

Developing Inclusive Education Models to Advance Gender Justice and Social Equity for All Learners

Youssef Abdel Rahman^{1*}

¹Alexandria University, Egypt

DOI: doi.org/10.66325/nusantaraeducation.v4i2.249

*Corresponding Author: youssefabdelrahman@gmail.com

|| Received: 27-06-2025 || Revised: 25-10-2025 || Accepted: 23-12-2025 || Published On: 31-12-2025

Abstract: This study aims to develop inclusive education models that promote gender justice and social equity for all learners, addressing persistent disparities in access, participation, and outcomes within formal educational settings. The research adopts a mixed-methods design, combining qualitative case studies of diverse schools with quantitative surveys of students, teachers, and administrators. Data collection involved in-depth interviews, focus group discussions, and structured questionnaires, which were analyzed using thematic and statistical techniques to identify patterns, barriers, and best practices for fostering inclusivity. The findings reveal that inclusive education is most effective when it integrates gender-sensitive curricula, participatory teaching strategies, and culturally responsive pedagogy that recognizes students' diverse backgrounds and learning needs. Structural factors, such as policy support, teacher training, and school leadership, significantly influence the implementation of inclusive practices. Additionally, the study identifies gaps in awareness and resource allocation, highlighting the need for systemic reforms to ensure equitable learning opportunities. Innovative practices, such as peer mentoring, adaptive learning technologies, and community engagement programs, demonstrate measurable improvements in students' academic performance, self-efficacy, and social inclusion. This research contributes to the field of education by offering a practical, evidence-based framework for designing and implementing inclusive education models that simultaneously advance gender justice and social equity. By providing actionable strategies and highlighting contextual challenges, the study informs policymakers, educators, and stakeholders in crafting interventions that promote equitable participation and learning outcomes. The findings underscore the critical role of intersectional approaches in addressing systemic inequalities and fostering environments where all learners, regardless of gender, socioeconomic status, or ability, can thrive.

Keywords: Education equity; Gender justice; Inclusive education; Social inclusion; Teaching strategies.

Copyright (c) 2025 Youssef Abdel Rahman



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

Introduction

Inclusive education has become a central agenda in global education reform, driven by growing awareness of the importance of equitable access to education for all learners, regardless of gender, social or economic background, or individual abilities. The concept of inclusive education emphasizes the need for an education system that is responsive to diversity, encourages active participation of every learner, and removes structural barriers that may lead to unequal learning outcomes (Ainscow, 2020). Although various educational policies have been designed to support inclusion, significant disparities persist, particularly concerning gender equity and social justice. UNESCO data indicate that in many countries, girls and marginalized groups still face substantial obstacles in accessing quality education at both primary and secondary levels (UNESCO, 2021).

The main issue addressed in this study is the limited availability of inclusive education models that simultaneously promote gender justice and social equity. Previous studies have explored certain dimensions of inclusive education. First, Sharma et al. (2019) emphasized the importance of gender-sensitive curricula and adaptive teaching practices to enhance girls' participation in classrooms; however, their study was limited to urban secondary schools and did not fully consider socioeconomic diversity. Second, Lindsay and Hart (2020) investigated the role of school leadership and teacher training in implementing inclusive education, finding that structural support is a key determinant of success. Yet, their research tended to overlook the specific dimension of gender justice and its intersection with other social issues. Third, Florian and Black-Hawkins (2018) highlighted innovative pedagogical practices and adaptive technologies to support students with special needs, yet research remains limited on how these practices can comprehensively reduce gender and social disparities.

Based on the literature review, several research gaps are evident: first, the need for an inclusive education model that holistically integrates gender, social, and pedagogical perspectives; second, the lack of studies that consolidate best practices from diverse educational contexts and demonstrate their empirical effectiveness; and third, the scarcity of practical frameworks that policymakers, educators, and stakeholders can use to promote equitable participation for all learners. This study addresses these gaps by developing an evidence-based inclusive education model that simultaneously considers gender equity, social justice, and innovative pedagogical practices. The model is designed for application in various formal education contexts and provides concrete guidance for schools and policymakers to reduce educational disparities (Ainscow & Sandill, 2010).

The primary research question is: How can an effective inclusive education model be developed to advance gender justice and social equity for all learners? This question emphasizes the need to identify best practices, implementation challenges, and adaptive strategies that enable all students to experience fair and equitable learning while fostering critical awareness of gender and social issues.

The significance of this study lies in both its theoretical and practical aspects. Theoretically, it expands understanding of inclusive education by integrating gender, social, and pedagogical perspectives, thus contributing to global education literature on justice and inclusion. In practice, the developed model can serve as a guide for schools, teachers, and policymakers in implementing more comprehensive inclusive education practices, helping reduce disparities arising from gender, social, or economic factors. Moreover, this research

provides recommendations for developing education policies that are more responsive to diverse learners' needs and promote a more just and inclusive society (Slee, 2018).

Thus, this study not only addresses previous research gaps but also offers practical contributions for building an equitable, inclusive, and equality-oriented education system, while laying the foundation for future studies examining the long-term impact of inclusive education models on learners' social and cognitive development across various contexts (Sharma et al., 2019; Lindsay & Hart, 2020; Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2018).

Method

This study employs a mixed-methods approach to develop an inclusive education model that promotes gender justice and social equity for all learners. This approach was selected because it allows the integration of quantitative and qualitative data to gain a comprehensive understanding of inclusive education practices, challenges, and implementation strategies. Quantitative data were collected through structured questionnaires administered to students, teachers, and school principals across various education levels, measuring perceptions, experiences, and the effectiveness of inclusive practices. Meanwhile, qualitative data were obtained through in-depth interviews with educational stakeholders, focus group discussions (FGDs) with teachers and students, and participant observation within school settings to explore real experiences and the social contexts influencing inclusion implementation.

Data analysis was conducted in stages: quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics to identify patterns and relationships among variables, while qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify key themes related to inclusive practices, challenges, and strategies. To enhance the validity and reliability of the findings, the study employed data triangulation, comparing and integrating results from questionnaires, interviews, FGDs, and observations. Additionally, member checking was conducted with participants to ensure that data interpretations accurately reflected their experiences, and peer debriefing was carried out with inclusive education experts to evaluate the consistency of analysis and the proposed model. This comprehensive methodological approach ensures that the developed inclusive education model is evidence-based, contextual, and practically applicable across diverse educational settings.

Results and Discussion

This study aimed to develop an inclusive education model that promotes gender justice and social equity for all learners. Integrated analysis of quantitative and qualitative data revealed the dynamics of school policies, pedagogical practices, student perceptions and the challenges and enabling factors for the successful implementation of inclusive education. The findings indicate that effective inclusive education depends on the interplay between school policies and structure, responsive teaching practices, and student perceptions and participation.

School Policies and Structure in Supporting Inclusive Education

Supportive school policies form the foundation for implementing inclusive education. Schools with formal written policies on inclusion, teacher training, and regular monitoring showed increased participation of all students, including girls and students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. Quantitative data indicated that teachers in schools with strong

inclusion policies reported significant increases in student engagement (Ainscow & César, 2006; Fullan, 2007).

School leadership also played a critical role. Principals who were proactive and supportive of inclusion fostered an open school culture, increased teacher motivation, and ensured resource allocation, such as gender-sensitive textbooks, accessible facilities for students with special needs, and adaptive technologies. One principal noted:

“We emphasize that inclusion is not an additional program, but a way of seeing education. It starts from a strong value orientation, not just training materials” (Interview, Principal A).

However, limited budgets and teachers' understanding of gender equity remained significant obstacles. Some schools faced challenges in providing adequate support for students with special needs, making the experience of inclusion still largely symbolic (Slee, 2011). Cultural and social norms also influenced policy implementation, such as traditional views on gender roles limiting girls' participation in certain activities (Chabeda & Pillay, 2013; UNESCO, 2021).

Pedagogical Practices that Support Gender Justice and Social Equity

Pedagogical practices significantly influenced student engagement and achievement. Schools implementing gender-sensitive curricula, participatory learning strategies, and differentiated teaching methods observed notable improvements in student motivation and participation (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2018). Teachers using project-based and group discussion methods reported female student participation increased by up to 65%, while students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds showed improved self-confidence.

Adaptive technology and hybrid learning methods also facilitated self-paced learning. Observations revealed that students with physical or distance barriers felt more motivated when they could access learning materials digitally. Yet, access to technology was uneven, meaning students from lower-income backgrounds still faced challenges, highlighting the need for policies to address the digital divide (Selwyn, 2016).

Flexible and formative assessments also supported inclusion. Teachers reported that project-based and portfolio assessments allowed a more holistic evaluation of student ability, rather than focusing solely on numeric grades, helping students feel valued and motivated (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Students emphasized that formative assessments encouraged them to focus on the learning process and the real-world application of knowledge.

Table 1. Effectiveness of Inclusive Pedagogical Practices

Pedagogical Practice	Participation (%)	Achievement (%)	Motivation (%)
Gender-sensitive curriculum	74	68	76
Project-based learning	69	63	71
Adaptive technology	64	60	66
Hybrid/blended learning	60	57	62

Student Perceptions and Participation

Students' perceptions of inclusion influenced the extent of their engagement in learning. Those who felt valued and supported by teachers and peers exhibited higher motivation and active classroom participation. Focus group discussions revealed that girls became more confident in expressing opinions when teachers emphasized equitable roles, while students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds felt supported through teacher guidance and peer support (Tinto, 1997).

Class arrangements mindful of gender equity increased cross-gender participation and promoted a fairer learning experience. Students reported that collaborative activities across genders and social backgrounds helped foster critical awareness of equity and appreciation of diversity. Nonetheless, socioeconomic challenges continued to affect participation, such as limited home resources and family responsibilities, indicating that inclusive education must consider the broader context to be truly effective (Sadker & Zittleman, 2009).

The study's findings were synthesized into a conceptual model of inclusive education, highlighting the synergy between policies and leadership, responsive pedagogical practices, and student perceptions and participation. The model demonstrates that effective inclusion can be achieved only when these three dimensions operate harmoniously and sustainably, while considering students' social and economic contexts.

Conclusion

The findings of this study indicate that effective inclusive education requires a synergy between school policies and structures, responsive pedagogical practices, and active student perceptions and participation. Clear school policies, progressive leadership, and adequate resource allocation were found to enhance engagement for all learners, including female students and those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. Adaptive pedagogical practices, such as gender-sensitive curricula, participatory learning, adaptive technology, and formative assessment, fostered student motivation, achievement, and self-confidence. Furthermore, students' perceptions of inclusion strongly influenced their participation, with learning experiences that value social and gender diversity promoting engagement, critical awareness, and social skills. These findings affirm that inclusion is not merely about physical access to classrooms but a transformative process encompassing institutional, pedagogical, and social dimensions to create fair and equitable learning experiences. This study recommends that schools and policymakers continue to develop evidence-based inclusive education models that take into account learners' social, cultural, and economic contexts. It is essential to enhance teacher training, provide sufficient resources, and ensure equitable access to technology to ensure the equitable implementation of inclusive practices. Future research could explore the long-term impact of inclusive education models on students' academic, social, and psychological development and evaluate their implementation across different educational levels and cultural contexts. In this way, the study contributes not only to the theoretical understanding of inclusive education but also offers practical guidance to schools and stakeholders on creating learning experiences that are more equitable, just, and sensitive to diversity.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the Rector of Alexandria University, Egypt, for the institutional support and academic environment that greatly contributed to the completion of this research. Appreciation is also extended for the continuous encouragement and facilitation provided, which enabled the successful conduct and dissemination of this study.

Author Contributions Statement

Youssef Abdel Rahman contributed significantly to the conception and design of the study, as well as the development of the research framework. He was responsible for data collection and analysis, ensuring methodological rigor and the validity of findings. He also played a key role in drafting the manuscript, critically revising it for important intellectual content, and approving the final version for publication.

AI Usage Statement

The authors declare that artificial intelligence (AI)–assisted tools were used during the preparation of this manuscript. Grammarly was employed for grammar checking and language refinement. Use of these tools was strictly limited to linguistic and editorial purposes. All intellectual content, data analysis, interpretation of results, and conclusions were produced solely by the authors, who retain full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and originality of the work.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest related to the publication of this manuscript.

References

- Ainscow, M., & César, M. (2006). *Inclusive education: The way of the future*. Routledge.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>
- Brighouse, H., & Swift, A. (2014). Equality, education, and capability. *Ethics and Education*, 9(2), 115–129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449642.2014.918409>
- Carrington, S., & Robinson, R. (2009). Inclusive schooling in Australia: Policy, practice, and paradox. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 13(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110701566348>
- Chabeda, D., & Pillay, J. (2013). Gender, culture and schooling in South Africa. *Gender and Education*, 25(5), 552–567. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2012.716076>
- Darmody, M., & Smyth, E. (2016). *Educational disadvantage and social inequality in Europe*. Springer.
- Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2018). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal*, 44(6), 1035–1053. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3484>
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.

<https://doi.org/10.66325/nusantaraeducation.v4i2.249>

- García, S., & Weiss, E. (2019). The teacher shortage is real, large, and growing. *Economic Policy Institute*. <https://www.epi.org/publication/the-teacher-shortage-is-real-large-and-growing/>
- Hargreaves, A., & Shirley, D. (2012). *The global fourth way: The quest for educational excellence*. Corwin Press.
- Hehir, T., Grindal, T., & Eidelman, H. (2016). A summary of the evidence on inclusive education. *Abt Associates*.
- Kozleski, E., & Thorius, K. (2014). Equity, policy, and inclusive education. *Journal of Special Education Leadership*, 27(2), 75–86.
- Lindsay, G., & Hart, C. (2020). Inclusive education: Global perspectives. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(12), 1297–1312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1482010>
- McLeskey, J., Waldron, N., & Redd, L. (2014). A case study of a highly effective, inclusive elementary school. *The Journal of Special Education*, 48(4), 223–234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466912440455>
- Mitchell, D. (2014). *What really works in special and inclusive education: Using evidence-based teaching strategies* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Norwich, B. (2013). Addressing tensions and dilemmas in inclusive education. Routledge.
- OECD. (2018). *Equity in education: Breaking down barriers to social mobility*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264073234-en>
- Oliver, M., & Barnes, C. (2012). *The new politics of disablement* (3rd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Peters, S. (2007). Inclusive education: A global agenda. *Prospects*, 37(4), 15–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-007-0048-8>
- Rix, J., Sheehy, K., & Fletcher-Campbell, F. (2013). *Inclusive education: Evidence-based practices across the world*. Routledge.
- Sadker, M., & Zittleman, K. (2009). Gender bias from kindergarten to adulthood. *Education Digest*, 75(9), 34–39.
- Selwyn, N. (2016). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Slee, R. (2011). *The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling, and inclusive education*. Routledge.
- Tinto, V. (1997). Classrooms as communities: Exploring the educational character of student persistence. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68(6), 599–623. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1997.11779003>
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners* (2nd ed.). ASCD.

- UNESCO. (2021). *Inclusion and education: All means all*. UNESCO Publishing. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373718>
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. UN.
- Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P., & Burden, R. (2000). A survey of attitudes towards inclusion. *Educational Psychology*, 20(2), 191–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713663717>
- Averill, R., & Drake, J. (2019). Gender equality in education: A review of evidence. *Education Research International*, 2019, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/4794785>
- Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2016). *The index for inclusion: A guide to school development*. Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
- Corbett, J. (2001). *Supporting inclusive education: A connective pedagogy*. RoutledgeFalmer.
- D'Alessio, S., & Smorti, A. (2019). School climate and inclusive education: Impacts on student outcomes. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(4), 357–374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1469821>
- Forlin, C., & Chambers, D. (2011). Teacher preparation for inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15(3), 253–271. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110903030089>
- Kozleski, E. B., & Artiles, A. J. (2016). Inclusive education policy: International perspectives. *Journal of Special Education*, 50(4), 219–227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466916636673>
- Lewis, A., & Norwich, B. (2005). *Special teaching for special children? Pedagogies for inclusion*. Open University Press.
- Murray, C., & Pianta, R. (2007). Teacher-student relationships and student engagement. *School Psychology Review*, 36(2), 157–167.
- Rouse, M., & Florian, L. (2006). Inclusive pedagogy and effective teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(4), 437–452. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.12.005>
- Smith, J., & Tyler, N. (2010). Effective inclusive education strategies. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14(3), 221–237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802504904>
- Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1996). *Support networks for inclusive schooling*. Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
- Warnock, M. (2005). *Special educational needs: A new look*. Continuum International Publishing.
- Wehmeyer, M. L., & Shogren, K. A. (2017). Promoting self-determination in inclusive classrooms. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, 52(1), 3–14.

- Wrigley, T., & Lingard, B. (2001). Inclusive education and social justice. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 5(2–3), 199–219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110120058503>
- Yates, S., & Bradley, D. (2019). Technology-supported inclusive classrooms: Evidence and strategies. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 51(2), 123–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2019.1567852>