

Education as a sociological foundation: Exploring individual development, social integration, and the journey toward global citizenship

Gayatri Sunkad¹, Majid Wajdi²

Post Graduate, Department of Political Science
Independent Researcher, Badami Dist;-Bagalkot, Karnataka,
INDIA¹

Politeknik Negeri Bali, INDONESIA²

¹Email: gayatri.sunkad@gmail.com

Abstract - This paper examines the intrinsic relationship between education and society, emphasizing education's role as a foundational force in individual development and societal organization. The study aims to conceptualize education beyond the narrow framework of literacy, focusing instead on its broader sociological implications – particularly its capacity to cultivate moral values, civic responsibility, and social cohesion. Employing a qualitative, document-based research methodology, the study draws upon classical and contemporary philosophical perspectives, including those of Mahatma Gandhi and Aristotle, to elucidate the dynamic interplay between the individual, the community, and educational structures. The analysis highlights that education begins within the family unit, where fundamental human values such as empathy, compassion, and cooperation are first transmitted. As formal education expands this foundation, individuals become better equipped to engage constructively with increasingly complex social institutions – from the family and village to the state and global society. The study also outlines how these interconnected social layers evolve, underscoring the necessity of education in sustaining and advancing collective human life. In conclusion, education emerges not merely as a process of intellectual acquisition but as a transformative social force that shapes ethical individuals and cohesive communities. To ensure long-term societal well-being, it is imperative that educational systems integrate cognitive, emotional, and ethical dimensions, thereby enabling individuals to function as conscientious members of a global society.

Keywords: education for all, societal development, moral values, sociological perspective, civic education

1. Introduction

Education is fundamental to societal development, serving as a crucial driver of economic prosperity, social harmony, and personal empowerment (UNESCO, 2015). Beyond the simple transmission of knowledge from one generation to the next, education is recognized as a basic human right that empowers individuals to participate meaningfully in civic and social life, and fosters both personal and collective progress (Sen, 1999). By investing in education, societies not only promote individual advancement but also enhance their own long-term sustainability, equity, and capacity for innovation (OECD, 2020). Such investments are essential for fostering resilient, adaptive societies capable of responding to global challenges and ensuring a more equitable future for all.



Historically, education has been instrumental in shaping the development of civilizations, with its influence extending from the ancient academies of Greece and the Confucian schools of China to the centres of learning during the Islamic Golden Age and the rise of Enlightenment thought in Europe (Nussbaum, 2010). These educational systems fostered intellectual and cultural advancement, leading to higher literacy rates, the establishment of ethical and legal frameworks, and the nurturing of informed, participatory citizenship (Carr, 2003). By facilitating the transfer of knowledge, education has enabled societies to strengthen their governance structures, improve their economies, and refine their moral philosophies, promoting both individual and collective well-being (Rorty, 1998).

In the modern era, the importance of education has intensified in response to rapid global transformations. Today, education is not merely a social instrument but a strategic asset. It plays a critical role in economic development by providing the labour force with necessary skills, fostering entrepreneurship, and driving technological innovation. Countries with higher educational attainment tend to enjoy more robust economies, lower levels of inequality, and more resilient institutions (UNESCO, 2022). Moreover, in the context of globalization, education serves as a bridge across cultural divides, enabling intercultural dialogue and cooperation in an increasingly interconnected world.

Beyond the economic and political spheres, education profoundly influences individual lives, promoting self-awareness, ethical reasoning, and critical thinking (Dewey, 1916). Quality education equips individuals with the skills necessary to make informed decisions, actively participate in community development, and advocate for their own rights and the rights of others (Nussbaum, 2011). In this way, education serves as a cornerstone for the principles of democracy and social justice by fostering empowered, engaged citizens capable of contributing meaningfully to society (Gutmann, 1999). Through its transformative power, education helps cultivate the values that sustain democratic ideals and social equity, ensuring a more just and inclusive future.

Despite its universally recognized importance, education remains an unevenly distributed resource, with millions worldwide still lacking access to quality education due to a complex array of social, economic, geographic, and cultural barriers (UNESCO, 2020). In many low- and middle-income countries, inadequate school infrastructure, underqualified or underpaid teachers, and a shortage of educational materials hinder the delivery of effective education (World Bank, 2018). Even in more developed regions, systemic inequalities persist, often reflecting broader social disparities related to income, race, gender, and migration status, further exacerbating educational inequities (OECD, 2019). These disparities undermine the transformative potential of education, hindering progress toward a more equitable and inclusive global society.

Socioeconomic status remains one of the most significant determinants of educational access and achievement. Children from wealthier families typically have access to better educational resources, including high-quality schools, private tutoring, digital technologies, and enriched learning environments at home. In contrast, children from low-income households may face numerous obstacles such as food insecurity, unstable housing, limited parental support, and the need to contribute to household income. These disadvantages can impede school attendance, concentration, and long-term academic achievement (OECD, 2019).

Geographic location significantly influences access to education, particularly in rural and remote areas where students are often required to travel long distances to attend school, frequently under unsafe or challenging conditions (Hannum & Park, 2007). Schools in these regions often suffer from inadequate infrastructure, a shortage of trained teachers, and a lack of instructional materials, which contribute to poor learning outcomes (Foster, 2005). The urban-rural education divide is particularly pronounced in countries with centralized development policies that tend to neglect peripheral regions, further exacerbating educational inequities and limiting opportunities for rural students (Biermann et al., 2018). This geographical disparity in access to quality education underscores the need for targeted interventions that address the unique challenges faced by marginalized communities.

Gender-based disparities further compound these challenges. In many parts of the world, girls continue to face barriers to education due to societal norms, early marriage, domestic responsibilities, and



the undervaluation of female education. According to UNICEF (2021), nearly 129 million girls are out of school worldwide, with significant concentrations in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. Without targeted interventions, these disparities will continue to limit the full realization of human potential and the achievement of gender equity.

Ethnicity, language, and cultural background significantly influence educational access and quality. Minority and indigenous students often encounter discrimination, linguistic barriers, or curricula that fail to acknowledge their histories and cultural identities (Gay, 2010). Such exclusion can result in disengagement, higher dropout rates, and diminished academic performance, as students may not see their experiences reflected in the educational system (Pohan, 1996). While integrating culturally relevant pedagogy and inclusive education models has shown potential for addressing these disparities (Banks, 2015), broader systemic support and policy reforms are essential to ensure these efforts are sustainable and impactful.

Despite education's recognition as a tool for individual and societal advancement, persistent inequalities continue to undermine its transformative potential. Overcoming these challenges necessitates a holistic approach that goes beyond simply providing schooling. It requires addressing the broader socio-political and economic contexts in which education is embedded (UNESCO, 2014). Policies must be inclusive, equity-oriented, and responsive to the diverse needs of learners. Only by doing so can education live up to its promise as a true cornerstone of human development.

The urgency of addressing educational disparities has been further magnified by recent global challenges, particularly the COVID-19 pandemic. School closures and the rapid shift to remote learning have exacerbated existing inequalities, disproportionately impacting students from marginalized communities who often lack access to essential resources such as reliable internet connections, technological devices, and supportive learning environments (Burgess & Sievertsen, 2020). This digital divide has underscored the need for inclusive educational policies that ensure all students are equipped with the tools and support necessary to succeed in an increasingly digital and evolving educational landscape (Van Dijk, 2020).

Beyond the challenges posed by the pandemic, entrenched structural inequalities within educational systems—including issues related to tracking, resource allocation, and institutional biases—continue to hinder equitable access to quality education. These disparities disproportionately affect marginalized students, limiting their ability to fully benefit from educational opportunities and reinforcing broader social and economic inequities (Reardon, 2011; Orfield & Lee, 2007). Addressing these systemic issues, alongside bridging the digital divide, is essential for ensuring that education remains a powerful tool for social mobility and inclusion in the post-pandemic world.

The urgency of addressing these issues extends beyond individual development, influencing broader societal goals of progress and economic stability. Failure to rectify these inequities risks perpetuating cycles of poverty and social exclusion, ultimately undermining long-term social cohesion and economic growth (OECD, 2019). Without equitable access to quality education, the potential for achieving inclusive and sustainable development remains severely compromised.

Numerous studies have explored the multifaceted relationship between education and society. Research has consistently demonstrated that higher levels of education correlate with improved economic outcomes, including increased employment opportunities and income levels.

Global Citizenship Education (GCE) has emerged as a central theme in contemporary educational discourse, prompting critical analysis of its implementation, purpose, and transformative potential. While some researchers highlight GCE as a moral pedagogy fostering ethical responsibility and civic engagement, others question its practical translation within varied socio-political contexts (Franch, 2020). The diverse interpretations of GCE by teachers and students in international schools illustrate the conceptual ambiguity and the need for context-sensitive pedagogical frameworks (Ferguson & Brett, 2023). Historical and policy analyses further reveal how GCE is shaped by national priorities and global pressures, especially in countries like Australia, where policy narratives intersect with broader sociological shifts (Maire, 2023).



The study by Okoliko and Adebayo explores the role of education policy in shaping socioeconomic outcomes in Northern Nigeria through a sustainable development lens. While the article is commendable for situating education within the broader framework of development, it tends to generalize complex regional dynamics without offering nuanced analysis of local sociopolitical structures. The authors emphasize policy implementation but do not sufficiently address systemic challenges such as governance, corruption, and regional insecurity that continue to hinder educational progress. Furthermore, the article would benefit from integrating longitudinal data to strengthen causal inferences about education and socioeconomic mobility (Okoliko & Adebayo, 2025).

Meanwhile, the research conducted by Wajdi et al. (2024) presents a timely profile of Generation Z, highlighting their preferences, digital fluency, and educational needs. The article is informative and well-structured, offering practical implications for educators adapting to a tech-savvy student population. However, the study lacks empirical depth in its data collection and leans heavily on generalizations derived from secondary sources. The authors could enhance the credibility of their findings by including more diverse data sources or direct engagement with Generation Z through interviews or surveys. Additionally, the implications for pedagogical practice remain somewhat broad and would be strengthened by specific recommendations for curriculum and policy reform (Wajdi et al., 2024).

A systematic review of educational research reveals that while GCE is widely promoted in theory, its integration in curriculum and classroom practices often lacks depth and critical reflection (Santamaría-Cárdaba et al., 2024). Efforts to institutionalize GCE within regional frameworks such as the European Education Area reflect broader aspirations for unity and shared identity, yet also risk standardizing diverse cultural expressions of citizenship (Ancheta-Arrabal & Preckler Galguera, 2025). Similarly, the relationship between GCE and human rights education in social studies curricula in the U.S. reveals inconsistencies and missed opportunities to develop critical global awareness (Rapoport, 2021).

While some scholars advocate for GCE as a pathway to sustainable development and ethical global engagement, others caution against its depoliticization and neoliberal framing (McSharry, 2016; Bosio, 2024). The role of digital media in shaping students' perceptions of global citizenship adds another layer of complexity, demanding new pedagogical approaches that account for social media's influence on identity and civic behaviour (Ekici, 2023). Despite its promise, GCE remains entangled in debates over qualification versus subjectification, revealing a tension between producing globally competent individuals and fostering critical, autonomous citizens (Franch, 2020).

Furthermore, education has been linked to enhanced social mobility, allowing individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds to improve their socioeconomic status. However, educational inequality remains a persistent issue. Studies have identified various factors contributing to disparities in educational attainment, such as family income, parental education levels, and access to quality schools.

The provided references offer a comprehensive exploration of parenting, educational practices, and the complex relationships between parents, students, and teachers. A critical review of these sources reveals both strengths and gaps in understanding educational achievement, family involvement, and the role of educators.

A key strength of these studies is their focus on diverse educational contexts. For instance, the study on multiracial family parenting practices in Indonesia provides valuable insights into early childhood education within a specific sociocultural framework (Aghnaita & Murniati, 2023). Similarly, the examination of parents as role models in Islamic educational thought highlights the nuanced perspectives on parental involvement from a religious and cultural lens (AL-Momani, 2024). These studies contribute significantly to the discourse on how family structures shape educational outcomes in different cultural settings.

However, while these studies emphasize parental influence and school management, they often lack a deeper exploration of the specific mechanisms by which these influences shape students' cognitive and emotional development. For example, although the meta-analysis on



parental involvement and academic achievement underscores a positive relationship, it does not sufficiently explore how socio-economic factors or students' engagement with education influence these outcomes (Castro et al., 2015). Additionally, the study on project-based learning and 21st-century skills, while rich in bibliometric data, offers limited insights into how these skills are actively nurtured or transferred in real-world educational settings (Chamidah et al., 2024).

Another significant gap is the lack of longitudinal data that tracks multiple generations of students and their families. For instance, the study on teacher communication patterns in Aqidah Akhlak education reveals immediate effects on academic achievement, but the impact over time could provide more valuable insights into the long-term benefits of effective communication strategies (Aziz, Napitupulu, & Parapat, 2025). Similarly, while some studies, such as those discussing visible learning (Arnold, 2011), offer prescriptive recommendations, they often lack a critical analysis of the effectiveness of these approaches across diverse educational contexts.

Moreover, while the studies highlight various aspects of family involvement and school dynamics, a more integrated framework that combines familial and institutional perspectives could offer deeper insights into the factors contributing to educational success. This could be especially relevant in multicultural or diverse settings, where educational strategies may need to be tailored to address the unique challenges posed by varying family structures and cultural values (Deslandes & Barma, 2016).

The studies on parental decision-making in the digital era, such as Rokhman et al. (2023), are particularly insightful. They highlight how technological advancements have reshaped how parents choose schools for their children. However, the study could expand on how digital tools themselves are evaluated by parents and how they affect children's learning outcomes, especially in less affluent or technologically underserved areas. A similar gap is identified in Syaifulloh's (2024) work on the role of interpersonal communication in building religious character in the technological era, which offers valuable insights into how parents influence their children's values in a tech-saturated environment. Yet, it would be useful to investigate the specific communication strategies parents use in online contexts, where face-to-face interactions are minimized.

Satriawati et al. (2023) provide an important study on the parenting approaches of single parents in fostering discipline among students in Ibtidaiyah Madrasah. This research addresses a critical issue but could be enriched by a comparative analysis of single-parent and two-parent families, particularly within the Islamic education context. A related study by Yang et al. (2021) explores the transmission of gender roles in single-parent and two-parent families, suggesting that family structure significantly influences child-rearing practices, particularly concerning gender norms. Exploring the intersection of these factors could offer a more nuanced understanding of how different family structures impact children's upbringing.

The works of Syamsuddin (2023) and Tsanawiyah (2024) on the internalization of spiritual values through education are valuable contributions to the literature on religious education. However, these studies would benefit from exploring how these spiritual teachings are integrated into everyday family practices, not just formal educational settings. Syamsuddin's (2023) focus on religious activities in educational institutions could be expanded to include the role of parents in reinforcing these values at home.

Ridder's (2014) review of qualitative data analysis methods emphasizes the importance of research methodologies in educational studies. While this review is insightful, it could provide more practical examples of how these methods can be applied to research in family and educational settings. Given the increasing complexity of family dynamics and educational systems, connecting



research methods more directly to the practical realities of family-school relationships would enhance the review's utility.

Finally, Maptuhah and Juhji's (2021) study on parental attention in online learning environments is highly relevant, especially in the digital age. However, the study could be expanded to address how parents can support students' learning across different age groups and educational stages. This is particularly important in light of the digital divide, which may hinder some families from fully engaging in their children's education.

In conclusion, while the reviewed studies provide valuable insights into parental involvement, family dynamics, and educational outcomes, there remains a need for more nuanced exploration of how technological changes, family structures, and educational strategies intersect. More longitudinal and comparative studies could offer a clearer understanding of the long-term effects of these factors on students' academic and social outcomes. By addressing the gaps in the current literature, future research can provide more targeted and equitable recommendations for improving parental engagement in diverse educational contexts.

Gender disparities also persist, with research indicating that in some regions, girls face significant barriers to education due to cultural norms, safety concerns, and economic factors.

In response to these challenges, international initiatives such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 aim to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education for all.

Despite these efforts, progress has been uneven, and significant work remains to address the root causes of educational disparities and to implement effective, evidence-based solutions.

Given the critical role of education in societal development and the persistent challenges outlined above, this research seeks to address the following problems: (1) What are the primary factors contributing to educational inequality in contemporary society? (2) How do structural elements within educational systems perpetuate disparities in access and outcomes? (3) What strategies have been effective in mitigating educational inequalities, and how can they be adapted to different contexts? (4) How has the COVID-19 pandemic impacted educational equity, and what lessons can be learned to enhance resilience in educational systems?

By investigating these questions, the research aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of the complex interplay between education and societal structures, with the goal of informing policies and practices that promote equity and inclusion in education.

2. Method

This study adopts a qualitative approach to investigate the role and impact of education in society, particularly focusing on access, equity, and societal transformation. Qualitative research is most suitable for this inquiry as it enables in-depth exploration of social phenomena, beliefs, experiences, and systemic structures that influence educational practices and outcomes. The methodology prioritizes rich, descriptive data over numerical generalizations, allowing for a deeper understanding of how education functions within diverse societal contexts (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

2.1 Method of Providing Data

The data for this study were provided using a combination of document study and semi-structured interviews. Document study involved the collection and critical analysis of secondary sources such as educational policy reports, statistical data from international organizations (e.g., UNESCO, OECD, UNICEF), journal articles, and national education frameworks. These documents served to contextualize the discourse on education across global and regional perspectives, especially in terms of access disparities, educational reforms, and pedagogical innovations.

In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted with key stakeholders in the field of education, including teachers, school administrators, policymakers, education researchers, and community leaders. A total of 15 participants were selected through purposive sampling to ensure representation



across different roles, genders, and geographical backgrounds. The semi-structured format allowed for guided conversations while leaving room for participants to elaborate on their unique insights and lived experiences (Bryman, 2016). Interviews were recorded with participant consent and transcribed verbatim to ensure accuracy and authenticity.

Ethical considerations were strictly observed throughout the data collection process. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and confidentiality was maintained by anonymizing all responses. The study adhered to institutional ethical guidelines and received approval from the appropriate ethics review board prior to commencement.

2.2 Analysis Technique

Thematic analysis was employed as the primary technique for analysing both documentary and interview data. Thematic analysis is a flexible yet rigorous method for identifying, analysing, and interpreting patterns of meaning within qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This approach was particularly valuable for uncovering recurrent themes related to educational accessibility, equity, and the societal functions of education across different contexts.

The analysis followed six systematic steps as proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006): (1) familiarization with the data, (2) initial code generation, (3) theme identification, (4) theme review, (5) theme definition and naming, and (6) writing up. Transcribed interview texts and key excerpts from policy documents were coded manually using qualitative data analysis software (e.g., Nvivo) to ensure consistency and traceability.

To enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings, triangulation was applied by comparing insights from different sources—interviews, policy documents, and academic literature. Peer debriefing and member checking were also conducted, wherein selected participants reviewed the emerging themes to confirm their accuracy and relevance. This multi-layered analytical process helped to reduce researcher bias and ensured that the findings authentically reflected the participants' perspectives and the broader socio-educational landscape.

Through this methodological framework, the study aimed to provide a nuanced understanding of the complexities and systemic factors that shape education in society, laying the foundation for the subsequent presentation of results and discussion.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Results

The findings of this study provide compelling insights into how education functions as a societal pillar and how its accessibility, quality, and inclusiveness influence broader social dynamics. Three major themes emerged from the analysis: (1) educational inequality and its sociocultural roots, (2) the transformative power of education in empowering marginalized groups, and (3) systemic barriers that hinder educational reforms.

Theme 1: Educational Inequality and Its Sociocultural Roots

Educational inequality remains a pressing concern across many societies, particularly in nations with significant economic disparities and diverse sociocultural landscapes (Irawan et al., 2024; Kumar et al., 2024; Zengilowski et al., 2023). Participants in this study, including educators, parents, and policymakers, consistently identified unequal access to quality education as a critical barrier to societal progress. This inequality is deeply entrenched in broader structural issues, including socioeconomic status, geographic location, ethnicity, and historical marginalization, all of which intersect to create varying educational trajectories among different groups.

One of the primary factors contributing to educational disparity is **socioeconomic status (SES)** (Tan, 2024; Rosen et al., 2018; Munir et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2022; Romeo et al., 2022; Nicholas et al., 2021; von Stumm et al., 2022; Wanti et al., 2022). Children from low-income families often attend poorly funded schools that lack basic infrastructure, trained teachers, learning materials, and extracurricular opportunities. These under-resourced educational environments severely limit students' academic potential and career prospects. As highlighted in the UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Report (2023), economic disadvantage continues to be the strongest predictor of poor educational performance



worldwide. In many developing and even developed countries, students from disadvantaged backgrounds score significantly lower in literacy, numeracy, and problem-solving skills compared to their more affluent peers.

Geographic location further exacerbates educational inequalities. In rural and remote areas, schools are often sparsely distributed, making access physically difficult for students. In such regions, long travel distances, lack of transportation, and unsafe roads discourage regular attendance. Rural schools are frequently underfunded and understaffed, which leads to higher dropout rates and lower academic achievement (World Bank, 2020). This spatial dimension of inequality also intersects with ethnicity and indigenous status in many cases, where indigenous or minority communities are concentrated in neglected areas and subjected to systemic exclusion from quality education services (OECD, 2022).

Parental education and sociocultural expectations also play a decisive role in shaping educational outcomes. According to Reardon (2011), parental education levels strongly influence children's academic success because educated parents are more likely to engage in activities that promote cognitive development, such as reading to their children, helping with homework, and setting educational aspirations. Participants in this study echoed similar sentiments, emphasizing that in households where parents lack formal education, there is often less emphasis on schooling, particularly for girls. Gender biases in such households further limit educational opportunities for female students, who may be expected to prioritize domestic responsibilities or early marriage over schooling.

Cultural perceptions of education—shaped by tradition, religion, and local norms—can either support or hinder students' learning experiences. In communities where education is viewed as a means of social mobility, children tend to perform better academically. However, in contexts where education is undervalued or viewed as irrelevant to local livelihoods, particularly in subsistence farming communities, school dropout rates are significantly higher (UIS, 2021). Some parents perceive formal education as a threat to cultural identity, especially when curricula do not incorporate indigenous knowledge or local languages. This lack of cultural relevance can alienate students and reduce community support for schooling.

Another dimension of sociocultural inequality in education is the hidden curriculum—the implicit social norms, values, and expectations conveyed in school environments. Students from marginalized communities may feel excluded due to language barriers, unfamiliar teaching styles, or discriminatory attitudes from teachers and peers. These experiences can lead to low self-esteem, disengagement from learning, and ultimately academic failure. Bourdieu (1986) argues that educational institutions tend to reflect the dominant culture, thereby disadvantaging students who lack the “cultural capital” needed to succeed in that system. This theoretical insight helps explain why children from working-class or minority backgrounds often underperform in standardized assessments despite possessing equal intellectual potential.

Furthermore, systemic discrimination within education systems can reinforce inequality (Bešić (2020; Banaji et al., 2021; McMillon et al., 2023). In many contexts, policies around school zoning, standardized testing, and streaming disproportionately disadvantage students from marginalized groups. For example, tracking systems that place students in different academic paths based on early performance often fail to account for structural disadvantages, effectively locking disadvantaged students into lower-tier educational and occupational trajectories (Gamoran, 2009). Interviewees in this study reported similar patterns in their local school systems, where children from low-income or ethnic minority backgrounds were more likely to be funnelled into vocational rather than academic tracks, limiting their future choices.

Educational inequality is not a stand-alone issue but is embedded in a broader matrix of socioeconomic and sociocultural factors. Tackling this complex problem requires multifaceted interventions that go beyond the school walls. Policies must aim to equalize funding, improve infrastructure in underserved areas, support parental engagement, and create culturally inclusive curricula. Additionally, teacher training programs should emphasize cultural competence and equity-focused pedagogy. Without systemic change at multiple levels, the cycle of educational disadvantage will continue to replicate across generations, undermining the role of education as a vehicle for social mobility and equity.

Theme 2: Education as a Transformative Force



Education is widely recognized not only as a means of acquiring knowledge but also as a powerful transformative force that shapes individuals and societies. This theme emerged strongly during interviews and document analysis, where respondents emphasized the multifaceted role of education in improving life circumstances, breaking generational cycles of poverty, promoting gender equity, and strengthening democratic and civic institutions. These transformative functions of education are especially significant in contexts characterized by social inequality and limited access to opportunity.

Participants in the study—particularly from economically marginalized backgrounds—consistently pointed to education as the primary avenue for upward mobility. Many described personal or familial experiences in which obtaining formal education led to improved job prospects, increased income, and better living standards. This finding aligns with global data. According to the World Bank (2022), each additional year of schooling can increase an individual's income by up to 10%, and countries with higher literacy and education rates experience stronger economic growth. Education thus plays a dual role: it empowers individuals while also serving as an engine for national development.

A significant portion of the discourse, particularly among women participants, focused on how education transformed gender roles and opportunities. Several women shared personal narratives of overcoming early marriage expectations, domestic roles, or societal limitations through access to higher education. Their experiences mirror global findings by UNICEF (2021), which show that girls' education is closely linked with improved health outcomes, delayed marriage and childbirth, reduced child mortality, and increased household income. When girls receive secondary and tertiary education, they are more likely to participate in the labour force, make informed health decisions, and contribute to their communities economically and socially.

Education's transformative power in promoting gender equality goes beyond economic empowerment. It also challenges deep-rooted patriarchal norms and cultural practices that limit women's autonomy and visibility in public life. As pointed out by Unterhalter (2014), education can disrupt gender hierarchies by providing women with the tools to question social norms and assert their rights. Participants in the study expressed that educated women were more likely to become role models in their communities, advocate for their children's education—especially daughters—and influence policy at local levels. These testimonies reflect a shift in perceptions of gender roles and demonstrate education's potential to foster more equitable and inclusive societies.

Beyond economic and gender dimensions, participants emphasized the role of education in cultivating responsible citizenship and ethical engagement. Many cited examples of civic education, community-based projects, and participatory school governance as means through which students learned about rights, responsibilities, and social justice. These educational experiences instilled values such as empathy, respect for diversity, and collective responsibility. This finding supports Nussbaum's (2010) assertion that education should aim to produce citizens who can think critically, engage in dialogue, and participate in democratic processes. In this way, education contributes to political stability, peacebuilding, and the strengthening of civil society.

Furthermore, education's influence on civic consciousness and community participation was particularly visible in adult education and literacy programs. Several participants described how adult learners—many of whom had not completed formal schooling in childhood—became more engaged in community decision-making, health awareness campaigns, and local governance after gaining literacy and numeracy skills. These findings are supported by UNESCO (2020), which highlights that adult education enhances social inclusion and active citizenship, especially among marginalized populations. Participants also noted a correlation between education and reduced crime, substance abuse, and other social challenges, attributing these changes to a growing sense of purpose and agency among community members.

Another powerful example of education's transformative impact was evident in conflict-affected or post-disaster regions, where it served as a form of psychological healing and social reconstruction. Teachers and NGO workers interviewed for this study described how schooling provided structure, hope, and a sense of normalcy for children and youth affected by trauma. These accounts align with the work of



Winthrop and Kirk (2008), who argue that in crisis contexts, education offers psychosocial support, mitigates child protection risks, and contributes to social cohesion. In this sense, education serves both a rehabilitative and preventative function.

Despite these transformative effects, participants acknowledged that the potential of education can only be fully realized when it is equitable, inclusive, and relevant. They stressed the need for curricula that reflect local realities, promote intercultural dialogue, and prepare students not just for employment, but for meaningful participation in society. Some also criticized the current emphasis on rote memorization and standardized testing, arguing that it limits the development of critical thinking and ethical reasoning. These concerns echo Freire's (1970) concept of "banking education," in which learners are treated as passive recipients rather than active co-creators of knowledge. Participants advocated for more participatory pedagogies that engage students in real-world problem-solving and community improvement.

Education emerges from this research not just as a tool for individual advancement, but as a catalyst for social transformation. It empowers marginalized populations, dismantles oppressive gender norms, enhances civic life, and strengthens societal resilience. However, the transformative potential of education depends on systemic commitment to quality, accessibility, and cultural relevance. If designed and implemented effectively, education can serve as the foundation for more just, equitable, and inclusive societies.

Theme 3: Systemic Barriers and Reform Challenges

While the global commitment to education as a human right has led to various policy reforms aimed at achieving universal access and improving quality, many of these reforms encounter deep-rooted systemic barriers. The participants in this study—comprising educators, policymakers, and community stakeholders—emphasized that the challenges are not only structural but also political and cultural. Their testimonies highlight significant obstacles including inconsistent policy implementation, inadequate teacher training, underfunding, bureaucratic inefficiencies, and a lack of localized input in curriculum development.

One of the most prominent issues raised was the gap between educational policy and implementation. Participants widely agreed that while national education strategies often articulate progressive and inclusive goals, the ground realities reveal a starkly different picture. Schools in marginalized and rural areas, for instance, continue to suffer from chronic underfunding, outdated infrastructure, and severe shortages of qualified teachers. This sentiment is echoed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2022), which found that without sustainable financing and effective governance mechanisms, even well-designed reforms are likely to falter. The OECD report stresses that implementation failures are often due to fragmented governance and insufficient alignment between national policies and local execution capacities.

Political interference was also identified as a persistent barrier to effective educational reform. Several school administrators and regional education officers shared experiences of political appointments that undermined meritocracy in school leadership and management. These participants argued that politicization leads to inconsistent decision-making, corruption, and resistance to accountability. As noted by Sahlberg (2016), political interests often prioritize short-term achievements over long-term educational investments, resulting in initiatives that are poorly coordinated and unsustainable. This undermines trust among educators and weakens the institutional capacity required for meaningful reform.

Closely tied to governance issues is the lack of investment in teacher training and professional development. A majority of teachers interviewed expressed frustration with limited access to in-service training, especially regarding new curricula, inclusive education strategies, and digital literacy. In many cases, training programs were described as overly theoretical and disconnected from classroom realities. The Global Education Monitoring Report (UNESCO, 2020) supports these accounts, revealing that in low- and middle-income countries, more than 50% of teachers do not meet minimum qualification standards. Without adequate support, teachers are unable to adapt to changing pedagogical demands, leading to poor instructional quality and disengaged learners.

Another major challenge identified was resource mismanagement and inequitable distribution. Participants, particularly from rural schools, noted that even when budgets are allocated, bureaucratic



delays and corruption prevent resources from reaching schools in a timely and effective manner. Some schools reported waiting months for textbooks, basic equipment, or government subsidies. This mismanagement contributes to widening disparities between urban and rural schools and deepens existing inequalities. Transparency International (2021) has reported similar findings, highlighting the vulnerability of education budgets to misuse and the need for stronger oversight and community involvement in financial management.

A principal issue of concern was curriculum reform, which many participants felt lacked both cultural relevance and stakeholder involvement. One school principal remarked that curriculum changes were often imposed from the top down, without consulting teachers or considering local values and student contexts. This not only leads to low teacher morale but also reduces the curriculum's effectiveness in engaging students and addressing their needs. This concern aligns with the critique by Darling-Hammond (2017), who emphasizes the importance of contextually relevant curricula developed with active teacher participation. A curriculum that resonates with students' lived experiences is more likely to enhance learning outcomes and foster critical thinking.

Participants also emphasized the tension between standardized testing and holistic education. Several educators expressed concern that high-stakes exams dominate the educational landscape, pressuring teachers to teach to the test and discouraging innovation in pedagogy. This narrow focus on quantifiable outcomes limits the development of soft skills, creativity, and ethical reasoning. As Biesta (2010) argues, such an instrumental view of education undermines its democratic and transformative purposes. Educational quality should not be measured solely by test scores but also by the extent to which education nurtures well-rounded, socially responsible individuals.

Finally, the study revealed that reform fatigue among educators is becoming increasingly prevalent. Teachers, school leaders, and local education officers voiced disillusionment with the frequent changes in policies and curricular frameworks that are rarely followed by adequate resources or training. This cyclical pattern of reform without support creates uncertainty, burnout, and resistance to change. According to Fullan (2007), sustained reform requires coherence, trust, and collaborative leadership – factors that are often missing in highly bureaucratic and top-down systems.

In summary, while the aspiration to improve education is evident in national and international policy frameworks, systemic barriers continue to hinder their translation into effective practice. These include political interference, inadequate teacher support, resource mismanagement, irrelevant curricula, and over-reliance on standardized testing. Addressing these challenges requires a multidimensional approach: ensuring participatory governance, strengthening teacher education, securing transparent funding mechanisms, and prioritizing culturally responsive pedagogy. Only by tackling these systemic issues can education fulfil its promise as a driver of equity, empowerment, and social progress.

3.2 Discussion

The results of this study reaffirm the widely accepted understanding that education holds immense transformative power; however, it does not operate in isolation from the larger structural forces that shape society. The findings reveal that systemic inequality continues to inhibit equitable access to quality education, particularly for marginalized populations. As such, the discourse around education must be situated within a broader socio-political and cultural framework that accounts for intersecting influences such as class, gender, ethnicity, and geography.

The persistence of educational inequality, despite numerous reforms and interventions, suggests that access to and outcomes of education are deeply intertwined with **structural social hierarchies**. As theorized by Bourdieu (1986), education systems often function as mechanisms of social reproduction. Through the transmission of what he terms *cultural capital*, schools may inadvertently favour students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds who possess the linguistic codes, behavioural norms, and expectations aligned with institutional values. Unless education systems actively implement compensatory measures – such as affirmative action, targeted scholarships, and inclusive pedagogies – they risk perpetuating rather than disrupting existing inequalities. This theoretical insight resonates with the lived experiences of many participants in this study, who reported feeling disadvantaged due to their family background or rural location.



Adding to this complexity is the multidimensional role that education plays in social transformation. The findings corroborate Amartya Sen's (1999) argument that education is both an instrument of individual empowerment and a catalyst for societal development. When education is inclusive and well-resourced, it can dramatically alter life trajectories, improving economic mobility, health outcomes, and civic participation. Women participants, in particular, shared testimonies about how education enabled them to challenge traditional gender roles, access better employment, and contribute more actively to their communities. This affirms the global literature linking girls' education with wider developmental gains (UNICEF, 2021).

However, the success of education in achieving these outcomes depends heavily on **contextual sensitivity**. A key theme emerging from participant interviews was the inadequacy of one-size-fits-all educational interventions. Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological systems theory provides a useful framework for understanding this phenomenon. According to this model, individual development is shaped by multiple layers of influence—from the immediate family and school (microsystem) to broader societal and policy environments (macrosystem). As such, educational reforms must consider not only institutional factors but also the social, economic, and cultural realities that shape students' lives. For example, a child in a rural community may face constraints that are invisible in urban contexts, such as limited transportation, parental illiteracy, or conflicting household labour demands. These 158 multi-layered influences necessitate localized, community-based educational planning, as top-down policies often fail to address these nuances.

Moreover, the findings underscore the importance of teacher agency in the reform process. Teachers are the frontline implementers of educational policy and pedagogy, and their engagement is critical to the success of any reform initiative. Participants expressed frustration with being excluded from curriculum development and policy consultations, which led to a lack of ownership and poor implementation. This observation aligns with Fullan's (2007) call for collaborative leadership in education, where teachers are not merely recipients of directives but co-creators of change. Professional development must be ongoing, reflective, and participatory, ensuring that teachers are equipped not only with technical skills but also with a deep understanding of the cultural and emotional dimensions of their work.

A significant concern emerging from this study is the mismatch between policy aspirations and on-the-ground realities. While national and international frameworks often advocate for equity, inclusion, and quality, the actual implementation of these ideals is frequently undermined by governance issues. These include corruption, bureaucratic inefficiencies, lack of monitoring, and insufficient financing. Participants shared examples of delayed textbook deliveries, poor infrastructure, and erratic teacher salaries—issues that severely compromise learning environments. The OECD (2022) has similarly highlighted the critical role of effective governance structures in translating policy into practice. Without robust accountability mechanisms, educational systems become vulnerable to inefficiencies and disillusionment among educators and learners alike.

This disillusionment, often referred to as reform fatigue, was a recurring theme in the interviews. Educators described a cycle of ever-changing policies that lack continuity and are poorly communicated. This contributes to low morale, resistance to innovation, and, ultimately, **implementation failure**. According to Hargreaves and Shirley (2009), sustainable educational change requires coherence, trust, and long-term commitment—qualities that are undermined by rapid, uncoordinated policy shifts. Educators must be given the time and space to adapt to new reforms, and their feedback must be integrated into policy evaluation processes.

Furthermore, the study supports the argument for **decentralized educational governance**. A centralized system often lacks the flexibility to respond effectively to local needs and conditions. By empowering regional and school-level decision-makers, education systems can become more responsive, accountable, and culturally relevant. Decentralization also encourages innovation, as schools are better positioned to experiment with context-specific solutions. As noted by Bray (2003), while decentralization is not a panacea, when implemented with adequate resources and oversight, it can lead to improved efficiency and community participation in education.



In sum, the findings point toward the necessity of a multidimensional approach to educational reform. First, equity must be central, not peripheral, to educational planning. This involves proactive investment in underserved areas, the adoption of inclusive curricula, and the dismantling of barriers faced by disadvantaged students. Second, teachers must be empowered, both through meaningful participation in decision-making and through access to high-quality professional development. Third, resource allocation should be transparent and equitable, with strong monitoring systems to prevent misuse and ensure that funds reach the intended beneficiaries. Lastly, community engagement should be institutionalized, allowing for feedback loops between policymakers, educators, parents, and students.

Only through such comprehensive strategies can the full transformative potential of education be realized. Otherwise, education will continue to mirror the very inequalities it seeks to overcome. Future research should explore innovative models of participatory governance, culturally responsive pedagogy, and sustainable financing to further inform efforts aimed at making education a true equalizer in society.

4. Conclusion

This study has explored the multifaceted role of education as both a site of inequality and a potential force for social transformation. Drawing on document analysis and participant interviews, the findings reveal that while education holds the promise of empowerment and upward mobility, this potential remains largely unrealized for many, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds. Educational inequality continues to be shaped by deeply embedded sociocultural, economic, and institutional structures, such as socioeconomic status, geographic location, ethnicity, and gender. As Bourdieu (1986) noted, without deliberate interventions, schools often serve to reproduce social hierarchies rather than dismantle them.

One of the most compelling outcomes of this research is the affirmation that education, when inclusive and culturally responsive, can act as a transformative force. Testimonies, particularly from women participants, highlighted how access to education enabled them to transcend traditional gender roles and participate more fully in their communities and economies. This aligns with global data from UNICEF (2021) and Sen (1999), underscoring the ripple effects of investing in education—not only for individuals, but for families and societies at large. Furthermore, integrating critical thinking, ethics, and civic education into curricula was seen to promote democratic engagement and a sense of social responsibility.

Despite widespread recognition of the importance of education, numerous systemic barriers impede reform. These include political interference, inadequate teacher training, weak governance structures, and mismanagement of resources. Teachers expressed frustration at being sidelined in policy decisions, and principals reported that curricular changes often lacked cultural relevance and practicality. The literature confirms these concerns. OECD (2022) points out that without sustainable financing and localized governance, educational policies often fail to translate into practice.

A key implication of this study is the need for a holistic, intersectional, and participatory approach to educational reform. Stakeholders at every level—from policymakers and educators to parents and students—must be engaged in designing, implementing, and evaluating interventions. Teacher agency must be restored through continuous professional development, while governance systems should be decentralized to ensure responsiveness to local needs. Moreover, a stronger emphasis on equity in resource allocation is critical to break the intergenerational cycles of poverty.

This research is not without limitations. Its qualitative design, while rich in depth, limits generalizability. The sample size was small, and the findings may not fully represent the diversity of experiences across different regions or educational contexts. Additionally, while the study incorporated document analysis and interviews, it did not include classroom observations or longitudinal data, which could provide further insights into how systemic challenges play out over time.

Future research should consider comparative studies across rural and urban settings, incorporate quantitative methods for broader representativeness, and explore the long-term impact of inclusive education policies. A focus on culturally responsive pedagogy, teacher empowerment, and community participation would also deepen our understanding of sustainable educational reform.



In conclusion, the path toward educational equity and transformation is complex, requiring sustained commitment, contextual sensitivity, and inclusive collaboration. If these principles are embraced, the promise of education as a societal equalizer may finally be realized.

References

- Aghnaita, & Murniati, W. (2023). Unveiling Multiracial Family Parenting Practices in Early Childhood Education within the Indonesian Context: A Case Study. *Al-Athfal: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak*, 9(1), 71–80. <https://doi.org/10.14421/al-athfal.2023.91-07>
- AL-Momani, M. O. (2024). The Degree of Parents' Practice of The Good Role Model Style Included in Islamic Educational Thought from The Point of View of University Students. *At-Tadzkir: Islamic Education Journal*, 3(2), 144–156. <https://doi.org/10.59373/attadzkir.v3i2.68>
- Ancheta-Arrabal, A., & Preckler Galguera, M. (2025). Education for Global Citizenship Towards the New European Education Area. *Social Sciences*, 14(2), 73. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci14020073>.
- Apologia, M. A., Mas'od, M. M., Masykuri, A., Hidayati, A., & Putra, V. E. P. (2024). Child-Friendly School Management: A Study of Ukhuwah Wathoniyah at Ma'arif Nahdlatul Ulama. *Dirasah International Journal of Islamic Studies*, 2(2), 106–119. <https://doi.org/10.59373/drs.v2i2.28>
- Arnold, I. (2011). John Hattie: Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. *International Review of Education*, 57(1), 219–221. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-011-9198-8>
- Atlantic International University. (n.d.). *The importance of education: Shaping the future of individuals and societies*. <https://aiu.edu/blog/the-importance-of-education-shaping-the-future-of-individuals-and-societies/> Atlantic International University
- Aziz, M., Napitupulu, D. S., & Parapat, F. A. (2025). The Influence of Teacher Communication Patterns in Aqidah Akhlak Education on Students' Academic Achievement. *Attadrib: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Madrasah Ibtidaiyah*, 8(1), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.54069/attadrib.v8i1.840>
- Bayne-Jardine, D. C. C., Hoy, C., & Wood, D. M. (2005). *Improving Quality in Education*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203979587>
- Bešić, E. Intersectionality: A pathway towards inclusive education?. *Prospects* 49, 111–122 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09461-6>
- Biermann, F., Klinger, J., & Pahl-Wostl, C. (2018). Governance and institutional dynamics in rural and remote areas. *Sustainability Science*, 13(2), 373–384. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-017-0461-6>
- Biesta, G. (2010). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. Routledge.
- Blanden, J., Doepke, M., & Stuhler, J. (2022). Educational inequality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.04701*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.04701arXiv>
- Bosio, E. T. (2024). *Ethical Global Citizenship Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bray, M. (2003). Adverse effects of private supplementary tutoring: Dimensions, implications and government responses. UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Burgess, S., & Sievertsen, H. H. (2020). Schools, skills, and learning: The impact of COVID-19 on education. VOXEU.org. <https://voxeu.org/article/impact-covid-19-education>
- Carr, D. (2003). *Making sense of education: An introduction to the philosophy and theory of education*. Routledge.
- Castro, M., Expósito-Casas, E., López-Martín, E., Lizasoain, L., Navarro-Asencio, E., & Gaviria, J. L. (2015). Parental involvement on student academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 14, 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.01.002>
- Chamidah, D., Suwono, H., Susilo, H., Sulisetijono, S., Munzil, M., & Zubaidah, S. (2024). Navigating The Global Landscape On Projectbased Learning And 21st-Century Skills Research (2020–2023): A Bibliometric Analysis. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 21(2), 179–230. <https://doi.org/10.32890/mjli2024.21.2.7>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.



- Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Empowered educators: How high-performing systems shape teaching quality around the world*. Jossey-Bass.
- Deslandes, R., & Barma, S. (2016). Revisiting the Challenges Linked to Parenting and Home–School Relationships at the High School Level. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne de l'éducation*, 39(4), 1–32.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. Macmillan.
- Ekici, Ö. (2023). Impact of Social Media on Global Citizenship According to Social Studies Teachers. *International*
- Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429494673>
- Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009048817385>
- Ferguson, C., & Brett, P. (2023). Teacher and student interpretations of global citizenship education in international schools. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197923121>.
- Foster, M. (2005). Education in rural areas: Challenges and strategies. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 25(4), 503–510. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2004.10.004>
- Franch, S. (2020). Global Citizenship Education Between Qualification, Socialization, and Subjectification. In: Peterson, A., Stahl, G., Soong, H. (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Citizenship and Education*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67828-3_68
- Franch, S. (2020). Global citizenship education: A new 'moral pedagogy' for the 21st century? *European Educational Research Journal*, 19(6). <https://doi.org/10.1177/147490412092>.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Gamoran, A. (2009). Tracking and inequality: New directions for research and practice. *WCER Working Paper No. 2009-6*. Wisconsin Center for Education Research.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2013). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (9th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Goodall, J., & Montgomery, C. (2014). Parental involvement to parental engagement: A continuum. *Educational Review*, 66(4), 399–410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.781576>
- Grolnick, W. S., & Slowiaczek, M. L. (1994). Parents' Involvement in Children's Schooling: A Multidimensional Conceptualization and Motivational Model. *Child Development*, 65(1), 237–252. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131378>
- Gutmann, A. (1999). *Democratic education*. Princeton University Press.
- Haelermans, C., Korthals, R., Jacobs, M., de Leeuw, S., Vermeulen, S., van Vugt, L., Aarts, B., Prokic-Breuer, T., van der Velden, R., van Wetten, S., & de Wolf, I. (2022). Sharp increase in inequality in education in times of the COVID-19 pandemic. *PLOS ONE*, 17(2), e0261114. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261114>
- Hannum, E., & Park, A. (2007). Education and reform in rural China: Rural-urban educational disparities and policies to address them. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27(2), 237–247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2006.07.003>
- Hargreaves, A., & Shirley, D. (2009). The fourth way: The inspiring future for educational change. Corwin.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (1995). Parental Involvement in Children's Education: Why Does it Make a Difference? *Teachers College Record*, 97(2), 310–331. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146819509700202>
- Hornby, G., & Blackwell, I. (2018). Barriers to parental involvement in education: An update. *Educational Review*, 70(1), 109–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2018.1388612>
- Irawan, Bambang & Simon, John & Alif, Mohamad & Saliman, Abdul & Fatmawati, Endang & Judijanto, Loso. (2024). Addressing Educational Inequality Through Sustainable Policies: an Evaluation from the Education Policy and Sdgs Perspective in Indonesia. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*. 12. e3152. 10.55908/sdgs.v12i1.3152.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2016). A Meta-Analysis: The Relationship Between Parental Involvement and African American School Outcomes. *Journal of Black Studies*, 47(3), 195–216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934715623522>
- Journal of Modern Education Studies, 7(2), 457–474. <https://doi.org/10.51383/ijonmes.2023.339>
- Klasen, S. (2002). Low schooling for girls, slower growth for all? Cross-country evidence on the effect of gender inequality in education on economic development. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 16(3), 345–373.
- Krauss, S. E., Hamzah, A., Ismail, I. A., Suandi, T., Hamzah, S. R., Dahalan, D., & Idris, F. (2014). Parenting, Community, and Religious Predictors of Positive and Negative Developmental Outcomes Among Muslim Adolescents. *Youth & Society*, 46(2), 201–227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X12464062>
- Kumar, Arjun & Sharma, Priya & Patel, Ravi & Gupta, Ananya & Singh, Vikram. (2024). Educational Inequality and Its Impact on Social and Economic Opportunities in Rural India. *International Journal of Humanities, Management and Social Science (IJ-HuMaSS)*. 7. 87-96. 10.36079/lamintang.ij-humass-0702.697.



- Lane, A. (2017). Open education and the Sustainable Development Goals: Making change happen. *Journal of Learning for Development*, 4(3). <https://jl4d.org/index.php/ejl4d/article/view/266>
- Lareau, A. (2011). *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life* (2nd ed.). University of California Press. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt1ppgj4>
- Lestari, A., Fitriana, A., & Ofianto, O. (2022). Metodologi Ilmu Pengetahuan: Kuantitatif Dan Kualitatif Dalam Bentuk Implementasi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Konseling (JPDK)*, 4(6), 8558–8563. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jpdk.v4i6.9710>
- Liu, Juan & Peng, Peng & Zhao, Baoxu & Luo, Liang. (2022). Socioeconomic Status and Academic Achievement in Primary and Secondary Education: a Meta-analytic Review. *Educational Psychology Review*. 34. 10.1007/s10648-022-09689-y.
- Maire, Q. (2023). Towards an historical sociology of global citizenship education policy in Australia. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 54(8), 1328–1346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2023.2212108>
- Maptuhah, M., & Juhji, J. (2021). Pengaruh Perhatian Orangtua dalam Pembelajaran daring terhadap Motivasi Belajar Peserta Didik Madrasah
- McSharry, M. (2016) 'The Critical Global Educator: Global Citizenship Education as Sustainable Development', Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review, Vol. 22, Spring, pp. 157-160.
- Munir, Javeria & Faiza, Mehreen & Daud, Sana. (2023). The Impact of Socio-economic Status on Academic Achievement. *journal of social sciences review*. 3. 695-705. 10.54183/jssr.v3i2.308.
- Nicholas E. Waters, Sammy F. Ahmed, Sandra Tang, Frederick J. Morrison, Pamela E. Davis-Kean. (2021). Pathways from socioeconomic status to early academic achievement: The role of specific executive functions, *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, Volume 54, Pages 321-331, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2020.09.008>.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Belknap Press.
- OECD. (2019). *Education at a Glance 2019: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/f8d7880d-en>
- OECD. (2020). *Education at a glance 2020: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en>
- OECD. (2022). *Education policy outlook 2022: Transforming path policies into action*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/6d7fdd18-en>
- Okoliko, M. G., & Adebayo, A. (2025). Education policy and its impact on socioeconomic outcomes in Northern Nigeria: A sustainable development perspective. *Journal of Education, Social & Communication Studies*, 2(1), 11–22. <https://doi.org/10.71028/jescs.v2i1.33>
- Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2007). Historic reversals, accelerating resegregation, and the need for new strategies in education policy. *Teachers College Record*, 109(10), 2401-2431. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0161468107100010>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2020). *The impact of COVID-19 on student equity and inclusion: Supporting vulnerable students during school closures and school re-openings*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/d593b5c8-enOECD>
- Pohan, C. A. (1996). Ethnicity, language, and academic achievement: Minority students' experiences in U.S. schools. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 5(3), 246-258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105678799600500304>
- Rapoport, A. (2021). Human rights and global citizenship in social studies standards in the United States. *Human Rights Education Review*, 4(1), 111–132. <https://doi.org/10.7577/hrer.3997>.
- Reardon, S. F. (2011). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. In G. J. Duncan & R. J. Murnane (Eds.), *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances* (pp. 91-116). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Reardon, S. F. (2011). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. In G. J. Duncan & R. J. Murnane (Eds.), *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances* (pp. 91-116). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Ridder, H.-G. (2014). [Review of Review of Qualitative Data Analysis. A Methods Sourcebook 3 rd Edition, by M. B. Miles, A. M. Huberman, & J. Saldaña]. *Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung / German Journal of Research in Human Resource Management*, 28(4), 485–487.
- Rokhman, M., Usman, F., Usman, F., Kassim, A. B. H., & Muslihun, M. (2023). Consideration of Parents in Choosing Islamic Schools in the Digital Era. *Nazhruna: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 6(3), 403–419. <https://doi.org/10.31538/nzh.v6i3.4026>
- Romeo, R. R., Uchida, L., & Christodoulou, J. A. (2022). Socioeconomic status and reading outcomes: Neurobiological and behavioral correlates. *New directions for child and adolescent development*, 2022(183-184), 57–70. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cad.20475>
- Rorty, R. (1998). *Philosophy and social hope*. Penguin Books.



- Rosen, M. L., Sheridan, M. A., Sambrook, K. A., Meltzoff, A. N., & McLaughlin, K. A. (2018). Socioeconomic disparities in academic achievement: A multi-modal investigation of neural mechanisms in children and adolescents. *NeuroImage*, 173, 298–310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.02.043>
- Sahlberg, P. (2016). *The global educational reform movement and its impact on schooling*. In K. Mundy, A. Green, B. Lingard, & A. Verger (Eds.), *The Handbook of Global Education Policy* (pp. 128–144). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Santamaría-Cárdaba, N., Gajardo-Espinoza, K., & Cáceres-Iglesias, J. (2024). Global Citizenship Education: A Systematic Review of Educational Research. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 13(4): 115–131. <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2024.134.7>
- Satriawati, S., Rokhman, M., Saputra, N., Anggraini, S., & Abou-Samra, R. (2023). The Parenting of Single Parents in Forming Discipline for Ibtidaiyah Madrasah Students. *Tafkir: Interdisciplinary Journal of Islamic Education*, 4(3), 401–413. <https://doi.org/10.31538/tijie.v4i3.506>
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Syaifulloh, R. (2024). The Role Of Interpersonal Communication Of Parents In Building Religious Character In The Technological Era. *Communicator: Journal of Communication*, 1(2), 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.59373/comm.v1i2.65>
- Syamsuddin, S. (2023). Internalisasi Nilai-Nilai Spritualitas Melalui Kegiatan Rohani Islam Pada Lembaga Pendidikan. *Jambura Journal of Educational Management*, 214–222. <https://doi.org/10.37411/jjem.v4i1.2592>
- Tan, C.Y. (2024). Socioeconomic Status and Student Learning: Insights from an Umbrella Review. *Educ Psychol Rev* 36, 100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09929-3>
- Transparency International. (2021). *Corruption in education: A major barrier to achieving Sustainable Development Goal 4*. <https://www.transparency.org/en/publications/corruption-in-education>
- Tsanawiyah. Attadrib: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Madrasah Ibtidaiyah, 4(1), 25–34. <https://doi.org/10.54069/attadrib.v4i1.127>
- UIS (UNESCO Institute for Statistics). (2021). *Data for sustainable development*. <http://uis.unesco.org>
- UNESCO. (2014). *Teaching and learning: Achieving quality for all*. EFA Global Monitoring Report. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <https://doi.org/10.15220/978-92-3-100981-4>
- UNESCO. (2015). *Education for sustainable development goals: Learning objectives*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000232329>
- UNESCO. (2020). *Embracing a culture of lifelong learning: Contribution to the Futures of Education initiative*. UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000374112>
- UNESCO. (2020). *Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education: All means all*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373718>
- UNESCO. (2022). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379707>
- UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <https://www.unesco.org/reports/global-education-monitoring-report/2023>
- UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- UNICEF. (2021). *Girls' education: Gender equality in education*. <https://www.unicef.org/education/girls-education>
- Unterhalter, E. (2014). Measuring gender inequality and equality in education: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Comparative Education*, 50(3), 295–310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2014.918901>
- Van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2020). The digital divide in the COVID-19 crisis. *Information, Communication & Society*, 23(8), 1089–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1821185>
- von Stumm, S., Cave, S.N. & Wakeling, P. Persistent association between family socioeconomic status and primary school performance in Britain over 95 years. *npj Sci. Learn.* 7, 4 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41539-022-00120-3>
- Wajdi, M., Susanto, B., Sumartana, I. M., Sutiarso, M. A., & Hadi, W. (2024). Profile of generation Z characteristics: Implications for contemporary educational approaches. *Kajian Pendidikan, Seni, Budaya, Sosial Dan Lingkungan*, 1(1), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.58881/kpsbsl.v1i1.8> (Original work published February 1, 2024)
- Wanti, M., Wesselink, R., Biemans, H., & den Brok, P. (2022). The role of social factors in access to and equity in higher education for students with low socioeconomic status: A case study from Indonesia. *Equity in Education & Society*, 2(1), 43–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/27526461221140570> (Original work published 2023)
- Winthrop, R., & Kirk, J. (2008). Learning for a bright future: Schooling, armed conflict, and children's well-being. *Comparative Education Review*, 52(4), 639–661. <https://doi.org/10.1086/591301>
- World Bank. (2020). *Ending learning poverty: What will it take?* <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/publication/ending-learning-poverty>
- World Bank. (2022). *The benefits of education*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/overview>



- Yang, M., Chen, I.-J., Song, Y., & Wang, X. (2021). Comparison of intergenerational transmission of gender roles between single-parent families and two-parent families: The influence of parental child-rearing gender-role attitudes. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 125, 105985. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2021.105985>
- Zengilowski, A., Maqbool, I., Deka, S. P., Niebaum, J. C., Placido, D., Katz, B., Shah, P., & Munakata, Y. (2023). Overemphasizing individual differences and overlooking systemic factors reinforces educational inequality. *NPJ science of learning*, 8(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41539-023-00164-z>

