International Journal of Studies in Psychology
E-ISSN: 2710-2327, P-ISSN: 2710-2319
Vol 5, No. 3, pp 41-44. https://doi.org/10.38140/ijspsy.v5i3.2089
GAERPSY Publishing, 2025
Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivatives (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence.

History of the article
Submitted 19 June 2025
Revised 3 July 2025
Accepted 20 July 2025
Published 30 October 2025

Educational leadership for inclusion: Strategies, challenges, and perspectives in diverse contexts

[1*]Eliecer Montero-Ojeda, [2]Sandra-Patricia Cardenas-Mahecha, [3]Yudis-Irene Lora-Guzman, and [4]Maria-Ofelia Alvarez-Gomez
[1,2,3,4]School of Education, Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios, Colombia
[1*]Primary author: emontero@uniminuto.edu

***Abstract*—**This study presents a critical literature review on the role of leadership in promoting inclusive educational environments. It argues that inclusive leadership is essential to guarantee equity and quality in diverse settings by overcoming structural and cultural barriers. The ongoing research analyses effective strategies such as teacher collaboration, curriculum adaptation, and community participation, while identifying challenges including resistance to change and lack of specialised training. The study highlights emerging perspectives, particularly the need for distributed and emotionally intelligent leadership that fosters school cultures based on social justice. This study adopts an interpretative qualitative methodology structured in three phases: (1) identification of inclusive leadership practices in diverse educational settings, (2) analysis of teachers' perceptions about leadership's impact on inclusion and (3) exploration of pedagogical strategies aligned with legal and theoretical frameworks of inclusive education Three data collection techniques are used: participant observation and semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, enabling triangulation that strengthens internal validity. The study emphasises the interaction between inclusion policies, transformational leadership practices, and special educational needs, providing empirical evidence for decision-making in real contexts. It concludes that while theoretical advances exist, their practical implementation requires flexible educational policies and sustained ethical commitment. This study contributes to academic debate by proposing an integrative framework for educational leaders in multicultural environments with diverse needs.

Keywords: Challenges of inclusion, Educational leadership, Inclusion strategies, Perspectives of inclusion, Teacher training

To cite this article (APA): Montero-Ojeda, E., Cardenas-Mahecha, S. P., Lora-Guzman, Y. I., & Alvarez-Gomez, M. O. (2025). Educational leadership for inclusion: Strategies, challenges, and perspectives in diverse contexts. *International Journal of Studies in Psychology, 5*(3), 41-44. https://doi.org/10.38140/ijspsy.v5i3.2089

I. INTRODUCTION

EDUCATIONAL inclusion has emerged over the past few decades as an essential guiding principle in the transformation processes of contemporary school systems. Far from being understood merely as a strategy aimed at serving students with disabilities, inclusion is now conceived as an ethical, political, and pedagogical framework that orients all educational activity toward equity, social justice, and the recognition of diversity as a foundational value (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation [UNESCO], 2017; Echeita, 2008). From this perspective, inclusion goes beyond integrative approaches and calls for a profound reorganisation of institutional cultures, school policies, and pedagogical practices, ensuring that all students, regardless of their personal, social, or cultural characteristics, can participate fully and learn meaningfully in typical learning environments (Ainscow, 2020; Booth & Ainscow, 2002).

One of the most influential contributions in this field is the "Index for Inclusion" developed by Booth and Ainscow (2002). It serves as a diagnostic and formative tool, allowing institutions to assess and redesign their internal conditions through the lenses of culture, policy, and practice. This approach seeks to eliminate physical or curricular barriers and transform the underlying conceptions that inform educational decisions, fostering environments where difference is tolerated and actively valued. In this regard, Bolívar (2012) warns that inclusion should not be regarded as a marginal add-on but as the core of the institutional educational project. Only through flexible organisational structures, adaptive pedagogies, and a shared ethical commitment among school actors can truly inclusive educational communities be realised.

At the same time, educational leadership has been extensively documented as a key factor in improving educational quality, especially when approached from a transformational and collaborative perspective (Day et al., 2016; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). Leadership is thus not seen as a merely administrative or technical function, but as a process of moral and professional influence that mobilises the educational community around shared goals, enhancing professional development, institutional learning, and equity as central aims of schooling (Fullan, 2002; Bolívar, 2010).

Transformational leadership has been established as a suitable model for contexts characterised by change and diversity, as it fosters innovation, collective empowerment, and the construction of a shared vision centered on continuous improvement and educational justice (Bass, 1998; Bolívar & López Yáñez, 2009). In this sense, school leadership teams acting as pedagogical leaders become strategic agents in guiding schools toward inclusive goals by strengthening collaborative work, developing reflective professional cultures, and promoting school policies that are responsive to the needs of all students.

Therefore, the relationship between inclusion and educational leadership is not merely functional but deeply structural. These two concepts are intertwined in a dynamic of mutual reinforcement, wherein inclusion represents the ethical goal of the school system, and leadership functions as the strategic means to achieve it. As Bolívar and López Yáñez (2009) assert, an inclusive school cannot be conceived without leadership capable of mobilising human, material, and symbolic resources in pursuit of the common good. From this

standpoint, inclusive leadership emerges as both a theoretical and practical category that integrates an ethical commitment to equity, a transformative vision of institutional change, and the capacity to create sustainable conditions for the learning of all.

This comprehensive understanding of inclusion also recognises diversity in all forms, including functional, linguistic, ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, and gender, as constitutive elements of the educational process. It entails acknowledging that equity is not achieved through uniform solutions but through differentiated practices that respond to the specific needs of learners and promote a more humane, relevant, and just education. For this reason, leadership committed to inclusion must not be occasional or delegable; it must be central to the planning, implementation, and evaluation of all school processes.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Educational inclusion is one of the core pillars of education systems committed to social justice. This concept has evolved from a focus on serving students with disabilities toward a more comprehensive vision that regards diversity in cultural, linguistic, ethnic, socioeconomic, gender, and ability-related terms as a structural value of the educational process (Booth & Ainscow, 2002; Bolívar, 2012). Under this approach, inclusion goes beyond the physical presence of students in classrooms; it entails their active participation, the recognition of their unique characteristics, and the assurance of meaningful learning opportunities for all. Booth and Ainscow (2002) present the "Index for Inclusion" as a tool for transforming school cultures, policies, and practices through participatory processes of institutional reflection that foster equity. Similarly, Bolívar (2012) argues that inclusion must occupy a central place within the institutional educational project, surpassing its status as a mere "appendix" and instead assuming an ethical orientation that permeates the entire school structure.

Essomba (2006) emphasises that inclusion must be built on human relationships and the collective ethos of the educational community, avoiding "micro-exclusions" that, although often invisible, sustain subtle forms of discrimination. This perspective underscores the cultural dimension of inclusion, recognising that structural changes can only be sustainable when accompanied by deep transformations in school values, beliefs, and daily practices.

In recent years, educational leadership has been central in academic debates on school improvement, equity, and innovation. Beyond its technical or administrative dimensions, leadership is understood as an ethical, professional, and political practice that directly influences the creation of inclusive school cultures and the quality of student learning (Fullan, 2002; Bolívar, 2010). From this standpoint, leading means managing resources, inspiring, mobilising, and transforming.

The transformational leadership model, developed by Bass (1985), highlights the leader's ability to generate a shared vision, empower teaching teams, and promote institutional change through moral commitment and pedagogical innovation. Complementarily, scholars such as Spillane (2006) and Gronn (2002) advocate for distributed leadership as an alternative to the traditional hierarchical model. This approach promotes decentralised decision-making and shared responsibility among all educational community members in driving change.

Adding to these perspectives, the concept of resilient leadership, introduced by Olmo (2017), focuses on leaders' competencies such as empathy, flexibility, active listening, and perseverance to navigate adversity, sustain team morale, and foster safe, collaborative, and inclusive school climates. However, empirical evidence reveals tensions between theoretical models and the realities of school leadership practice. The TALIS 2018 results notes that school leaders spend only 16% of their time on pedagogical tasks, while over 30% are devoted to administrative duties, limiting their capacity to lead innovation and equity processes (OECD, 2019). This situation underscores the urgent need to redefine the role of school leadership to fulfill its transformative potential.

From an integrative perspective, various studies have identified three fundamental dimensions of inclusive leadership: Collaborative and distributed leadership. Inclusive leadership requires dismantling rigid hierarchical structures, promoting professional learning communities, and fostering collective participation in decision-making processes (Spillane, 2006; Murillo, 2006). It does not focus solely on classroom innovation. Instead, it is transformative in addressing systemic barriers such as discriminatory policies, territorial disparities, exclusionary assessment systems, and homogeneous institutional cultures (Ainscow & Kugelmass, 2005; Muijs et al., 2007; Murillo, 2012). This necessitates a strategic vision that connects schools with the broader social and political contexts in which they operate. These three dimensions must be developed in a coordinated manner, considering local contexts, available resources, and institutional trajectories. As Chapman (2005) cautions, there is no single model of inclusive leadership; instead, there is a need to adopt contingent and flexible approaches tailored to the specific realities of each educational community. In Latin America, where centralised models still prevail, this dimension is key to democratising school practices and reducing exclusion gaps.

Leaders must translate ethical principles such as equity, respect for diversity, and high expectations into concrete actions: curricular adaptations, intercultural pedagogical strategies, and active engagement with families (Kugelmass, 2003; UNESCO, 2017). Ethically managing diversity requires recognising heterogeneity as a pedagogical opportunity.

The relationship between inclusion and educational leadership must not be seen as a tactical coincidence but as a structural interdependence. Leadership acts as a catalyst for inclusive processes by mobilising commitment, fostering shared responsibility, and coordinating available resources toward a vision of educational justice (Ainscow & Sandill, 2010; Bolívar & López Yáñez, 2009). In turn, inclusion provides ethical and political meaning to leadership by orienting it toward constructing equitable, democratic, and community-oriented school environments.

Numerous studies (Murillo, 2006; Hallinger & Heck, 2011; Seashore et al., 2010) have shown that school leadership teams directly impact creating inclusive school environments. This responsibility cannot be delegated solely to specialists; it must be embraced collectively by all school actors, overcoming fragmented logic and isolated interventions. From this perspective, inclusive leadership is configured as a critical, transformative, and collective professional practice capable of generating sustainable organisational, cultural, and pedagogical conditions for effective inclusion.

III. METHODS

This study adopts a theoretical-analytical approach that combines the conceptual frameworks of inclusion and educational leadership from a critical and transformative perspective. This study conducted an interpretative review and synthesis of empirical research was conducted to support the analysis. Due to their methodological nature, contextual application, and problem-oriented focus, these studies are relevant references for understanding inclusive leadership within school systems. This methodological strategy is aligned with the criterion of theoretical qualitative sampling (Patton, 2002), insofar as the selected studies illuminate complex and meaningful relationships among the key concepts of the study.

The selected research includes studies conducted in Spain and Colombia, which share a comprehensive approach to inclusive leadership by integrating ethical, organisational, and pedagogical dimensions. The first study, conducted by López Rubio (2020), is situated within a socio-critical paradigm and employs a mixed methodology with a qualitative predominance. In public schools in Andalusia (Spain), the study involved 316 school leadership team members who responded to structured questionnaires and participated in formative discussion groups. The methodological strategy combined

descriptive statistical analysis with a qualitative exploration of participants' discourse.

The second study, by Rojas Cetina (2021), was based on a multiple case study of a qualitative nature conducted in three public educational institutions in the municipality of Chía, Colombia. Data collection techniques included semi-structured interviews, unstructured participant observation, and document analysis, enabling deep immersion in the institutional context and leadership practices. The approach was grounded in the principles of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 2017), emphasising contextual interpretation and the progressive construction of meaning emerging from the data.

Both studies employed thematic content analysis and categorical coding - open and axial - following the principles proposed by Strauss and Corbin (2002), and grounded their interpretation in well-established theoretical frameworks. These included transformational leadership (Bass, 1985), distributed leadership (Spillane, 2006), the concept of resilient leadership (Olmo, 2017), and the systemic inclusive approach proposed by Booth and Ainscow (2002). These frameworks made it possible to interpret the discourses, practices, and tensions that shape leadership practices concerning developing inclusive school cultures.

From an ethical standpoint, the referenced studies ensured informed consent, participant confidentiality, and anonymity in disseminating findings, by the principles of research integrity and voluntary participation. In addition, procedures for cross-validation and intersubjective verification were applied to ensure the reliability of the analysis and the relevance of emerging categories. This methodological approach contributes to establishing a situated and comparative perspective on inclusive leadership in diverse school settings, offering relevant evidence to support a theoretical-practical proposal that integrates the principles of equity, participation, and institutional transformation in school management.

IV. RESULTS

The findings derived from the review and triangulation of the studies referenced in this article reveal consistent patterns that deepen the understanding of the relationship between educational leadership and inclusion. Within these studies, the discourse and practices of school actors suggest that inclusive leadership functions as an enabling condition for institutional transformation, provided they can overcome certain structural, cultural, and organisational tensions. One of the most significant pieces of evidence is the widespread perception that school leadership is key in driving sustainable, inclusive processes. In the case of Andalusia, 89% of surveyed school leaders reported that their role directly impacts learning quality and the creation of equitable educational environments (López Rubio, 2020). Similarly, in the Colombian educational institutions analysed, leadership teams are valued for their ability to promote differentiated pedagogical practices, foster intercultural dialogue, and build a shared vision of inclusion as a core component of the institutional project (Rojas Cetina, 2021).

These findings reinforce the argument by Leithwood et al. (2006), who assert that school leadership is the second most influential in-school factor in student outcomes, after classroom instruction. Moreover, they support the notion that leadership should not be limited to administrative functions, but instead expanded to encompass pedagogical, distributed, and ethical dimensions (Bolívar & López Yáñez, 2009). Nonetheless, significant tensions were identified between the model of inclusive leadership promoted in the literature and the actual conditions under which school leaders operate. In both contexts, leadership teams report feeling overwhelmed by administrative tasks, constrained by limited decision-making autonomy, and insufficiently supported in professional training for leading inclusive processes.

Rojas Cetina's (2021) study shows that many school leaders understand the importance of inclusion, yet face obstacles such as standardised assessment systems, pressure for quantifiable results, and a lack of human and material resources. These limitations echo the concerns raised by the OECD (2019), which reports that school leaders devote less than 20% of their time to pedagogical tasks due to administrative pressures hindering the effective implementation of transformative practices.

Furthermore, internal resistance among teaching staff and fragmented understandings of inclusion hinder the development of a coherent organisational culture committed to equity (Essomba, 2006; Murillo, 2012). In many cases, inclusion is still viewed as the responsibility of specialists or as a compensatory task, which contradicts the principle of shared responsibility required by inclusive leadership. Despite these constraints, both studies highlight successful experiences of inclusive leadership aligning actions with equity and social justice principles. Documented practices include:

The creation of professional learning communities focused on collective pedagogical reflection.

The implementation of active and adaptive teaching methodologies is responsive to student diversity.

Effective engagement with families and community settings.

The promotion of distributed leadership through the delegation of responsibilities to teaching teams.

These strategies align with Ainscow and Sandill (2010), who emphasise that inclusive leadership does not reside solely in the figure of the school principal, but rather in the institution's capacity to foster a culture of collaboration, openness, and participation. As described by Olno (2017), the relevance of resilient leadership is also evident, particularly in its potential to sustain positive school climates in contexts of high social and educational vulnerability. Regionally, Murillo (2012) underscores the importance of these practices in Latin America, where educational systems face profound territorial and cultural inequalities. Adopting intersectional and place-based approaches by school leaders emerges as an effective strategy to translate the principles of inclusion into concrete, context-sensitive actions.

V. CONCLUSION

This study reaffirms that educational leadership is crucial in fostering inclusive school environments. Drawing from both theoretical perspectives and empirical research conducted in Ibero-American contexts, it is evident that leadership should no longer be viewed merely as an administrative or technical role. Instead, it must be understood as an ethical, critical, and transformative practice committed to pursuing equity and social justice (Bolívar, 2012; Ainscow & Sandill, 2010).

One of the central findings highlights the intrinsic relationship between inclusive leadership and institutional culture. While important, the personal commitment of school leaders is not sufficient. An essential component is a flexible organisational structure, a teaching staff that shares responsibility, and a school community actively embracing diversity. The evidence reviewed suggests that where distributed leadership is promoted, conditions improve for participation, pedagogical innovation, and collaborative practices (Spillane, 2006; Murillo, 2012).

At the same time, significant tensions persist between the normative ideal of inclusive leadership and the actual working conditions experienced by leadership teams. Administrative burdens, limited access to specialised training, pressure to meet standardised outcomes, and fragmented public policy frameworks present barriers to developing sustainable, inclusive practices (OECD, 2019; Rojas Cetina, 2021). Addressing these challenges requires a shift in education policy toward more adaptable and context-aware approaches that recognise the territorial, cultural, and social specificities within which schools operate.

The analysis also underscores the growing relevance of resilient leadership (Olmo, 2017), especially in high-vulnerability contexts. The capacity of school leaders to offer emotional support, nurture trust, and guide communities through uncertainty is increasingly viewed as a critical competency in times of change and transition.

From the authors' perspective, moving toward a more just and

inclusive education system demands a strong ethical and political commitment from educational leaders to inclusion. This involves moving beyond managerial or efficiency-driven models and embracing approaches grounded in democratic participation, recognition of diversity, and equitable redistribution of opportunities. In this light, inclusive leadership is not simply one strategy among many; it forms the very foundation of transformative education.

Finally, the study recommends continued investment in the professional development of school leaders, the creation of collaborative research networks, and the establishment of systemic conditions that enable the sustainability of inclusive practices. Through these combined efforts, schools can be truly consolidated as learning communities where everyone can participate, grow, and succeed.

VI. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There are no conflicts of interest in this article.

VII. DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data are available upon request.

REFERENCES

Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, *6*(1), 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587

Ainscow, M., & Kugelmass, J. (2005). Leadership for inclusion: A comparison of international practices. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, *5*(3), 144–152. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2004.00028.x

Ainscow, M., & Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organisational cultures and leadership. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14*(4), 401–416. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802504903

Ainscow, M., & Sandill, A. (2021). Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organisational cultures and leadership. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *25*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802504903

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. London, England: Collier Macmillan.

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Bolívar, A. (2010). Liderazgo educativo para el aprendizaje: Lecciones y desafíos. *Revista de Educación*, (353), 35–70.

Bolívar, A. (2012). La equidad y la inclusión como ejes del cambio educativo. *Revista de Educación*, (358), 45–67.

Bolívar, A., & López Yáñez, J. (2009). Liderazgo para la justicia social y la inclusión en contextos escolares. *Revista de Educación*, (350), 15–38.

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools*. London: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education (CSIE).

Chapman, C. (2005). System failure: Why governments must learn to support system leaders. *Journal of Educational Change, 6*(2), 101–113.

Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *52*(2), 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863

Echeita, G. (2008). Inclusión y exclusión educativa: *Paradigmas, políticas y prácticas*. Narcea.

Essomba, M. A. (2006). Liderazgo e inclusión en contextos educativos diversos. *En Educación y diversidad cultural* (pp. 95–113). Graó.

Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership*, *59*(8), 16-20.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (2017). *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. London: Routledge.

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(4), 423-451.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2011). Exploring the journey of school improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 22(1), 1-27.

Kugelmass, J. W. (2003). Inclusive leadership: Leadership for inclusion. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 6*(3), 231–248.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(2), 201-227. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450600565829

Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2006). *How leadership influences student learning*. The Wallace Foundation.

López Rubio, A. B. (2020). *Liderazgo educativo en los procesos de innovación e inclusión educativa* (Unpublished PhD tesis), Almería: Universidad de Almería, Spain.

Muijs, D., Harris, A., Chapman, C., Stoll, L., & Russ, J. (2007). Improving schools in socioeconomically disadvantaged areas – A review of research evidence. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 15*(2), 149–175. https://doi.org/10.1076/sesi.15.2.149.30433

Murillo, F. J. (2006). *Hacia una educación de calidad para todos: Cómo mejorar las escuelas*. Editorial SM.

Murillo, F. J. (2012). Liderazgo para la justicia social: Una mirada desde Iberoamérica. REICE. *Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficacia y Cambio en Educación*, *10*(2), 3-20.

OECD. (2009). *Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from TALIS*. OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2019). *TALIS 2018 results: Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners* (Vol. 1). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/1d0bc92a-en

Olmo, M. (2017). *Liderazgo resiliente: Una propuesta para la mejora de la dirección escolar* (Unpublished PhD tesis), Universidad de Granada.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rojas Cetina, C. M. (2021). [Título de tesis] (Unpublished Masters thesis), Chía, Cundinamarca: Universidad de La Sabana, Colombia.

Seashore, L. K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (2002). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO). (2017). *A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education*. Paris: UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000248254

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO). (2017). *Guía para asegurar la inclusión y la equidad en la educación*. París: UNESCO.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The views, statements, opinions, and data expressed in all publications are solely those of the individual author (s) and contributor (s) and do not necessarily reflect those of GAERPSY or the editor (s). GAERPSY and the editor (s) assume no responsibility for any injury to persons or property arising from using any methods, instructions, products, or ideas in the published content.