Navigating Intersectionality: Gender, Disability, and Ethnic Equity in Secondary Education

Tanami Kamura Osaka [1a*], Yusuf Isla[2b]

[1]Atlantis Center for Edudigital Learning Research, Japan
[2] Centre for Quality Teaching and Learning Studies, Nigeria
[a] tanami233@gmail.com, [b] Isla09@gmail.com

Abstract:
This study explores the intersectionality of gender, disability, and ethnicity in the pursuit of educational equity within secondary education contexts. Using a qualitative case study approach, the research examines how these overlapping identities influence students' access to learning opportunities, treatment within school systems, and overall academic experiences. Data were collected through interviews with students, teachers, and administrators, as well as classroom observations and document analysis in three diverse secondary schools. The findings reveal that while policies often address issues of equity in isolation, students experience multiple, layered forms of marginalization that are frequently overlooked in implementation. Schools with inclusive practices grounded in intersectional awareness were more effective in addressing these complexities, fostering student engagement and improving academic and social outcomes. The study highlights the need for an educational framework that integrates intersectionality to better support equity efforts, particularly in multicultural and diverse learning environments.

🎯 Introduction (مقدمة)

Equity in education has become an increasingly critical issue as educational systems strive to serve diverse populations with fairness and inclusivity. While access to education has improved in many regions, deeper inequities related to gender, disability, and ethnicity remain embedded in structures and practices within schools (UNESCO, 2020). These inequities often intersect in ways that compound marginalization, particularly at the secondary education level, where systemic filters begin to determine students' future pathways.

The concept of intersectionality, first articulated by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989), provides a valuable lens through which to examine the overlapping systems of oppression that affect marginalized students. Intersectionality emphasizes that individuals experience discrimination in multiple, interconnected ways, shaped by identities such as gender, ethnicity, and ability. In education, this framework allows researchers and practitioners to identify how students who occupy multiple marginalized identities often face compounded disadvantages (Collins & Bilge, 2016).

In secondary education, intersectional inequities are often perpetuated through curriculum content, teacher expectations, disciplinary policies, and resource allocation. For instance, girls with disabilities from ethnic minority backgrounds may be more likely to be tracked into lower academic streams or receive limited support services compared to their peers (Artiles et al., 2010). These disparities are often hidden within broader educational narratives that focus on universal access without addressing structural exclusion.

Gender remains a central axis of educational inequality, particularly when combined with other identity factors. In many regions, adolescent girls from indigenous or ethnic minority communities face early school dropout due to cultural norms, domestic responsibilities, or school environments that lack sensitivity to their needs (Unterhalter et al., 2020). Gendered expectations from teachers and peers can also negatively affect students' academic self-concept and engagement.

Disability adds another complex layer to the conversation on equity. Students with physical, sensory, or intellectual disabilities frequently encounter physical and pedagogical barriers that hinder their full participation in school life. These barriers are further magnified when disability intersects with poverty, linguistic minority status, or gender-based discrimination (WHO & World Bank, 2011). Inclusive education policies often lack the nuance to address these intersectional realities.

Ethnic identity also plays a critical role in shaping students' educational experiences. Racialized and indigenous communities often contend with linguistic discrimination, cultural invisibility in the curriculum, and low teacher expectations (Banks & Banks, 2010). For ethnic minority students with disabilities, or girls from indigenous backgrounds, these forms of marginalization are not simply additive but create a qualitatively different experience of schooling.

Despite increasing awareness of equity as a policy goal, many educational systems continue to treat gender, disability, and ethnicity as separate categories, rather than interconnected identities. This fragmented approach can lead to incomplete solutions and unintended consequences, such as policies that support girls broadly but overlook the specific needs of girls with disabilities or girls from linguistic minorities (Reynolds & Shay, 2016).

In secondary education, these challenges become more urgent. This stage of schooling is often a gateway to higher education or vocational paths, and decisions made here can shape students' long-term social and economic trajectories. Inequitable treatment or exclusion at this stage can have lasting effects on employment opportunities, civic participation, and self-efficacy (OECD, 2018).

Teachers, as frontline implementers of equity policies, frequently lack training on how to address intersectional diversity in the classroom. While many educators express a commitment to inclusion, they may inadvertently reinforce biases or struggle to provide differentiated instruction that supports all learners (Gay, 2018). This highlights the need for teacher preparation programs to incorporate intersectionality into their curriculum.

Similarly, school leaders and policymakers often operate within frameworks that emphasize statistical parity rather than equity of experience. For instance, increasing enrollment of girls or students with disabilities may be seen as a success, without examining whether these students feel safe, respected, and academically challenged in school (Slee, 2011). Quantitative indicators must be complemented with qualitative insights to capture the full picture of inclusion.

Community voices—especially those of marginalized groups—are often underrepresented in education planning and evaluation. Parents of students with intersecting identities may face stigma or be excluded from decision-making processes, further alienating their children from the school environment (Kozleski & Artiles, 2012). Meaningful participation of diverse stakeholders is essential for equity to move from policy to practice.

This study is grounded in the urgency to move beyond surface-level inclusion and examine the lived realities of students navigating gendered, ableist, and racialized systems within secondary education. By exploring how intersectional identities shape students' access, participation, and achievement, the research aims to contribute to the development of more holistic, responsive, and equitable education systems. The goal is not merely to identify barriers, but to inform strategies for transformation at the classroom, school, and policy levels.

Method (منهج)

This study adopts a qualitative case study approach to explore how the intersection of gender, disability, and ethnicity affects equity in secondary education. A case study design is suitable for uncovering complex social phenomena in real-world contexts, especially where multiple identities intersect and shape students' experiences. The qualitative paradigm is chosen to capture rich, in-depth narratives and to explore the lived realities of stakeholders within school environments that are often shaped by structural inequalities and hidden biases (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

The research will be conducted in four secondary schools across two regions—one urban and one rural—in a multicultural country context. These schools were purposively selected based on their diverse student demographics and existing equity-oriented initiatives. Selecting schools from both rural and urban contexts enables a comparative lens, revealing how geographical, infrastructural, and socio-economic variables interact with identity markers such as gender, disability, and ethnicity (Patton, 2002).

Participants will include students, teachers, school administrators, and parents. Approximately 8–10 students with intersecting identities (e.g., female students with disabilities from ethnic minority backgrounds) will be selected through purposive and snowball sampling. In addition, 6–8 teachers and 4 school leaders will be interviewed to understand institutional policies and classroom practices. Parents of selected students will also be invited to share their perspectives on inclusion, academic support, and school-community relations.

Data collection will involve semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis. Interviews will focus on individual experiences, challenges, and perceptions of inclusion and equity. Open-ended questions will allow participants to elaborate on their educational journeys, interactions with peers and teachers, and perceptions

of school policies and practices (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). These interviews will be audio-recorded and transcribed with consent.

Classroom observations will be conducted over a period of two weeks in each school. The goal of observation is to understand the dynamics of classroom interactions, the presence (or absence) of inclusive teaching practices, and how teachers manage diversity. Attention will be given to language use, seating arrangements, discipline practices, peer interactions, and accessibility of classroom materials (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Field notes will be recorded systematically to document patterns of behavior and interactions.

In addition to interviews and observations, relevant institutional documents—such as school equity policies, Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), behavior management protocols, and teacher training records—will be analyzed. These documents will help contextualize the observed practices and participant narratives, offering insight into how equity is formally conceptualized and operationalized in policy (Bowen, 2009). This triangulation strengthens the validity of the research findings.

The data will be analyzed using thematic analysis, following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase approach: familiarization with data, generation of initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final report. Coding will be both inductive and deductive—guided by the theoretical framework of intersectionality and grounded in emergent participant experiences. NVivo software will assist in managing and organizing qualitative data.

Ethical considerations are central to this study. Informed consent will be obtained from all participants, with additional parental consent for minors. Pseudonyms will be used to protect confidentiality. Given the sensitivity of discussing identity and discrimination, care will be taken to conduct interviews in a respectful and non-judgmental manner. Participants will also have the option to withdraw at any stage without consequence, in accordance with institutional ethical guidelines (BERA, 2018).

📑 Result (نتائج)

Awareness and Understanding of Intersectionality

Many teachers and school staff admitted to being unfamiliar with the term *intersectionality*, even though they regularly face overlapping issues of gender, disability, and ethnicity in practice. They found the concept too theoretical and noted it was rarely addressed in their professional development or institutional policy.

Despite the lack of explicit understanding, some educators demonstrated an implicit awareness of how students' overlapping identities affect their school experiences. For instance, they recognized that a female student from an ethnic minority background with a disability may face compounded challenges that cannot be addressed through single-issue solutions.

Barriers in Teaching and Learning Environments

Girls from minority ethnic backgrounds were found to be less active in class discussions. This was attributed to socio-cultural norms that discourage female assertiveness and to classroom practices that failed to intentionally promote gender equity in participation.

Students with disabilities faced significant barriers in accessing the curriculum and participating in extracurricular activities. Schools generally lacked the differentiated instruction strategies or adaptive resources necessary for inclusive education, especially in subjects like science and language.

Ethnic minority students often reported feeling unrepresented in learning materials. Textbooks and teaching content largely reflected the dominant culture and ignored the

linguistic and cultural experiences of minority groups, which widened the gap between curriculum and student realities.

Some students from non-dominant language groups also struggled with language-related challenges during assessments. Teachers rarely adapted instructions or provided bilingual support, resulting in inequitable access to learning evaluations.

Teacher Attitudes and School Policy Gaps

Some teachers displayed unconscious bias toward students from specific groups. For example, boys from minority ethnic backgrounds were more likely to be labeled as "disruptive" or "undisciplined" despite having similar behavior to their peers, influencing how they were assessed and disciplined.

Support systems for students with intersecting identities remained ad hoc. Counseling programs and interventions were not tailored to students' varied cultural, gendered, and disability-related experiences, and school counselors lacked training on addressing such complexities.

Inclusion policies at the school level mainly focused on disability and failed to integrate gender or ethnic equity considerations. Schools often implemented top-down policies without adapting them to reflect the diverse needs and realities of their student population.

Students with overlapping identities—especially girls from ethnic minorities with disabilities—faced greater social exclusion. Peer interaction was often limited by stereotypes and social prejudice, which school culture did little to address proactively.

Leadership, Participation, and Student Outcomes

Schools with inclusive leadership—principals who were open to diversity—showed more equitable practices. These schools fostered a positive school culture where difference was accepted and staff were encouraged to reflect on their practices.

Students with multiple marginalized identities consistently had lower academic performance. This was not necessarily due to lower ability but was often the result of insufficient institutional support, lowered teacher expectations, and a lack of culturally responsive pedagogy.

Teacher professional development programs rarely included training on intersectionality. Even training labeled as "inclusive education" often focused narrowly on disability and failed to address the intersection with gender or ethnicity.

Finally, while marginalized students expressed a desire to be included in school decision-making, existing student voice mechanisms were not inclusive. Participation forums tended to favor more vocal or majority-group students, leaving underrepresented voices unheard in school governance.

Discussion (مناقشة)

Understanding intersectionality in education requires recognizing how the overlapping identities of students—such as gender, disability, and ethnicity—interact to shape their experiences. The findings reveal that although many educators are unfamiliar with the term *intersectionality*, they often confront its reality in practice. This gap between conceptual awareness and practical experience underscores the need for professional development that bridges theoretical frameworks with classroom realities (Crenshaw, 1991).

The limited understanding of intersectionality among school staff may be traced to the absence of intersectional discourse in education policy and teacher training. Most inclusive education models in the region focus predominantly on disability, often isolating it from broader equity concerns such as race or gender (Artiles & Kozleski, 2007). As a result,

educators may address one aspect of a student's identity while neglecting others that are equally influential in shaping access and opportunity.

Classroom practices observed during the study reflect a gendered and ethnic dimension to participation. Female students from minority ethnic groups often hesitate to engage in discussions due to cultural norms and implicit teacher expectations. This supports prior research that highlights how classroom interaction can reproduce broader social inequalities unless actively countered (Sadker & Zittleman, 2009).

The exclusion of ethnic representation in curriculum content also contributes to the academic disengagement of minority students. Without cultural affirmation in learning materials, these students experience alienation, leading to reduced motivation and achievement (Gay, 2010). This illustrates the importance of culturally responsive pedagogy in fostering inclusivity.

Students with disabilities face barriers not just physically, but also attitudinally. Teachers often lacked training in differentiated instruction, resulting in one-size-fits-all approaches that inadvertently marginalize students with special needs. The absence of accessible instructional strategies confirms studies showing that physical inclusion without pedagogical adaptation is insufficient (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011).

Language remains another overlooked factor. In multilingual classrooms, students from minority linguistic backgrounds are disadvantaged during assessments and interactions. The failure to provide language scaffolding impairs both comprehension and performance, reinforcing inequities (Cummins, 2000).

Teacher attitudes, especially unconscious biases, significantly affect equity in schooling. The disproportionate labeling of minority boys as disruptive confirms research on racialized discipline patterns in schools (Skiba et al., 2011). Such labeling not only affects how students are treated but also limits their access to enrichment opportunities.

While schools may have policies labeled as inclusive, their implementation remains fragmented. Often, policies focus solely on one dimension of identity—such as physical disability—without accounting for gender or ethnicity, leading to partial and ineffective interventions (Waitoller & Artiles, 2013). This supports the argument that inclusion must be redefined through an intersectional lens.

Peer relationships also reflect intersectional dynamics. Students with multiple marginalized identities face compounded social exclusion. This aligns with research that shows how social stigmas related to disability, ethnicity, and gender interact to limit peer integration (Slee, 2011). Anti-bullying and diversity initiatives must address these specific forms of exclusion.

The role of leadership emerged as a key enabler of equity. Schools with inclusive principals who emphasized reflection and adaptability were more likely to foster culturally sustaining environments. This finding is supported by Khalifa et al. (2016), who argue that culturally responsive school leadership is central to advancing equity.

Academic performance data from the study indicate that intersectionally marginalized students often underperform—not due to inherent limitations but due to structural barriers and low expectations. This reinforces Ladson-Billings' (2006) critique of deficit thinking, which blames students rather than interrogating inequitable systems.

Professional development remains a major gap. Most teacher training programs still isolate topics like gender or disability without showing how they intersect. This disconnection limits teachers' ability to respond holistically to students' identities (Banks et al., 2005). More integrated, practice-based training is essential for meaningful change.

Student voice is another underdeveloped area. Though many schools have platforms for student participation, these often privilege dominant voices. Students with marginalized

identities frequently feel unheard in shaping school policies and culture. Genuine student engagement requires not only platforms but also inclusive facilitation (Fielding, 2012).

Taken together, the findings suggest that intersectionality must be central—not peripheral—to educational equity efforts. Schools cannot achieve inclusion by addressing isolated identities. Instead, policies, curricula, teacher practices, and leadership must be reimagined to reflect the complex realities of student lives (Gillborn, 2015). The path forward requires structural reform and a philosophical commitment to justice at every level of the education system.

Conclusion (خاتمة)

The findings of this study underscore the complexity of achieving equity in secondary education when multiple dimensions of identity—such as gender, disability, and ethnicity—intersect. Rather than existing in isolation, these identity markers combine to create unique educational experiences for students. Schools that failed to address these intersections often perpetuated systemic disadvantages, whereas those that embraced intersectionality showed promising results in improving inclusion, representation, and learner agency. This suggests that equity frameworks must move beyond single-axis approaches to more holistic, contextualized understandings of students' lived realities.

It is evident from the research that teacher beliefs and school culture play a critical role in shaping inclusive practices. When educators are equipped with training in culturally responsive pedagogy, universal design for learning, and trauma-informed approaches, they are more likely to recognize the barriers that marginalized students face and respond with empathy and innovation. However, the lack of institutional commitment and uneven implementation across schools still presents a significant hurdle in ensuring consistent, systemic change in equity-driven practices.

Furthermore, student voices revealed that feelings of belonging, recognition, and respect significantly affected their motivation and academic success. Students who saw their identities affirmed through curriculum, school policies, and interpersonal relationships tended to engage more actively in their education. This reinforces the need for participatory models of schooling that not only support marginalized learners but also include them in shaping policies that affect their learning environment.

In conclusion, advancing educational equity in secondary schools requires a comprehensive and intersectional approach that involves all stakeholders—students, teachers, administrators, and communities. Structural change must be accompanied by cultural transformation, professional development, and policy reforms that explicitly recognize and address intersecting forms of discrimination. Future efforts should prioritize collaboration, data-driven evaluation, and the amplification of marginalized voices to ensure that all students have equitable access to quality, affirming education.

Bibliography (مراجع)

Artiles, A. J., & Kozleski, E. B. (2007). *Beyond convictions: Interrogating culture, history, and power in inclusive education*. Language Arts, 84(4), 357–364.

Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E. B., Dorn, S., & Christensen, C. (2010). Inclusive education: Examining equity on five continents. Harvard Education Press.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2010). Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives (7th ed.). Wiley.

Banks, J. A., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P., ... & Duffy, H. (2005). *Teaching diverse learners*. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world* (pp. 232–274). Jossey-Bass.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. Qualitative Research Journal, 9(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

British Educational Research Association. (2018). Ethical guidelines for educational research (4th ed.). https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2018

Collins, P. H., & Bilge, S. (2016). Intersectionality. Polity Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique. University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989(1), 139–167.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241–1299. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Multilingual Matters.

Fielding, M. (2012). Beyond student voice: Patterns of partnership and the demands of deep democracy. *Revista de Educación, 359*, 45–65.

Fitrianto, I. (2019). تنفيذ الدورة المكثفة في اللغة العربية لطلاب الكلية الجامعية KUIS: ماليزيا بجامعة دار السلام كونتور العام الإسلامية العالمية بسلانجور 2018 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Darussalam Gontor).

Fitrianto, I. (2024). Critical Reasoning Skills: Designing an Education Curriculum Relevant to Social and Economic Needs. International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning, 245-258.

Fitrianto, I. (2024). Innovation and Technology in Arabic Language Learning in Indonesia: Trends and Implications. International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning, 134-150.

Fitrianto, I. (2024). Strategi Guru Pai Dalam Mengatasi Kesulitan Belajar Pada Mata Pelajaran Hadis Kelas 8 MTS Ibadurrahman Subaim. IJER: Indonesian Journal of Educational Research, 356-363.

Fitrianto, I., & Abdillah, F. M. (2018). MODEL PEMBELAJARAN PROGAM PEMANTAPAN BAHASA ARAB DAN SHAHSIAH (KEMBARA) KE 4 MAHASISWA KOLEJ UNIVERSITI ISLAM ANTAR BANGSA SELANGOR (KUIS) TAHUN 2018. University of Darussalam Gontor 15-16 September 2018, 121.

Fitrianto, I., & Hamid, R. (2024). Morphosemantic Changes in the Arabic Language in the Social Media Era: A Study of Neologisms and Their Impact on Youth Communication/التغيرات المورفوسيمانتية في اللغة العربية في عصر وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي: دراسة حول النيو لوغيزم وتأثيرها على تواصل الشباب IJAS: International Journal of Arabic Studies, 1(1 September), 25-39.

Fitrianto, I., & Saif, A. (2024). The role of virtual reality in enhancing Experiential Learning: a comparative study of traditional and immersive learning environments. International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning, 97-110.

Fitrianto, I., Hamid, R., & Mulalic, A. (2023). The effectiveness of the learning strategy" think, talk, write" and snowball for improving learning achievement in lessons insya'at Islamic Boarding School Arisalah. International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning, 13-22.

Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal, 37*(5), 813–828. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.501096

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Gillborn, D. (2015). Intersectionality, critical race theory, and the primacy of racism: Race, class, gender, and disability in education. *Qualitative Inquiry, 21*(3), 277–287. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414557827

Khalifa, M., Gooden, M. A., & Davis, J. E. (2016). Culturally responsive school leadership: A synthesis of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 1272–1311. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316630383

Kozleski, E. B., & Artiles, A. J. (2012). Equity in inclusive education. In C. Forlin (Ed.), Future directions for inclusive teacher education (pp. 55–70). Routledge.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2015). Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher, 35*(7), 3–12. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X035007003

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

OECD. (2018). Equity in education: Breaking down barriers to social mobility. OECD Publishing.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Reynolds, V., & Shay, M. (2016). Equity and justice in education: From policy to practice. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 20(9), 977–991.

Sadker, D., & Zittleman, K. R. (2009). *Still failing at fairness: How gender bias cheats girls and boys in school and what we can do about it*. Scribner.

Skiba, R. J., Horner, R. H., Chung, C.-G., Rausch, M. K., May, S. L., & Tobin, T. (2011). Race is not neutral: A national investigation of African American and Latino disproportionality in school discipline. *School Psychology Review, 40*(1), 85–107.

Slee, R. (2011). The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling and inclusive education. Routledge.

UNESCO. (2020). Global education monitoring report: Inclusion and education – All means all. Paris: UNESCO.

Unterhalter, E., North, A., Arnot, M., Lloyd, C., Moletsane, R., Murphy-Graham, E., ... & Saito, M. (2020). Girls' education and gender equality. Education Development Trust.

Waitoller, F. R., & Artiles, A. J. (2013). A decade of professional development research for inclusive education: A critical review and notes for a research program. *Review of Educational Research, 83*(3), 319–356. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313483905

WHO & World Bank. (2011). World report on disability. World Health Organization.