

Social Connectivity and Educational Inclusion Among Disabled Individuals

Belouadah Ahmed Seif Eddine, Cipriano Nunes Mendonca, Gregorius Seran

University of Saida Dr Moulay Tahar, Algeria
Universidade Oriental Timor Lorosa'e
International House Sydney Australia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 30 March 2024

Revised 17 April 2024

Accepted 23 April 2024

Key words:

disability,
educational access,
social relations,
inclusion,
peer support,
identity,
intersectionality.

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates how internal social relations within disabled communities influence access to and engagement with educational opportunities. Through a comprehensive literature-based analysis, the study identifies key relational mechanisms such as peer support, collective identity, informal mentorship, and cultural discourse that enable or hinder participation in educational systems. The findings reveal that relational networks function as both sources of resilience and potential sites of fragmentation, significantly affecting motivation, institutional navigation, and help-seeking behavior. Empowering community discourses enhance self-efficacy and persistence, while internalized stigma and fragmented alliances may suppress educational aspirations. Digital interaction, disclosure norms, and intersectional identities further shape access, producing a diverse landscape of relational influence. The paper argues that educational access must be understood not solely through institutional metrics or policy compliance, but through the emotional, cultural, and political textures of everyday life within disabled populations. By shifting focus toward the epistemic and structural role of community dynamics, this study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of inclusive education. It recommends greater attention to intra-community engagement in research, policy formation, and program design. The analysis affirms the critical need to recognize social relations not as auxiliary, but as constitutive of how education is sought, experienced, and sustained.

INTRODUCTION

Access to education is frequently framed as a fundamental human right, yet its realization remains uneven across different populations (Osler et al., 2021). Persistent disparities are individuals with disabilities, whose pathways into formal learning environments are often obstructed by more than infrastructural or pedagogical inadequacies. Social dynamics and around disabled communities exert substantial influence on educational trajectories, affecting not only participation but also persistence and attainment. Institutional policies and physical accommodations receive considerable attention, the interpersonal and collective dimensions of inclusion have not been equally foregrounded in academic discourse (Eide et al., 2021). Access to public services, including education, is often influenced by public perceptions and stigma attached to certain groups, meaning that efforts to create an inclusive society require a gradual change in social attitudes (Hardyansah et al., 2021).

Within disabled communities, patterns of

interaction and support vary significantly, shaped by cultural norms, economic conditions, and the availability of communal resources. For some, tightly knit peer networks foster mutual encouragement and shared problem-solving in navigating educational spaces. In other cases, internal fragmentation, stigma, or the absence of advocacy mechanisms weakens the capacity for collective empowerment (Logie et al., 2022). These variations highlight the need to examine relational structures not merely as background conditions, but as active forces shaping how education is experienced and accessed (Shuayb, 2020). Various policies and regulations also began to emphasize the importance of protecting the rights of vulnerable groups so that they have equal opportunities in various areas of life, including employment and education (Jakariya et al., 2024).

The quality of social relationships among disabled individuals also intersects with external perceptions and institutional behavior. Schools and universities that operate with rigid assumptions about

* Corresponding author, email address: belouadahahmededdine@gmail.com

disability may fail to recognize the social capital that emerges from within marginalized groups (Wolbring & Lilywhite, 2021). This oversight can lead to educational practices that isolate rather than integrate, particularly when relational interdependence is misinterpreted as dependency. Educational access, is not simply a matter of physical entry or policy compliance, but a function of embedded social meanings and interactions (Vincent & Chiwandire, 2019). In addition, the modern legal approach also emphasizes that protection for persons with disabilities must include equal opportunities in various sectors of life so that they can participate fully in society (Basar & Darmawan, 2024).

Understanding how social relations operate in disabled communities thus requires more than descriptive mapping (Robinson et al., 2021). It calls for critical engagement with the ways networks of trust, reciprocity, and shared identity either support or undermine educational engagement. The literature offers valuable insights into how these dynamics unfold, yet gaps remain in how they are conceptualized and translated into inclusive practice. A deeper inquiry into this terrain is essential to advancing not only equity, but a richer understanding of the social dimensions of learning (Philip & Azevedo, 2017). From a public policy perspective, fulfilling the basic rights of persons with disabilities is also often linked to access to various essential services, such as health services, which are part of human rights guarantees in modern legal systems (Subiakso et al., 2023).

Many studies on disability and education focus on institutional design, but fewer explore how interpersonal and intra-group dynamics affect educational outcomes (Schudde, 2018). As Barnes and Mercer (1997) noted, sociological analysis of disability often emphasizes exclusion by mainstream systems without sufficiently addressing the internal dynamics of disabled groups themselves. Similarly, Oliver (1996) emphasized structural barriers but paid less attention to how solidarity or fragmentation within these community's shapes agency and participation.

Another major concern lies in how educational access is framed within policy and research. Shakespeare and Watson (2002) argued that the binary of inclusion and exclusion obscures the complex lived realities of disabled individuals, particularly those navigating relational dependencies or negotiating cultural stigma within their communities. This framing often flattens diverse experiences into a single narrative, making it difficult to develop nuanced approaches to access and belonging.

Social capital within marginalized populations

has been examined in various contexts, yet specific studies focusing on disabled communities remain limited. Putnam (2000) conceptualization of bonding and bridging capital provides a useful starting point, but applications to disability studies require further development. Without this expansion, the ways in which social ties enable or restrict educational engagement among disabled individuals remain under-theorized and under-explored (Loosemore et al., 2021).

The significance of these relational dimensions extends beyond academic theorizing. They shape everyday experiences of aspiration, resistance, and support within educational spaces (Boccagni, 2022). Disabled individuals do not enter classrooms as isolated actors, but as members of social worlds that carry histories, meanings, and expectations (Boonstra, 2021). If those networks are strong, adaptive, and informed, educational pursuit becomes more attainable. If those connections are weak, stigmatized, or fractured, access becomes precarious and incomplete.

This study aims to explore the literature that examines the relationship between intra-community social dynamics among disabled populations and their access to educational opportunities. It seeks to identify how internal support systems, collective identity, and relational structures contribute to or hinder educational engagement. The findings are expected to contribute to the refinement of inclusive education frameworks by integrating the relational dimension as a core analytical category.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a qualitative literature review approach to examine how internal social relations within disabled communities affect educational access. The design is rooted in interpretive inquiry, which allows for the exploration of relational structures, cultural dynamics, and shared narratives across scholarly works. The purpose of this method is to synthesize knowledge dispersed across disability studies, sociology, and education, while identifying conceptual overlaps and research gaps. Hart (1998) emphasizes that a rigorous literature review not only maps existing knowledge but also constructs a foundation for deeper theoretical engagement. This approach is particularly relevant given the underrepresentation of relational variables in mainstream analyses of educational access for disabled individuals.

Sources were gathered through systematic searches of databases such as JSTOR, Taylor & Francis Online, and Scopus using search terms including

“disability and social networks,” “education access and disabled communities,” and “intra-group dynamics in disability studies.” The selection criteria emphasized peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, and empirically grounded research published across interdisciplinary fields. The analytic process drew upon thematic coding and comparative synthesis, as outlined by Jesson et al. (2001), who advocate for structured engagement with texts to

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Educational engagement is rarely a solitary pursuit. For disabled individuals, the path to formal learning environments is shaped long before institutional contact begins. Within communities often misunderstood by dominant systems, relational encounters become formative (Peterson, 2020). The nature of these encounters supportive or fragmented, affirming or ambivalent can determine the degree to which education is perceived as a possibility, a burden, or a right. These internal ecosystems of meaning-making establish not only psychological resilience but also frameworks of interpretation that deeply affect orientation toward learning (Vinogradova & Kohan, 2019). Educational access is often influenced by broader social and structural conditions that shape opportunities for learning (Rojak & Khayru, 2022).

Disabled networks, relationships act as carriers of emotional strength and practical insight. These are not auxiliary forms of assistance but constitute essential infrastructures of participation. Through mutual storytelling, everyday negotiation, and shared resourcefulness, members of such community’s co-produce strategies for engagement that are both culturally resonant and contextually adaptive (Schrooten, 2019). This collective wisdom enables members to navigate the bureaucracy and abstraction of educational systems with greater confidence and clarity (McNicholl et al., 2020). Education also plays an important role in strengthening public awareness of rights and responsibilities in society (Rojak, 2021).

Belonging to a peer circle that affirms lived experience transforms the psychological terms of educational access. When students feel acknowledged and represented within their immediate social environments, they are more likely to envision themselves as legitimate participants in formal spaces (Wade et al., 2021). Relational inclusion fosters symbolic anchoring, which reduces the psychological cost of confronting exclusionary structures. This anchoring provides continuity between the self that learns and the community that remembers (Pérez-Salas et al., 2021).

uncover patterns, contradictions, and silences. This method enables the development of an integrated framework that reflects the sociocultural textures of lived experience while remaining analytically robust. The findings serve to deepen understanding of how collective identity, mutual support, and social fragmentation within disabled groups shape educational participation.

These bonds often carry intergenerational depth, where past struggles inform current approaches to schooling. Wisdom is passed through conversation and proximity rather than formal instruction (Ma, 2021). Historical memory embedded in communal ties provides a sense of orientation, caution, and hope. Through these inheritances, the educational endeavor becomes not just a personal achievement but a relational responsibility carried forward with shared significance (Rath, 2022). Education is widely seen as a tool to build social responsibility and collective awareness in society (Hariani & Mardikaningsih, 2022).

Understanding this relational field is critical to rethinking what inclusive education actually demands. It shifts the lens from individualized accommodation to communal recognition, from policy adjustment to cultural transformation. The insights and solidarities that emerge within disabled communities are not mere supplements to institutional inclusion they are its unacknowledged foundations. Any meaningful reform must begin by listening not only to individual voices but to the networks that sustain them (Arnaiz-Sánchez et al., 2022). Inclusive education is closely related to efforts to encourage positive social change through awareness and learning (Gautama & Mardikaningsih, 2022).

The social architecture within disabled communities serves as a foundational determinant in how individuals’ approach, interpret, and navigate educational access. Relational proximity, emotional reciprocity, and shared lived experience provide a psychological bedrock that mediates interactions with formal learning environments. Hughes and Paterson (2005) emphasized that such internal dynamics do not function merely as background social support but constitute a relational epistemology that reorients how disability itself is understood within institutional frameworks. These relations foster a sense of mutual recognition and narrative coherence, especially in systems historically characterized by alienation and exclusion. For many disabled learners, the assurance derived from communal affirmation allows them to reframe education from a site of imposed deficiency to

a space of potential reclamation (Platts & Hoosier, 2020). This transformation begins not in the classroom, but within the social microclimates of peer groups, advocacy circles, and informal alliances that prefigure engagement with formal institutions (Webster, 2021). Organizational and educational effectiveness often depends on several interacting factors within the learning environment (Darmawan, 2024).

Collective identity becomes a strategic asset rather than a passive descriptor. Zarb and Oliver (1993) suggested identification among disabled persons enables a kind of relational resistance to the dominant pathologizing discourses often embedded in educational systems. Through rituals of inclusion such as storytelling, co-mentoring, and shared humor members affirm not only each other's dignity but the legitimacy of their aspirations. The community's social capital thus becomes an incubator for persistence and self-efficacy. Critical in environments where institutional actors continue to frame disability in individualistic and deficit-based terms (Van Aswegen & Shevlin, 2019). In contrast, the community-as-resource model highlights the capacity of internal social bonds to produce counter-narratives that reorient the learner's place in academic space from marginal presence to intentional participant. Mentoring relationships are commonly recognized as important for supporting students' academic and career development (Chada, 2023). Social stereotypes can influence opportunities and inequalities in areas such as education and employment (Sajjapong et al., 2022).

Conversely, where internal relational networks are fractured or marked by internalized stigma, the outcomes for educational engagement become far less favorable. Priestley (1999) noted that intragroup disunity often replicates external hierarchies of privilege, perpetuating exclusion from within. In such communities, the absence of solidarity corrodes not only the emotional resilience of individuals but also the ability to mobilize collectively in response to barriers (Chatzidakis et al., 2021). Competitive dynamics, unresolved trauma, and ideological fragmentation can transform potentially empowering spaces into arenas of disaffection and withdrawal. The resulting disconnection weakens informal accountability structures and leads to a scarcity of shared resources, thereby undermining the very mechanisms that often compensate for formal institutional neglect.

Community discourses about disability influence how individuals approach education. The way disability is framed either as empowerment or tragedy affects engagement with learning environments

(Shakespeare, 2006). Supportive communities often view education as a right and a path for collective progress, while medicalized perspectives may limit expectations and participation (Kaczmarek, 2019). These views shape help-seeking behavior and responses to challenges (Ziakas et al., 2021), while education itself can strengthen broader social awareness (Mardikaningsih et al., 2021). Informal mentorship within disability communities also supports learning through shared experiences and guidance in navigating academic systems (Barnes & Mercer, 2001; Martin, 2021), with sustainability depending on trust and mutual respect (Collings & Wright, 2022). In addition, access to digital technology and skills increasingly supports participation in education (Arifin & Darmawan, 2021). At the same time, intersectionality shapes diverse experiences within disabled communities, as disability interacts with race, gender, and socioeconomic background (Thomas, 1999), creating different educational pressures and opportunities (Pihl et al., 2018). Therefore, inclusive educational approaches must consider these diverse backgrounds to support equitable learning environments (Mendonca et al., 2021).

Language, both spoken and symbolic, acts as a circulatory system within relational networks, shaping what is imaginable and what is actionable. Barton (2001) stressed that the terminologies adopted within peer circles are not ideologically neutral they carry connotations that inform identity, motivation, and perception of institutional legitimacy. Words such as "burden," "dependent," or "inspirational" embed assumptions that either constrain or liberate the self-image of disabled learners. Communities that actively reconfigure these terms through affirming discourse help their members articulate educational goals with greater conviction and agency. Multidisciplinary education can support the development of students' social competence and adaptability (Hariyani et al., 2021). Readiness to adapt to changing educational environments is important for sustainable learning processes (Liwak et al., 2023).

Digital spaces have revolutionized how disabled individuals maintain relational networks, especially in geographically dispersed or socioeconomically marginalized areas. Goggin and Newell (2003) documented how online platforms provide not just information but emotional co-presence and community-building. Digital interaction allows for continuous feedback, asynchronous support, and the decentralization of authority. However, Seale (2006) cautioned that this techno-social potential is unevenly distributed. Differential access to hardware,

bandwidth, and digital literacy reinforces old exclusions under a new guise. Thus, digital inclusion must be approached not merely as a technical solution but as a relational imperative embedded in equity-centered design (Koehle et al., 2022).

Disclosure norms within disabled communities exert a subtle but powerful influence on access behavior. Reindal (2000) found that in communities where concealment is encouraged either to avoid external stigma or to conform to internal ideals individuals are less likely to seek accommodations or voice educational needs. These silencing compromises the effectiveness of inclusion policies that rely on self-identification. In contrast, relational environments that affirm visibility and normalize difference foster proactive help-seeking and fuller participation (Meija-Domenzain et al., 2022). Cultural norms, therefore, shape not only behavior but the very contours of accessibility frameworks. Legal protection of basic rights, including education and health, remains an important foundation for equal opportunities (Hariyani et al., 2021).

Shared resource pooling represents another relational mechanism by which educational access is scaffolded. Barton and Armstrong (2001) observed that communities with strong bonding capital often engage in collaborative logistics: co-funded transportation, shared readers or interpreters, and collective navigation of institutional processes. These practices embody an ethic of mutual aid that counters institutional inflexibility. Yet, the sustainability of such arrangements is threatened by economic strain, uneven contributions, and burnout (Zambrana et al., 2022). When reciprocity breaks down, trust dissolves, and the relational glue that supports education begins to fragment.

Perceptions of institutional legitimacy are shaped not only by personal experience but by collective memory and shared narratives. Tisdall and Riddell (2006) noted that distrust toward educational systems among disabled populations is often historically rooted passed through oral storytelling, advocacy history, and intergenerational recollection. Such narratives frame schools not as neutral providers but as contested spaces requiring constant negotiation. This collective skepticism influences enrollment decisions, persistence rates, and willingness to engage in institutional reform (Benneworth et al., 2017).

The emotional labor involved in sustaining communal bonds is both generative and exhausting. Morris (2001) highlights that the same individuals who act as supporters often carry unspoken emotional burdens that interfere with their own educational goals. The affective cost of relational caregiving is

particularly high in communities lacking formal psychological support or rest spaces. When care networks are reciprocal and non-exploitative, they become engines of collective resilience, offering emotional elasticity that supports long-term engagement (Ulug & Trell, 2020).

Knowledge production, as argued by Slee (1996), is relationally mediated. When disabled learners are encouraged to interrogate dominant narratives and contribute to epistemic frameworks from their lived experience, they begin to reposition themselves not as passive recipients. Communities that support critical reflection foster not only educational access but educational transformation (Green, 2017). Spaces cultivate intellectual agency and challenge the normativity of mainstream pedagogy (Smith & Seal, 2021)

The affective tone of peer interaction determines much of what is sustainable in educational pursuit. Goodley (2001) asserted that affirmation expressed through attentive listening, sincere encouragement, and acknowledgment of effort builds a motivational architecture more durable than institutional rewards. Environments saturated with critique, neglect, or conditional support erode confidence, delay achievement, and amplify dropout risk (Vallée & Ruglis, 2017). Education for sustainability also encourages individuals to become more responsible and adaptive global citizens (Mardikaningsih et al., 2021). Therefore, the moral climate of relational life within disabled communities is not an accessory to education, but its very condition of possibility.

CONCLUSION

The analysis shows that internal social relations within disabled communities strongly influence how individuals access and engage with education. Peer support, collective identity, and informal mentorship can strengthen confidence, persistence, and resilience when facing institutional barriers. In contrast, weak networks, stigma, or unequal caregiving roles may lead to isolation and reduced participation. Therefore, the relational dynamics within communities must be recognized as an important factor in understanding inclusive education.

These findings highlight that educational access should not be addressed only through policies or infrastructure. Institutions and policymakers need to consider the social environments that shape students' motivation, visibility, and participation. Inclusive programs should engage with the relational networks that support disabled learners and recognize communities as important sources of knowledge, support, and collective experience.

Future research should further explore how internal community dynamics influence educational access, especially in non-Western, rural, and low-income contexts. Educational institutions should support peer-led initiatives, digital literacy programs,

and culturally sensitive mentoring systems. Strengthening both physical accessibility and community-based support can help create more meaningful and inclusive educational opportunities for disabled learners.

REFERENCES

- Arifin, S., & Darmawan, D. (2021). Technology Access and Digital Skills: Bridging the Gaps in Education and Employment Opportunities in the Age of Technology 4.0. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 163-168.
- Arnaiz-Sánchez, P., De Haro-Rodríguez, R., Alcaraz, S., & Caballero, C. M. (2022). Perceptions of the Educational Community on the Inclusion and Presence of Students with SEN in Mainstream Schools: A Mixed Study. *Children*, 9(6), 886.
- Barnes, C., & Mercer, G. (1997). *Doing Disability Research*. The Disability Press, Leeds.
- Barnes, C., & Mercer, G. (2001). *Exploring Disability*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Barton, L. (2001). Disability, Struggle and the Politics of Hope. *Disability & Society*, 16(2), 207-210.
- Barton, L., & Armstrong, F. (2001). Disability, Education and Inclusion: Cross-Cultural Issues and Dilemmas. *Disability & Society*, 16(1), 103-110.
- Basar, M. I., & Darmawan, D. (2024). Implementation of Laws to Support the Disabled Workforce. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 6(1), 1-6.
- Benneworth, P., Pinheiro, R., & Karlsen, J. (2017). Strategic Agency and Institutional Change: Investigating the Role of Universities in Regional Innovation Systems. *Regional Studies*, 51(2), 235-248.
- Boccagni, P. (2022). Homing: A Category for Research on Space Appropriation and 'Home-Oriented' mobilities. *Mobilities*, 17(4), 585-601.
- Boonstra, K. E. (2021). Constructing "Behavior Problems": Race, Disability, and Everyday Discipline Practices in the Figured World of Kindergarten. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 52(4), 373-390.
- Chada, N. S. (2023). Structured Evaluation in Mentoring Programs for Student Career Development in Higher Education. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 2(3), 64-71.
- Chatzidakis, A., Maclaran, P., & Varman, R. (2021). The Regeneration of Consumer Movement Solidarity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 48(2), 289-308.
- Collings, S., & Wright, A. C. (2022). Two Families Joined by a Child: The Role of Direct Contact in Fostering Relationships Between Birth and Carer Families in Permanent Care. *Journal of Family Studies*, 28(2), 716-732.
- Darmawan, D. (2024). Distribution of Six Major Factors Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness. *Journal of Distribution Science*, 22(4), 47-58.
- Eide, A. H., Lamichhane, K., & Neupane, S. (2021). Gaps in Access and School Attainments among People with and without Disabilities: A Case from Nepal. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 43(14), 1995-2000.
- Gautama, E. C., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2022). Driving Sustainable Behavior Change Through Education and Public Awareness. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 259-264.
- Goggin, G. (2021). "Chapter 17: Disability, Internet, and digital inequality: the research agenda". In *Handbook of Digital Inequality*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK.
- Goodley, D. (2001). 'Learning Difficulties', the Social Model of Disability and Impairment: Challenging Epistemologies. *Disability & Society*, 16(2), 207-231.
- Green, T. L. (2017). Community-Based Equity Audits: A Practical Approach for Educational Leaders to Support Equitable Community-School Improvements. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 53(1), 3-39.
- Hardyansah, R., R. Saputra, & D. S. Negara. (2021). Social Perception and Stigma: Creating an Inclusive and Equal Society. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 79 - 86.
- Hariani, M., Aliyah, N. D., & Issalillah, F. (2021). Legal Guarantee of Children's Rights in Education and Health. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 177-180.
- Hariani, M., Safira, M. E., & Wahyuni, S. (2021). Multidisciplinary Education and the Growth of Social Competence in Children. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 253-258.
- Hariani, M., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2022). The Social Education Role in Shaping Students' Global Awareness in Higher Education. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 55-60.
- Hart, C. (1998). *Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Social Science Research Imagination*. SAGE Publications, London.
- Hughes, B., & Paterson, K. (2005). The Social Model of Disability and the Disappearing Body: Towards a

- Sociology of Impairment. *Disability & Society*, 12(3), 325-340.
- Jakariya, J., R. Hardyansah, & D. Darmawan. (2024). The Impact of the Job Creation Law on the Protection of Wages for Fixed-Term Employment Workers (PKWT). *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 3(2), 17-22.
- Jesson, J., Matheson, L., & Lacey, F. M. (2001). *Doing Your Literature Review: Traditional and Systematic Techniques*. SAGE Publications, London.
- Kaczmarek, E. (2019). How to Distinguish Medicalization from Over-Medicalization?. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*, 22(1), 119-128.
- Koehle, H., Kronk, C., & Lee, Y. J. (2022). Digital Health Equity: Addressing Power, Usability, and Trust to Strengthen Health Systems. *Yearbook of Medical Informatics*, 31(01), 020-032.
- Liwak, S., Darmawan, D., & El-Yunusi, M. Y. M. (2023). Adaptation Readiness and Resilience Building of Novice Teachers in Navigating the World of Education Professional Work. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 213-222.
- Logie, C. H., Earnshaw, V., Nyblade, L., Turan, J., Stangl, A., Poteat, T., & Baral, S. (2022). A Scoping Review of the Integration of Empowerment-Based Perspectives in Quantitative Intersectional Stigma Research. *Global public health*, 17(8), 1451-1466.
- Loosemore, M., Alkilani, S. Z., & Murphy, R. (2021). The Institutional Drivers of Social Procurement Implementation in Australian Construction Projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 39(7), 750-761.
- Ma, Y. (2021). Reconceptualizing Stem Education in China as Praxis: A Curriculum Turn. *Sustainability*, 13(9), 1-14.
- Mardikaningsih, R., Masnawati, E., & Aisyah, N. (2021). Fostering Competence for Sustainability through Education and Adaptive Global Citizenship. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 267-272.
- Martin, N. (2021). Perspectives on UK University Employment from Autistic Researchers and Lecturers. *Disability & Society*, 36(9), 1510-1531.
- McNicholl, A., Desmond, D., & Gallagher, P. (2020). Assistive Technologies, Educational Engagement and Psychosocial Outcomes among Students with Disabilities in Higher Education. *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology*, 18(1), 50-58.
- Mejia-Domenzain, P., Marras, M., Giang, C., Cattaneo, A., & Käser, T. (2022). Evolutionary Clustering of Apprentices' Self-Regulated Learning Behavior in Learning Journals. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 15(5), 579-593.
- Mendonca, C. N., Wahyudi, Kabalmay, R. N. K., & Amri, M. W. (2021). Developing Technical and Social Competencies for Future-Ready Education in Digitally Mediated Labor Environments. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 259-266.
- Morris, J. (2001). *Impairment and Disability: Constructing an Ethics of Care*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London.
- Oliver, M. (1996). *Understanding disability: From theory to practice*. Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Osler, A., & Skarra, J. A. (2021). The Rhetoric and Reality of Human Rights Education: Policy Frameworks and Teacher Perspectives. *Multicultural Education Review*, 13(3), 191-210.
- Pérez-Salas, C. P., Parra, V., Sáez-Delgado, F., & Olivares, H. (2021). Influence of Teacher-Student Relationships and Special Educational Needs on Student Engagement and Disengagement: A Correlational Study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1-12.
- Peterson, M. (2020). Micro Aggressions and Connections in the Context of National Multiculturalism: Everyday Geographies of Racialisation and Resistance in Contemporary Scotland. *Antipode*, 52(5), 1393-1412.
- Philip, T. M., & Azevedo, F. S. (2017). Everyday Science Learning and Equity: Mapping the Contested Terrain. *Science Education*, 101(4), 526-532.
- Pihl, J., Holm, G., Riitaoja, A. L., Kjaran, J. I., & Carlson, M. (2018). Nordic Discourses on Marginalisation Through Education. *Education Inquiry*, 9(1), 22-39.
- Platts, T. K., & Hoosier, K. (2020). Reducing Stereotype Threat in the Classroom. *Inquiry: The Journal of the Virginia Community Colleges*, 23(1), 1-18.
- Priestley, M. (1999). *Disability Politics and Community Care*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster, New York.
- Rath, V. (2022). Social Engagement: Hearing the Experiences of Disabled Students in Higher Education in Ireland. *Front. Educ*, 7, 1-10.
- Reindal, S. M. (2000). Justice and the Circle of Inclusion. *Disability & Society*, 15(1), 119-126.
- Robinson, S., Graham, A., Fisher, K. R., Neale, K., Davy, L., Johnson, K., & Hall, E. (2021). Understanding Paid Support Relationships: Possibilities for Mutual Recognition Between Young People with Disability and Their Support Workers. *Disability & Society*, 36(9), 1423-1448.
- Rojak, J. A. (2021). The Importance of Civic Education to Increase Community Legal Awareness. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 44-50.
- Rojak, J. A., & Khayru, R. K. (2022). Disparities in Access

- to Education in Developing Countries: Determinants, Impacts, and Solution Strategies. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 31-38.
- Sajjapong, T., Darmawan, D., & Marsal, A. P. (2022). The Role of Social Stereotypes in Shaping Opportunities and Inequalities in Society: Their Impact on Education, Employment, and Intergroup Interactions. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 1(1), 44-49.
- Schrooten, M., & Meeus, B. (2020). The Possible Role and Position of Social Work as Part of the Arrival Infrastructure. *European Journal of Social Work*, 23(3), 414-424.
- Schudde, L. (2018). Heterogeneous Effects in Education: The Promise and Challenge of Incorporating Intersectionality into Quantitative Methodological Approaches. *Review of Research in Education*, 42(1), 72-92.
- Seale, J. (2006). *E-learning and Disability in Higher Education: Accessibility Research and Practice*. Routledge, London.
- Shakespeare, T. (2006). *Disability Rights and Wrongs*. Routledge, London.
- Shakespeare, T., & Watson, N. (2002). The Social Model of Disability: An Outdated Ideology?, *Research in Social Science and Disability*, 2, 9-28.
- Shuayb, I. (2020). Impact of the Disability Rights Movement and Legislation on Educational Programmes and Buildings. In: *Inclusive University Built Environments*. Springer Cham, 7-33.
- Slee, R. (1996). Inclusive Schooling and the Struggle for Democracy. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1(1), 1-17.
- Smith, A., & Seal, M. (2021). The Contested Terrain of Critical Pedagogy and Teaching Informal Education in Higher Education. *Education Sciences*, 11(9), 476.
- Subiakso, A., Juliarto, T. S., Darmawan, D., Sisminarnohadi, S., & Romli, R. I. A. (2023). Legal Rights in Access to Health Services for Persons with Disabilities. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 2(3), 15-20.
- Thomas, C. (1999). *Female Forms: Experiencing and Understanding Disability*. Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Tisdall, E. K. M., & Riddell, S. (2006). Policies on Special Needs Education: Competing Strategies and Discourses. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 21(4), 425-439.
- Ulug, C., & Trelle, E. M. (2020). 'It's Not Really about the Food, It's Also about Food': Urban Collective Action, the Community Economy and Autonomous Food Systems at the Groningen Free Café. *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development*, 12(2), 127-142.
- Vallée, D., & Ruglis, J. (2017). Student Disengagement in English-speaking Montréal. *Educational Studies*, 53(3), 285-314.
- Van Aswegen, J., & Shevlin, M. (2019). Disabling Discourses and Ableist Assumptions: Reimagining Social Justice Through Education for Disabled People Through a Critical Discourse Analysis Approach. *Policy Futures in Education*, 17(5), 634-656.
- Vincent, L., & Chiwandire, D. (2019). Funding and Inclusion in Higher Education Institutions for Students with Disabilities. *African Journal of Disability*, 8(1), 1-12.
- Vinogradova, N. I., & Kohan, S. T. (2019). Resilience as a Basis for Psychological Safety of Students with Disabilities. *Proceedings of the First International Volga Region Conference on Economics, Humanities and Sports (FICEHS 2019)*, 551 - 554.
- Wade-Jaimes, K., King, N. S., & Schwartz, R. (2021). "You Could Like Science and Not be a Science Person": Black Girls' Negotiation of Space and Identity in Science. *Science Education*, 105(5), 855-879.
- Webster, N. (2021). Re-centering Global Civic Engagement through a Critical Lens: A Collaborative Center Approach. *Globally*, 227-237.
- Wolbring, G., & Lillywhite, A. (2021). Equity/Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) in Universities: The Case of Disabled People. *Societies*, 11(2), 1-34.
- Zambrana, R. E., Hardaway, C. R., & Neubauer, L. C. (2022). Beyond Role Strain: Work-Family Sacrifice among Underrepresented Minority Faculty. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 84(5), 1469-1486.
- Zarb, G., & Oliver, M. (1993). *Ageing with a Disability: What do They Expect After All These Years*. University of Greenwich, London.
- Ziakas, V., Lundberg, C., & Sakkas, G. (2021). "Out of the Black, Into the Big Blue" on a Single Breath: Sport Event Value Co-Creation as Symbolic World-Making. *Journal of Sport Management*, 36(1), 25-44.