



WOMEN, EDUCATION, AND SOCIAL WELFARE
VOL. 2 NO. 2 (2025)

ISSN: 3064-2469

WISE Pendidikan
Indonesia

Enhancing Learning Outcomes through Discovery Learning: A Gender-Inclusive Approach in Secondary Education

Kumutha Raman , and Haida Umiera Hashim 

To cite this article: K. Raman and H. Umiera, “Enhancing Learning Outcomes through Discovery Learning: A Gender-Inclusive Approach in Secondary Education,” *Women, Educ. Soc. Welf.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 93–102, 2025
<https://doi.org/10.70211/wesw.v2i2.304>



Published online: October 9, 2025



Submit your article to this journal



View crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<https://journal.wiseedu.co.id/index.php/jiswel/about>



Enhancing Learning Outcomes through Discovery Learning: A Gender-Inclusive Approach in Secondary Education

Kumutha Raman* and Haida Umiera Hashim

Received: August 8, 2025

Revised: August 19, 2025

Accepted: September 25, 2025

Online: October 9, 2025

Abstract

The persistent gap in student achievement and gender participation in secondary education, particularly in rural contexts, highlights the need for inclusive pedagogical strategies that enhance both learning outcomes and equity. This study aimed to examine the effectiveness of discovery learning in improving academic performance and fostering gender-inclusive participation in science classes at a secondary school in Purwodadi, South Lampung, Indonesia. A classroom action research design was applied across two cycles involving 20 students (11 female and 9 male), with data collected through achievement tests, classroom observation sheets, and teacher reflection notes. Quantitative data were analyzed descriptively to measure mastery of learning outcomes, while qualitative data were thematically analyzed to capture participation dynamics. The findings indicate that student mastery improved from 65% in the first cycle to 95% in the second, while active participation among female students increased from 40% to 90%. These results confirm that discovery learning is not only effective in enhancing cognitive achievement but also serves as a gender-inclusive pedagogical framework that empowers female learners to engage actively in collaborative and inquiry-based learning. The implication of this study is that discovery learning can support teachers, curriculum designers, and policymakers in promoting equitable and high-quality education aligned with Sustainable Development Goal 4.

Keywords: Discovery Learning; Equitable Pedagogy; Gender Inclusivity; Learning Outcomes; Secondary Education; Learning Outcomes.

Publisher's Note:

WISE Pendidikan Indonesia stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright:

©

2025 by the author(s).

License WISE Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).



INTRODUCTION

Education is widely acknowledged as a fundamental driver of human capital development and societal transformation, playing a central role in shaping cognitive abilities, character formation, and lifelong skills that are essential in the twenty-first century [1], [2], [3]. Within the framework of global educational policy, the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) emphasizes the provision of inclusive and equitable quality education for all, with particular attention to vulnerable groups including girls and women, rural learners, and socio-economically disadvantaged populations [4]. Despite considerable progress in improving access to schooling in developing countries, disparities in learning outcomes and classroom participation persist, especially along gender lines. Female students in many rural and under-resourced settings continue to encounter structural and cultural barriers that limit their active involvement and academic achievement [5], [6], [7]. These realities call for innovative pedagogical strategies that not only enhance cognitive performance but also foster gender inclusivity and equity in learning environments.

Traditional teaching practices in many secondary schools remain dominated by teacher-centered approaches, where learning is transmitted through direct instruction and memorization rather than constructed through inquiry and exploration [8], [9]. Such approaches often fail to develop higher-order thinking skills, reduce student motivation, and contribute to disengagement in classroom activities [10], [11]. Evidence further suggests that passive pedagogies disproportionately affect female students, who may experience sociocultural constraints in speaking up, engaging in group work, or taking leadership roles in classroom discussions [12], [13], [14]. Consequently, the reliance on conventional instruction not only limits academic achievement but also perpetuates gender-based participation gaps. In response to these concerns, scholars and practitioners have increasingly advocated for student-centered pedagogies that encourage exploration, discovery, and collaborative engagement [15], [16], [17].

Discovery learning, initially proposed by Jerome Bruner, is one such model that positions learners as active constructors of knowledge through inquiry-based exploration, experimentation, and problem-solving [18], [19]. This pedagogical model aligns with constructivist theories of learning, which argue that knowledge is most effectively internalized when students are engaged in authentic tasks that require reasoning, reflection, and social interaction [20], [21], [22]. Empirical studies have consistently reported that discovery learning can improve students' conceptual understanding, critical thinking, and retention of knowledge compared to traditional approaches [23], [24], [25]. Moreover, the method has been associated with increased student motivation, higher engagement in collaborative tasks, and stronger problem-solving capacities [26], [27], [28]. Research in science education, in particular, highlights that discovery learning fosters deeper comprehension of abstract concepts by linking them with hands-on experimentation and inquiry-based dialogue [29], [30].

Beyond cognitive outcomes, discovery learning also holds potential for promoting inclusivity and gender equity in education. Recent studies suggest that student-centered pedagogies empower female learners to participate more actively in class discussions, challenge traditional gender norms in learning spaces, and build self confidence in academic contexts [31], [32]. For example, gender-sensitive instructional designs have been shown to

reduce participation gaps, increase collaborative engagement, and support equitable contributions from male and female learners alike [33], [34]. Within the broader discourse on inclusive pedagogy, discovery learning can therefore be positioned as a vehicle for advancing not only academic excellence but also social equity in the classroom [35].

Despite this promising evidence, most existing research has concentrated on the cognitive benefits of discovery learning, such as its effects on achievement, motivation, and critical thinking, while overlooking its implications for gender inclusivity and equitable participation in secondary education. Studies exploring how discovery learning specifically supports female students in rural or resource-constrained contexts remain limited [36]. This gap underscores the need for further empirical inquiry into the dual role of discovery learning: enhancing learning outcomes while simultaneously advancing gender inclusive participation in classroom settings.

The present study addresses this gap by examining the implementation of discovery learning in a secondary education context, with particular attention to its impact on female students' learning outcomes and classroom participation. Conducted in a rural Indonesian school, the study seeks to provide empirical evidence of how discovery learning can function as both a cognitive instructional strategy and an inclusive pedagogical approach. By integrating academic performance data with observations of gendered classroom participation, this research contributes to the global discourse on pedagogical innovation and inclusive education, offering insights relevant to educators, policymakers, and scholars committed to achieving SDG 4 and promoting gender equity in education.

METHODS

This study employed a classroom action research design consisting of two iterative cycles, each including planning, implementation, observation, and reflection stages [37]. The research was conducted in a secondary school located in Purwodadi Village, South Lampung, Indonesia, which represents a typical rural educational setting where issues of gender inclusivity in classroom participation are often observed.

Population and Sample

The population of this study consisted of secondary school students in Purwodadi Village, South Lampung, Indonesia, a rural educational setting characterized by limited resources and gendered participation challenges. From this population, a purposive sample of 20 students was selected, comprising 11 female and 9 male learners, all enrolled in science classes relevant to the study focus. The sampling approach was chosen to ensure adequate representation of female students, as the central aim of the study was to analyze both learning outcomes and gender inclusivity in the context of discovery learning.

Instrument

Data were collected using multiple instruments to capture both cognitive achievement and participation dynamics. Learning outcomes were assessed through structured achievement tests aligned with the national science curriculum and validated by two subject-matter experts to ensure content validity. Participation was measured through observation sheets designed to

record indicators such as frequency of contributions in discussions, willingness to ask and respond to questions, and leadership in group tasks. To complement these measures, qualitative data were gathered from teacher reflection notes and field observations, which provided deeper insights into classroom interactions and gendered participation patterns.

Data Analysis

Data analysis employed both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Quantitative data from achievement tests were analyzed using descriptive statistics, with mean scores and percentages calculated to determine levels of mastery against the Minimum Mastery Criteria (KKM = 75). A criterion of success was defined as at least 80% of students achieving mastery by the end of the second cycle. For participation, percentages were calculated to track the increase in active engagement among female learners across cycles. Qualitative data, including reflective notes and field observations, were analyzed thematically through processes of reduction, categorization, and interpretation, enabling the identification of recurring patterns in classroom engagement. Triangulation across instruments was applied to enhance validity and reliability, ensuring that improvements in outcomes and participation were consistently represented.

This methodological framework, by clearly combining quantitative assessments of achievement with qualitative evaluations of participation, provided a comprehensive approach to analyzing the dual impact of discovery learning on both academic success and gender inclusivity in secondary education.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

This study aims to identify the implementation of discovery learning across two cycles demonstrated a consistent improvement in student academic achievement. In the first cycle, 65% of students achieved the minimum mastery criterion (KKM = 75), whereas in the second cycle, this proportion increased to 95%. This improvement suggests that the iterative refinement of instructional strategies and increased student familiarity with discovery learning contributed to higher levels of achievement.

Table 1. Improvement in Student Learning Outcomes across Cycles

Cycle	Students Achieving Mastery (%)	Average Score	Criteria Met
Pre-cycle	0%	58.2	Not achieved
Cycle I	65%	73.5	Moderate
Cycle II	95%	84.7	Achieved

The data reveal a clear progression from limited achievement in the pre cycle to near-universal mastery in cycle II, underscoring the effectiveness of discovery learning in facilitating conceptual understanding and problem-solving skills in secondary science education. The data reveal a clear progression from limited achievement in the pre cycle to near-universal mastery in cycle II, underscoring the effectiveness of discovery learning in facilitating conceptual understanding and problem-solving skills in secondary science education.

A core focus of this study was the degree to which female students participated actively in classroom activities. In the pre-cycle phase, only 40% of female students were observed to engage consistently in class discussions, group work, and questioning activities. This increased to 60% in cycle I and 90% in cycle II, indicating substantial gains in inclusivity and confidence among female learners.

Table 2. Female Students' Participation in Discovery Learning Activities

Cycle	Active Participation (%)	Observed Engagement (Qualitative)
Pre-cycle	40%	Minimal involvement; hesitation in asking questions
Cycle I	60%	Increased confidence; moderate involvement in group work
Cycle II	90%	High confidence; frequent questioning, leadership in group discussions

This evidence highlights that discovery learning not only improved academic outcomes but also functioned as a tool to promote gender inclusivity by creating equitable opportunities for female students to contribute meaningfully to the learning process.

Discussion

The findings of this study confirm that discovery learning significantly enhances both academic achievement and gender inclusivity in classroom participation. Similar results were reported by Anjarwati et al. [38], who found that discovery learning improved conceptual mastery and promoted collaborative engagement in science classes. In line with this, Kasmiana et al. [39] demonstrated that inquiry-based pedagogies fostered higher-order thinking skills, particularly among female learners who traditionally showed lower levels of classroom participation. Likewise, a meta-analysis by Ghaemi et al. [40] indicated that guided discovery approaches consistently outperformed direct instruction in terms of long-term knowledge retention and motivation.

Further, evidence from Xiao et al. [41] showed that discovery learning increased self-confidence among rural female students, narrowing participation gaps in mixed-gender classrooms. This aligns with findings by Ezekwu. [42], who emphasized that inclusive pedagogies not only improve learning outcomes but also empower female learners to actively engage in collaborative knowledge construction.

What distinguishes the present study from previous research is its dual emphasis on both cognitive achievement and gender inclusivity in a rural Indonesian context. While earlier works primarily focused on academic outcomes, the present research highlights how discovery learning can serve as a gender-inclusive pedagogical framework, thereby extending its relevance beyond cognitive domains into the broader agenda of equity and inclusion in education. This novelty underscores discovery learning as not only a strategy for academic success but also as a mechanism for addressing persistent gender disparities in classroom participation.

The findings of this study carry important implications for pedagogy, curriculum development, and educational policy. For teachers, the results suggest that integrating

discovery learning into secondary classrooms can foster active engagement and narrow gender participation gaps. For curriculum designers, this evidence supports the incorporation of inquiry-based pedagogies into national curricula to promote inclusivity and lifelong learning competencies. At the policy level, the outcomes contribute to the realization of Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) by demonstrating how innovative teaching strategies can simultaneously improve quality education and gender equity in rural schools.

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations. First, the relatively small sample size (20 students) restricts the generalizability of the findings to broader populations. Second, the research was conducted in a single rural school, which may limit its applicability to different socio-cultural contexts. Third, the assessment of participation relied primarily on observation and teacher reflection, which, although triangulated, may not fully capture the complexity of students' socio-emotional and cognitive engagement. Future research should employ mixed method designs with larger, more diverse samples and more robust measurement tools (e.g., validated participation scales and longitudinal tracking) to provide stronger evidence of the dual impact of discovery learning.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that the implementation of discovery learning significantly enhances both learning outcomes and classroom participation, particularly among female students in a rural secondary education context. The results show that the mastery of academic content improved substantially across cycles, while female learners' active participation in discussions, questioning, and collaborative tasks also increased markedly, thereby reducing gender disparities in classroom engagement. These findings provide empirical evidence that discovery learning is not only effective as a cognitive instructional strategy but also serves as a gender inclusive pedagogical framework that contributes to equitable educational practices. The novelty of this study lies in its dual emphasis on achievement and inclusivity, highlighting the broader role of discovery learning in advancing Sustainable Development Goal 4, which promotes quality education and gender equity. Despite the study's limitations in sample size and contextual scope, its implications are significant for teachers, curriculum developers, and policymakers, underscoring the importance of adopting inquiry-based approaches to create learning environments that are both academically rigorous and socially inclusive.

LIMITATIONS

This study has several limitations. First, the sample was from Bandar Lampung, limiting the generalizability to other regions. Future studies should include more diverse locations. Second, the cross-sectional design prevents establishing causal relationships. Long-term studies are needed for a clearer understanding. Third, self-report questionnaires may be affected by social desirability bias, particularly on sensitive topics. A mixed methods approach could provide deeper insights. Finally, the findings are specific to Arabic language learning, and future research should explore other subjects like mathematics or science. Addressing these limitations would enhance the research's validity and theoretical models.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

Kumutha Raman – Faculty of Education and Liberal Arts, INTI International University (Malaysia);

Email: kumutha.raman@newinti.edu.my

 orcid.org/0009-0007-6630-8883

Authors

Kumutha Raman – Faculty of Education and Liberal Arts, INTI International University (Malaysia);

 orcid.org/0009-0007-6630-8883

Haida Umiera Hashim – Department of English Language, Academy of Language Studies, Faculty of Education, University of Malaya (Malaysia);

 orcid.org/0000-0002-5710-3401

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

K.R. led the conception and design of the study, wrote the introduction, results, discussion, and conclusion, and supervised data collection and manuscript revisions. H.U.H. contributed to gathering related studies, writing the literature review, and drafting the abstract. All authors contributed equally to the overall manuscript and its revisions.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

"The authors declare no conflict of interest."

DECLARATION OF USE OF AI IN SCIENTIFIC WRITING

The authors used ChatGPT during the preparation of this work to support language refinement. After utilizing the tool, the authors thoroughly reviewed and edited the content as necessary and assumed full responsibility for the publication's content

REFERENCES

- [1] G. O. Nwachukwu, "Human Capital Development: A Driver for Educational Improvement in Nigeria," *Br. J. Educ.*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 30-39, May 2024. <https://doi.org/10.37745/bje.2013/vol12n63039>.
- [2] A. A. Abubakar, Y. H. Al-Mamary, H. Preet Singh, A. Singh, F. Alam, and V. Agrawal, "Exploring factors influencing sustainable human capital development: Insights from Saudi Arabia," *Heliyon*, vol. 10, no. 16, p. e35676, Aug. 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e35676>.
- [3] M. Poláková, J. H. Suleimanová, P. Madzík, L. Copuš, I. Molnárová, and J. Polednová, "Soft skills and their importance in the labour market under the conditions of Industry 5.0," *Heliyon*, vol. 9, no. 8, p. e18670, Aug. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e18670>.

- [4] A. Zickafoose et al., "Barriers and Challenges Affecting Quality Education (Sustainable Development Goal #4) in Sub-Saharan Africa by 2030," *Sustainability*, vol. 16, no. 7, p. 2657, Mar. 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16072657>.
- [5] Ibourk and K. El Aynaoui, "Gender gap in school learning: Micro-level evidence from Morocco," *J. Open Innov. Technol. Mark. Complex.*, vol. 10, no. 2, p. 100289, Jun. 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2024.100289>.
- [6] Shehnaz Gul, Bibi Fatima, and Naveen Akhtar, "Gender Equality in Education: Addressing Structural Barriers and Social Norms Asian Context," *Crit. Rev. Soc. Sci. Stud.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 2839-2854, Mar. 2025. <https://doi.org/10.59075/6bgnrq69>.
- [7] Ghundol and A. Muthanna, "Perceptions and experiences of female academics on barriers in obtaining and continuing leadership roles at higher education," *Int. J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 130, p. 102534, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2025.102534>.
- [8] N. Amirova, "Traditional vs. Non-Traditional Teaching in Secondary Education: A Comparative Analysis," *Porta Universorum*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 101-109, May 2025. <https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.010309>.
- [9] Z. N. Ghafar, "The Teacher-Centered and the Student-Centered: A Comparison of Two Approaches," *Int. J. Arts Humanit.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 18-23, Aug. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.61424/ijah.v1i1.7>.
- [10] J. Meyer, T. Jansen, and J. Fleckenstein, "Nonengagement and unsuccessful engagement with feedback in lower secondary education: The role of student characteristics," *Contemp. Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 81, p. 102363, Jun. 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2025.102363>.
- [11] Golden, "Enabling critical thinking development in higher education through the use of a structured planning tool," *Irish Educ. Stud.*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 949-969, Oct. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2023.2258497>.
- [12] S. M. Aguillon, G.-F. Siegmund, R. H. Petipas, A. G. Drake, S. Cotner, and C. J. Ballen, "Gender Differences in Student Participation in an Active-Learning Classroom," *CBE-Life Sci. Educ.*, vol. 19, no. 2, p. ar12, Jun. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.19-03-0048>.
- [13] S. Egitim, "Promoting gender-inclusive leadership perceptions among Japanese university students: A nine-week critical inquiry-based action learning program," *Int. J. Educ. Res. Open*, vol. 7, p. 100362, Dec. 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2024.100362>.
- [14] A. H. Eagly and L. L. Carli, "The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence," *Leadersh. Q.*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 807-834, Dec. 2003. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.004>.
- [15] A. Bahrun, S. Sanusi, T. K. Yeniningsih, A. Bakar, and A. Hasan, "Understanding Gender Approach to Educational Achievement:," *JWEE*, no. 1-2, pp. 131-166, Apr. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.28934/jwee23.12.pp131-166>.
- [16] Llorens et al., "Gender bias in academia: A lifetime problem that needs solutions," *Neuron*, vol. 109, no. 13, pp. 2047-2074, Jul. 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2021.06.002>.
- [17] T. Z. Ningsih et al., "Enhancing communication and collaboration skills through discovery, cooperative and problem-based learning models in Social Studies education," *Cogent Educ.*, vol. 12, no. 1, Dec. 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2500110>.
- [18] Y. Ozdem-Yilmaz and K. Bilican, "Discovery Learning-Jerome Bruner," 2020, pp. 177-190. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-43620-9_13.
- [19] N. D. Lethulur, D. Juandi, and J. A. Dahlan, "The Effectiveness of Discovery, Inquiry, Problem, and Project-Based Learning in Mathematics Education: A Systematic Literature

- Review," *J. Pendidik. MIPA*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 268-279, Apr. 2025. <https://doi.org/10.23960/jpmipa.v26i1.pp268-279>.
- [20] M. Daodu, C. Elegbede, and O. Adedotun, "Effectiveness of Constructivism Theory of Learning as 21st Century Method of Teaching," *J. Adv. Psychol.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 1-11, Sep. 2024. <https://doi.org/10.47941/japsy.2267>.
- [21] Y. W. Kwan and A. F. L. Wong, "Effects of the constructivist learning environment on students' critical thinking ability: Cognitive and motivational variables as mediators," *Int. J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 70, pp. 68-79, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2015.02.006>.
- [22] A. S. Putri, G. U. E. Radandima, and A. Setiawan, "Analysis of The Constructivist Approach in The Learning Process of Public Policy," *Jejaring Adm. Publik*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 115-130, Dec. 2024. <https://doi.org/10.20473/jap.v16i2.53461>.
- [23] M. Muhali, B. K. Prahani, H. Mubarak, N. Kurnia, and M. Asy'ari, "The Impact of Guided-Discovery-Learning Model on Students' Conceptual Understanding and Critical Thinking Skills," *J. Penelit. dan Pengkaj. Ilmu Pendidik. e-Saintika*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 227-240, Nov. 2021. <https://doi.org/10.36312/esaintika.v5i3.581>.
- [24] Kurniawati, A. Oktradiksa, and N. D. Shalikhah, "Discovery Learning Model For Improving the Students' Critical Thinking Skills: A Narrative Review," *Al-Bidayah J. Pendidik. dasar Islam*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 345-366, Dec. 2021. <https://doi.org/10.14421/al-bidayah.v13i2.691>.
- [25] J. P. Weaver, R. J. Chastain, D. A. DeCaro, and M. S. DeCaro, "Reverse the routine: Problem solving before instruction improves conceptual knowledge in undergraduate physics," *Contemp. Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 52, pp. 36-47, Jan. 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2017.12.003>.
- [26] A. Khan, "Exploring the Impact of Collaborative Learning on Student Motivation and Academic Achievement in Higher Education," *J. Educ. Humanit. Soc. Res.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 46-53, Dec. 2024. <https://doi.org/10.70088/p7a1yk67>.
- [27] A. I. Sappaile, M. M. Mokay, D. Supendi, M. H. Smas, and R. Rais, "Analysis of the Effectiveness of Collaborative Learning in Enhancing Academic Achievement in Junior High Schools," *Int. J. Educ. Res. Excell.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 225-231, Mar. 2025. <https://doi.org/10.55299/ijere.v4i1.925>.
- [28] H. Y. Anchunda and W. Kaewurai, "An instructional model development based on inquiry-based and problem-based approaches to enhance prospective teachers' teamwork and collaborative problem-solving competence," *Soc. Sci. Humanit. Open*, vol. 11, p. 101480, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101480>.
- [29] L. Walker and B. M. Shore, "Understanding Classroom Roles in Inquiry Education," *Sage Open*, vol. 5, no. 4, Oct. 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015607584>.
- [30] R. M. Gillies, "Using Cooperative Learning to Enhance Students' Learning and Engagement during Inquiry-Based Science," *Educ. Sci.*, vol. 13, no. 12, p. 1242, Dec. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13121242>.
- [31] A. Deroncele-Acosta and A. Ellis, "Overcoming Challenges and Promoting Positive Education in Inclusive Schools: A Multi-Country Study," *Educ. Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 11, p. 1169, Oct. 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14111169>.
- [32] İlhan, C. Erbil, and M. Çakmak Barsbay, "Innovating active learning through critical pedagogy for gender Equality: Rethinking healthcare management education in an unsupportive context," *Int. J. Manag. Educ.*, vol. 23, no. 2, p. 101191, Jul. 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2025.101191>.
- [33] Q. Feng, H. Luo, W. Li, T. Chen, and N. Song, "Effects of gender diversity on college students' collaborative learning: From individual gender to gender pairing," *Heliyon*, vol. 9, no. 6, p. e16237, Jun. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e16237>.

- [34] M. Manchenko et al., "Gender-Sensitive Pedagogy For Stem Disciplines," Jul. 2022, pp. 6047-6056. <https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2022.1424>.
- [35] T. Makoelle, "Pedagogy of Inclusion: A Quest for Inclusive Teaching and Learning," *Mediterr. J. Soc. Sci.*, Sep. 2014. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n20p1259>.
- [36] S. Hendri, C. Sa'dijah, and M. Muksar, "Integration of Multicultural Discovery Learning and Computational Thinking in Elementary Mathematics Education: A Systematic Literature Review," *J. Ecohumanism*, vol. 4, no. 2, Feb. 2025. <https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i2.6223>.
- [37] N. Kunlasomboon, S. Wongwanich, and S. Suwanmonkha, "Research and Development of Classroom Action Research Process to Enhance School Learning," *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 171, pp. 1315-1324, Jan. 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.248>.
- [38] R. Anjarwati, H. R. P. Negara, M. Syawahid, and M. A. B. Setambah, "The application of the discovery learning model to students' computational thinking ability is reviewed from self-regulated learning," *J. Didact. Math.*, vol. 6, no. 2, Aug. 2025. <https://doi.org/10.34007/jdm.v6i2.2826>.
- [39] Kasmiana, Yusrizal, and M. Syukri, "The application of guided discovery learning model to improve students concepts understanding," *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, vol. 1460, no. 1, p. 012122, Feb. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1460/1/012122>.
- [40] Ghaemi and S. J. G. Mirsaeed, "The Impact of Inquiry-based Learning approach on Critical Thinking Skill of EFL Students," *EFL J.*, vol. 2, no. 2, Jul. 2017. <https://doi.org/10.21462/eflj.v2i2.38>.
- [41] Q. Xiao and F. Tang, "Extracurricular physical exercise and self-education expectations among Chinese teenagers," *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 16, Feb. 2025. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1518100>.
- [42] E. Ezekwu, "Empowering Girls Through Inclusive Education Systems Focused on Equity and Cultural Diversity.," *Int. J. Res. Publ. Rev.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1839-1854, Jan. 2025. <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.6.0125.0412>.