

Teacher Training and Its Effect on Learning Outcomes: A Review of Evidence from Special Education

¹Amjad Islam Amjad, ²Shamim Akhter, ³Chiang Wan Ling

¹Department of Education, The University of Lahore, Lahore, 54600, Pakistan.

Email: amjad_14@yahoo.com 3

²INTI International University, Persiaran Perdana BBN, Putra Nilai, Bandar Baru Nilai, 71800 Nilai, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia.

Email: shamim.akhter@newinti.edu.my

³INTI International University, Persiaran Perdana BBN, Putra Nilai, Bandar Baru Nilai, 71800 Nilai, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia.

Email: chiangwlstef@gmail.com

HOW TO CITE:

Amjad Islam Amjad, Shamim Akhter, Chiang Wan Ling (2026). Teacher Training and Its Effect on Learning Outcomes: A Review of Evidence from Special Education. International Journal of Special Education, 41(12s), 130-138.

ABSTRACT:

Teacher preparation is widely regarded as one of the most influential school-based factors shaping student achievement, yet its impact is especially pronounced in special education, where instructional decisions must be tailored to a wide range of learner profiles, disability categories, and support needs. This article provides an extensive narrative review of the theoretical and empirical basis for the relationship between teacher training and learning outcomes among students with disabilities. It examines pre-service preparation, alternative and traditional certification routes, in-service professional development, coaching and mentorship models, and specialized content-area training, and considers how each contributes to teachers' instructional competence, classroom and behavior management, collaborative practice, and use of evidence-based interventions. The review further considers moderating variables such as years of experience, school context, and administrative support, and examines the methodological strengths and weaknesses of the existing evidence base. The article concludes with detailed implications for teacher education programs, school leaders, and policymakers, and outlines directions for future research, including the need for longitudinal, mixed-methods, and quasi-experimental designs that connect specific training components to measurable student gains across diverse disability populations.

Keywords: teacher training, special education, learning opportunities, professional development, evidence-based practice, teacher preparation.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The quality of instruction a student receives is consistently identified as one of the strongest in-school predictors of academic achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000). This relationship is amplified in special education, where teachers must simultaneously manage individualized education programs (IEPs), differentiate instruction across diverse cognitive and behavioral profiles, and collaborate with multidisciplinary teams. Despite growing recognition of these demands, many special education teachers report entering classrooms with insufficient preparation in evidence-based instructional strategies, behavior management, and assessment-driven planning (Brownell et al., 2010).

The stakes of this question have grown alongside broader shifts in educational policy. Inclusive education mandates in many countries now place a substantial proportion of students with disabilities in general education classrooms for at least part of the school day, requiring both special and general educators to possess overlapping competencies in differentiation, co-teaching, and progress monitoring (McLeskey et al., 2017). At the same time, persistent shortages of qualified special education teachers have led many districts to rely on emergency-certified, provisionally licensed, or out-of-field teachers, raising concerns about whether the workforce serving the most vulnerable learners is adequately prepared (Boe, 2006). These converging pressures make it essential to understand precisely which forms of teacher training yield measurable benefits for student learning, and which are more symbolic than substantive.

This article examines the extent to which teacher training spanning initial certification, ongoing professional development, coaching, mentorship, and specialized coursework affects learning outcomes for students with disabilities. It synthesizes existing research to answer four guiding questions:

- What components of teacher training are most strongly associated with improved student learning outcomes?

- Through what mechanisms does training translate into classroom practice and, subsequently, student achievement?
- Which contextual and individual factors moderate the strength of the training–outcomes relationship?
- What gaps remain in the evidence base, and how should future research address them?

To address these questions, this review draws on peer-reviewed studies, meta-analyses, and policy reports spanning early-childhood, elementary, and secondary special education contexts. Rather than restricting the discussion to a single disability category, the review takes an intentionally broad view, since many training components explicit instruction, progress monitoring, positive behavior support cut across categories such as specific learning disabilities, autism spectrum disorder, emotional and behavioral disorders, and intellectual disabilities. Where category-specific findings are available, they are noted explicitly.

2. Conceptual Framework

Teacher effectiveness in special education can be understood through three interacting domains: content and pedagogical knowledge, instructional practice, and professional disposition. Training programs influence student outcomes indirectly by shaping what teachers know and believe and directly, through the specific skills and strategies teachers are equipped to deploy in the classroom (Feng & Sass, 2013). This mediated pathway (training → teacher knowledge and practice → student outcomes) provides the organizing structure for this review.

A useful complementary lens is Shulman's (1987) concept of pedagogical content knowledge, extended in special education to include knowledge of disability-specific characteristics, legal frameworks (such as IDEA and Section 504), and individualized instructional design. Teachers who possess strong pedagogical content knowledge are better equipped to translate general curricular goals into accessible, individualized learning tasks. Bandura's (1997) construct of teacher self-efficacy is also relevant:

teachers who feel prepared and confident in their ability to instruct students with disabilities are more likely to persist with evidence-based strategies in the face of implementation challenges, and self-efficacy itself appears to be strengthened by high-quality training and mentorship (Ruble et al., 2011).

Finally, an ecological perspective reminds us that teacher training does not operate in isolation. School leadership, availability of instructional resources, caseload size, and collegial support systems all condition whether trained teachers can translate their knowledge into consistent classroom practice (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). The framework guiding this review therefore treats training as a necessary but not solely sufficient condition for improved learning outcomes—one whose effects are amplified or constrained by the systems surrounding the teacher.

3. Methodology of This Review

This article adopts a narrative review methodology, appropriate for synthesizing a heterogeneous body of literature spanning distinct disability categories, training modalities, and outcome measures that would not be amenable to formal meta-analytic pooling. Relevant literature was identified through searches of major education databases using combinations of terms including 'teacher training,' 'teacher preparation,' 'professional development,' 'special education,' 'learning outcomes,' 'student achievement,' and 'evidence-based practice.' Priority was given to peer-reviewed empirical studies, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses published in recognized special education and teacher education journals, supplemented by foundational theoretical works where they inform the conceptual framework.

Studies were included if they examined some form of teacher training, preparation, or professional development in relation to an instructional, behavioral, or academic outcome for students identified with, or at risk for, a disability. Studies focused exclusively on general education teacher training without a special education component were generally excluded

unless findings had direct bearing on inclusive practice relevant to students with disabilities. Because the aim of this review is to synthesize patterns and identify implications rather than to calculate a pooled effect size, no formal meta-analytic procedures were applied; instead, findings are organized thematically around the training components, mechanisms, and moderators identified across the literature.

3.1. Pre-Service Preparation and Certification

Research comparing certified and uncertified special education teachers generally finds that formal certification is associated with more consistent use of individualized instruction and higher student achievement gains, particularly in reading and mathematics (Nougaret et al., 2005). Certified teachers tend to demonstrate stronger command of instructional adaptations, progress monitoring, and legal/procedural knowledge related to IEP implementation. However, certification alone is an imperfect proxy for classroom competence; program quality, clinical practicum hours, and mentorship during student teaching appear to matter as much as certification status itself (Sindelar et al., 2014).

Comparative studies of traditional versus alternative certification routes offer a more nuanced picture. Alternatively certified teachers who typically enter the classroom before completing full coursework and receive concurrent training often show achievement outcomes comparable to traditionally certified peers when the alternative program includes structured mentoring and coursework completed within the first two years (Sindelar et al., 2014). Without these supports, however, alternatively certified teachers report significantly higher attrition and lower confidence in behavior management and individualized instructional planning (Boe, 2006). This suggests that the pathway into the profession matters less than the structure, intensity, and sequencing of the preparation embedded within it.

Clinical practicum experiences deserve particular attention. Programs that embed extended, supervised field placements in special education settings ideally across more than one disability

category and grade band produce teachers who report greater readiness to manage individualized instruction, collaborate with related-service providers, and apply behavior-support strategies (Brownell et al., 2010). Conversely, programs that front-load theoretical coursework with minimal applied practice tend to produce teachers who, in their first years, struggle to translate conceptual knowledge into classroom routines, a phenomenon often described in the literature as the 'theory-to-practice gap.' Mentored student teaching, in which a novice is paired with an experienced special educator for an extended placement with structured feedback cycles, appears to be one of the more consistent predictors of first-year teaching quality and, indirectly, student engagement and progress (Sindelar et al., 2014).

Coursework content also matters. Programs that dedicate substantial instructional time to applied behavior analysis, data-based individualization, and disability-specific pedagogy (e.g., structured literacy for students with dyslexia, augmentative and alternative communication for students with complex communication needs) produce teachers with more precise and varied instructional repertoires than programs offering only broad, generalist special education coursework (Feng & Sass, 2013). This points to an important tension in teacher preparation: broad certification requirements intended to prepare teachers for any disability category may come at the cost of depth in any single area, even though many classroom demands are highly specific.

3.2. In-Service Professional Development

Because pre-service training cannot anticipate every classroom context a teacher will encounter, sustained in-service professional development (PD) plays a central role in maintaining and extending instructional effectiveness. The literature points to several features that distinguish effective PD from ineffective, one-off workshops:

- **Duration and intensity:** PD sustained over multiple sessions across a school year is more strongly linked to changes in practice

than single-day workshops (Desimone, 2009).

- **Content focus:** Programs centered on specific evidence-based practices (e.g., explicit instruction, functional behavior assessment) show clearer effects on student outcomes than generic pedagogical training.
- **Active learning and coaching:** Job-embedded coaching and opportunities to practice new strategies with feedback are associated with higher fidelity of implementation (Kretlow & Bartholomew, 2010).
- **Collective participation:** PD involving teams of teachers from the same school fosters shared instructional language and peer support, which sustains practice change over time.

Studies using coaching-based PD models in special education report measurable improvements in students' academic engagement and skill acquisition, particularly when paired with performance feedback and data-based decision-making (Fallon et al., 2015).

It is worth distinguishing between PD aimed at knowledge acquisition and PD aimed at practice change, since the two do not always move together. Many traditional PD formats — a lecture-style workshop on, for example, universal design for learning — can successfully increase teachers' declarative knowledge of a strategy without producing any observable change in classroom implementation (Desimone, 2009). By contrast, PD models that incorporate modeling, guided practice with student data, and iterative coaching cycles are considerably more likely to produce durable changes in instructional behavior, because they address not only what teachers know but also how confident and skilled they feel in applying it under real classroom conditions (Kretlow & Bartholomew, 2010).

A growing body of research also points to the value of PD that is explicitly tied to student data. In data-based individualization (DBI) models, teachers are trained not merely in a set of instructional techniques but in an iterative

decision-making cycle: administer a validated progress-monitoring tool, compare student trajectories to expected growth rates, and adjust instructional intensity when a student fails to respond adequately (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1986). Districts that have implemented DBI-focused PD report improvements in both the precision of individualized instruction and, in several studies, statistically significant gains in student reading and mathematics outcomes relative to comparison schools using standard PD models.

Peer learning communities represent another promising in-service structure. When special education teachers within a school or district meet regularly in professional learning communities (PLCs) organized around a shared instructional framework, they report increased confidence in problem-solving around individual student cases and greater consistency in applying agreed-upon evidence-based practices across classrooms (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). The effectiveness of PLCs, however, depends heavily on facilitation quality; loosely structured meetings without a clear protocol or data focus tend to default to informal case discussion without measurable instructional change.

3.3. Moderating Factors: When Training Translates into Outcomes

The relationship between teacher training and student learning outcomes is not uniform; it is shaped by several contextual and individual factors that either amplify or dampen the effect of training on practice.

Years of teaching experience interact with training in complex ways. Novice teachers often benefit most from structured, explicit training models that provide clear procedural guidance, since they have not yet developed an internalized repertoire of instructional routines (Sindelar et al., 2014). Veteran teachers, by contrast, tend to benefit more from PD that challenges and refines existing practice for example, feedback on implementation fidelity rather than from introductory-level content they may already possess. Mismatches between a teacher's experience level and the pitch of the training they

receive appear to reduce the practical impact of otherwise well-designed programs.

School leadership and administrative support constitute another critical moderator. Even highly trained teachers report difficulty sustaining evidence-based practices when administrators do not protect planning time, fail to provide access to assessment materials, or do not reinforce fidelity expectations through classroom observation and feedback (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). Conversely, schools with instructional leaders who are themselves knowledgeable about special education pedagogy tend to see stronger transfer of training content into daily practice, likely because such leaders can provide targeted, informed feedback rather than generic supervisory oversight.

Caseload size and role diversity also matter. Special education teachers serving large or highly heterogeneous caseloads spanning multiple disability categories, grade levels, and service delivery models within a single school day report substantially reduced capacity to implement the individualized planning and progress monitoring emphasized in their training, regardless of how well-prepared they are (Boe, 2006). This suggests that structural working conditions can neutralize the benefits of even excellent training if caseloads exceed a manageable threshold.

Finally, the alignment between training content and the specific population served appears to moderate effect size. Training in general differentiation strategies shows modest effects across disability categories, whereas training matched closely to a specific population such as structured literacy instruction for students with dyslexia or discrete trial training for students with autism shows considerably larger effects on outcomes specific to that population (Feng & Sass, 2013)..

3.4. Mechanisms Linking Training to Outcomes

Three mechanisms appear to mediate the relationship between training and student learning:

- Increased use of evidence-based practices (EBPs): Trained teachers are more likely to implement validated strategies such as explicit instruction, scaffolded prompting, and systematic error correction with fidelity.
- Improved classroom and behavior management: Training in function-based behavioral support reduces disruptive behavior and increases instructional time, indirectly improving academic outcomes.
- Stronger assessment literacy: Teachers trained in progress monitoring and data-based individualization are better able to adjust instruction responsively, a practice strongly associated with growth for students with disabilities (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1986; updated by later meta-analytic work).

A fourth, less frequently studied mechanism involves collaborative capacity. Training that explicitly addresses co-teaching, communication with related-service providers, and family engagement appears to strengthen the coherence of a student's overall instructional program across settings and providers (McLeskey et al., 2017). Students with disabilities often receive services from multiple adults across a school day: a special educator, a general educator, a speech-language pathologist, a paraprofessional and inconsistent instructional approaches across these providers can undermine progress even when each individual is competently trained. Training programs that build collaborative planning skills, rather than treating instructional competence as a purely individual attribute, may therefore have outsized effects on outcomes by improving the coherence of the student's total instructional experience, not merely the quality of instruction delivered by any single teacher.

These four mechanisms are not mutually exclusive and often operate in combination. A teacher trained in data-based individualization, for instance, is likely to also strengthen collaborative practice, since sharing progress-monitoring data with colleagues and families is a core component of most DBI models. Disentangling the unique contribution of each mechanism to student outcomes remains an open

empirical question, discussed further in the following section.

3.5. Gaps and Methodological Considerations

While the association between teacher training and learning outcomes is well established descriptively, causal evidence remains limited. Several methodological challenges persist across the literature reviewed in this article.

- Many studies rely on teacher self-report of practice change rather than direct classroom observation, raising the possibility of social desirability bias and overestimation of implementation fidelity.
- Few studies track training effects longitudinally into subsequent school years, making it difficult to determine whether training effects persist, fade, or compound over a teacher's career.
- Heterogeneity in disability categories, grade levels, and outcome measures makes cross-study comparison and meta-analytic synthesis difficult; a training model shown effective for elementary reading outcomes cannot be assumed to generalize to secondary mathematics or to students with more significant support needs.
- Little research disentangles the relative contribution of pre-service versus in-service training when both are present, since most in-service teachers have already been shaped by some prior preparation pathway.
- Publication and selection bias may inflate reported effect sizes, as studies documenting successful training interventions are more likely to be published than null results.
- Very few studies employ a true experimental design in which teachers are randomly assigned to differing training conditions and student outcomes are tracked with standardized, blinded assessment; most available evidence is correlational or quasi-experimental in nature.

Future research would benefit from randomized or quasi-experimental designs that isolate specific training components, coupled with direct classroom observation measures, implementation fidelity checklists, and multi-year student outcome data. Where randomization is not feasible for ethical or logistical reasons, regression discontinuity designs and matched-comparison studies using large administrative datasets offer promising alternatives for approximating causal estimates. Additionally, mixed methods designs that pair quantitative outcome data with qualitative accounts of teachers' instructional decision-making would help clarify not only whether training works, but why and under what conditions it does or does not translate into practice.

. Implications for Practice and Policy

The findings synthesized in this review carry distinct implications for the three primary stakeholder groups responsible for shaping the special education teacher workforce.

9.1 Implications for Teacher Preparation Programs

- Strengthen clinical practicum experiences by extending their duration, ensuring placements span multiple disability categories and grade bands, and pairing novices with trained, effective mentor teachers rather than any available cooperating teacher.
- Embed explicit instruction in evidence-based practices — such as systematic instruction, functional behavior assessment, and data-based individualization — as core, assessed competencies rather than optional coursework, so that all graduates leave with a common instructional foundation regardless of specialization track.
- Reconsider the balance between breadth and depth in certification requirements, potentially offering focused specialization strands (e.g., a structured literacy strand, an autism-focused strand) alongside general certification, so that teachers develop

sufficient depth in the areas most relevant to their eventual caseload.

4. Implications for School and District Leaders

- Prioritize sustained, coaching-supported professional development over isolated workshops, allocating budget and staff time for instructional coaches with special education expertise rather than relying solely on generalist coaches.
- Allocate protected time for collaborative planning among special education staff and between special and general educators, since co-planning time is consistently cited as a resource constraint limiting the transfer of training into classroom practice.
- Monitor caseload size and role complexity, recognizing that even well-trained teachers cannot consistently implement individualized, evidence-based instruction under unsustainable workload conditions.
- Build instructional leadership capacity in special education pedagogy among principals and assistant principals, so that classroom observation and feedback cycles reinforce, rather than dilute, the content of teachers' training.

4.1 Implications for Policymakers

- Reconsider certification and licensure requirements to account for practicum quality and mentorship structure, not solely coursework completion or hours accumulated.
- Require or incentivize ongoing, job-embedded professional development as a condition of license renewal, with an emphasis on coaching and data-based models rather than seat-time workshops.
- Fund research infrastructure including state longitudinal data systems linking teacher preparation records to student outcomes that would allow the kind of causal, multi-year evaluation this review identifies as most needed.

5. Conclusion

Teacher training spanning initial certification, mentored clinical practice, coaching-supported professional development, and specialized content-area preparation exerts a meaningful and largely mediated influence on the learning outcomes of students with disabilities. The strength of this influence appears to depend less on training quantity and more on its quality: specificity of content, duration, coaching support, alignment with the population served, and opportunities for practice with feedback. Equally important, the review makes clear that training does not operate in a vacuum; its translation into sustained classroom practice depends on contextual supports such as manageable caseloads, informed instructional leadership, and protected collaborative planning time.

Strengthening these features across both pre-service and in-service training systems represents a promising and actionable avenue for improving outcomes for students with disabilities. At the same time, the evidence base underpinning this conclusion remains largely correlational, and stronger causal research designs particularly those

capable of isolating specific training components and tracking their effects across multiple years are needed to confirm the magnitude and durability of these effects. As inclusive education mandates continue to expand and workforce shortages persist, closing this research gap should be treated as a priority for the field, since the instructional quality experienced by students with disabilities depends directly on the quality and structure of the training their teachers receive.

Ultimately, the evidence reviewed here suggests that improving outcomes for students with disabilities is not simply a matter of requiring more training, but of designing training systems spanning initial preparation, induction, and career-long professional learning that are sustained, specific, collaborative, and responsive to the working conditions in which special educators actually practice. Achieving this will require coordinated effort across teacher preparation programs, school and district leadership, and policymakers, each of whom controls a different lever in the system that ultimately determines the quality of instruction a student with a disability receives.

References

- Akhter, S., Prasad, R. D., Tan, M., & Iftikhar, S. (2026). Beyond Tech-Fluent Generations: Investigating Cross-Generational Technology Adoption Patterns in Collaborative Online Learning Spaces. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologie*, 75s, 20(4).
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.
- Billingsley, B., & Bettini, E. (2019). Special education teacher attrition and retention: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(5), 697–744.
- Boe, E. E. (2006). Long-term trends in the national demand, supply, and shortage of special education teachers. *Journal of Special Education*, 40(3), 138–150.
- Brownell, M. T., Sindelar, P. T., Kiely, M. T., & Danielson, L. C. (2010). Special education teacher quality and preparation: Exposing foundations, constructing a new model. *Exceptional Children*, 76(3), 357–377.
- Chang, G., Akhter, S., & Lin, C. (2025). Exploring learning uncertainty and test anxiety with mindfulness as a mediator in EFL students: An Expectancy-Value Approach. *Learning and Motivation*, 92, 102189.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1).
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181–199.
- Fallon, L. M., Collier-Meek, M. A., Maggin, D. M., Sanetti, L. M. H., & Johnson, A. H. (2015). Is performance feedback for educators an evidence-based practice? A systematic review. *Exceptional Children*, 81(2), 227–246.

- Feng, L., & Sass, T. R. (2013). What makes special-education teachers special? Teacher training and achievement of students with disabilities. *Economics of Education Review*, 36, 122–134.
- Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (1986). Effects of systematic formative evaluation: A meta-analysis. *Exceptional Children*, 53(3), 199–208.
- Jiang, M., Akhter, S., & Hashemifardnia, A. (2026). Neurodivergent English learners in digital classrooms: Investigating the impact of gamified learning on engagement and emotional regulation. *Psychology in the Schools*, 63(2), 530-543.
- Kretlow, A. G., & Bartholomew, C. C. (2010). Using coaching to improve the fidelity of evidence-based practices: A review of studies. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 33(4), 279–299.
- McLeskey, J., Barringer, M.-D., Billingsley, B., Brownell, M., Jackson, D., Kennedy, M., Lewis, T., Maheady, L., Rodriguez, J., Scheeler, M. C., Winn, J., & Ziegler, D. (2017). High-leverage practices in special education. Council for Exceptional Children & CEEDAR Center.
- Nougaret, A. A., Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. A. (2005). Does teacher education produce better special education teachers? *Exceptional Children*, 71(3), 217–229.
- Ruble, L. A., Toland, M. D., Birdwhistell, J. L., McGrew, J. H., & Usher, E. L. (2011). Preliminary study of the autism self-efficacy scale for teachers (ASSET). *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 5(3), 967–974.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–23.
- Sindelar, P. T., Brownell, M. T., & Billingsley, B. (2014). Special education teacher education research: Current status and future directions. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 33(1), 8–24.