

Integration of SDG 4 and Leadership in Education: A Pathway to Inclusive and Quality Learning

Moslem Zamani<sup>1</sup>, Anong Rungsuk<sup>2</sup> and George Kwasi Prempeh<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>PhD Candidate, Faculty of Education, Shinawatra University, Pathum Thani, Thailand

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer, International College of Phetchabun Rajabhat University, Thailand,

Email: [rungsuk56@gmail.com](mailto:rungsuk56@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Education, Shinawatra University, Pathum Thani, Thailand,

Email [revpremphe@rocketmail.com](mailto:revpremphe@rocketmail.com)

Received: 27/08/2025

Revised: 04/09/2025

Accepted:27/09/2025

Published:11/10/2025

**Abstract**— This paper explores the intersection between Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) and leadership in education, emphasizing the role of leadership in fostering inclusive, equitable, and quality education. Using a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) approach guided by the PRISMA methodology, the study synthesizes literature from major databases to identify effective leadership models that advance inclusive, equitable, and quality education. Findings reveal that transformational and democratic leadership styles are pivotal in implementing SDG 4 policies, improving student engagement, and promoting institutional innovation. The study also highlights the importance of leadership in addressing educational inequalities through equity-driven policies and technology-enhanced learning strategies. The paper concludes with implications for policy, practice, and further research.

**Keywords:** SDG 4, Leadership in Education, Inclusive Education, PRISMA, Educational Policy.



© 2025 by the authors; license Advances in Consumer Research. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BYNC.ND) license(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

INTRODUCTION

Leadership in education encompasses the ability to inspire, motivate, (Said, n.d.), and guide others towards achieving educational goals and fostering a positive learning environment (Thimmaraju, 2024). SDG 4 (The Global Goals, 2024) aspires to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and encourage lifelong learning opportunities for all. Effective educational leaders possess a unique blend of skills, knowledge, and qualities (Amanchukwu, Stanley, & Ololube, 2015) that enable them to navigate complex challenges and create a lasting impact. Important characteristics of effective educational leaders are shown in Table 1 and include the following:

Table 1: Characteristics of effective educational leaders

Important characteristics of effective educational leaders	Visionary: Educational leaders should have a clear vision for the future of education and the ability to inspire others to share that vision (Kantabutra, 2010; Kanchanawongpaisan et al, 2025).
	Collaborative: They should be able to build strong relationships with teachers, students, parents,

and community members, fostering a collaborative and supportive learning environment (Young & Carpenter, 2008).
Innovative: Educational leaders should be open to new ideas, flexible and willing to experiment with innovative teaching and learning approaches (Leithwood, 2007).
Ethical: They should uphold the highest ethical standards and ensure that all students have equal opportunities to succeed (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2016).
Communicative: Effective communication skills are essential for building relationships (Slater, 2008), motivating others, and providing clear direction (Kalargyrou, Pescosolido, & Kalargiros, 2012).
Problem-Solving: Educational leaders should be able to identify and solve problems effectively, particularly in challenging or

	uncertain circumstances (Mintrop & Zumpe, 2019).
--	--

Effective leadership plays a crucial role in shaping this culture. Leaders who are committed to creating a positive school culture can foster a sense of belonging, community, and academic excellence. School leaders set the tone for the entire school community. Their actions, attitudes, and values have a significant impact on the culture. Some roles of leadership in creating a positive school culture include building relationships, promote collaboration and teamwork, and encourage innovation (Culduz, 2024).

**Research Objectives:** The Objectives of this research is to: investigate the role of leadership in ensuring inclusive and equitable education, examine enhancing teaching and learning practices; understand developing a culture of continuous improvement and innovation in education; and develop methods for measuring and assessing educational outcomes.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Acknowledging the foundational role of high-quality education in fostering stable societies and efficient institutions (Suleiman, 2023), it is crucial to recognize that economic development alone is insufficient to ensure the full potential of all individuals. The pursuit of knowledge cultivates expanded perspectives and fuels creativity, both integral to self-worth (Friedman-Stefansky, 2024), ultimately empowering individuals to contribute meaningfully to global well-being (Adipat & Chotikapanich, 2022). Consequently, equitable access to education for every member of society is paramount. Sustainable Development Goal 4 underscores the importance of ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promoting lifelong learning. Achieving this necessitates leadership that actively dismantles systemic barriers rooted in poverty, disability, and discrimination. Successful models, such as those implemented in Finland and Sweden, demonstrate the effectiveness of investing in teacher training, disability support systems, and gender equity initiatives (Jahnukainen et al., 2023; Savolainen, 2009; Brussin & McBrien, 2022). Effective leadership strategies for fostering inclusivity encompass establishing a shared vision, proactively addressing educational barriers like poverty, discrimination, and disability, providing tailored special education services, and employing data to inform strategic decisions (Leithwood, 2021; Ross & Berger, 2009; Adelman & Taylor, 2006; Yell et al., 2013; Dodman et al., 2019).

Leadership exerts a substantial influence on both the quality of teaching and the success of students. Effective leaders cultivate high expectations, champion professional development opportunities, foster innovation in pedagogical approaches, and advocate for data-informed decision-making (Hayat, 2024; Seechaliao, 2017; Hora, Bouwma-Gearhart, & Park, 2017; Kanchanawongpaisan et al, 2025). Concrete strategies include modeling instructional excellence,

allocating resources for educational research, and facilitating faculty coaching initiatives. Furthermore, the strategic utilization of data enables targeted interventions and facilitates the identification of specific areas where students may require academic support (Pasi, 2001; Hampton, Rhodes, & Stokes, 2004; Poorghasemi, Moein, & Afkaneh, 2025; Ivanova, Kozhuharova, & Todorova, 2022).

In today's rapidly evolving educational landscape, cultivating a culture of continuous improvement is essential. Leadership must actively promote ongoing professional learning, collaborative practices among educators, and a spirit of experimentation with new methodologies (Ahmed et al., 1999; Liao et al., 2010). Innovative educational practices, such as project-based learning (PBL), personalized learning pathways, interdisciplinary teaching approaches, and the thoughtful integration of technologies like virtual reality (VR) and online platforms, have the potential to significantly enhance student engagement and improve learning outcomes (Lattimer & Riordan, 2011; Walkington & Bernacki, 2020; Ivanitskaya et al., 2002; Kokkinos, 2024; Kem, 2022).

Finally, the systematic measurement and assessment of educational outcomes are indispensable for evaluating student progress and effectively guiding instructional decisions. Common assessment methods include standardized tests, performance-based tasks, and the use of portfolios (Birrell & Ross, 1996). However, challenges exist in ensuring effective assessment, particularly concerning issues of standardization, the complexities of data analysis, and the organizational capacity to translate data insights into meaningful action (Zlatkin-Troitschanskaia et al., 2016; Fan et al., 2014). Therefore, it is incumbent upon leaders to cultivate data literacy within their institutions and build the necessary infrastructure to support a culture of continuous improvement driven by evidence-based practices.

**METHODOLOGY**

This study employs a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) methodology to examine the role of leadership in education in achieving Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4). Peer-reviewed literature (as displays in Table 2) from Google Scholar and Scopus was filtered using keywords including "SDG," "Leadership in Education", "inclusive education," and "Quality Learning."

**Table 6: Search Strategy (Google Scholar)**

Keywords	duration	results – Any type	results – articles
“SDG”	Since 2015	17,500	2,270
“Leadership in Education”	Since 2015	24,800	2,320
“Inclusive Education”	Since 2015	112	5
“Quality Learning”	Since 2015	52,500	3,680

How to cite: Moslem Zamani, *et. al.* Integration of SDG 4 and Leadership in Education: A Pathway to Inclusive and Quality Learning. *Adv Consum Res.* 2025;2(4):5080–5084.

Inclusion criteria included English-language articles published since 2015 focusing on SDG 4 implementation and leadership practices in education. The review synthesized 40–60 high-quality articles after screening over 25,000 initial results.

## FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The findings from this study, based on a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) guided by the PRISMA methodology, underscore the pivotal role of leadership in achieving Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), particularly in promoting inclusive, equitable, and quality education. Transformational and democratic leadership models are identified as the most effective in supporting the implementation of SDG 4. These models prioritize vision-driven policies, encourage participatory governance, and support curricular innovation (Peters, 2023; Pawar, 2016; Woods, 2021). The research highlights several key leadership strategies crucial for achieving inclusive and equitable education. Transformational leadership contributes by setting a clear vision that prioritizes equal access and fosters diversity. Institutions that adopt inclusive policies report increased student engagement and retention (Guo-Brennan & Guo-Brennan, 2021). Additionally, Data-driven leadership plays a pivotal role, with educational leaders increasingly leveraging student performance analytics to inform equity-focused interventions.

The findings reveal that strong educational leadership enhances teaching quality and student engagement through professional development and innovation (Attoh, 2024). Leaders who invest in teacher training and instructional coaching encourage the adoption of active, technology-supported, and personalized learning strategies. These approaches contribute to improved academic performance and curriculum adaptability, as institutions increasingly rely on digital tools to meet diverse student needs.

Improvement Schools that cultivate a culture of continuous improvement demonstrate greater responsiveness to evolving educational needs. Leadership plays a vital role in promoting research-driven practices, facilitating collaboration, and supporting professional growth. Environments that embrace experimentation and innovation are more likely to foster student-centered learning and maintain institutional relevance in dynamic educational contexts (Meng & Sermsri, 2024; Riddel & Zulfikar, 2024; Caro-Gonzalez, 2023; Sinhaneti, 2011).

Educational Outcomes Effective leadership in education includes a strong emphasis on monitoring and assessment (Eddy-Spicer et al., 2016). Leaders utilize both standardized tests and performance-based evaluations to measure learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness. However, challenges such as the complexity of data interpretation, disparities in assessment standards, and limited institutional capacity for data utilization hinder optimal decision-making. Overcoming these barriers requires enhanced data

literacy and investment in assessment infrastructure (Birrell & Ross, 1996; Zlatkin-Troitschanskaia, Pant, & Coates, 2016; Fan et al., 2014; Omoso, 2012).

By using SLR and PRISMA, this study achieved a rigorous synthesis of high-quality literature, offering a comparative analysis of leadership models and their alignment with SDG 4. The implications of these findings for policy and practice are significant. Strengthening leadership training programs to integrate SDG 4 principles, enhancing institutional autonomy to foster innovation, leveraging technology to promote equity, and developing cross-sector partnerships are crucial steps. Future research should focus on longitudinal studies of leadership impact, comparative analyses across different regions, and the role of AI and digital leadership in SDG 4 implementation. Overall, this study reinforces the central role of transformational and democratic leadership in ensuring inclusive, equitable, and quality education, highlighting the importance of data-driven decision-making, innovative pedagogy, and institutional resilience in achieving sustainable improvements in education.

## CONCLUSION

Educational leadership is essential in realizing the aims of SDG 4. Visionary, ethical, and participatory leadership drives inclusive policy, equity in learning opportunities, and innovation in education. This study offers valuable insights for policymakers, researchers, and practitioners, calling for increased investment in leadership training, digital integration, and cross-sector collaboration to advance global education goals.

## Acknowledgement

"The authors acknowledge the use of Chat GPT-4o in facilitating some stages of writing and Data analysis for this paper."

## REFERENCE

1. Adelman, H. S., & Taylor, L. (2006). *The school leader's guide to student learning supports: New directions for addressing barriers to learning*. Corwin Press.
2. Adipat, S., & Chotikapanich, R. (2022). Sustainable development goal 4: An education goal to achieve equitable quality education. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 11(6), 174-183.
3. Ahmed, P. K., Loh, A. Y., & Zairi, M. (1999). Cultures for continuous improvement and learning. *Total Quality Management*, 10(4-5), 426-434.
4. Amanchukwu, R. N., Stanley, G. J., & Ololube, N. P. (2015). A review of leadership theories, principles and styles and their relevance to educational management. *Management*, 5(1), 6-14.
5. Attoh, S. U. (2024). The Impact of School Administrators on Teaching and Learning as Strategies for Effective Leadership: A Case Study of Jema'a Lgea. *International Journal of Technology, Innovation and Management (IJTIM)*, 4(1), 83-93.

How to cite: Moslem Zamani, *et. al.* Integration of SDG 4 and Leadership in Education: A Pathway to Inclusive and Quality Learning. *Adv Consum Res.* 2025;2(4):5080–5084.

6. Birrell, J. R., & Ross, S. K. (1996). Standardized testing and portfolio assessment: Rethinking the debate.
7. Brussino, O., & McBrien, J. (2022). Gender stereotypes in education: Policies and practices to address gender stereotyping across OECD education systems. *OECD Education Working Papers*, (271), 0\_1-44.
8. Caro-Gonzalez, A. (2023). Establishing a culture of innovation and risk-taking. In *Transformative Governance for the Future: Navigating Profound Transitions* (pp. 47-56). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
9. Culduz, M. (2024). The Impact of Educational Leadership in Improving the Learning Experience. In *Promoting Crisis Management and Creative Problem-Solving Skills in Educational Leadership* (pp. 168-189). IGI Global.
10. Dodman, S. L., DeMulder, E. K., View, J. L., Swalwell, K., Stribling, S., Ra, S., & Dallman, L. (2019). Equity audits as a tool of critical data-driven decision making: Preparing teachers to see beyond achievement gaps and bubbles. *Action in Teacher Education*, 41(1), 4-22.
11. Eddy-Spicer, D., Ehren, M. C. M. M., Bangpan, M., Khatwa, M., & Perrone, F. (2016). Under what conditions do inspection, monitoring and assessment improve system efficiency, service delivery and learning outcomes for the poorest and most marginalised? A realist synthesis of school accountability in low-and middle-income countries. Social Science Research Unit, UCL Institute of Education, University College London.
12. Fan, J., Han, F., & Liu, H. (2014). Challenges of big data analysis. *National science review*, 1(2), 293-314.
13. Friedman-Stefansky, E. (2024). Empowering Students to Discover Their Unique Self-worth Through the School-Based Motivational Interview (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University).
14. Guo-Brennan, L., & Guo-Brennan, M. (2021). Leading welcoming and inclusive schools for newcomer students: A conceptual framework. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 20(1), 57-75.
15. Hampton, G., Rhodes, C., & Stokes, M. (2004). A practical guide to mentoring, coaching and peer-networking: Teacher professional development in schools and colleges. Routledge.
16. Hayat, Z. (2024). Catalysing Change: The Power of Effective Leadership in Driving Innovation. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(5), 3789-3793.
17. Hora, M. T., Bouwma-Gearhart, J., & Park, H. J. (2017). Data driven decision-making in the era of accountability: Fostering faculty data cultures for learning. *The Review of Higher Education*, 40(3), 391-426.
18. Ivanitskaya, L., Clark, D., Montgomery, G., & Primeau, R. (2002). Interdisciplinary learning: Process and outcomes. *Innovative higher education*, 27, 95-111.
19. Ivanova, I., Kozhuharova, P., & Todorova, R. (2022). SUSTAINABLE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH COACHING: BENEFITS FOR TEACHERS AND LEARNERS. *Strategies for Policy in Science & Education/Strategii Na Obrazovatelna i Nauchna Politika*, 30(5).
20. Jahnukainen, M., Hienonen, N., Lintuvuori, M., & Lempinen, S. (2023). Inclusion in Finland: Myths and realities. In *Finland's famous education system: Unvarnished insights into Finnish schooling* (pp. 401-415). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.
21. Kalargyrou, V., Pescosolido, A. T., & Kalargiros, E. A. (2012). Leadership skills in management education. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 16(4), 39.
22. Kanchanawongpaisan, S., Khumsab, R., Elena, S., & Rezeki, S. (2025). Political Leadership, Policy Innovation, and Sustainable Urban Governance: A Structural Equation Modeling Study of SDG 11 Implementation in Bangkok, Thailand. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 2(4).
23. Kantabutra, S. (2010). Vision effects: a critical gap in educational leadership research. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 24(5), 376-390.
24. Kem, D. (2022). Personalised and adaptive learning: Emerging learning platforms in the era of digital and smart learning. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 5(2), 385-391.
25. Kokkinos, L. (2024). Revolutionizing Education: The Dynamic Intersection of Technology and Learning. *Educational Research (IJMCER)*, 6(1), 26-32.
26. Lattimer, H., & Riordan, R. (2011). Project-based learning engages students in meaningful work: Students at High Tech Middle engage in project-based learning. *Middle School Journal*, 43(2), 18-23.
27. Leithwood, K. (2007). What we know about educational leadership. In *Intelligent leadership: Constructs for thinking education leaders* (pp. 41-66). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
28. Leithwood, K. (2021). A review of evidence about equitable school leadership. *Education Sciences*, 11(8), 377.
29. Liao, S. H., Chang, W. J., & Wu, C. C. (2010). Exploring TQM-Innovation relationship in continuing education: A system architecture and propositions. *Total Quality Management*, 21(11), 1121-1139.
30. Meng, N., & Sermsri, N. (2024). Integration of Big Data and AI in Educational Leadership Practices: Opportunities and Challenges. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER)*, (111).
31. Mintrop, R., & Zumpe, E. (2019). Solving real-life problems of practice and education leaders' school improvement mind-set. *American Journal of Education*, 125(3), 295-344.
32. Omoso, E. O. (2012). Data-based decision making in the school environment: An assessment of data use by secondary school teachers in Kisumu East



How to cite: Moslem Zamani, *et. al.* Integration of SDG 4 and Leadership in Education: A Pathway to Inclusive and Quality Learning. *Adv Consum Res.* 2025;2(4):5080–5084.

- District, Kenya (Master's thesis, University of Twente).
33. Pasi, R. J. (2001). Higher expectations: Promoting social emotional learning and academic achievement in your school. Teachers College Press.
34. Pawar, A. (2016). Transformational leadership: inspirational, intellectual and motivational stimulation in business. *International Journal of Enhanced Research in Management & Computer Applications*, 5(5), 14-21.
35. Peters, M. A. (2023). Who Leads, Who Follows? Critical Review of the Field of Leadership Studies: From the 'Great Man' & Trait Theory to Equity & Diversity Leadership in the Biodigital Era. *Beijing International Review of Education*, 5(1-2), 25-50.
36. Poorghasemi, P., Moein, K. P., & Afkaneh, S. (2025). Design and Validation of a Professional Development Model for Senior Managers at the University of Applied Science and Technology for Sustainable Development. *Management Strategies and Engineering Sciences*, 7(1), 82-90.
37. Riddel, M., & Zulfikar, I. R. (2024). The Role of Innovative Leadership in Transforming Student Learning Effectiveness: A Review of Best Practices and Future Directions. *Development: Studies in Educational Management and Leadership*, 3(1), 35-50.
38. Ross, J. A., & Berger, M. J. (2009). Equity and leadership: Research-based strategies for school leaders. *School leadership and management*, 29(5), 463-476.
39. Said, S. E. Educational Leadership: Empowering Minds, Inspiring Success.
40. Savolainen, H. (2009). Responding to diversity and striving for excellence: The case of Finland. *Prospects*, 39, 281-292.
41. Seechaliao, T. (2017). Instructional strategies to support creativity and innovation in education. *Journal of education and learning*, 6(4), 201-208.
42. Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2016). Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas. Routledge.
43. Sinhaneti, K. (2011). Emerging Trends of Thai Higher Education and a Case Study of Shinawatra University in Coping with Global Challenges. Online Submission.
44. Slater, L. (2008). Pathways to building leadership capacity. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 36(1), 55-69.
45. Suleiman, A. (2023). Quality assurance strategies in higher education institutions. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 29-37.
46. The Global Goals, (2024). 4 Quality Education. Retrieved from <https://www.globalgoals.org/goals/4-quality-education/>
47. Thimmaraju, T. (2024). Educational Administration and Leadership. Laxmi Book Publication.
48. Walkington, C., & Bernacki, M. L. (2020). Appraising research on personalized learning: Definitions, theoretical alignment, advancements, and future directions. *Journal of research on technology in education*, 52(3), 235-252.
49. Woods, P. (2021). Democratic leadership. *Oxford Encyclopedia of Educational Administration*.
50. Yell, M. L., Conroy, T., Katsiyannis, A., & Conroy, T. (2013). Individualized education programs and special education programming for students with disabilities in urban schools. *Fordham Urb. LJ*, 41, 669.
51. Young, M. D., & Carpenter, B. C. (2008). Preparing educational leaders to build transformative communities of involvement: The importance of trust. *Journal of School Public Relations*, 29(2), 276-311.
52. Zlatkin-Troitschanskaia, O., Pant, H. A., & Coates, H. (2016). Assessing student learning outcomes in higher education: Challenges and international perspectives. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(5), 655-661.