



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Exploring inclusive teaching practices of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) in Higher Education (HE): Recommendations for practice*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/227953/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Bakogiannis, A. and Papavasiliou, E. orcid.org/0000-0002-6504-515X (2025) Exploring inclusive teaching practices of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) in Higher Education (HE): Recommendations for practice. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 76. 101538. ISSN 1475-1585

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2025.101538>

This is an author produced version of an article published in the *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, made available under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Abstract

This study presents a context-sensitive, evidence-informed framework for inclusive English for Academic Purposes (EAP) in Higher Education (HE), developed through a rigorous, multi-method research design. In response to persistent gaps in how inclusivity is conceptualised and implemented in EAP settings, the study integrates data from a qualitative survey, co-production focus groups, and a systematic literature review using Best Fit Framework Synthesis. Findings reveal that meaningful inclusivity in EAP requires coordinated action across three systemic levels: micro (individual practices), meso (departmental structures), and macro (institutional policies). At the micro level, inclusive pedagogy is achieved through differentiated instruction, culturally responsive teaching, equitable assessment, and reflective practice. The meso level emphasises the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration, curriculum decolonisation, and staff development, while the macro level underscores the need for institutional commitment to equity, linguistic justice, and multilingual policy. The resulting framework is both practically applicable and adaptable, offering a strategic model for embedding inclusivity into EAP instruction and aligning it with broader social justice goals. By bridging theory and practice, the study contributes to the under-researched area of EAP inclusivity and repositions EAP not as a neutral support function, but as a transformative site for advancing equity and decolonial pedagogy in higher education. The findings offer concrete recommendations for educators, programme leads, and policymakers committed to creating equitable academic environments for linguistically and culturally diverse learners.

Keywords: Inclusive Teaching Practices; English for Academic Purposes (EAP); Higher Education (HE); Recommendations for Practice

24 Introduction

25 Framing the Study: Context, Rationale & Literature Review

26 Social justice is a complex and evolving construct, closely associated with principles of human
27 rights, equity, and fairness (Bates, 2007; **Sensoy and DiAngelo, 2017; Zembylas, 2018; North,**
28 **2019**). At its heart lies the pursuit of equality, which underpins democratic societies and
29 demands the equitable distribution of resources, opportunities, and recognition (Singh, 2011).
30 Higher education (HE) occupies a critical position in this context, serving both as a mirror of
31 existing societal inequalities and a site for their potential redress. Educational institutions are
32 thus not only shaped by social structures but are also capable of shaping them. Pedagogical
33 practices that foreground inclusion and equity are, therefore, essential to this transformative
34 role (Osman et al., 2018).

35 The concept of inclusion within HE has gained increasing prominence, recognised as both an
36 ethical imperative and an indicator of institutional excellence (Baltaru, 2020). Initially
37 associated with accessibility and the support of students with disabilities (Fuller et al., 2004;
38 Riddell et al., 2007), inclusion is now more broadly conceptualised **to encompass diversity in**
39 **culture, language, socioeconomic status, gender identity, and other intersecting dimensions**
40 **(Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011; Slee, 2018; Ainscow, 2020)**, as a systemic process aimed at
41 ensuring full participation and academic success for all learners (Opertti & Zhang, 2014;
42 Messiou, 2017; Phasha & Dei, 2017). This shift acknowledges that educational barriers extend
43 beyond physical or cognitive impairments to include socio-economic marginalisation, linguistic
44 disadvantage, and cultural exclusion (Devlin et al., 2012; Ladson-Billings, 2014). Inclusive

approaches are increasingly seen as beneficial not only for social equity but also for enhancing institutional performance and innovation through diversity (UNESCO, 2020).

In parallel, inclusive teaching has emerged as a central strategy for addressing these barriers in HE. Inclusive pedagogy moves beyond accommodation, aiming instead to proactively design learning environments that anticipate and respond to diverse needs (Equality Challenge Unit, 2013). Evidence demonstrates that such approaches improve student engagement, retention, and attainment (Thomas, 2012; Dewsbury & Brame, 2019; Valdez & Kelp, 2023; Morgan, 2024). **Nevertheless, in practice inclusive teaching may often be unevenly implemented**, in part due to inconsistencies in how it is defined and operationalised within institutional policy and practice (Hockings, 2010; Ainscow, 2020).

Some institutions adopt a narrow view, framing inclusion primarily in terms of compliance with disability legislation and focusing on accommodations for individual students (e.g., extended time or accessible formats). Others take a broader, more proactive stance, defining inclusive teaching as a pedagogical commitment to equity and justice that addresses structural inequalities related to race, gender, language, and socioeconomic background (Hockings, 2010; Schuelka et al., 2019). Operationally, this can range from ad hoc support services to the systematic embedding of inclusive principles in curriculum design, assessment, and staff development. These varying interpretations can result in uneven application of inclusive practices both within and across institutions.

Recent empirical research has begun to examine the intersection of inclusive pedagogy and English for Academic Purposes (EAP), revealing a number of persistent tensions. For instance, Liyanage and Bartlett (2010) explore how EAP instruction can unintentionally reinforce

Western academic norms, marginalising students from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds. Wingate and Tribble (2012) highlight the challenge of aligning inclusive language development with disciplinary expectations, particularly in contexts where EAP is delivered in isolation from subject teaching.

These inconsistencies are particularly salient in English for Academic Purposes (EAP), a field dedicated to supporting students' academic literacy development, particularly those from international or linguistically diverse backgrounds. While EAP is positioned as a crucial support structure within HE, research suggests that it often fails to account for the complexities of students' linguistic and cultural identities, reinforcing deficit narratives and privileging normative models of academic English (Hyland, 2006; Wingate, 2015; Benesch, 2001). Such approaches often overlook the socio-political dimensions of language use, and the diverse linguistic repertoires students bring to academic settings. While the broader TESOL field has long engaged with issues of structural inequity and power dynamics (e.g., Canagarajah, 1999; Holliday, 1994), English for Academic Purposes (EAP) has been slower to confront its own complicity in reproducing normative assumptions about language, identity, and academic legitimacy. There thus remains a significant gap in research that explores how inclusive teaching can be effectively enacted in EAP contexts (Mortenson, 2021; 2022).

More recently, studies such as those by Kormos and Nijakowska (2017) and Tai et al. (2022) have examined how inclusive teaching principles are (or are not) embedded into EAP practices, raising concerns about assessment fairness, linguistic bias, and the need for pedagogical frameworks that reflect the multilingual realities of student populations. Despite these contributions, there remains a lack of cohesive guidance on how inclusive EAP should be

defined, implemented, and supported at an institutional level - a gap this study seeks to address.

Conceptualisations and operationalisation of inclusivity in EAP must therefore extend beyond individualised support to include structural change. Scholars have argued for a re-examination of EAP curriculum design, assessment practices, and institutional language policies to address embedded inequalities (García & Li Wei, 2014; Holliday, 2020; Holliday & Amadasí, 2022). Inclusivity should be viewed not as a static endpoint but as a continuous, reflective process of transformation, requiring engagement with wider issues of linguistic imperialism, epistemic injustice, and power relations in knowledge production (Phillipson, 1992; Mizumura, 2015; Krischler et al., 2019; Ainscow, 2020). Recent critical and decolonial perspectives have further challenged the assumption that academic English is neutral or universal, highlighting how EAP often marginalises multilingual students by positioning their language practices as deficient (Canagarajah, 1999; Ortega, 2019; Li & Garcia, 2022). Accordingly, inclusive EAP pedagogy must critically interrogate its own foundations to foster a more just and equitable learning environment.

Positioning the Study: Scope, Aims & Overview

Considering the tensions and gaps identified in the literature, this BALEAP-funded research project, *“Exploring Inclusive Teaching Practices of English for Academic Purposes in Higher Education,”* seeks to provide a structured and evidence-based response (Bakogiannis & Papavasiliou, 2023). It aims to examine how inclusivity is currently understood, enacted, and experienced in EAP teaching contexts, and to develop a practical framework for more equitable pedagogical practice. The project recognises that inclusivity must be systematically integrated

111 at multiple levels - curriculum, pedagogy, and policy - if EAP is to fulfil its role in fostering
112 academic success for all students.

113 The study draws on a multi-method, multi-phase approach, incorporating insights from a range
114 of key stakeholders - including EAP practitioners, subject tutors, course, and program leads,
115 learning developers, academic skills advisors, and institutional coordinators - and is grounded
116 in the belief that inclusive EAP teaching must not only respond to student diversity, but actively
117 interrogate and transform the structures that perpetuate inequity (Bakogiannis, 2025a). By
118 bridging theoretical insights from social justice, critical pedagogy, and decolonial perspectives
119 with empirical data from HE contexts, the project contributes to a growing body of scholarship
120 that calls for systemic change in academic literacy education (Bakogiannis, 2024).

121 Ultimately, this paper - the final output of the project - aims to present a set of concrete,
122 actionable recommendations for inclusive EAP pedagogy. It seeks to support educators,
123 institutional leaders, and policymakers in developing teaching strategies and institutional
124 practices that are informed by research, grounded in equity, and responsive to the evolving
125 needs of a diverse student population. In doing so, the study aspires to advance the role of EAP
126 not merely as a support mechanism, but as a transformative space within HE that fosters
127 genuine educational inclusion and social justice.

128 **Methods**

129 **Structuring the Study: Design & Process**

130 This study employed a comprehensive, multi-phased qualitative research design, integrating
131 theoretical and empirical evidence to develop a robust framework for inclusive teaching

practices in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) within higher education (Bakogiannis & Papavasiliou, 2023; Bakogiannis, 2025a). The research process unfolded in two primary empirical phases (Phase I and Phase II), **complemented by a systematic review of existing literature (Phase III)**. This paper presents a summary of the methods employed across the three phases of the study, focusing on the key elements necessary to understand the overall **research design and progression**. Comprehensive accounts of the study design, sampling and recruitment strategies, data collection and preparation processes, analytical procedures, and ethical considerations for Phases I and II are provided in the published study protocol (Bakogiannis & Papavasiliou, 2023). Detailed information regarding the design, search strategy, inclusion and exclusion criteria, study selection, critical appraisal, data extraction, and synthesis for Phase III can be found in the systematic review protocol, registered with the International Database of Education Systematic Reviews (IDESR) (Bakogiannis & Papavasiliou, 2024). **A detailed summary of the multi-phased methodology is presented in Table 1, outlining key information for each phase, including study aims, design, settings, participant characteristics, sampling and recruitment methods, data collection tools and procedures, analysis techniques, and key findings in bullet-point form, to support transparency and clarity.** A concise summary of the methodology of each phase is provided below:

Phase I: Online Qualitative Survey

In the first phase, a self-administered online qualitative survey was designed and distributed to EAP practitioners working in higher education institutions. This survey sought to explore perspectives, attitudes, and experiences regarding inclusive teaching, capturing detailed insights into how inclusivity is conceptualised, the benefits and challenges associated with implementing inclusive pedagogy, and the practical strategies educators currently employ.

Given the study's emphasis on depth over breadth, the survey was structured with open-ended questions, allowing respondents to articulate their views in their own words. This qualitative approach facilitated the collection of rich, nuanced data, avoiding the constraints of pre-determined response categories. Participants were recruited via the BALEAP JISC mailing list, employing a convenience and snowball sampling strategy to ensure representation from a diverse range of EAP professionals. Data were exported to Microsoft Excel to provide a visual summary of the dataset, facilitating the identification of commonalities, differences, and emerging patterns. Thematic analysis was employed to analyse the data, beginning with deductive coding based on the structure of the survey questions to identify overarching themes (Braun & Clark, 2006). This was followed by iterative, inductive coding involving repeated readings of the dataset to refine the coding framework and uncover emergent themes, sub-themes, and contrasting viewpoints. To enhance trustworthiness and transparency, an audit trail was maintained throughout the analytic process, and the COREQ checklist (Tong et al., 2007) was used to guide comprehensive and explicit reporting.

Phase II: Co-production Focus Groups

Building on the insights generated from the survey, the second phase of the study involved co-production focus groups, which aimed to refine and expand upon the initial findings through collective discussion and knowledge exchange. The design integrated the nominal group technique, which captured a wide range of individual perspectives on inclusive pedagogy, with co-production focus groups, which harnessed the collective dynamic to validate, deepen, and extend these initial insights (Harvey et al., 2012; Varga-Atkins et al., 2015). This layered approach allowed the study to progress from individual reflection to collaborative discussion, fostering a nuanced and comprehensive understanding of inclusive practices. Building upon

themes identified through the initial survey, two online co-production focus groups were conducted via MS Teams. Each group comprised six to eight participants purposively selected from the original survey respondents to ensure broad and diverse stakeholder representation. This diversity was vital in reflecting the multifaceted nature of inclusive EAP instruction, encompassing pedagogical, administrative, and structural dimensions. The focus groups followed a semi-structured facilitation guide, which encouraged participants to validate and critique survey findings, share challenges, and best practices, and explore strategies for embedding inclusive pedagogy into EAP curricula across institutional levels. These sessions were video recorded with participants' consent and subsequently transcribed verbatim. An iterative, inductive thematic content analysis was then carried out on the transcripts, ensuring that the emerging perspectives were systematically categorised and synthesised in alignment with the study's participatory and exploratory ethos (Terry et al., 2017).

Phase III: Systematic Literature Review

To complement the empirical findings (Bakogiannis, 2025a), a systematic review of existing literature was undertaken to identify, document, and evaluate best practices and theoretical models that inform inclusive EAP instruction. This process followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Moher et al., 2009), ensuring methodological rigor and transparency. The review employed a comprehensive search strategy across multiple academic databases, including Education Research Complete, Education Research Information Centre (ERIC) and Web of Science, and grey literature sources, retrieved through the Social Science Research Network (SSRN) Electronic Library and the Data Archiving and Network Services (DANS) EASY. The review was designed to capture literature that provided insights into inclusive pedagogical strategies, theoretical frameworks, and

201 institutional policies relevant to EAP instruction. Studies were included based on specific
202 inclusion criteria, prioritising peer-reviewed empirical research, theoretical models, and policy
203 reports published in English after 1994, a benchmark year when inclusion in higher education
204 became a significant global agenda. The Gough Weight of Evidence framework was used to
205 critically appraise the studies included in the review (Gough, 2007), ensuring that the
206 recommendations drawn from the literature were based on methodologically sound and
207 contextually relevant evidence. By synthesising the findings through narrative synthesis (Popay
208 et al., 2006), the study was able to identify common themes, best practices, and gaps in existing
209 research. This allowed for a structured comparison between what was already known in the
210 literature and the novel insights generated from the empirical research phases.

211 Table 1: Overview of Study Phases

Phase	Aim	Research Question(s)	Study Design	Study Setting	Study Participants	Sampling	Recruitment	Data Collection Methods	Data Analysis	Key Findings
Phase I ¹	To explore barriers to and strategies for inclusive teaching practices in EAP within higher education contexts.	What are the barriers to inclusive teaching in EAP? What strategies / approaches can promote inclusive EAP practices?	Exploratory Qualitative Survey-based Study	Online International (primarily UK) ²	Twenty-three (n=23) EAP practitioners from a range of roles (e.g., subject tutors, programme leads, learning developers, skills advisors) across 15 institutions in 4 countries	Non-probability convenience sampling	Recruited via BALEAP JISC mail list	Online qualitative questionnaire with open-ended questions via Microsoft Forms Designed to take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete, depending on the depth of participants' responses Questions were designed to elicit in-depth insights into conceptualisations of inclusion, perceived barriers, implementation strategies, and practitioner roles and attributes ³	Thematic analysis was used to identify patterns and themes through iterative coding. Initial deductive coding, aligned with the survey questions, was followed by inductive refinement to capture emergent insights. An audit trail and the COREQ checklist were used to ensure rigour and transparency	Barriers: Lack of awareness / training, prescriptive delivery, limited diversity consideration, high course costs, time constraints. Approaches: Inclusive curriculum, equality & diversity, personalised learning, autonomy, differentiated instruction ⁵ , culturally responsive teaching, reflective practice.
Phase II ¹	To explore stakeholder-informed	What strategies, approaches,	Sequential Exploratory Qualitative	Online International	Twelve (n=12) EAP practitioners	Non-probability	Selected from Phase I	Two 90-minute online workshops	Thematic analysis using an inductive, data-	Micro: Needs analysis, differentiated

	approaches to inclusive EAP teaching.	or practices can be used to promote inclusive teaching in the classroom?	Study using Nominal Group Technique and Co-production Focus Groups ⁴	(primarily UK) ²	from diverse roles (e.g., subject tutors, programme leads, learning developers, skills advisors) and experiences	purposive sampling	survey participants	<p>conducted via MS Teams</p> <p>First, the Nominal Group Technique was employed to gather individual written responses to key questions, followed by participant-led prioritisation of ideas. Second, Focus Group Discussions were conducted to explore, validate, and elaborate on these responses through facilitated dialogue and collaborative co-production.</p> <p>A structured focus group guide was developed and used to ensure consistency across sessions,</p>	<p>driven approach. Transcripts were open-coded, and codes were iteratively grouped into themes through constant comparison.</p> <p>An audit trail and the COREQ checklist were used to ensure transparency and rigour.</p>	<p>briefs, challenging stereotypes, reflexivity</p> <p>Meso: Decolonising curriculum, embedding EAP into disciplines, collaboration with subject tutors, CPD investment</p> <p>Macro: Providing time/resources, top-down collaboration, EDI/social justice initiatives</p>
--	---------------------------------------	--	---	-----------------------------	--	--------------------	---------------------	--	---	--

								facilitate in-depth discussion, and align the dialogue with the study aims ³		
Phase III	To identify recommended approaches for fostering inclusivity in the EAP classroom and examine the theoretical frameworks that inform inclusive EAP teaching.	<p>What are the recommended approaches for promoting inclusivity in the EAP classroom within higher education?</p> <p>What theoretical frameworks inform inclusive practices of EAP in higher education settings?</p>	Systematic Review	International (literature from multiple international contexts)	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	<p>Searches across 5 academic databases (ERIC, Scopus, Web of Science, Education Research Complete, British Education Index)</p> <p>Grey literature included</p> <p>Search terms combined “EAP,” “inclusive teaching,” “higher education,” and “pedagogy”</p>	<p>Narrative synthesis incorporating thematic coding to identify patterns across diverse study designs. Relationships between themes were explored through iterative comparison.</p> <p>The Gough Weight of Evidence framework was applied to assess methodological quality, relevance, and contribution, ensuring rigour and transparency in</p>	<p>Inclusive approaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusive curriculum design • Culturally responsive / social justice pedagogy • Equitable assessment / language support • Intercultural communication and campus climate • Decolonial and multilingual practices <p>Frameworks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intercultural competence • Culturally responsive pedagogy • Critical pedagogy • Translingual /

									the synthesis process.	decolonial theory • Needs-based / contextualised learning
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	------------------------	--

212

213 ¹ Ethical approval for Phases I and II was obtained from the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Law Research Ethics Committee at Teesside University, UK

214 (Reference No: 7080, March 2022). Both phases adhered to the ethical principles of voluntary participation, informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality, in

215 accordance with institutional and disciplinary ethical guidelines. Participants were informed of the study’s aims, procedures, and their rights prior to participation, and

216 provided informed consent in line with institutional ethical standards

217 ² Participants were drawn from diverse institutional contexts, ensuring a range of perspectives reflective of contemporary EAP settings in the UK and beyond.

218 ³ The survey questionnaire and the focus group guide were developed based on a review of current literature on inclusive education and were informally piloted to

219 ensure clarity and alignment with the study’s aims.

220 ⁴ Unlike traditional focus group interviews, the co-production focus groups followed a participatory model, using collaborative dialogue to jointly construct and prioritise

221 inclusive teaching strategies.

222 ⁵ Differentiated instruction is a pedagogical approach that adapts teaching methods, materials, and assessments to meet the diverse needs, backgrounds, and learning

223 preferences of students, particularly those marginalised by linguistic, cultural, or cognitive differences. It promotes flexibility in curriculum design to ensure equitable

224 access and engagement, recognising diversity as a strength and responding through planned variation in content, process, and product (Tomlinson, 2014)."

225 **Constructing the Framework: Evidence Synthesis & Integration**

226 To synthesise and integrate findings across all phases of this multi-stage study, an adaptation
227 of the Best Fit Framework Synthesis (BFFS) method was employed (Carroll et al., 2013). This
228 approach was selected for its ability to - pragmatically and systematically - integrate existing
229 theoretical evidence with new qualitative evidence, thereby producing a coherent, context-
230 sensitive framework of actionable recommendations. Unlike purely inductive methods, BFFS
231 combines both deductive coding against a predefined (a priori) framework and inductive
232 thematic analysis to incorporate emerging insights, making it ideally suited to complex, policy-
233 relevant research questions such as those surrounding inclusive EAP instruction in HE.

234 The BFFS approach - harnessing the established strengths of both framework synthesis and
235 thematic synthesis (Barnett-Page & Thomas, 2009) - begins with identifying or developing a
236 framework grounded in existing theory or models relevant to the phenomenon under study
237 (Carroll et al., 2013). In this study, the approach was slightly adapted; instead of using existing
238 theory, the framework was initially structured around three overarching systemic levels - micro
239 (individual/practitioner level), meso (departmental/programme level), and macro

(institutional/structural level) - as these levels consistently emerged during Phase II focus group analysis as key loci for systemic change (Bakogiannis et al., 2024). These domains served as guiding pillars to anchor and organise the synthesis, within which both theoretical evidence from the systematic review and empirical evidence from the primary research was integrated.

The method has been effectively applied in a range of settings, particularly in public health and education, where timely, theory-informed evidence synthesis is needed to guide policy and practice (Carroll et al., 2013). Its strength lies in balancing the interpretive richness of qualitative data with the systematic transparency of framework synthesis, making it especially useful for generating conceptual models or frameworks that are both rigorous and applicable to real-world contexts.

The rationale for employing BFFS in this study rests on its capacity to manage the diverse and layered data generated across three phases - from individual qualitative survey responses to co-production focus groups, to a systematic qualitative evidence review. This integrative method allowed the research team to map recurrent and emerging themes from all phases of data collection, ensuring that both the confirmatory and novel insights were systematically accounted for in the resulting framework. The deductive aspect allowed alignment with established domains of systemic educational change, while the inductive component ensured responsiveness to stakeholder perspectives and contextual nuances identified in the empirical and theoretical evidence.

To construct the framework, the findings from each phase - survey (Phase I), co-production focus groups (Phase II), and the systematic review (Phase III) - were first analysed separately to identify key inclusive teaching practices. Each dataset was coded using a consistent thematic

structure that included both a priori categories and emergent codes, facilitating cross-phase comparability. The synthesis process began by mapping all data from Phases I–III against the three overarching themes (micro, meso, and macro), which were informed by both the project’s theoretical framing and the nature of the data itself. Insights from each phase were then cross-referenced within these levels to identify convergences (i.e., practices that appeared across two or more phases) and divergences (i.e., unique practices or tensions identified in only one phase).

Within each of these domains, sub-themes were generated to reflect both recurrent patterns across phases and newly identified insights that had not been captured in earlier analyses. For instance, at the micro level, themes included practitioner reflexivity, differentiated instructional design, and inclusive feedback practices. By layering findings in this way, the framework captures both depth and breadth, providing a nuanced picture of inclusive EAP practice that reflects stakeholder perspectives, practitioner insight, and established literature.

In this way, the BFFS method enabled a layered and integrative approach to evidence synthesis, ensuring that all data were accounted for, no relevant finding was excluded, and the final framework provided a holistic, multi-level set of recommendations for embedding inclusive pedagogy within EAP instruction. This structured but flexible approach also ensured analytical transparency, as each stage of the synthesis - from initial framework construction, through iterative coding, to final model development - was systematically documented and open to external scrutiny. Ultimately, the application of Best Fit Framework Synthesis in this study not only ensured a rigorous integration of evidence but also supported the development of a practical, evidence-informed framework for systemic change, relevant to educators, programme leaders, and institutional policymakers.

285 **Safeguarding the Study: Ethical Approval & Oversight**

286 Ethical considerations were carefully addressed throughout the study. Ethical approval was
287 obtained from the School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Law Research Ethics Committee
288 at Teesside University, UK. All participants provided informed consent before engaging in the
289 study, and confidentiality was maintained through secure data storage and anonymisation
290 procedures. Participants had the right to withdraw at any stage, and every effort was made to
291 ensure that the study upheld the highest ethical standards in qualitative research.

292 **Results**

293 The findings of this study present a structured and multi-dimensional approach to fostering
294 inclusive teaching practices of EAP in HE. The recommendations operate across three levels:
295 micro, which focuses on individual instructional strategies; meso, which encompasses
296 departmental and faculty-wide initiatives; and macro, which deals with institutional policies
297 and systemic support. This section provides a detailed exploration of these findings,
298 synthesising the proposed strategies and illustrating their implementation with explicit
299 examples.

300 **Reporting the Study: Micro-Level Strategies & Implementation**

301 At the micro level, as illustrated in Table 2, inclusive teaching begins with differentiated
302 instruction, which ensures that teaching methods and materials are tailored to students'
303 diverse linguistic, cognitive, and cultural needs. This is achieved through the use of scaffolding
304 techniques that allow students to build their understanding progressively, as well as through
305 adaptive technologies such as text-to-speech tools that support students with reading

306 difficulties. Educators who employ differentiated instruction might design tasks with varying
307 difficulty levels, allowing students to engage at a pace and depth that suits their capabilities.
308 For example, in an EAP writing class, an instructor might provide multiple options for
309 completing an assignment - one involving structured sentence frames for those who need
310 additional linguistic support, and another offering more open-ended prompts for advanced
311 learners.

312 Personalised learning and needs analysis further enhance inclusive instruction by centering the
313 learning experience around individual students. A key component of this approach involves
314 conducting diagnostic assessments at the beginning of a course to identify each student's
315 linguistic proficiency, cultural background, and academic aspirations. These assessments are
316 followed by one-on-one meetings where instructors work with students to develop
317 individualised learning plans. By incorporating student feedback loops, these plans can evolve
318 throughout the course, ensuring that students receive the necessary support as their language
319 skills develop. For instance, a student struggling with academic writing conventions may
320 receive additional one-on-one tutoring and customised exercises, while another student
321 requiring support in listening comprehension may be given access to targeted audio resources.

322 Table 2: Micro-Level Strategies & Implementation

Level ¹	Approaches ²	Description/Strategies ³	Actionable Steps ⁴
Micro/Individual	Differentiated Instruction	Tailor methods and materials to students' diverse needs. Use scaffolding, adaptive technologies, and multimodal resources to ensure all students can engage meaningfully.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design tasks with varying difficulty levels. • Use multimedia resources (audio, visual, textual). • Scaffold tasks for step-by-step engagement. • Pair advanced learners with beginners. • Incorporate adaptive technologies (e.g., text-to-speech tools). • Provide optional pathways for assignments. • Monitor and adjust methods based on student feedback.
	Personalised Learning & Needs Analysis	Conduct comprehensive diagnostics to identify linguistic, cultural, and academic needs. Develop individualised support plans and adaptive tasks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement initial diagnostic tests and interviews. • Conduct one-on-one meetings to identify goals. • Create tailored support plans based on diagnostics. • Incorporate individual feedback loops. • Regularly update plans to reflect progress. • Offer flexible deadlines for assignments. • Include peer mentoring tailored to student needs.
	Culturally Responsive Teaching	Incorporate cultural and linguistic diversity into content. Use examples relevant to students' backgrounds, fostering identity validation and inclusion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use culturally relevant texts and examples. • Incorporate case studies from diverse cultural contexts. • Celebrate cultural events or traditions in discussions. • Engage students in sharing their cultural experiences. • Adapt assignments to allow multiple cultural perspectives. • Use inclusive language in teaching materials. • Address cultural stereotypes directly through discussions.
	Reflective Practice	Encourage continuous self-reflection among educators to challenge biases. Collect student feedback and adapt teaching based on inclusivity metrics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain a teaching journal to reflect on inclusivity. • Use student feedback surveys regularly. • Attend workshops on reflective and inclusive teaching. • Engage in peer observations and discussions. • Analyse classroom participation patterns for inclusivity. • Adjust lesson plans to address identified gaps. • Discuss inclusivity goals with colleagues for accountability.

	Supportive Classroom Environment	Build safe, inclusive spaces that foster open dialogue, respect, and belonging. Use trauma-informed practices and flexible participation structures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish and communicate clear classroom norms for respect. • Use structured, low-stakes interaction early in the course (e.g., collaborative tasks, reflective sharing, or purpose-driven dialogue) to foster trust • Encourage anonymous feedback to identify barriers. • Provide varied participation options (e.g., written, verbal). • Avoid high-stakes public critiques. • Incorporate well-being check-ins at intervals. • Use inclusive seating arrangements and collaborative spaces.
	Equitable Assessment	Design fair assessments that account for multilingual and cultural backgrounds. Use open-ended tasks, portfolios, and iterative feedback processes to reduce bias.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use multiple assessment formats (e.g., written, oral, digital). • Include opportunities for self-assessment. • Develop rubrics that value process over perfection. • Provide drafts and allow resubmissions. • Use group projects to promote collaborative learning. • Train graders on inclusive evaluation practices. • Collect student input on assessment fairness.
	Task-Based and Discipline-Specific Learning	Develop tasks and content specific to students' academic disciplines, ensuring practical application and alignment with professional goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborate with subject tutors to align EAP tasks with disciplinary needs. • Use real-world problems from students' fields for tasks. • Integrate case studies from target disciplines. • Develop glossaries of discipline-specific terms. • Design presentations simulating professional scenarios. • Assign reflective writing tasks linked to disciplines. • Provide feedback focused on both language and content relevance.

323

324 ¹**Level:** Refers to the scale/systemic level at which the intervention is applied.

325 ²**Approaches:** Identifies the main (recommended) approach being implemented to promote inclusivity.

326 ³**Description/Strategies:** Offers a brief overview of the approach and explains how it contributes to inclusivity, including common strategies that align with the approach.

327 ⁴**Actionable Steps:** Details specific, practical actions that can be taken to implement the approach effectively in day-to-day practice.

328 Culturally responsive teaching is another fundamental micro-level strategy that enhances
329 inclusivity by integrating students' cultural backgrounds into the curriculum. This method
330 acknowledges and validates diverse identities, using course materials and examples that reflect
331 the lived experiences of students from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds. In practice,
332 this could mean selecting readings and case studies from multiple global perspectives, allowing
333 students to engage with familiar cultural contexts while also being exposed to new ones. For
334 instance, an EAP instructor teaching argumentation skills might incorporate debate topics
335 related to international education policies, enabling students to contribute insights from their
336 own countries while learning to articulate arguments in academic English.

337 In addition to instructional approaches, reflective practice among educators is essential for
338 fostering inclusive teaching. Continuous self-reflection helps instructors identify biases and
339 areas for improvement. By maintaining a teaching journal, conducting regular student
340 feedback surveys, and participating in peer observations, educators can systematically assess
341 whether their teaching methods are truly inclusive. For example, an instructor who notices
342 that certain student groups are less engaged in class discussions might adjust their
343 participation structures, offering written response options in addition to verbal contributions
344 to accommodate varying levels of confidence in spoken English.

345 Creating a supportive classroom environment is equally critical. This involves fostering a sense
346 of belonging, trust, and respect through trauma-informed practices and flexible participation
347 structures. Educators can build such an environment by setting clear norms for respectful
348 communication, using **structured low-stakes interaction early in the course (e.g., collaborative**
349 **tasks, reflective sharing, or purpose-driven dialogue)** to foster trust, rather than relying on
350 **conventional 'icebreakers' which may not align with students' academic expectations or**

351 **cultural norms; they can also implement** well-being check-ins to monitor students' emotional
352 and mental health. In an EAP seminar, for instance, a teacher might allow students to
353 participate in discussions in different ways - some contributing verbally, others through written
354 reflections - so that those who experience anxiety in public speaking settings are not
355 disadvantaged.

356 **Equitable assessment is a cornerstone of inclusive EAP instruction. Traditional assessment**
357 **models, which often emphasise native-like accuracy and familiarity with Western academic**
358 **conventions, may inadvertently advantage learners with prior exposure to these norms,**
359 **thereby creating barriers for others,** potentially disadvantaging multilingual learners. By
360 designing assessments that include multiple formats -such as written, oral, and digital
361 submissions - educators can better accommodate diverse learning preferences. Additionally,
362 allowing students to submit drafts for formative feedback before final grading ensures that
363 assessment is a tool for learning rather than merely a measurement of ability. **This aligns with**
364 **long-standing EAP practices, such as process-based writing instruction, where students receive**
365 **formative feedback on early drafts and are given opportunities to revise before final**
366 **assessment - an approach that supports inclusion by valuing growth and learner development.**

367 **Reporting the Study: Meso-Level Strategies & Implementation**

368 At the meso level, which pertains to departmental and faculty-wide initiatives, several
369 strategies ensure that inclusivity is institutionalised within academic programs, as illustrated in
370 Table 3. One of the most significant initiatives is decolonising the curriculum, which involves
371 expanding reading lists to include non-Western perspectives and challenging dominant
372 Eurocentric narratives. Academic departments can conduct curriculum audits to ensure
373 representation and equity, involving faculty from diverse backgrounds and student

374 representatives in the process. For instance, an EAP program might introduce texts by African,
375 Asian, and Indigenous scholars, providing a broader and more representative academic
376 foundation for students.

377 EAP-discipline integration is another crucial strategy at the meso level, emphasising the need
378 for language learning to be embedded within students' academic fields. **Collaboration between**
379 **EAP instructors and subject-area specialists has long been a feature of effective EAP provision,**
380 **supporting discipline-specific language development and enabling students to engage with the**
381 **terminology, genres, and communicative conventions of their academic fields. Inclusive EAP**
382 **practices can build on this foundation by more deliberately co-designing syllabi and**
383 **interdisciplinary workshops that align language instruction with diverse disciplinary**
384 **expectations and learner needs.**

385 Interdepartmental collaboration is further strengthened through initiatives that encourage
386 interdisciplinary teaching and professional development. Faculty training workshops on
387 inclusive pedagogy and cross-disciplinary teaching strategies can help educators refine their
388 approaches and share best practices. Establishing mentorship pairs between EAP tutors and
389 subject-area instructors fosters collaboration, while online resource portals ensure that faculty
390 have access to inclusive teaching materials.

391 Ongoing staff training is enhanced through structured initiatives focused on inclusive practices,
392 DEI principles, and culturally responsive pedagogy. Annual workshops provide dedicated space
393 for developing trauma-informed and translingual teaching strategies, while certification
394 opportunities and professional development incentives encourage sustained engagement.
395 Peer-led sessions and case-based training scenarios offer practical, context-specific learning,

396 helping staff apply theory to classroom realities. Follow-up evaluations are used to assess the
397 impact and effectiveness of these training efforts over time.

398 Finally, support for bilingual and multilingual pedagogy is promoted through the integration of
399 students' home languages into both learning and assessment. Translanguaging practices, such
400 as encouraging code-switching and allowing multilingual submissions where appropriate, help
401 reduce language barriers and build academic confidence. Bilingual glossaries, subtitled
402 materials, and the inclusion of multilingual peer mentors further facilitate access and
403 engagement. Training tutors in these approaches and embedding linguistic diversity into
404 classroom tasks creates a more inclusive and affirming learning environment.

405 **Reporting the Study: Macro-Level Strategies & Implementation**

406 At the macro level, institutional policies and systemic support mechanisms play a vital role in
407 sustaining inclusive EAP practices, as illustrated in Table 4. Allocating financial and
408 administrative resources ensures that departments and faculty have the means to develop
409 inclusive curricula and support students effectively. Universities can dedicate budgets to DEI
410 initiatives, provide grants for faculty engagement in inclusive teaching projects, and invest in
411 software and tools that enhance accessibility for students with diverse needs.

412 Top-down collaboration ensures that inclusivity is not treated as an optional effort but is
413 embedded into the institutional fabric. Universities can establish diversity and inclusion
414 committees, publish public progress reports, and implement leadership training programs to
415 ensure that inclusion is a priority at all levels of decision-making.

416 Table 3: Meso-Level Strategies & Implementation

Level	Approaches	Description/Strategies	Actionable Steps
Meso/Departmental	Decolonising the Curriculum	Include non-Western authors and perspectives in reading lists. Partner with stakeholders to redesign materials, ensuring representation and equity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and update reading lists for diversity. • Partner with faculty from diverse backgrounds. • Conduct curriculum audits with DEI focus groups. • Include student representatives in material review processes. • Offer workshops on decolonising pedagogy. • Integrate Non-Western media (videos, articles). • Create modules exploring global perspectives.
	EAP-Discipline Integration	Collaborate with subject-area specialists to embed EAP skills in disciplinary contexts, ensuring that language learning supports academic success.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Host joint planning sessions with subject-area tutors. • Co-design syllabi with EAP and discipline-specific components. • Develop cross-disciplinary workshops for students. • Create shared resource banks for tutors. • Organise peer teaching sessions between EAP and discipline tutors. • Incorporate interdisciplinary projects into EAP classes. • Monitor alignment through regular cross-departmental evaluations.
	Collaborative Teaching Initiatives	Promote regular inter-departmental workshops between EAP and disciplinary tutors to co-create inclusive teaching strategies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish mentorship pairs between EAP and subject tutors. • Facilitate biannual inclusion workshops. • Share best practices through departmental meetings. • Develop case studies showcasing successful collaborations. • Create an online portal for sharing resources. • Host reflection sessions to evaluate progress. • Encourage interdisciplinary teaching exchanges.
	Staff Training & Professional Development	Provide continuous training on inclusive practices, DEI principles, and culturally responsive pedagogy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organise annual DEI training workshops. • Incorporate trauma-informed modules in staff training. • Offer certifications in inclusive pedagogy. • Provide incentives for professional development.

		Include modules on trauma-informed teaching and translingual strategies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Host peer-led training sessions. • Use case studies for practical training scenarios. • Evaluate training effectiveness through follow-ups.
	Bilingual and Multilingual Pedagogy	<p>Support the use of students' native languages in learning and assessments.</p> <p>Employ translanguaging approaches to bridge language barriers and support academic confidence.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage code-switching in classroom discussions. • Allow multilingual submissions where feasible. • Provide bilingual glossaries. • Include multilingual peer mentors. • Use subtitled videos and bilingual resources. • Train tutors in translanguaging practices. • Celebrate linguistic diversity in classroom tasks.

418 Supporting multilingualism is another critical institutional responsibility. Many students
419 entering EAP programs speak multiple languages, yet academic policies often reinforce
420 monolingual norms. Institutions can support inclusive EAP practices by funding research on
421 translanguaging pedagogy, particularly in relation to classroom strategies that recognise and
422 build on students' full linguistic repertoires. While formal submissions in EAP contexts typically
423 require English, translanguaging can be meaningfully incorporated into formative activities
424 such as brainstorming, peer discussion, and drafting, thereby supporting deeper engagement
425 and learning.

426 Intercultural communication initiatives further enhance inclusivity by fostering meaningful
427 cross-cultural engagement. Universities can host intercultural events, create shared social
428 spaces for students from diverse backgrounds, and integrate intercultural communication
429 training into coursework. For instance, a university might establish a student-led mentorship
430 program where domestic and international students collaborate on academic and cultural
431 exchange projects.

432 Financial barriers also play a significant role in access to EAP programs, particularly for students
433 from low-income backgrounds. While many institutions already offer need-based scholarships,
434 flexible payment plans, and emergency financial aid to support students from such
435 backgrounds, continued efforts are needed to ensure these provisions are consistently
436 available and accessible to EAP students, who may face unique financial vulnerabilities during
437 pre-sessional or bridging programmes.

438 Finally, incorporating social justice pedagogy into EAP instruction builds on the foundational
439 work of scholars such as Benesch (2001), who argued that EAP should engage explicitly with

issues of equity, power, and representation. This approach ensures that students are not only developing academic English proficiency but also critically engaging with the socio-political dimensions of language and education. By integrating themes such as linguistic discrimination, educational inequities, and global social justice movements into coursework, educators help students develop both linguistic competence and critical awareness.

These findings highlight that inclusive EAP instruction requires a multi-tiered approach, in which micro-level teaching strategies, meso-level faculty initiatives, and macro-level institutional policies are aligned to create a genuinely equitable learning environment. For example, an educator who adopts a culturally responsive teaching approach at the classroom level will be more effective if their department supports professional development in inclusive pedagogy, and if the institution provides resources for multilingual learning. By integrating these strategies holistically, higher education institutions can move toward a model of EAP instruction that truly prioritises equity, diversity, and inclusion, ensuring that all students - regardless of their linguistic or cultural background - have opportunities to succeed.

Discussion

Summarising the Study: Core Findings & Insights

The findings underscore the need for a multi-level, systemic approach to inclusive EAP instruction, with interrelated strategies operating at the micro (classroom), meso (departmental), and macro (institutional) levels.

459 Table 4: Macro-Level Strategies & Implementation

Level	Approaches	Description/Strategies	Actionable Steps
Macro/Institutional	Allocating Time and Resources	Provide dedicated budgets and institutional support for developing inclusive teaching materials and staff training programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set aside annual budgets for DEI in education. • Offer grants for EAP-related inclusion projects. • Allocate paid time for curriculum development. • Provide access to inclusive teaching tools and software. • Establish a central fund for student accessibility services. • Conduct annual budget reviews for DEI effectiveness. • Include DEI goals in institutional strategic plans.
	Top-Down Collaboration	Embed inclusivity in institutional policies. Encourage collaboration between leadership, staff, and external stakeholders to promote systemic equity initiatives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publish inclusion goals in institutional mission statements. • Facilitate town halls on inclusion policies. • Create DEI committees at all levels. • Mandate leadership training on inclusion. • Partner with external DEI organisations. • Develop public progress reports. • Set measurable inclusion benchmarks.
	Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Initiatives	Develop institutional frameworks for EDI. Encourage diverse hiring practices and regular reviews of curricular inclusivity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mandate DEI audits of academic programs. • Recruit faculty from underrepresented backgrounds. • Host annual EDI conferences. • Publish diversity statistics and goals. • Incentivise faculty for inclusive practices. • Create DEI ambassador roles. • Partner with underrepresented student groups.
	Decolonial and Multilingual Practices	Foster a culture of linguistic justice by challenging monolingual norms. Introduce policies supporting translingual academic writing and multilingual resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish institutional language policies for multilingual use. • Fund research into translingual practices. • Publish translingual teaching guides. • Host workshops on decolonial language use. • Support publications in multiple languages. • Provide access to multilingual academic journals. • Integrate multilingual modules in teacher training.

	Intercultural Communication & Shared Campus Spaces	Create initiatives that encourage cross-cultural engagement among students, such as intercultural events and shared academic-social spaces.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organise cultural exchange events on campus. • Develop intercultural training for staff. • Fund student-led intercultural initiatives. • Include intercultural communication modules in coursework. • Set up inclusive student hubs. • Monitor intercultural engagement outcomes. • Include alumni in intercultural mentoring programs.
	Reducing Financial Barriers	Offer scholarships, subsidies, and alternative funding models to ensure equitable access to EAP programs for low-income students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop need-based scholarships for EAP students. • Partner with governments for subsidised fees. • Offer flexible payment plans for courses. • Provide emergency financial aid for EAP students. • Waive fees for high-performing low-income students. • Introduce work-study options for EAP programs. • Review fee structures regularly for accessibility.
	Social Justice Pedagogy	Incorporate critical awareness and social justice themes in curriculum design to promote equity and foster broader societal engagement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include social justice topics in EAP coursework. • Develop case studies highlighting equity challenges. • Partner with NGOs for applied projects. • Host seminars on global social justice. • Assign research projects addressing inequities. • Use multimedia on societal issues in EAP lessons. • Publish student work on social justice topics.

At the micro level, inclusive teaching is supported by differentiated instruction, personalised learning, and culturally responsive pedagogy. These approaches validate students' linguistic and cultural identities, and are further strengthened by reflective teaching, supportive classroom climates, and equitable assessment practices. The meso level highlights the importance of structural support within academic departments. Key strategies include integrating EAP with disciplinary content, decolonising the curriculum, and promoting collaborative teaching between EAP and subject faculty. Professional development is central to enabling staff to adopt inclusive, responsive practices across curricula. At the macro level, the findings point to the necessity of institutional commitment. Sustainable change depends on inclusive policies, strategic funding, and structural alignment with diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) goals. This includes supporting multilingualism, removing financial barriers, and embedding inclusive EAP within broader university governance.

Taken together, the findings advocate for a coordinated and embedded model of inclusive EAP that spans individual teaching practices, departmental structures, and institutional policies - ensuring alignment with the wider principles of social justice in higher education.

Interpreting the Study: Comparison with Existing Literature

The study's findings align strongly with and meaningfully extend existing literature on inclusive education, particularly in how inclusivity should be addressed across micro, meso, and macro levels. By embedding differentiated, culturally responsive, and reflective teaching practices at the micro level, the study echoes the pedagogical emphasis seen in Kumar and Wideman (2014), who advocate for instructional customisation and student-centred approaches to account for learner heterogeneity. This reflects a broader pedagogical shift in higher

education, from uniform delivery models towards more fluid and dynamic approaches that account for students' lived realities and prior knowledge. This emphasis on proactive curriculum design represents a significant shift from deficit models to a more empowering, participatory pedagogy - an approach also supported by Hughes et al. (2015) and aligned with Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles (Garcia-Campos et al., 2018; Gheysens et al., 2022). **UDL is a research-based educational framework that promotes flexible learning environments and curricula to accommodate individual learning differences. It emphasises the provision of multiple means of representation, engagement, and expression to support access and participation for all learners.** Importantly, these models reposition the learner not as a passive recipient of knowledge but as an active co-creator, thus challenging traditional hierarchical teacher-student relationships in academic settings.

Furthermore, the call for multimodal and adaptive learning technologies in the study resonates with the work of Mihovska et al. (2021) and Westwood (2018), who underscore the importance of adaptive tools in supporting diverse learning styles. Multimodal approaches - engaging visual, auditory, and kinaesthetic modalities - are particularly effective for neurodiverse and multilingual learners, promoting cognitive flexibility and enhancing the ability to process complex academic content (Mayer, 2009). Grounded in principles from educational psychology, such technology-enhanced practices allow for content to be tailored and delivered in ways that meet students at their individual levels of readiness, thereby improving engagement, motivation, and attainment (Rose & Meyer, 2002; CAST, 2018). These findings not only confirm the educational psychology perspective on diverse learner needs but also suggest that inclusive EAP practice can serve as a testing ground for personalised and equitable

505 instructional models. In this sense, EAP classrooms may act as microcosms of wider
506 institutional equity goals, offering valuable insights into scalable inclusion practices.

507 The emphasis on equitable assessment methods and the creation of safe, supportive
508 classrooms also aligns with critical work on inclusive evaluation (Shohamy, 2017; Tai et al.,
509 2022). As Scott et al. (2013) and Bain (2023) argue, assessments rooted in monolingual and
510 standardised norms often exclude multilingual students and reinforce deficit narratives. This
511 critique is particularly salient in EAP, where language proficiency is often conflated with
512 intellectual capacity, inadvertently perpetuating inequality. The study's findings - particularly
513 the advocacy for learner-centered, formative assessments - support calls for transformation
514 toward frameworks that validate multilingual identities and knowledge repertoires (Ortega,
515 2019; Lillis & Turner, 2001). By reimagining assessment as a dialogic and developmental
516 process rather than a summative judgement, EAP instructors can shift the emphasis from
517 language as a gatekeeping mechanism to language as a means of access and empowerment.

518 At the meso (departmental) level, the study builds upon existing research by highlighting the
519 structural role academic departments must play in normalising inclusive practices. Notably, the
520 recommendation to integrate EAP instruction within disciplinary teaching resonates with
521 Maldoni and Lear (2016) and Tan and Scott (2021), who advocate for embedding academic
522 literacy into disciplinary learning contexts. This cross-pollination between language and
523 subject-area teaching not only enhances relevance but also supports epistemological
524 inclusivity, allowing students to see how language operates differently across academic fields.
525 Such integration helps dismantle the binary between language and content, a divide that often
526 marginalises EAP within the academy. Additionally, the study's emphasis on decolonising the
527 curriculum draws on the work of Walton (2018) and Meda (2019), who argue for the

528 incorporation of marginalised knowledge systems and multilingual resources to counter
529 Eurocentric dominance. Decolonising efforts in EAP not only broaden the representational
530 landscape of course content but also invite critical engagement with whose knowledge counts
531 in academic spaces, challenging students, and educators alike to question inherited power
532 dynamics.

533 These recommendations extend beyond surface-level curriculum changes to promote
534 epistemological transformation. As the literature suggests, interdisciplinary collaboration and
535 professional development are foundational to this transformation (Li, 2021; Alhassan et al.,
536 2021). However, such collaboration must go beyond tokenistic partnerships and foster
537 sustained dialogue between EAP professionals and subject-matter experts to co-construct
538 pedagogically sound and inclusive curricula. By equipping educators with cultural
539 competencies and inclusive pedagogical strategies (Holmqvist & Lelinge, 2021; Ng'andu, 2023),
540 faculties can ensure that inclusivity is more than an individual commitment - it becomes a
541 shared departmental ethos. This also addresses the issue of uneven inclusivity practices across
542 departments, which can undermine institutional goals and lead to inconsistent student
543 experiences.

544 At the macro-institutional level, the study's findings strongly reinforce the urgent need for
545 structural and policy-level commitments to inclusivity and linguistic justice. Literature has long
546 called for institutional buy-in and policy alignment (May & Bridger, 2010; Salmi & D'Addio,
547 2020), and the study underlines this by advocating for strategic funding, policy integration, and
548 resource allocation. These systemic supports are crucial, as reliance on individual champions
549 of inclusion often leads to burnout and unsustainable efforts. Moreover, the emphasis on
550 removing financial barriers and supporting DEI initiatives aligns with the growing recognition

in higher education of the links between social justice, inclusion, and academic success (Howard et al., 2022; Ramlackhan & Catania, 2022). Without such top-down policy alignment (Bakogiannis, 2025b), inclusive practices risk remaining peripheral and vulnerable to institutional neglect, especially in resource-strapped environments.

Crucially, the study contributes to the under-researched area of EAP inclusivity - a gap that Mortenson (2021; 2022) has identified as problematic, given the increasingly diverse linguistic profiles of higher education cohorts. While broader HE literature is rich with inclusivity discourse (Stentiford et al., 2021; Collins et al., 2018), specific and sustained attention to inclusive EAP remains scarce. The study addresses this gap directly, proposing a model that not only adapts but innovatively applies inclusive principles in EAP contexts. This represents a critical intervention in the field, as EAP has traditionally been framed as a neutral, skills-based discipline, thereby sidestepping important questions of equity, power, and representation. By situating inclusive EAP within wider discourses of decoloniality and translingualism (Canagarajah, 2013; Li & Garcia, 2022), the study highlights how language education can serve as a site of resistance against colonial and monolingual ideologies. Such positioning reframes EAP not as a gatekeeping function, but as a transformative space where linguistic diversity is leveraged as a pedagogical asset and a political stance.

In sum, this study does not merely affirm current understandings of inclusivity in higher education; it meaningfully extends them by providing a comprehensive, multi-tiered framework for EAP. It supports the transformation of EAP from a marginalised, remedial support area into a dynamic site for equity-driven pedagogy. By addressing individual learner needs, departmental practices, and institutional policy simultaneously, the study constructs a compelling argument that inclusive EAP is both necessary and achievable. The challenge now

lies in translating this vision into practice through sustained institutional will, educator capacity-building, and critical reflection on entrenched norms. Most importantly, it reframes EAP as an active agent in higher education's broader project of social justice, equity, and decolonisation. As such, the study marks an important step in redefining not just how EAP is taught, but why it matters in the contemporary educational landscape.

Translating the Study: Implications for Practice & Policy

The findings of this study underscore the urgent need for a systemic transformation in EAP education, requiring coordinated efforts at the individual, departmental, and institutional levels. At the micro level, educators must adopt differentiated instruction, culturally responsive teaching, and equitable assessment strategies to support the diverse needs of multilingual students. This necessitates professional development in inclusive teaching methods, particularly in areas such as translanguaging pedagogy, trauma-informed practices, and scaffolded learning approaches. Institutions should invest in teacher training programs that equip EAP instructors with the tools to create inclusive learning environments, ensuring that pedagogy is not only accessible but also responsive to students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

At the meso level, academic departments must play a pivotal role in institutionalising inclusivity within EAP programs. The integration of EAP instruction with subject-area disciplines should become a standard practice rather than an ad hoc initiative, ensuring that students acquire the discipline-specific academic language skills necessary for success in their respective fields. To achieve this, universities should foster interdisciplinary collaboration by establishing joint curriculum development initiatives, interdisciplinary teaching partnerships, and faculty-wide

596 discussions on inclusive education. Additionally, the decolonisation of EAP curricula should be
597 a formalised institutional priority, with curriculum audits, diverse reading lists, and the
598 inclusion of non-Western academic perspectives becoming integral to program design.

599 At the macro level, institutions must implement comprehensive policies and resource
600 allocation strategies that sustain inclusive EAP instruction. This includes establishing Diversity,
601 Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) committees, setting institutional benchmarks for inclusivity, and
602 embedding equity-focused goals in university mission statements. Funding allocation is a
603 crucial factor in ensuring the long-term viability of inclusive initiatives. Institutions should
604 earmark dedicated budgets for EAP-related DEI projects, support research into multilingual
605 pedagogies, and provide financial assistance for students who face barriers to accessing
606 language support. Furthermore, policies that support multilingual academic writing,
607 multilingual assessment options, and translingual communication in the classroom should be
608 formally integrated into institutional guidelines.

609 Beyond the university setting, policymakers and accrediting bodies must also play a role in
610 fostering inclusive EAP instruction. National and international educational organisations should
611 establish guidelines and quality assurance measures that require universities to implement
612 inclusive teaching practices in their language programs. This could be achieved through the
613 accreditation of EAP programs based on inclusivity metrics, the provision of government-
614 funded initiatives for multilingual education, and policy frameworks that mandate equitable
615 access to language learning resources. By embedding inclusive EAP instruction into broader
616 national and institutional educational policies, the higher education sector can move toward a
617 sustainable and equity-driven approach to academic language learning.

618 **Extending the Study: Recommendations for further research**

619 While this study provides a comprehensive framework for inclusive EAP instruction, several
620 areas require further research to deepen our understanding of effective implementation
621 strategies and long-term impacts. One critical area for future investigation is the effectiveness
622 of translanguaging approaches in EAP contexts, particularly in higher education settings where
623 academic discourse is traditionally monolingual. Research should explore how students
624 navigate multiple languages in academic writing, how educators can assess multilingual
625 compositions fairly, and how translanguaging can be formally incorporated into EAP curricula
626 without reinforcing linguistic hierarchies. Longitudinal studies are particularly needed to
627 examine the impact of multilingual pedagogies on student academic performance and
628 engagement over time.

629 Additionally, further research should examine the institutional and policy-level challenges
630 associated with embedding inclusive EAP instruction into university structures. While this study
631 highlights funding allocation, faculty training, and DEI initiatives as critical factors, more
632 empirical research is required to understand the specific barriers that institutions face in
633 implementing these policies at scale. Comparative studies across different higher education
634 contexts, including Global North and Global South institutions, could provide valuable insights
635 into how inclusive EAP practices can be adapted to different linguistic, cultural, and socio-
636 political settings. Investigating how universities can collaborate with policymakers to
637 standardise inclusive teaching practices in EAP would also be a valuable avenue for future
638 research, ensuring that systemic change extends beyond individual institutions and influences
639 the broader landscape of academic language education.

640 Conclusion

641 This study developed a context-sensitive, evidence-informed framework for inclusive EAP in
642 HE through a rigorous, multi-method design. **By integrating qualitative surveys, co-production**
643 **focus groups, and a systematic literature review using Best Fit Framework Synthesis, the**
644 **research generated findings intend to inform both theory and practice.** The framework offers
645 a clear, adaptable roadmap for advancing equity, diversity, and inclusion in EAP, bridging the
646 gap between inclusive teaching principles and classroom realities. It contributes not only to
647 the improvement of instructional practices but also to the broader discourse on inclusive
648 pedagogy in higher education.

649 The findings emphasise that meaningful inclusivity in EAP requires a coordinated, multi-level
650 approach - micro (individual), meso (departmental), and macro (institutional). While strategies
651 like differentiated instruction and equitable assessment can improve student outcomes at the
652 classroom level, long-term impact depends on supportive departmental cultures, cross-
653 disciplinary collaboration, and institutional policies that prioritise accessibility, linguistic
654 diversity, and social justice. Although challenges remain - such as inconsistent institutional
655 support and limited faculty engagement - this study addresses those gaps by offering a flexible,
656 scalable model for inclusive practice. Moving forward, institutions must centre equity and
657 linguistic justice in their academic language policies, ensuring EAP instruction evolves in
658 alignment with the wider goals of inclusive, globally responsive higher education.

659 References

660 Ainscow, M. (2020). Inclusion and equity in education: Making sense of global challenges.
661 *Prospects*, 49(1–2), 123–134. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09485-4>

662 Alhassan, A., Bora, S. F., & Abdalla, Y. A. (2021). Collaboration with EAP teachers in English-
663 medium instruction contexts in higher education: Content lecturer perspectives. *TESOL*
664 *Journal*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.610>

665 Bakogiannis, A. (2024). Exploring inclusive teaching practices of English for Academic
666 Purposes (EAP) in higher education (HE): A call for systemic change. *Journal of Learning*
667 *Development in Higher Education*, (31). <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi31.1282>

668 Bakogiannis, A. (2025a). Exploring inclusive teaching practices of English for Academic
669 Purposes (EAP) in higher education (HE): Progress, challenges, and next steps. *The Language*
670 *Scholar*. [https://languagescholar.leeds.ac.uk/exploring-inclusive-teaching-practices-of-](https://languagescholar.leeds.ac.uk/exploring-inclusive-teaching-practices-of-english-for-academic-purposes-eap-in-higher-education-he-progress-challenges-and-next-steps/)
671 [english-for-academic-purposes-eap-in-higher-education-he-progress-challenges-and-next-](https://languagescholar.leeds.ac.uk/exploring-inclusive-teaching-practices-of-english-for-academic-purposes-eap-in-higher-education-he-progress-challenges-and-next-steps/)
672 [steps/](https://languagescholar.leeds.ac.uk/exploring-inclusive-teaching-practices-of-english-for-academic-purposes-eap-in-higher-education-he-progress-challenges-and-next-steps/)

673 Bakogiannis, A. (2025b). From research to reality: Practical guidance for inclusive teaching
674 practices of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) in higher education (HE). *Journal of Learning*
675 *Development in Higher Education*, (32). <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi34.1367>

676 Bakogiannis, A., & Papavasiliou, E. (2023). Exploring inclusive teaching practices of English for
677 Academic Purposes (EAP) in higher education (HE): Research protocol. *International Journal*
678 *of English for Academic Purposes: Research and Practice*, 3(1).
679 <https://www.liverpooluniversitypress.co.uk/doi/10.3828/ijeap.2022.10>

680 Bakogiannis, A., & Papavasiliou, E. (2024). Exploring inclusive teaching practices of English for
681 Academic Purposes (EAP) in higher education (HE): Protocol for a systematic review.
682 *International Database of Education Systematic Reviews*.
683 <https://idesr.org/?doc=IDESR000149idesr.org>

684 Bakogiannis, A., Lorrimer, S., & Papavasiliou, E. (2024). Inclusive pedagogies & practices of
685 English for Academic Purposes (EAP) in higher education (HE): A focus group study. *European*
686 *Journal of Higher Education and Academic Advancement*.
687 <https://doi.org/10.61796/ejheaa.v1i10.850>

688 Bain, K. (2023). Inclusive assessment in higher education: What does the literature tell us on
 689 how to define and design inclusive assessments? *Journal of Learning Development in Higher*
 690 *Education*, (27). <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi27.1014>

691 Baltaru, R. D. (2020). The rise of agentic inclusion in the UK universities: Maintaining reputation
 692 through (formal) diversification. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1–14.
 693 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1723533>

694 Barnett-Page, E., & Thomas, J. (2009). Methods for the synthesis of qualitative research: A
 695 critical review. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 9, Article 59.
 696 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-9-59>

697 Bates, R. (2007). Educational administration and social justice. *Education, Citizenship and Social*
 698 *Justice*, 1(2), 141–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197906064672>

699 Benesch, S. (2001). *Critical English for Academic Purposes: Theory, politics, and practice*.
 700 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

701 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*
 702 *Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>

703 Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English language teaching*. Oxford
 704 University Press.

705 Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*.
 706 Routledge.

707 Carroll, C., Booth, A., Leaviss, J., & Rick, J. (2013). "Best fit" framework synthesis: Refining the
 708 method. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 13, Article 37. [https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-13-37)
 709 [2288-13-37](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-13-37)

710 CAST. (2018). *Universal design for learning guidelines version 2.2*. <http://udlguidelines.cast.org>

711 Collins, A., Azmat, F., & Rentschler, R. (2019). "Bringing everyone on the same journey":
 712 Revisiting inclusion in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(8), 1475–1487.
 713 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1450852>

714 Devlin, M., Kift, S., Nelson, K., Smith, L., & McKay, J. (2012). *Effective teaching and support of*
 715 *students from low socioeconomic status backgrounds: Resources for Australian higher*
 716 *education*. <http://www.lowses.edu.au/assets/ALTC%20LSES%20Final%20Report%202012.pdf>

717 Dewsbury, B., & Brame, C. J. (2019). Inclusive teaching. *CBE - Life Sciences Education*, 18(2),
 718 fe2. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.19-01-0021>

719 Equality Challenge Unit. (2013). *Equality and diversity for academics: Inclusive practice*.
 720 www.ecu.ac.uk/publications/e-and-d-for-academics-factsheets

721 Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational*
 722 *Research Journal*, 37(5), 813–828.

723 Fuller, M., Healey, M., Bradley, A., & Hall, T. (2004). Barriers to learning: A systematic study of
 724 the experience of disabled students in one university. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29(3), 303–
 725 318. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070410001682592>

726 García-Campos, M. D., Canabal, C., & Alba-Pastor, C. (2020). Executive functions in universal
 727 design for learning: Moving towards inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive*
 728 *Education*, 24(6), 660–674. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1474957>

729 Gheyssens, E., Coubergs, C., Griful-Freixenet, J., Engels, N., & Struyven, K. (2022). Differentiated
 730 instruction: The diversity of teachers' philosophy and praxis to adapt teaching to students'
 731 interests, readiness and learning profiles. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 26(14),
 732 1383–1400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1752826>

733 Gough, D. (2007). Weight of evidence: A framework for the appraisal of the quality and
 734 relevance of evidence. *Research Papers in Education*, 22(2), 213–228.
 735 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671520701296189>

- 736 Harvey, N., & Holmes, C. A. (2012). Nominal group technique: An effective method for
 737 obtaining group consensus. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 18(2), 188–194.
 738 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-172X.2012.02017.x>
- 739 Hockings, C. (2010). *Inclusive learning and teaching in higher education: A synthesis of research*.
 740 Higher Education Academy.
- 741 Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge University Press.
- 742 Holliday, A. (2020). Culture, communication, context, and power. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The*
 743 *Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (2nd ed., pp. 39–52).
 744 Routledge.
- 745 Holliday, A., & Amadasi, S. (2022). *Making sense of the intercultural: Finding decentred threads*.
 746 Routledge.
- 747 Holmqvist, M., & Lelinge, B. (2021). Teachers' collaborative professional development for
 748 inclusive education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 36(5), 819–833.
 749 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2020.1755929>
- 750 Howard, L. A., Statham, A., Gilles, E. E., Roberts, M. R., & Turner, W. (2024). From awareness
 751 to activism: Understanding commitment to social justice in higher education. *Education,*
 752 *Citizenship and Social Justice*, 19(2), 272–291. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17461979211012345>
- 753 Hughes, K., Corcoran, T., & Slee, R. (2016). Health-inclusive higher education: Listening to
 754 students with disabilities or chronic illnesses. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(3),
 755 488–501. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2015.1107885>
- 756 Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. Routledge.
- 757 Kormos, J., & Nijakowska, J. (2017). Inclusive practices in foreign language teaching: A review
 758 of recent research. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 32(2), 1–14.

759 Krischler, M., Powell, J. J. W., & Pit-Ten Cate, I. M. (2019). What is meant by inclusion? On the
 760 effects of different definitions on attitudes toward inclusive education. *European Journal of*
 761 *Special Needs Education*, 34(5), 632–648. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2019.1580837>

762 Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (2006). Race and TESOL: Introduction to concepts and theories. *TESOL*
 763 *Quarterly*, 40(3), 471–493. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264540>

764 Kumar, K. L., & Wideman, M. (2014). Accessible by design: Applying UDL principles in a first-
 765 year undergraduate course. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 44(1), 125–147.

766 Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: A.k.a. the remix. *Harvard*
 767 *Educational Review*, 84(1), 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.1.p2rj131485484751>

768 Li, W., & García, O. (2022). Not a first language but one repertoire: Translanguaging as a
 769 decolonizing project. *RELC Journal*, 53(2), 313–324.
 770 <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221092874>

771 Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–
 772 30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>

773 Li, Y. (2021). Collaboration between EAP teachers and content teachers: Insights from the
 774 literature for the Chinese context. *International Journal of English for Academic Purposes:*
 775 *Research and Practice*, 1, 37–55.

776 Lillis, T., & Turner, J. (2001). Student writing in higher education: Contemporary confusion,
 777 traditional concerns. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6(1), 57–68.
 778 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510020029608>

779 Lin, A., & Luke, A. (2006). Coloniality, post coloniality, and TESOL... Can a spider weave its way
 780 out of the web that it is being woven into just as it weaves? *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*,
 781 3(2–3), 65–73.

782 Liyanage, I., & Bartlett, B. (2010). English language teaching in Sri Lanka: Towards a
 783 sociocultural perspective. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 23(3), 285–302.

784 Maldoni, A., & Lear, E. (2016). A decade of embedding: Where are we now? *Journal of*
785 *University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 13(3), 1–20.

786 May, H., & Bridger, K. (2010). *Developing and embedding inclusive policy and practice in higher*
787 *education*. The Higher Education Academy.

788 Mayer, R. E. (2009). *Multimedia learning* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

789 Meda, L. (2019). Decolonising the curriculum: Students' perspectives. *Africa Education Review*,
790 17(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18146627.2017.1404653>

791 Messiou, K. (2017). Research in the field of inclusive education: Time for a rethink?
792 *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 21(2), 146–159.
793 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2016.1223184>

794 Mihovska, A., Prevedourou, D., Tsankova, J., Manolova, A., & Poulkov, V. (2021). Building
795 adaptive and inclusive education readiness through digital technologies. In *2021 Joint*
796 *International Conference on Digital Arts, Media, and Technology with ECTI Northern Section*
797 *Conference on Electrical, Electronics, Computer and Telecommunication Engineering* (pp. 384–
798 388). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ECTIDAMTNCON51837.2021.9456116>

799 Mizumura, M. (2015). *The fall of language in the age of English*. Columbia University Press.

800 Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & PRISMA Group. (2009). Preferred reporting
801 items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLOS Medicine*, 6(7),
802 e1000097. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>

803 Morgan, J. (2024). Fostering belonging in higher education: Implications for student retention
804 and wellbeing. *Advance HE*. [https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/news-and-views/fostering-](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/news-and-views/fostering-belonging-higher-education-implications-student-retention-and-wellbeing)
805 [belonging-higher-education-implications-student-retention-and-wellbeing](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/news-and-views/fostering-belonging-higher-education-implications-student-retention-and-wellbeing)

806 Mortenson, L. (2021). White TESOL instructors' engagement with social justice content in an
807 EAP program: Teacher neutrality as a tool of white supremacy. *BC TEAL Journal*, 6(1), 106–131.
808 <https://doi.org/10.14288/bctj.v6i1.390>

809 Mortenson, L. (2022). Integrating social justice-oriented content into English for Academic
810 Purposes (EAP) instruction: A case study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 65, 1–14.
811 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.08.002>

812 Ng'andu, N. (2023). Exploring teachers' perceptions of continuing professional development
813 for inclusive education: General and special education teachers in Mkushi District, Zambia.
814 *International Journal of Special Education*, 38(1), 145–160.

815 North, C. E. (2019). Teaching for social justice? Voices from the front lines. *Teachers College*
816 *Record*, 121(6), 1–36.

817 Opertti, R., Walker, Z., & Zhang, Y. (2014). Inclusive education: From targeting groups and
818 schools to achieving quality education as the core of EFA. In L. Florian (Ed.), *The SAGE Handbook*
819 *of Special Education* (pp. 149–169). SAGE.

820 Ortega, L. (2019). SLA and the study of equitable multilingualism. *The Modern Language*
821 *Journal*, 103(S1), 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12525>

822 Osman, R., Ojo, E., & Hornsby, D. J. (2018). Transforming higher education towards a socially
823 just pedagogy. *Journal of Human Behaviour in the Social Environment*, 28(4), 393–396.
824 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2018.1435328>

825 Pennycook, A. (2002). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. Routledge.
826 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203006344>

827 Phasha, N., Mahlo, D., & Dei, G. J. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Inclusive education in Africa: A critical reader*.
828 Sense Publishers.

829 Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

830 Popay, J., Roberts, H., Sowden, A., Petticrew, M., Arai, L., Britten, N., Rodgers, M., Roen, K., &
831 Duffy, S. (2006). *Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews: A*
832 *product from the ESRC Methods Programme*. ESRC.
833 [https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/media/lancaster-university/content-](https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/media/lancaster-university/content-assets/documents/fhm/dhr/chir/NSsynthesisguidanceVersion1-April2006.pdf)
834 [assets/documents/fhm/dhr/chir/NSsynthesisguidanceVersion1-April2006.pdf](https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/media/lancaster-university/content-assets/documents/fhm/dhr/chir/NSsynthesisguidanceVersion1-April2006.pdf)

835 Ramlackhan, K., & Catania, N. (2022). Fostering creativity, equity, and inclusion through social
836 justice praxis. *Power and Education*, 14(3), 282–295.
837 <https://doi.org/10.1177/17577438221112392>

838 Riddell, S., Tinklin, T., & Wilson, A. (2007). Disabled students in higher education: Perspectives
839 on widening access and changing policy. *Routledge*.

840 Riddell, S., Weedon, E., Fuller, M., Healey, M., Hurst, A., Kelly, K., & Piggott, L. (2007).
841 Managerialism and equalities: Tensions within widening access policy and practice for disabled
842 students in UK universities. *Higher Education*, 54(4), 615–628.
843 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-006-9014-8>

844 Rose, D. H., & Meyer, A. (2002). *Teaching every student in the digital age: Universal design for*
845 *learning*. ASCD.

846 Salmi, J., & D’Addio, A. (2020). Policies for achieving inclusion in higher education. *Policy*
847 *Reviews in Higher Education*, 5(1), 47–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322969.2020.1724545>

848 Schuelka, M. J., Johnstone, C. J., Thomas, G., & Artiles, A. J. (Eds.). (2019). *The SAGE handbook*
849 *of inclusion and diversity in education*. SAGE Publications.

850 Scott, S., Webber, C. F., Lupart, J. L., Aitken, N., & Scott, D. E. (2013). Fair and equitable
851 assessment practices for all students. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*,
852 21(1), 52–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2013.776943>

853 Sensoy, Ö., & DiAngelo, R. (2017). *Is everyone really equal? An introduction to key concepts in*
854 *social justice education* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.

855 Shohamy, E. (2017). Critical language testing and social justice. In T. McNamara & E. Shohamy
856 (Eds.), *Language testing and assessment* (pp. 137–156). Oxford University Press.

857 Singh, M. (2011). The place of social justice in higher education and social change discourses.
858 *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 41(4), 481–494.
859 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2011.581515>

- 860 Slee, R. (2018). *Inclusive education isn't dead, it just smells funny*. Routledge.
- 861 Stentiford, L., & Koutsouris, G. (2021). What are inclusive pedagogies in higher education? A
862 systematic scoping review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 46(11), 2245–2261.
863 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1843151>
- 864 Sterzuk, A., & Hengen, S. (2019). “When I came to Canada like I heard lots of bad stuff about
865 Aboriginal people”: Disrupting settler colonial discourses through English language teaching.
866 In M. López-Gopar (Ed.), *International Perspectives on Critical Pedagogies in ELT* (pp. 159–179).
867 Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25001-4_10
- 868 Tai, H., Shibasaki, S., & O’Dowd, R. (2022). Reimagining inclusivity in academic English
869 provision: A comparative perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 32(2), 273–
870 290.
- 871 Tai, J., Ajjaw, R., Bearman, M., Boud, D., Dawson, P., & Jorre de St Jorre, T. (2022). Assessment
872 for inclusion: Rethinking contemporary strategies in assessment design. *Higher Education
873 Research & Development*, 42(2), 483–497. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2022.2067673>
- 874 Tann, K., & Scott, A. (2021). Bridging disciplinary knowledge: The challenge of integrating EAP
875 in business education. *Higher Education*, 81, 453–470. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00551-0)
876 [00551-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00551-0)
- 877 Terry, G., Hayfield, N., Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. In C. Willig & W.
878 Stainton Rogers (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology* (2nd ed., pp.
879 17–37). SAGE Publications.
- 880 Thomas, L. (2012). *Building student engagement and belonging in higher education at a time
881 of change*. Paul Hamlyn Foundation.
- 882 Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*
883 (2nd ed.). ASCD.

884 Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative
 885 research (COREQ): A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal*
 886 *for Quality in Health Care*, 19(6), 349–357. <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042>

887 UNESCO. (2020). *Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education – All means*
 888 *all*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373718>

889 Valdez, C. J., & Kelp, N. C. (2023). Student perceptions of inclusive pedagogy in undergraduate
 890 STEM classrooms. *Journal of Microbiology & Biology Education*, 24(3), e00097-23.
 891 <https://doi.org/10.1128/jmbe.00097-23>

892 Varga-Atkins, T., McIsaac, J., & Willis, I. (2017). Focus group meets nominal group technique:
 893 An effective combination for student evaluation? *Innovations in Education and Teaching*
 894 *International*, 54(4), 289–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2015.1058721>

895 Von Esch, K., Motha, S., & Kubota, R. (2020). Race and language teaching. *Language Teaching*,
 896 53(4), 391–421. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000435>

897 Walton, E. (2018). Decolonising (through) inclusive education? *Educational Research for Social*
 898 *Change*, 7(0), 31–45. <https://doi.org/10.17159/2221-4070/2018/v7i0a3>

899 Wingate, U. (2015). *Academic literacy and student diversity: The case for inclusive practice*.
 900 Multilingual Matters.

901 Wingate, U., & Tribble, C. (2012). The best of both worlds? Towards an English for Academic
 902 Purposes/academic literacies writing pedagogy. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(4), 481–495.

903 Zembylas, M. (2018). Affect and the re-politicization of the contemporary subject: Ethics,
 904 politics, and the task of emancipatory education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 50(3),
 905 271–273.