Pileggi, <i>Non-cognitive competence and critical-creative skills. A critical review of the current perspectives</i>	116
Francis J. Prescott-Pickup, <i>Finding a successful teacher identity: the role of the mentor-mentee relationship</i>	122
Nathanaili Valbona, <i>Analyzing poor academic performance of Albanian pupils in PISA</i>	129
Elena Zanfroni, <i>Problematic behaviours and classroom management: teachers' representations</i>	137

## Teaching and learning challenges and professional development

Monica Banzato, <i>Attitudes of Humanities Students and Aspiring Teachers Toward Quantitative Educational Research: An Introductory Study</i>	146
Ane Bergersen, <i>Global awareness and professional teacher competence through student mobility from Norway to Zambia</i>	152
Barbara Bocchi, Elena Bortolitti & Paola Damiani, <i>Informal Support Teacher Networks: training and self-training between Communities of Practice</i>	160
Barbara Bocchi, Elena Bortolitti, Paola Damiani, Giuseppe Filippo Dettori & Barbara Letteri, <i>The use of artificial intelligence (AI) in inclusive learning: an exploratory investigation</i>	167
Virginia Capriotti, <i>The Impact of Teaching and Learning Centers (TLCs) on Initial Teacher Education Programs in Italy</i>	176
Giorgia Coppola, <i>From Burnout toward Pedagogical Teacher Education. A communities perspective</i>	183
Alexandra Efstathiades, Christiane Gesierich, Christian Rudloff & Anna Kapsalis, <i>FOOTT PRINTTS: Advancing Quality Standards in Teacher Training</i>	189

Elena Gabbi, Ilaria ancillotti & Maria Ranieri, <i>Rethinking digital competences for teaching in the Post-Covid Era: A participatory approach</i>	197
Marco Giganti, <i>Emergency Remote Teaching and Teacher Training: The Role of Implicit Beliefs in Lasting Educational Change</i>	205
Hege Knudsmoen & Mette Birgitte Helleve, <i>Develop teachers' professional identity through global internship</i>	212
Charlotte Kohlloffel, <i>Opening the black box of writing instruction in times of change: insights from Italian secondary school teachers</i>	220
Regine Lehberger, <i>A learning-design to promote reflection and digital media skills for professionalisation of teacher students</i>	229
Marica Liotino, Taiwo Isaac Olatunji, Marianne Grace Araneta, & Monica Fedeli, <i>Reflective Practice in MOOCs: Exploring the Role of Tutors and Fostering Teacher Professional Development</i>	236
Cristina Lisimberty & Katia Montalbetti, <i>Guiding students from lower to upper secondary: a challenging and shared task for families and schools</i>	244
Sabrina Natali, <i>Rethinking teacher training in emotional education through sports</i>	256
Sara Nosari & Emanuela Guarcello, <i>The question of non-cognitive skills and the cheetah's coat perspective</i>	262
Alessandro Oro, Ira Vannini & Elisa Guasconi, <i>A formative assessment framework to develop primary school pre-service and in-service teachers' video analysis programs</i>	271
Federica Pelizzari & Simona Ferrari, <i>Exploring Coding and Educational Robotics in Primary Schools. Results and Perspectives from an Action Research Approach to Teaching Innovation</i>	278
Annfrid Rosey & Tove Leming, <i>Internationalization in Teacher Education: How can student practice in Southern Africa contribute to strengthening the professional work as teachers in Northern Norway?</i>	293
Stefano Spennati, <i>Educating on complexity at the time of transition</i>	300
Chiara Urbani, <i>Collaborative and epistemic advances: a study on teacher agency</i>	305
Gerd Wikan, <i>Global Teachers and Practicum in the Global South. A study of Long-Term Impact of International Practicum in Namibia</i>	312
Franco Zengaro & Sally A. Zengaro, <i>Teachers Reflect on Their Identities as Former Students and Future Teachers</i>	318
Sally A. Zengaro & Franco Zengaro, <i>Supporting Active Learning in Online Learning: Creating a Culture of Care</i>	326

## Inclusion in teaching and learning processes and school improvement

Luca Angelone & Federica Festa, <i>Cultivating Inclusive Education: A Collaborative Journey of Secondary School Teachers in Promoting Cognitive and Linguistic Accessibility through Picture Books and AAC</i>	333
Luca Ballestra Caffaratti, Cecilia Marchisio, Alessandro Monchietto, Alessandro Zanzo & Marco Secchia, <i>The Use of Artificial Intelligence in Secondary Schools: Experiences in Initial Teacher Training</i>	340
Daniele Bullegas & Martina Monteverde, <i>Theory into practice: exploring teacher perceptions about Early Intervention in the Italian school system</i>	346
Sara Cecchetti & Nicole Bianquin, <i>The work plan (Plan de Travail) as an educational device that addresses everyone's needs. A survey of teachers' and pupils' perspectives</i>	354
Federica Cilia, Jeanne Kruck, Marie-Hélène Plumet & Mélina Dell'armi, <i>Well-Being and Social Participation of Autism Spectrum Disorder Students at University: the impact of Atypie Friendly Inclusion Program</i>	362
Alice Di Leva & Federica Festa, <i>The Student Voice in teacher training, an investigation into the inclusiveness of European practices</i>	370
Ilaria Folci & Anna Monauni, <i>Differentiation in Preschool. Pedagogical Issues and Best Practices</i>	378
Mabel Giraldo & Fabio Sacchi, <i>Planning the transition to adulthood for students with disabilities: knowledge, perceptions, challenges from STRADE teacher training program</i>	384
Jørgen Klein, Ann Sylvi Larsen & Tove Grete Lie, <i>'People are people' - An investigation of long-term impacts of an international practicum</i>	393
Daniela Maccario & Annamaria Garibaldi, <i>Helping to learn. What are good practices of educational intervention? Structure and preliminary results of a participatory research study</i>	400
Cecilia Marchisio & Alessandro Monchietto, <i>Improving Inclusive Education: The Turin Model of Collaboration between Schools, Universities and Communities</i>	405
Francesca Placanica, Rosa Sgambelluri & Alessandra Priore, <i>Life Designing and inclusive prospects in Italian schools</i>	411
Ilaria Ravasi, <i>Preventing early school leaving. Perspectives of intervention research between school and territory</i>	417

## Digital innovation and artificial intelligence (AI): schools, teachers and students between real and virtual world

Valentina Berardinetti, Michele Ciletti, Andreana Lavanga & Giusi Antonia Toto, <i>Digital Innovation and Artificial Intelligence in Museum Education: perspectives, debates and psychological implications</i>	424
Roxana-Madalina Cristea, <i>Investigating the Relationships between In-service Teachers' Technology Pedagogy Content Knowledge and Virtual Learning Environment Success</i>	432
Francesca De Vitis & Marcello Tempesta, <i>Touch in small hands. Responding to the challenges of technology in childhood 0-6</i>	439
Silvia Larghi & Edoardo Datteri, <i>Programming errors and the attribution of intentionality to educational robots</i>	445
Juliana Elisa Raffaghelli, Francesca Crudele, Laura Foschi & Graziano Cecchinato, <i>Let me introduce open education... Facilitating Prospective teachers' understanding of open Education through an ai-based tool</i>	453
Alice Roffi, <i>Digital technologies and collaborative activities for science teaching in the upper secondary school: a qualitative study on teacher's perspective</i>	464
Alice Roffi, Gabriele Biagini, Stefano Cuomo & Maria Ranieri, <i>Development of teachers' competences on Learning Design and on supporting student's Self-Regulated Learning in the lower secondary school</i>	472
Marcello Tempesta, <i>Teacher education and motivation culture</i>	481

## School & work and the role of teachers in Vocational Education and Training

Maria Concetta Carruba, Mariateresa Cairo & Magdalena Tsoneva, <i>Comparative Analysis of Inclusive Education Practices in Italy and Bulgaria: Reflections from the Erasmus Plus ASuMIE Project</i>	488
Valerio Ferrero, <i>Teacher Education as a Game Changer: Non-Traditional Factors of Inequality and the Role of Teachers for Equity</i>	494
Anna Granata & Valerio Ferrero, <i>Beyond Patriarchy: Teaching Profession, Gender Issues and Teacher Education in Italy</i>	502
Paola Zini & Dalila Raccagni, <i>Teacher training and well-being best practices: the 3H project</i>	508



## POSTER SESSION

Antinea Ambretti, Chiara Gamberini & Arianna Fogliata, *Integration of the Sincrony method in physical education during school age in the digital era* 517

Francesca Finestrone, *Music as an inclusive tool for promoting a sustainable Culture* 523

Francesca Finestrone, Francesco Pio Savino, Leonardo Palmisano & Giusi Antonia Toto, *Nature Connection and Music in Early Education: Insights from the CNS-ch Scale and TEAL Methods* 532

Paula Matijašević, Bruno Matijašević, Ana Žnidarec Čučković & Vesna Babić, *Kinesiologists' and Coaches' Self-Assessment of Their Pedagogical Competences* 538

The contributions published in this book of proceedings have been evaluated through a double-blind peer review process. We would like to thank the members of the Scientific Committee, as well as the many other professors, researchers and experts who agreed to act as reviewers.

# **The Student Voice in Teacher Training, an investigation into the inclusiveness of European practices**

Alice Di Leva, *University of Turin*, [alice.dileva@unito.it](mailto:alice.dileva@unito.it)

Federica Festa, *University of Turin*, [f.festa@unito.it](mailto:f.festa@unito.it)

## **Abstract**

This study investigates the integration of student voice in teacher training programs, with a focus on practices involving students with disabilities across European contexts. Employing a systematic review guided by the PRISMA framework, 47 studies were analyzed to identify trends, barriers, and innovations in promoting inclusivity. Findings highlight significant methodological gaps, such as limited use of non-verbal communication tools, and systemic barriers that hinder authentic student engagement. Despite challenges, promising practices demonstrate the transformative potential of student voice in fostering agency and improving teacher preparedness. These insights advocate for refined methodologies and culturally adaptable strategies to enhance inclusive education.

**Keywords:** student voice; teacher training; intellectual disabilities; complex communicative needs; higher education.

## 1. Introduction

Inclusive education is a cornerstone of equitable societies, yet its implementation remains fraught with challenges. Italian schools have historically been pioneers in integrating students with disabilities, setting a precedent for inclusive practices across Europe. However, despite legislative advancements and policy frameworks aligned with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD, 2006), the gap between policy aspirations and practical outcomes persists.

Central to achieving authentic inclusion is the concept of student voice—the active involvement of students in shaping their educational experiences. As Lundy (2007) emphasizes, inclusion is not merely about physical presence but about creating spaces where students, particularly those with disabilities, can meaningfully participate and influence decision-making processes. This shift challenges traditional hierarchies in education, which often position students as passive recipients rather than active agents.

The dynamics of inclusion also reveal deeper power structures. Those who belong to the majority often hold the privilege of deciding whom to include and under what conditions, a concession that can be revoked at any time. This dynamic risks reducing inclusion to an act of tokenism, attaching subjects as appendices to discourses designed and verbalized by the majority. In this context, researchers have an ethical obligation to place their expertise at the service of people with disabilities, positioning them as participants and collaborators in the research process (Kubiak, 2021). The term “voice”, while signifying a repositioning of students in educational research and reform, must also contend with its limitations. As Lorde (1984) cautions, privileging voice risks denying the potential power of silence and resistance. Furthermore, the societal construct of disability, as Mitchell and Snyder (2000) argue, has historically served as a trope for human disqualification. Disability, in a sense, is the foundation upon which the concept of the “normal” body has been built (Davis, 1995). This study investigates the integration of student voice in teacher training, focusing on practices that involve students with disabilities as co-designers of inclusive education. By conducting a systematic review, we aim to identify trends, barriers, and innovative strategies for embedding student voice into teacher training programs across Europe. This review contributes to a growing body of research advocating for systemic changes to address structural ableism and empower diverse student populations:

«Inclusion as a power dynamic. Who belongs to the majority can afford the luxury of deciding from time to time if and who to include, to whom to allow access to their group, while on the other hand the person who is included will suffer such concession that can be revoked at any time» (Acanfora, 2020, p. 63).

## 2. Methodology

This study adopts a systematic review methodology to explore the integration of student voice into practices involving students with disabilities, with a particular focus on deriving actionable insights for teacher training. The systematic review was conducted following the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) framework, ensuring transparency, rigor, and reproducibility throughout the process. By adhering to these stringent guidelines, the study aimed to minimize bias and enhance the validity of its findings, creating a robust foundation for addressing gaps in current educational practices.

The review aimed to address the following key questions: (1) To what extent are students with disabilities actively involved in student voice practices within formal education contexts? (2) What methodological innovations have been developed to amplify the voices of students with complex communicative needs? (3) How do student voice practices differ between secondary school and university settings? These questions were informed by the conceptualization of student voice as both a process and an outcome, emphasizing the role of students as co-creators of educational change rather than mere participants (Cook-Sather, 2006). This dual conceptualization underscores

the transformative potential of empowering students to influence decisions that shape their learning environments.

### **2.1 Search Strategy and Inclusion Criteria**

The study encompassed empirical research published between 2006 (UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities) and 2024, aligning the start date with the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), which established a global framework for inclusion and equity. A comprehensive search strategy was employed, utilizing databases such as PsycINFO and EBSCO, and deploying Boolean operators to combine a wide range of terms related to "student voice," "disability," and "complex communication needs." These search terms were meticulously designed to capture studies that explicitly addressed the participatory inclusion of students with disabilities in educational settings. Additionally, efforts were made to include literature in multiple languages, provided an abstract was available in English, ensuring a broad and inclusive scope.

The selection of studies was guided by a refined adaptation of the PICO's framework. The population criterion focused on students with disabilities engaged in formal education settings, including both secondary and higher education contexts. The interventions of interest encompassed participatory practices that emphasized active involvement and decision-making by students. While a formal comparison was not a requirement, studies that contrasted traditional approaches with participatory methodologies provided valuable insights. Outcomes were assessed in terms of their impact on fostering inclusivity and enhancing teacher training practices. Finally, only empirical studies employing robust methodologies—qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-method designs—were considered, ensuring that the evidence base was both diverse and methodologically sound. Studies were excluded if they failed to emphasize participatory practices or if the role of student voice was tangential rather than central.

Eliminating duplicates, a pool of 286 studies for screening was created. Titles and abstracts were meticulously reviewed against the inclusion criteria, resulting in 97 full-text articles subjected to a more detailed evaluation. Ultimately, 30 studies met the stringent eligibility requirements, forming the basis for a comprehensive analysis. The PRISMA flowchart (Figure 1) provides a visual representation of the systematic selection process, highlighting the rigor and transparency of the methodology.



Figure 1: PRISMA workflow.

## 2.2 Data Extraction and Analysis

The data extraction process was conducted with a high degree of precision, focusing on key variables such as participant demographics, study design, and reported outcomes. Two independent reviewers systematically extracted data, ensuring inter-rater reliability by resolving any discrepancies through consensus. Thematic synthesis served as the primary analytical approach, enabling the identification of recurring patterns, methodological innovations, and existing gaps within the literature. This method allowed for the integration of findings across studies, providing a nuanced understanding of how student voice practices intersect with inclusive education.

Particular interest was placed on exploring strategies that facilitated the inclusion of students with complex communicative needs. Non-verbal and alternative communication methods, often underrepresented in traditional educational research, emerged as critical tools for enabling meaningful participation. The analysis also incorporated a detailed examination of the levels of student involvement, categorized according to Fielding's (2004) framework, which ranges from students as data sources to full collaborators in research and decision-making processes.

The methodological diversity of the included studies was a notable strength, encompassing a wide array of qualitative and quantitative designs. However, a consistent limitation across the corpus was the underutilization of innovative communication tools, such as augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) systems. Resch (2023) emphasizes the pressing need for greater representation of student voices in diversity policies, highlighting how institutional frameworks often fail to fully engage marginalized groups. Similarly, Gonzalez et al. (2017) delve into methodologies designed to include historically excluded voices, stressing the importance of innovative and inclusive approaches that actively amplify the participation of students with disabilities. Together, these studies illuminate critical gaps in current practices and underscore the transformative potential of

reimagining methodologies to foster genuine inclusivity and collaboration. This finding underscores the need for educational stakeholders to prioritize the adoption of such methodologies, ensuring that all students, regardless of their communicative abilities, can actively contribute to shaping their educational experiences.

By synthesizing findings from diverse geographical and cultural contexts, the review illuminated the disparities in how student voice practices are conceptualized and implemented. While the majority of studies originated from English-speaking countries, such as the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia, there was a conspicuous lack of representation from non-Anglophone regions. This imbalance highlights the importance of conducting culturally contextualized research to develop inclusive practices that are adaptable to varying educational systems worldwide. The thematic synthesis not only identified gaps but also highlighted promising practices, offering actionable insights for reimagining teacher training programs to align with the principles of inclusivity and equity.

### **3. Results**

The results of the systematic review reveal a complex landscape characterized by both significant challenges and promising practices. A predominant finding is the limited integration of students with disabilities in participatory processes, with many studies positioning these students primarily as data sources rather than as active participants or co-researchers. Fielding's (2004) framework of student involvement highlights this gap, showing that only a small fraction of studies positioned students with disabilities in leadership or co-researcher roles, thereby failing to fully harness their potential as change agents within educational systems.

One of the most striking gaps identified is the reliance on traditional, verbal-centric methodologies, which exclude students with complex communicative needs. Preliminary analyses reveal that only 4% of the studies reviewed employed non-verbal methods such as Talking Mats or other assistive tools, despite their recognized potential in fostering inclusive participation. This underscores a significant methodological gap in addressing the needs of students with complex communicative requirements. Furthermore, art-based and narrative approaches, while occasionally utilized, often remain supplementary rather than central to the research design, limiting their transformative potential.

Geographically, the review highlighted the anglocentric nature of student voice as a methodological framework, with a significant concentration of studies originating from English-speaking countries, particularly the UK, North America, and Australia. This reflects the cultural and historical roots of the approach, which is deeply embedded in traditions of participatory and democratic education prevalent in these regions. However, this emphasis also reveals a gap in exploring how student voice practices are conceptualized and implemented in non-anglophone contexts, particularly in regions where educational systems may differ significantly in structure and philosophy. This uneven distribution underscores the need for more contextually nuanced research that accounts for cultural and systemic variations while adapting student voice methodologies to diverse educational landscapes.

Despite these challenges, the review identified several innovative practices that hold promise for advancing inclusivity. Participatory methods that positioned students as co-researchers demonstrated significant potential for fostering meaningful engagement and collaboration. For instance, projects that utilized visual and tactile communication strategies effectively enabled students with disabilities to play a central role in shaping educational decisions. Such approaches align with the principles of inclusive inquiry, emphasizing the importance of co-creation and shared authority in educational research (Messiou & Ainscow, 2021).

Looking ahead, the review highlights the importance of integrating intersubjectivity, reflexivity, and power dynamics as critical components for fostering inclusivity. These elements represent significant challenges and opportunities for future research and practice, emphasizing the need to develop participatory methodologies that address systemic inequities while empowering students with disabilities to contribute meaningfully to educational reform. These dimensions, as articulated

by the Student Voice Research Framework (Brasof & Levitan, 2022), provide a robust foundation for designing participatory practices that genuinely empower students with disabilities. By addressing systemic inequities and prioritizing culturally responsive methodologies, these frameworks have the potential to bridge the gap between inclusive theory and practice, paving the way for more equitable and impactful educational research.

#### 4. Conclusion

The findings of this review emphasize the growing recognition of the importance of student voice in fostering inclusive education across Europe. As highlighted by international frameworks such as the Bologna Declaration of 1999, there has been an increasing focus on aligning teacher education with the demands of inclusivity and diversity. This trend is further driven by the internationalization of education, which has placed significant pressure on institutions to identify and embed vital competencies for future educators (Persson, 2004).

The analysis also underscores the transformative potential of student voice in bridging the gap between theoretical inclusion frameworks and real-world practices. Evidence from this review indicates that teacher training programs benefit from integrating participatory approaches, which foster agency and self-efficacy among students with disabilities. However, systemic barriers remain pervasive, including entrenched ableism, resource constraints, and limited methodological diversity, particularly for students with complex communicative needs.

Additionally, the inclusion of non-verbal methodologies has shown promise but remains underutilized. Expanding such approaches is essential for ensuring the active participation of all students. Furthermore, fostering collaboration between educational stakeholders—teachers, families, and students—is critical for developing inclusive frameworks that prioritize diverse voices. The adoption of frameworks such as the Student Voice Research Framework (Brasof & Levitan, 2022) could provide guidance for addressing key elements like intersubjectivity, reflexivity, power dynamics, and context, which are essential for meaningful engagement.

In conclusion, while significant progress has been made in recognizing the value of student voice, achieving its full impact requires ongoing efforts to address systemic inequities and methodological gaps. Future research should explore innovative participatory practices, focusing on cultural and contextual adaptability, to better align teacher training with the needs of diverse learners.

These findings suggest that teacher education programs should incorporate specific training on the implementation of Student Voice as a structured methodology to foster the meaningful inclusion and active participation of students with disabilities. By embedding these practices into educational systems, we can move closer to a transformative vision of inclusion that empowers every voice to shape the future of education.

#### Bibliography

- Allen, G., Milne, B., Velija, P., & Radley, R. (2022). 'Hearing their voice': the experiences of physical education with pupils diagnosed with severe learning disabilities. *Sport, Education and Society*, 29(3), 342–357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2022.2141704> \*
- Andriana, E., & Evans, D. (2021). *Voices of students with intellectual disabilities: Experiences of transition in "inclusive schools" in Indonesia*. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 49, 316–328. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bld.12411> \*
- Bacon, J., & Baglieri, S. (2021). *Perspectives of Students Labeled Intellectually Disabled at College: Using Disability Studies in Education as a Lens to Contemplate Inclusive Postsecondary Education*. *Journal of Disability Studies in Education*, 2(1), 27–49. <https://doi.org/10.1163/25888803-bja10007> \*
- Barkas, L. A., Armstrong, P. A., & Bishop, G. (2020). *Is inclusion still an illusion in higher education? exploring the curriculum through the student voice*. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 26(11), 1125–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1776777> \*
- Barr, F. & Mavropoulou, S. (2021) *Curriculum Accommodations in Mathematics Instruction for Adolescents with Mild Intellectual Disability Educated in Inclusive Classrooms*. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 68(2), pp. 270–286 \*
- Brasof, M., & Levitan, J. (Eds.). (2022). *Student voice research: Theory, methods, and innovations from the field*. Teachers College Press.
- Capewell, C. (2016). *Glue ear – a common but complicated childhood condition*. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 16: 122–131. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12100> \*
- Carrington, S., Allen, K. and Osmolowski, D. (2007), *Visual narrative: a technique to enhance secondary students' contribution to the development of inclusive, socially just school environments – lessons from a box of crayons*. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 7: 8–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2007.00076> \*
- Caslin, M. (2021), 'They have just given up on me' How pupils labelled with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD) experience the process of exclusion from school. *Support for Learning*, 36: 116–132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9604.12341> \*

- Cook-Sather, A. (2006). *Sound, presence, and power: "Student voice" in educational research and reform*. Curriculum inquiry, 36(4), 359-390.
- Cook-Sather, A., Bovill, C., & Felten, P. (2014). *Engaging students as partners in learning and teaching: A guide for faculty*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Cunningham, M. (2020). 'This school is 100% not autistic friendly!' Listening to the voices of primary-aged autistic children to understand what an autistic friendly primary school should be like. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 26(12), 1211-1225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1789767> \*
- D'Angelo, I., Giacconi, C., Del Bianco, N., & Perry, V. (2020). *Students' Voice and Disability: Ethical and methodological reflections for Special Pedagogy research*. EDUCATION SCIENCES AND SOCIETY, (2020/1).
- Davis, L. (1995). *Enforcing normalcy: Disability, deafness, and the body*. Verso.
- Dell'Anna, S. (2021). *Modelli di valutazione di un sistema scolastico inclusivo: Prospettive di dialogo tra implementazione, ricerca e (auto-) miglioramento* (p. 148). FrancoAngeli.
- Dell'Anna, S., Bellacicco, R., & Ianes, D. (2023). *Cosa sappiamo dell'inclusione scolastica in Italia?: I contributi della ricerca empirica*. Erickson.
- Demo, H., & Veronesi, D. (2019). *Universal Design for Learning nelle interazioni in classe, tra pedagogia speciale e analisi della conversazione*. In Didattica e Inclusione Scolastica: Ricerche e pratiche in dialogo (pp. 31-50). Franco Angeli.
- Edwards, J. (2008). *A matter of opinion? The involvement of student voice in aspects of school management, policy development and initial teacher training*. Management in Education, 22(3), 13-14.
- Fielding, M., (2004), "New Wave' Student Voice and the Renewal of Civic Society", London Review of Education 2(3), 197-217.
- Florian, L. (2015). *Inclusive Pedagogy: A transformative approach to individual differences but can it help reduce educational inequalities?* Scottish educational review, 47(1), 5-14.
- Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). *Exploring inclusive pedagogy*. British educational research journal, 37(5), 813-828.
- González, T. E., Hernandez-Saca, D. I., & Artiles, A. J. (2017). *In search of voice: Theory and methods in K-12 student voice research in the US, 1990-2010*. Educational Review, 69(4), 451-473.
- González, T., Bertrand, M., Salinas, S. (2019). *Pursuing Inclusive Schools: The Case of Youth Researchers of Color Expanding a New Vision. Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners*.19 (1): 4-22. doi: <https://doi.org/10.56829/2158-396X.19.1> \*
- Goodley, D., D'Alessio, S., Ferri, B., Monceri, F., Titchkosky, T., Vadalà, G., & Medeghini, R. (2018). *Disability Studies e inclusione. Per una lettura critica delle politiche e pratiche educative*. Erickson, Trento.
- Bron, J., Emerson, N., & Kákonyi, L. (2018). *Diverse student voice approaches across Europe*. European Journal of Education, 53(3), 310-324.
- Cefai, C., & Spiteri Pizzuto, S. A. (2017) *Listening to the voices of young children in a nurture class. Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 22(3), 248-260 \*
- Connor, D. J., Cavendish, W., Hallaran, A., & Olander, L. (2020). "I'm Bright Enough to Do It, Even Though Sometimes I Feel I Can't Do It": Perspectives of High School Students with Learning Disabilities About Existing Supports to Achieve Graduation. Disability Studies Quarterly, 40(2). <https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v40i2.6665> \*
- Ferguson, D. L., Hanreddy, A., & Draxton, S. (2011). *Giving Students Voice as a Strategy for Improving Teacher Practice*. London Review of Education, 9, 55-70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14748460.2011.550435> \*
- Flynn, P., Shevlin, M., & Lodge, A. (2011). *Are You Listening? I'm Me!*. REACH: Journal of Inclusive Education in Ireland, 25(1), 60-74. Retrieved from <https://reachjournal.ie/index.php/reach/article/view/86> \*
- Grue, J. (2015). *Disability and Discourse Analysis* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315577302>
- Harrison, N. (2019). *Student voice and agency: Successes and challenges*. Connect, (237), 18-20. <https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.448370892202653> \*
- Ianes, D., Cappello, S., & Demo, H. (2017). *Teacher and student voices: a comparison between two perspectives to study integration processes in Italy*. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 32(3), 301-313.
- Keefe, E. S. (2022). *From detractive to democratic: The duty of teacher education to disrupt structural ableism and reimagine disability*. Teachers College Record, 124(3), 115-147.
- Kubiak, J., Aston, D., Devitt, M., & Ringwood, B. (2021). *University Students with Intellectual Disabilities: Empowerment through Voice*. Education Sciences, 11(10), 571. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11100571> \*
- Lamb, P., Firbank, D., & Aldous, D. (2014). *Capturing the world of physical education through the eyes of children with autism spectrum disorders*. Sport, Education and Society, 21(5), 698-722. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2014.941794> \*
- LaPorte, A. M. (2019). *Inverse inclusion: Transforming dispositions of disability and inclusion*. International Journal of Lifelong Learning in Art Education, 2(1), 6.
- Lane, L. (2017). 'Am I being heard?'The 'voice of students with disability in higher education: A literature review. Rome: EU
- Messiou, K., & Ainscow, M. (2021). *Inclusive Inquiry: an innovative approach for promoting inclusion in schools*. Revista latinoamericana de educación inclusiva, 15(2), 23-37.
- Messiou, K., Bui, L. T., Ainscow, M., Gasteiger-Klicpera, B., Bešić, E., Paleczek, L., & Echeita, G. (2022). *Student diversity and student voice conceptualisations in five European countries: Implications for including all students in schools*. European Educational Research Journal, 21(2), 355-376.
- Mitchell, D. T., & Snyder, S. L. (2000). *Narrative Prosthesis: Disability and the Dependencies of Discourse*. University of Michigan Press.
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & Group, T. P. (2009). *Linee guida per il reporting di revisioni sistematiche e meta-analisi: Il PRISMA Statement*. PLoS Med, 6(7), 1-8.
- Morganti, A., Signorelli, A., & Marsili, F. (2023). *Il futuro dell'educazione inclusiva in Europa: Il progetto eco-in*. ITALIAN JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR INCLUSION, 11(2), 268-280.
- Naraian, S. (2021). *Making Inclusion Matter: Critical Disability Studies and Teacher Education*. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 53(3), 298-313.
- O'Brien, T. (2022). *Exploring the views of students with dyslexia attending a third level college in Ireland*. Support for Learning, 37: 423-434. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9604.12418> \*
- O'Connor, M., Hodkinson, A., Burton, D., & Torstensson, G. (2011). *Pupil voice: listening to and hearing the educational experiences of young people with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties (BESD)*. Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 16(3), 289-302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632752.2011.595095> \*
- Pazey, B. L., & DeMatthews, D. (2016). *Student Voice From a Turnaround Urban High School: An Account of Students With and Without Dis/Abilities Leading Resistance Against Accountability Reform*. Urban Education, 54(7), 919-956. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916666930> (Original work published 2019) \*
- Persson, M. (2004). *Towards the teacher as a learner*. The Learning Teacher Network Publications.

- Porter, J. (2009), *Missing out? Challenges to hearing the views of all children on the barriers and supports to learning*. *Education 3-13*, 37(4), 349–360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004270903099892> \*
- Phuong, J., DiPasquale, K., & Rivera, N. (2021), "If you're gonna be inclusive, you have to be inclusive on all levels": *Ableism in teacher collaboration*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(3), 684–693.
- Resch, K. (2023), *Student voice in higher education diversity policies: A systematic review*. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 8, p. 1039578). Frontiers Media SA.
- Richards, N., & Crane, L. (2020), *The Development and Feasibility Study of a Multimodal 'Talking Wall' to Facilitate the Voice of Young People with Autism and Complex Needs: A Case Study in a Specialist Residential School*. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, 50(12), 4267–4279. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-020-04476-6> \*
- Sellman, E. (2009), *Lessons learned: Student voice at a school for pupils experiencing social, emotional and behavioural difficulties*. *Emotional & Behavioural Difficulties*, 14(1), 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632750802655687> \*
- Spivak, G. C. (1988), *Can the subaltern speak?* In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). London: Macmillan.
- Warren, A., Buckingham, K., & Parsons, S. (2020), *Everyday experiences of inclusion in Primary resourced provision: the voices of autistic pupils and their teachers*. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 36(5), 803–818. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2020.1823166> \*
- Young, S. (2018), *With no pre-conceived ideas...: Exploring student voice*. *Connect*, (231/232), 3–4. <https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.670332532020466> \*
- Zorec, K., Desmond, D., Boland, T., McNicholl, A., O'Connor, A., Stafford, G., & Gallagher, P. (2022), *A whole-campus approach to technology and inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education in Ireland*. *Disability & Society*, 39(5), 1147–1172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2022.2114885> \*
- Zazzi H, Faragher R. (2018), 'Visual clutter' in the classroom: voices of students with Autism Spectrum Disorder. *Int J Dev Disabil*. 2018 May 22;64(3):212–224. doi: 10.1080/20473869.2018.1468619. PMID: 34141308; PMCID: PMC8115453 \*
- \* (studies that were included in the systematic review primary corpus)