BHARATI INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT (BIJMRD)

(Open Access Peer-Reviewed International Journal)

DOI Link : https://doi.org/10.70798/Bijmrd/04020002

Available Online: www.bijmrd.com | BIJMRD Volume: 4 | Issue: 02 | February 2026 | e-ISSN: 2584-1890

Bridging Barriers or Deepening Divides? A Critical Analysis of ICT in Inclusive Education

Avishek Khanra

Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Rishi Aurobindo Institute of Teacher Education, Panchkhuri, Paschim Medinipur, West Bengal, India

Abstract:

Information and Communication technology (ICT) has become central to contemporary discourses of Inclusive Education, promoted as a catalyst for equitable learning opportunities. Assistive technologies, online learning platforms and adaptive systems are celebrated for dismantling barriers faced by learners with disabilities, marginalized communities and those in remote regions. Yet this optimistic narrative often obscures structural inequalities, cultural erasures and privatization pressures that ICT may also reinforce. This paper critically interrogates the role of ICT in Inclusive Education through the lens of critical pedagogy and global policy experiences. Using a qualitative critical review methodology, it asks: Does ICT genuinely enable Inclusive Education or does it risk reproducing or deepening existing educational inequalities? The analysis reveals that while ICT can expand accessibility and personalization, its effectiveness is constrained by digital divides, Western-centric designs, weak teacher preparation and corporate interests. The paper concludes that ICT is not inherently inclusive; its emancipatory potential depends on systemic equity measures, cultural responsiveness and participatory implementation.

Keywords: *ICT, Inclusive Education, Digital Divide, Critical Pedagogy, Equity, Universal Design.*

Introduction:

Inclusive Education is globally recognized as a moral, social and legal imperative to ensure equitable participation for all learners, including those with disabilities, marginalized socio-economic backgrounds and minority cultural or linguistic communities (Ainscow, 2020). Within this context, Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has been promoted as a transformative enabler, offering tools that support accessibility, personalization and connectivity (UNESCO, 2017). From screen readers for visually impaired students to online platforms reaching remote learners, ICT appears to embody the promise of equitable education.

However, critical perspectives reveal that the rhetoric of ICT inclusion often masks persistent inequalities. Learners who are most marginalized are frequently the least likely to have reliable access to infrastructure, devices, or culturally relevant content (World Bank, 2020). Moreover, ICT-driven inclusion can inadvertently reinforce cultural homogenization, privatization and market-driven education.

This study interrogates ICT inclusion by asking: *Does ICT genuinely enable equitable learning opportunities, or does it risk reproducing structural inequalities under a digital guise?* By synthesizing global case studies, scholarly literature, and policy frameworks, this paper critically evaluates ICT's promises, limitations and conditions for equitable implementation.

Research Questions:

a. To what extent does ICT promote Inclusive Education?

b. How might it simultaneously reproduce or deepen existing educational inequalities?

Objectives:

1. To critically analyze the promises and limitations of ICT in advancing Inclusive Education.
2. To examine how socio-economic, cultural and political contexts shape the inclusivity of ICT initiatives.
3. To interrogate contradictions between global ICT in education policies and local realities.
4. To propose a critical framework for ensuring ICT serves as a tool of equity rather than exclusion.

Theoretical Framework:

Inclusive Education aligns with social justice and critical pedagogy perspectives, emphasizing education as a site for empowerment and structural transformation (Freire, 2005). Universal Design for Learning (UDL) provides a framework for creating flexible and accessible learning experiences, highlighting the potential of ICT for personalization and barrier reduction (Meyer et al., 2014).

Critical theorists caution against technological determinism—the belief that technology alone can resolve social inequities (Selwyn, 2016). ICT operates within political, economic and cultural structures that shape who benefits and who is excluded. A critical framework therefore analyzes not only technological affordances but also power relations, contextual realities and systemic inequities.

Methodology:

This study employs a qualitative critical review methodology, designed to interrogate the assumptions, power relations, and socio-political contexts embedded in ICT inclusion discourse. Unlike conventional literature reviews, a critical review emphasizes interpretation, evaluation and uncovering of systemic inequities (Hart, 1998; Selwyn, 2016).

❖ **Research Approach:**

The study synthesizes empirical studies, policy analyses, and theoretical frameworks published between 2015 and 2025, including peer-reviewed journals, UNESCO and World Bank reports, and selected case studies. Selection criteria prioritized research addressing accessibility, equity, teacher perspectives and socio-cultural contexts of ICT use in education.

❖ **Critical Lens:**

The study applies a critical pedagogy and discourse analysis lens, interrogating:

- Whose voices are prioritized in ICT inclusion discourse?
- How do global policies and corporate frameworks shape narratives about inclusion?
- Which structural, cultural and socio-economic inequalities are obscured by technology-focused solutions?

❖ **Analytical Procedure:**

- Data Collection: Sources were gathered using database searches (Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar) with keywords: 'ICT', 'Inclusive Education', 'Digital divide', 'Accessibility', 'Teacher agency' and 'Equity'.
- Thematic Analysis: Findings were coded according to the four objectives, generating themes on ICT promises, contextual influences, policy contradictions, and equity frameworks.
- Critical Synthesis: Beyond summarizing findings, the analysis interrogates assumptions about technology, examines privileging of certain knowledge systems and identifies gaps in representation of marginalized groups.

❖ **Reflexivity and Limitations:**

The methodology acknowledges potential biases:

- Epistemic bias: Literature largely originates from the Global North, privileging Western definitions of inclusion.
- Policy-driven framing: Many studies assume ICT inherently supports inclusion, possibly masking the reproduction of inequities.
- Representation gaps: Voices of marginalized learners and under-resourced teachers may be underrepresented.

By incorporating reflexivity, this methodology ensures transparent, rigorous and critical engagement with the evidence.

Results:

Objective- 1: Critically analyze the promises and limitations of ICT in advancing Inclusive Education

ICT offers clear benefits, such as assistive technologies for learners with disabilities, adaptive learning platforms and virtual classrooms that extend access. Yet, these advantages are unevenly realized. Symbolic inclusion—providing devices without ensuring usability, teacher support, or pedagogical integration—limits actual impact. For example, adaptive software may exist, but without trained teachers or reliable electricity, its utility is restricted (Alper & Goggin, 2017). The findings underscore that technological provision alone does not guarantee meaningful inclusion.

Objective- 2: Examine how socio-economic, cultural and political contexts shape ICT inclusivity

Contextual factors critically mediate ICT's impact. Access is uneven across income, geography, gender and disability, with rural and marginalized learners disproportionately excluded (World Bank, 2020). Furthermore, ICT often embeds Western-centric knowledge and languages, marginalizing indigenous epistemologies and non-dominant linguistic groups (Nguyen et al., 2019). Political commitment, resource allocation and cultural sensitivity emerge as essential for translating ICT provision into genuine learning opportunities.

Objective- 3: Interrogate contradictions between global ICT in education policies and local realities

Global ICT policies, promoted by UNESCO and the World Bank, assume universality and scalability. However, local implementation frequently fails to meet these expectations. Teachers report insufficient training, inadequate infrastructure and limited participation in planning, resulting in underutilized devices and resistance (Howard et al., 2021). Consequently, inclusion becomes a performative policy goal rather than a lived educational reality.

Objective- 4: Propose a critical framework for ensuring ICT serves as a tool of equity rather than exclusion

The study identifies key components of a critical framework for ICT in Inclusive Education:

i. Equity of Access: Ensuring targeted support for marginalized learners, including device provision, internet access, and affordability.

ii. Universal Design: Enforcing accessibility standards for all digital tools.

iii. Cultural and Linguistic Relevance: Integrating local knowledge, languages, and epistemologies into content.

iv. Teacher Empowerment: Involving teachers in design, decision-making, and training for ICT initiatives.

v. Public Accountability: Safeguarding against commercialization and market-driven education that prioritizes profit over equity (Williamson & Hogan, 2020).

Without these systemic interventions, ICT risks deepening inequities under the guise of inclusion.

Discussions:

Objective- 1: ICT offers technical solutions but cannot overcome systemic inequities alone. Symbolic inclusion persists where devices exist without pedagogical integration (Freire, 2005; Selwyn, 2016).

Objective- 2: Context shapes ICT's effectiveness. Rural, low-income and linguistically marginalized learners remain excluded. Access alone is insufficient; equity demands culturally relevant and locally adapted ICT (Nguyen et al., 2019).

Objective- 3: Policy-practice contradictions highlight misalignment between global frameworks and local realities. Inclusion becomes performative unless ICT initiatives address contextual barriers (Howard et al., 2021).

Objective- 4: Equitable ICT deployment requires systemic interventions: infrastructure, universal design, cultural responsiveness, teacher agency and accountability. ICT's transformative potential is conditional, not inherent.

Overall Interpretation: ICT can both enable and hinder inclusion. Its impact depends on systemic, socio-cultural and political factors, as well as whose knowledge is represented in ICT policies and tools.

Conclusion:

This study critically examined the role of ICT in inclusive education, interrogating both its potential and its limitations through the lens of equity, socio-cultural context and policy-practice contradictions. While ICT can enhance accessibility, personalization and adaptive learning, its benefits are unevenly distributed, often privileging urban, affluent and digitally literate learners. Structural inequalities, such as inadequate infrastructure, teacher preparedness and socio-economic disparities, persist, highlighting that technology alone cannot guarantee inclusion.

Global ICT policies and initiatives frequently assume universality, but local realities reveal a disconnect: schools in under-resourced contexts struggle to implement tools effectively and marginalized voices are often underrepresented in decision-making processes. Moreover, Western-centric designs and market-driven approaches can inadvertently reinforce cultural and epistemic biases, reducing inclusion to symbolic access rather than substantive participation.

A critical framework for equitable ICT integration requires systemic interventions: targeted infrastructure, culturally and linguistically responsive content, universal design, teacher empowerment and accountability mechanisms that prioritize social justice over commercialization. ICT's transformative potential lies not in the technology itself but in the conscious, justice-oriented design and implementation within local contexts.

In conclusion, ICT should be viewed as a tool for empowerment only when integrated within broader equity-driven educational strategies. Without attention to structural, cultural and pedagogical factors, ICT risks becoming a digital veneer over persistent inequities, rather than a genuine enabler of Inclusive Education.

References:

- Abegglen, S. (2025). Critical pedagogy and digital liberation: A Freirean debate for SoTL. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 19*(1), 1–10.
- Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy, 6*(1), 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587
- Al-Azawei, A., Serenelli, F., & Lundqvist, K. (2016). Universal Design for Learning (UDL): A content analysis of peer-reviewed journal papers from 2012 to 2015. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 16*(3), 39–56. https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v16i3.19295
- Alper, M., & Goggin, G. (2017). Digital inclusion, disability, and the digital divide. In M. Alper & G. Goggin (Eds.), *Disability and the Digital Divide: Implications for Education* (pp. 1–20). Springer.
- Alper, M., & Raharinirina, S. (2006). Digital inclusion: Promoting access to technology for people with disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education, 39*(3), 199–203. https://doi.org/10.1177/00224669060390030501
- Corbett, J. (2021). *Critical pedagogy and quality education (UNESCO SDG-4)*. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 25*(7), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2021.1962900
- Eshtehardi, R. (2025). Contradictions in the position of technology in online English language teacher training programmes. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 51*(2), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2025.2490795
- Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.). Continuum.
- Fu, J. S. (2013). ICT in education: A critical literature review and its implications. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology, 9*(1), 112–125.
- Howard, S. K., & Mozejko, A. (2021). Teacher agency in the digital age: A critical review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 24*(2), 1–13.
- Kozma, R. B. (2005). National policies that connect ICT-based education reform to economic and social development. *Human Technology, 1*(2), 117–156.
- Meyer, A., Rose, D. H., & Gordon, D. (2014). *Universal Design for Learning: Theory and practice*. CAST Professional Publishing.
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record, 108*(6), 1017–1054.

- Nguyen, T. T. H., & Nguyen, T. H. (2019). ICT in education: A critical review of the literature. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology, 15*(2), 1–14.
- OECD. (2023). *Digital equity and inclusion in education*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/eduwkp2023-14-en
- Plomp, T., et al. (1996). Barriers to the introduction of ICT into education. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 44*(2), 43–61.
- Prestridge, S. (2017). The role of ICT in the teaching and learning of mathematics. *Australian Mathematics Teacher, 73*(2), 3–10.
- Santilli, T. (2025). Integrating educational technologies: Critical analysis and teacher perceptions. *Journal of E-Learning and Knowledge Society, 21*(1), 1–15.
- Selwyn, N. (2016). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Sezgin, S. (2024). Exploring the digital divide in open education. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 25*(2), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v25i2.7236
- UNESCO. (2017). *Education for Sustainable Development Goals: Learning Objectives*. UNESCO Publishing.
- UNESCO. (2025). *Digital technologies for inclusive education: Recommendations for policy and practice*. UNESCO IITE. https://iite.unesco.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/IITE_Publication-2_Recommendations.pdf
- Ure-de-Oliveira, R. (2025). Digital divides and educational inclusion: Perceptions from educators. *Education Sciences, 15*(8), 939. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15080939
- Van De Werfhorst, H. G., & Mijs, J. J. B. (2022). *The digital divide in online education: Inequality in digital readiness*. *PLOS ONE, 17*(3), e0265501. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0265501
- Warschauer, M. (2003). *Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide*. MIT Press.
- Williamson, B., & Hogan, A. (2020). The commodification of education technology: Implications for equity and inclusion. *Learning, Media and Technology, 45*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1710369
- Zhao, Y., & Frank, K. A. (2003). Factors affecting technology uses in schools: An ecological perspective. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(4), 807–840.
- Zillien, N., & Hargittai, E. (2009). Digital distinction: Status-specific internet uses. *Social Science Quarterly, 90*(2), 274–291.
- Zillien, N., & Marr, M. (2013). *The digital divide in Europe*. In M. Ragnedda & G. W. Muschert (Eds.), *The Digital Divide: The Internet and Social Inequality in International Perspective* (pp. 123–142). Routledge.

Citation: **Khanra. A.,** (2026) “Bridging Barriers or Deepening Divides? A Critical Analysis of ICT in Inclusive Education”, *Bharati International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Development (BIJMRD)*, Vol-4, Issue-02, February-2026.