International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation
ISSN: 2617-0299 (Online); ISSN: 2708-0099 (Print)
DOI: 10.32996/ijllt
Journal Homepage: www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijllt

IJLLT
AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Investigating The Role of Using Equity (E) Among Students To Achieve Equality

Hassan Mahill Abdallah Hassan[1]✉, Ayman Hamad Elneil Hamdan Abdala[2],Muayad Muhammed Ali Awadalbari[3] , Javed Ahmad[4] , Gaus Chowdhury[5] and Ghada Alghabbash[6]

[1]Assistant Professor, King Khalid University, English Language Centre, Abha, KSA
[2]Assistant Professor, King Khalid University, Applied College, Dhahran Aljanoub, KSA
[3]Assistant Professor, King Khalid University, Applied College, Tanumah, KSA
[4]Lecturer, King Khalid University, English Language Centre, Abha, KSA
[5]Lecturer, King Khalid University, English Language Centre, Abha, KSA
[6]Lecturer, King Khalid University, English Language Centre, Abha, KSA

Corresponding Author: Hassan Mahill Abdallah Hassan, **E-mail**: mahill74@yahoo.com

| ABSTRACT

This study aims to answer the question, "to what extent using Equity (E) among students can achieve equality"?. To highlight that using Equity (E) among students can achieve equality. Therefore, the analysis concentrates on observation and testing to identify students' problems and provide solutions. These means have been chosen as primary tools for the analysis because they are closely related to the two kinds of activities, mainly written and spoken. Problem-solving-based learning and learning-by-doing analysis are used to respond to such situations. Written and spoken activities are set to clarify the level of students among themselves, namely weak and strong. The study is concerned with analyzing how weak students (WS) can get help to develop their level in terms of performance perspective. The analysis has proved that using Equity (E) among students to achieve equality is highly recommended.

| KEYWORDS

WS, OECD, E and EE

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 12 January 2024 **PUBLISHED:** 03 February 2025 **DOI:** 10.32996/ijllt.2025.8.2.1

1. Introduction

The words "Equity" and "Equality" (EE) have a similar ring, but they have distinctly different meanings. Equality is treating everyone the same, such as ensuring the equal right of every US citizen to vote in elections.

However, while everyone may have the right to vote, that does not mean everyone has the same access to the voting process. For example, some may not be able to leave work to vote, they might lack reliable transportation, or their voting district is drawn so that they have to travel long distances or stand in line for hours to mark their ballots. So while voting rights may be equal, the ability to equitably exercise that right is in question.

Equity (E) means giving everyone access to the same opportunities in whichever way makes the most sense for the individual. Here are some classroom scenarios that demonstrate the difference between equality and equity:
While equality is a good idea to strive for, it ultimately falls short. With equality, resources are wasted; some students receive too much while others do not. But, with a focus on equity, schools can help close the opportunity gap experienced by students from low-income communities.

2. Aim and Scope of the Study

This study returns to the acknowledgment that there is a direct link between a students' performance and their levels in general when they were exposed to written or spoken activities. The study is exclusively dependent on written and spoken activities in their course book, which are analyzed as essential to sort out their real levels.

This study aims to sort out the students' levels from different perspectives: when weak students (WS) are assigned out, they can easily get help. Therefore, this study aims to specify a way to equalize between them.

Hopefully, this study will provide insight and practical help to weak students (WS) to develop their levels and step forward quickly.

3. Theoretical Background

3.1 Introduction

Education systems throughout the world are faced with the challenge of achieving equity. This is mainly about the estimated 70 million children who are not in school in economically poorer countries. Meanwhile, in wealthier countries, many young people leave school with no worthwhile qualifications, others are placed in various forms of special provision away from mainstream educational experiences, and some simply choose to drop out since the lessons seem irrelevant to their lives.

This study draws on evidence from our program of study to assign what needs to change to address this crucial policy challenge. It asks how schools can ensure that every child is treated fairly, particularly those from less advantaged backgrounds. England is a valuable context to consider when considering this issue, as noted in a 2007 OECD study, which reported that the impact of socio-economic circumstances on young people's attainment was more marked than in any other of the 52 countries considered.

3.2 Making Sense Of Equity

Our study is guided by the principle of equity, which involves notions of inclusion and fairness. As we have worked with schools for many years, we have become aware of the problems this involves. One way to think about the processes at work is to see them as linked within an 'ecology of equity' (Ainscow, Dyson, Goldrick and West, 2012). By this we mean that the extent to which students' experiences and outputs are equitable is not dependent only on the educational practices of their teachers, or even their schools. Instead, it depends on a whole range of interacting processes that reach into the school from outside. These include the demographics of the areas served by schools, the histories and cultures of the populations who send (or fail to send) their children to the school, and the economic realities they face. Beyond this, they involve the underlying socio-economic processes that make some areas poor and others affluent, drawing migrant groups into some places rather than others. They are also influenced by the wider politics of the teaching profession, of decision-making at the district level, and of national policy-making, and the impacts of schools on one another over issues such as exclusion and parental option. In addition, they reflect new models of school governance, how local school hierarchies are established and maintained and how school actions are constrained and enabled by their positions in those hierarchies.

It is essential to recognize the problems of interactions between the different elements in this ecology and their implications for achieving more equitable school systems. As we work on improvement projects with schools, we find it helpful to think of three interlinked areas within which Equity (E) issues arise. These are:
・Within schools. These are issues that arise from school and teacher practices. They include how students are taught and engaged with learning; how teaching groups are organized and the different kinds of opportunities that result from this organization; the kinds of social relations and personal support that are characteristic of the school; how the school responds to diversity in terms of attainment, gender, ethnicity and social background; and the kinds of relationships the school builds with families and local communities. ・ Between schools. These are issues that arise from the characteristics of the local school system. They include how different types of schools emerge locally; how these schools acquire different levels so that hierarchies emerge in terms of performance and preference; how schools compete or collaborate; the processes of integration and segregation which concentrate students with similar backgrounds in different schools; the distribution of educational opportunities across schools; and the extent to which students in every school can access similar opportunities. ・ Beyond schools. This far-reaching arena includes: the wider policy context within which schools operate, the family processes and resources which shape how children learn and develop, the interests and understandings of the professionals working in schools; and the demographics, economics, cultures and histories of the areas served by schools. Beyond this, it includes the underlying social and economic processes at national and – in many respects – at global levels out of which local situations arise.

Looking at this in this way, it is clear that there is much that individual schools can do to tackle issues within their organizations, and that such actions are likely to have a profound impact on student experiences and may have some influence on inequities arising elsewhere. However, it is equally clear that these strategies do not directly lead to schools tackling between- and beyond-school issues. No school strategy can, for example, make a poor area more affluent or increase the resources available to students' families, any more than it could create a stable student population or tackle the global processes underlying migration patterns. However, issues of access or the allocation of students to schools might be tackled if schools work together on a common agenda.

Bearing these discussions in mind, we explore possibilities for linking within-school, between-school and beyond-school strategies to develop more equitable improvement approaches.

3.3 Within School Factors

Our study has shown how using evidence to study teaching within a school can help foster the development of inclusive practices (Ainscow, Booth & Dyson, 2006; Miles & Ainscow, 2011). Specifically, this can create space for rethinking by interrupting existing discourses. Particularly powerful techniques in this respect involve using mutual lesson observation, sometimes through video recordings, and student evidence about teaching and learning arrangements within a school. Under certain situations, such approaches provide 'interruptions' that help to make the familiar unfamiliar in ways that stimulate self-questioning, creativity and action. In so doing, they can sometimes lead to a reframing of perceived problems that, in turn, draw the teacher's attention to overlooked possibilities for addressing barriers to participation and learning.

However, such inquiry-based approaches to developing practice are far from straightforward. An interruption to thinking created as a group of teachers engages with evidence may not necessarily lead to considering new ways of working. Indeed, we have documented examples of how deeply held beliefs within a school may prevent the experimentation that is necessary to foster the development of more inclusive practices.

This points to the significance of leadership forms that encourage colleagues to challenge one another's assumptions about particular students. Some schools are characterized by 'inclusive cultures' (Dyson, Howes & Roberts, 2004). Within such schools, there is a consensus amongst adults around values of respect for difference and a commitment to offering all students access to learning opportunities. This consensus may not be total and does not necessarily remove all tensions or contradictions in practice. On the other hand, there is likely to be a high level of staff collaboration and joint problem-solving, and similar values and commitments may extend into the student body and, parents and other society stakeholders in the school.

Between 2006 and 2011 we had a chance to explore these ideas in more detail through our involvement in a group of English secondary schools (see Ainscow et al 2012 for a detailed account of this project). The initiative was located in an area characterized by socio-economic disadvantage and social and ethnic segregation. The district's secondary school system comprised a hierarchy of sixteen schools, some selective based on attainment or religious faith, with others being non-selective and described as comprehensive schools.

The network grew out of an existing partnership of four schools, with ten other schools joining in at various stages over the five years. Whilst the head teachers involved had developed very good working relationships, which led to some collaborative activities, they felt that the impact had been limited. Consequently, they decided there was a need to develop ways of working that would challenge practices, assumptions and beliefs of staff, and which would help create a stimulus for further sustainable improvement. With this in mind, they approached us to support and facilitate the use of study to strengthen their network. The schools agreed to fund our involvement.

Through discussions involving the head teachers, it was agreed that Equity (E) was a central issue facing each partner school. It soon became evident, however, that what this meant was different in each context, not least in respect to the groups of learners who seemed to be missing out within existing arrangements. As a result, it was agreed that the work of the network should take account of these differences by adopting a broad set of study questions to focus its activities, within which each school would assign its own particular focus. These questions were as follows:
・Which of our learners are most vulnerable to underachievement, marginalization or exclusion? ・What changes in policy and practice need to be made in order to reach out to these students? ・How can these changes be introduced effectively and evaluated in terms of student output?

In adopting the strategic decision to focus attention on groups of learners thought to be missing out within existing arrangements, we were anxious that this might lead to narrowly concentrated efforts to 'fix' students who were seen as being in some sense inadequate. However, collecting evidence about these groups usually led to a refocusing of attention on contextual factors acting

as barriers to their participation and learning. In this way, most of the projects carried out gradually became mainstream school improvement efforts that had the potential to benefit many students.

As with our earlier projects, staff inquiry groups were set up in each school, usually consisting of five or six participants representing different perspectives within their school communities. These groups took part in introductory workshops at which we discussed an initial analysis we had made of the area, based on a consideration of various documents, statistics and interviews with a selection of stakeholders, including head teachers, local authority staff, society group representatives and politicians.

Following this process of contextual analysis, we took the staff teams through a process of planning the investigations they intended to carry out. In so doing, we helped them to develop a clearer focus and plan the procedures they would follow. Subsequently, each school team set out to gather evidence about students identified as losing out in some way, the aim being to develop better insights regarding their experiences in the schools. The groups also shared their findings with their colleagues in the partner schools. In these ways, the intention was to deepen understanding of practices, beliefs, assumptions and organizational processes within and across the schools in the network.

Adopting place as it did over five years of intense government activity to improve educational outputs -or at least raise the annually reported attainment levels- was a time of multiple policy initiatives and interventions to drive up standards. Consequently, it is not easy to disentangle particular effects and attribute them to the work of the project teams, rather than the pressures imposed generally on schools over this period. Nonetheless, the evidence we collected showed that teachers in the schools themselves could clarify changes and trace these to their involvement in the project. It can also be asserted that these schools contributed fully to the overall increase in examination results recorded in the particular local authority during this period. In fact, the percentage of students gaining five or more A* to C grades in GCSE, the national examination taken by almost all young people at the age of 16, went up from 54.6% in 2005 to 76.5 % in 2010, a rise of 22% (during the same period the national average went from 56.3 % to 75.3 %, or 19%). Looking at a more inclusive measure of student performance, during the same period the percentage of students gaining five or more A* to G grades went up at almost twice the national average, from 90% to 96.1% (compared to 89% to 92.7% nationally).

Our consideration of what this particular network achieved points to a series of factors that seem particularly significant for developing more equitable schools. At their most fundamental, the factors we are concerned with are located in classrooms, where, first and foremost, Equity (E) is about attitudes. Simply put, the attitudes of teachers and fellow students can either promote or inhibit a fair, welcoming and inclusive working climate. In a school that is committed to fairness, all students should expect to be welcome in their classrooms - not only in explicit ways, which embrace cultural, social and intellectual differences - but also in implicit ways, so they will not feel marginalized because of feedback (or lack of it) on their behavior and performance. Because all students are welcome, they can expect positive interactions as a normal part of their classroom experience. As a result, they will feel included, valued, and acknowledged.

Then there is the issue of practice. If teachers favor one style it will tend to suit those students who are comfortable with that style. Strong teaching orthodoxies can disenfranchise students who are less confident or engaged by that approach. Equity (E) therefore, requires practitioners who understand the significance of teaching the same thing in different ways to different students, and of teaching different things in different ways to the same students.

The network schools could point to examples of good practice in all of these areas before they joined the project. But, the issue they were addressing through their involvement was whether they were sure that all students could feel they were embraced by these ways of working. In most of the schools, there was evidence, too, of changes in classrooms so that specific groups who felt to be missing out were now more actively engaged in learning, and that this had been achieved through deliberate attention to the attitudes displayed, the language used and interactions engineered in lessons, all of which were reflected in the range of teachings approaches used.

Of course, these are the less difficult aspects of Equity (E) to deliver. That is not to deny their value, but simply to accept that while adjustments in classroom practices can significantly impact particular students' experiences, they may not do much to alter the factors that led to these students 'missing out' in the first place. Often, such factors are more intransigent and, therefore, more difficult to influence in a single school.

3.4 Between School Factors

The approach we have outlined so far is based on those within schools collecting and engaging with various forms of data to stimulate moves to create more equitable arrangements. Our study has provided a convincing case for the power of this approach

(Ainscow et al, 2012). It has also highlighted the difficulties in implementing such an approach within current policy contexts. This led us to analyze the limitations of within-school strategies, leading us, in turn, to argue that these should be complemented by between-school activities.

In recent years, we have carried out a series of studies that have generated considerable evidence that school-to-school collaboration can strengthen improvement processes by adding to the range of expertise made available (see: Ainscow, 2010; Ainscow & Howes, 2007; Ainscow, Muijs & West, 2006; Ainscow, Nicolaidou & West, 2003; Ainscow & West, 2006; Ainscow, West & Nicolaidou, 2005; Muijs, West & Ainscow, 2010; Muijs, Ainscow, Chapman & West, 2011). Together, these studies indicate that school-to-school collaboration has an enormous potential for fostering system-wide improvement, particularly in challenging urban contexts. More specifically, they show how collaboration between schools can provide an effective means of solving immediate problems, such as staffing shortages; how it can have a positive impact in periods of crisis, such as during the closure of a school; and, how in the longer run, schools working together can contribute to the raising of expectations and attainment in schools that have had a record of low achievement. There is also evidence here that collaboration can help reduce schools' polarization according to their position in 'league tables', to the particular benefit of those students who seem marginalized at the edges of the system and whose performance and attitudes cause increasing concern.
These studies have concentrated on situations where schools have been given short-term financial incentives linked to demonstrating collaborative planning and activity. Nevertheless, they convince us this approach can be a powerful catalyst for change. However, it does not represent an easy option, particularly in policy contexts where competition and option remain the main policy drivers.

The most convincing evidence about the power of schools working together comes from our recent involvement in the Greater Manchester Challenge. This three-year project, which involved over 1,100 schools in ten local authorities, had a government investment of around £50 million (see Ainscow, 2012, for a detailed account of this initiative). The decision to invest such a large budget reflected a concern regarding educational standards in the city region, particularly amongst children and young people from disadvantaged backgrounds. The approach adopted was influenced by an earlier initiative in London (Brighouse, 2007).

Reflecting much of the thinking developed in this study, the overall approach to the challenge emerged from a detailed analysis of the local context, using both statistical data and local intelligence provided by stakeholders. This drew attention to areas of concern and helped pinpoint a range of human resources that could be mobilized to support improvement efforts. Recognizing the potential of these resources, it was decided that networking and collaboration should be the essential strategies for strengthening the overall improvement capacity of the system. More specifically, this involved a series of interconnected activities that involved 'moving knowledge around' (Ainscow, 2012).

So, for example, in an attempt to engage all schools in processes of networking and collaboration, Families of Schools was set up, using a data system that groups between 12 and 20 schools on the basis of the prior attainment of their students and their socio-economic home backgrounds. The strength of this approach is that it partners schools that serve similar populations while encouraging partnerships amongst schools that are not in direct competition with one another because they do not serve the same neighborhoods. Led by head teachers, the Families of Schools proved to be successful in strengthening collaborative processes within the city region, although the impact was varied.

Regarding schools working in highly disadvantaged contexts, evidence from the Challenge suggests that school-to-school partnerships are the most powerful means of fostering development. Most notably, the Essentials to Success program led to striking developments in the performance of some 200 schools facing the most challenging circumstances. There is also evidence that these schools' progress helped to trigger improvement across the system. A common feature of almost all of these interventions was that progress was achieved through carefully matched pairings (or, sometimes, trios) of schools that cut across social 'boundaries' of various kinds, including those that separate schools in different local authorities. This way, expertise previously trapped in particular contexts was made more widely available.

Another effective strategy to facilitate the movement of expertise was provided through the creation of various types of hub schools. For example, some of the hubs supported other schools in ways of supporting students with English as an additional language. Similarly, so-called 'teaching schools' providing professional development programs concentrated on bringing about developments in classroom practice. Other hub schools offered support concerning particular subject areas and in responding to groups of potentially vulnerable groups, such as those categorised as having special educational needs. In this latter context, a further significant strategy involved new roles for special schools in supporting developments in the mainstream.
Significantly, we found that such collaborative arrangements can have a positive impact on the learning of students in all of the participating schools. This is a significant finding in that it draws attention to a way of strengthening relatively low performing

schools that can also help foster wider developments in the system. It also offers a convincing argument as to why relatively strong schools should support other schools. Put simply, the evidence is that by helping others you help yourself.

Whilst increased collaboration of this sort is vital as a strategy for developing more effective ways of working, the experience of Greater Manchester showed that it is not enough. The essential additional ingredient is an engagement with data that can bring an element of mutual challenge to such collaborative processes. We found that data was particularly essential when partnering schools, since collaboration is at its most powerful where partner schools are carefully matched and know what they are trying to achieve. Data also matters so that schools go beyond cozy relationships without impacting outputs. Consequently, schools need to base their relationships on evidence about each other's strengths and weaknesses to challenge each other to improve.

To facilitate this kind of contextual analysis, strategies and frameworks were devised to help schools support one another in reviewing. In the primary sector, this involved colleagues from another school acting as critical friends to internally driven review processes; whilst in secondary schools, subject departments took part in 'deep dives', where skilled specialists from another school visited in order to observe and analyze practice, and promote concentrated improvement activities. The power of these approaches is in providing teachers with opportunities to have strategic conversations with colleagues from another school.

The powerful impact of the collaborative strategies developed in the Greater Manchester Challenge points to how the processes used within individual schools can be deepened and strengthened. This requires an emphasis on mutual critique, within and between schools, based on an engagement with shared data. This, in turn, requires strong collective commitment from senior school staff and a willingness to share responsibility for system reform. Our study of new patterns of school leadership that have emerged in response to the structural changes occurring in the English education system offers some promise in this respect (Chapman et al 2008).

3.5 Beyond School Factors

An OECD report, 'No more failures: ten steps to Equity (E) in Education' (2007) argues that educational Equity (E) has two dimensions. First, it is a matter of fairness, which implies ensuring that personal and social circumstances – for example, gender, socio-economic status or ethnic origin – should not be an obstacle to achieving educational potential. Secondly, it concerns inclusion, which is about ensuring a basic minimum standard of education for all. The report notes that the two dimensions are closely intertwined since, 'tackling school failure helps to overcome the effects of social deprivation which often causes school failure' (p. 11).

The report argues that a fair and inclusive education is desirable because of the human rights command for people to develop their capacities and participate fully in society. It also reminds us of the long-term social and financial costs of educational failure, since those without the skills to participate socially and economically generate higher costs for health, income support, child welfare and security. In addition, increased migration poses new challenges for social cohesion in more and more countries.

Despite the efforts made in response to such discussions, in many parts of the world there remains a worrying gap between the achievements of students from rich and poor families (Kerr & West, 2010; UNESCO, 2010; Wilkinson and Pickett, 2000). The extent of this gap varies significantly between countries. For example, Mourshed, Chijioke & Barber (2010) argue:
'In a world-class system like Finland's, socioeconomic standing is far less predictive of student achievement. All things being equal, a low-income student in the United States is far less likely to do well in school than a low-income student in Finland. Given the enormous economic impact of educational achievement, this is one of the best indicators of equal opportunity in a society….' (p. 8-9)

On a more optimistic note, the most recent international comparisons in relation to literacy indicate that the best-performing school systems manage to provide high-quality education for all of their students. For example: 'Canada, Finland, Japan, Korea and the partner economies Hong Kong-China and Shanghai-China all perform well above the OECD mean performance and students tend to perform well regardless of their own background or the school they attend. They not only have large proportions of students performing at the highest levels of reading proficiency, but also relatively few students at the lower proficiency levels.' (OECD, 2010, p. 15)
The implication is that countries can develop education systems that are both excellent and equitable. The question is: what needs to be done to move policy and practice forward?

There is evidence of a division of opinion within the international study society regarding how to respond to this question. On the one hand, some argue that what is required is a school-concentrated approach, with better implementation of the knowledge base that has been created through many years of school effectiveness and improvement study (e.g. Hopkins, Reynols and Gay,

2005; Sammons, 2007). Such researchers point to examples of where this approach has impacted the performance of schools serving disadvantaged communities (e.g. Chenoweth, 2007; Stringfield, 1995). On the other hand, some argue that such school-concentrated approaches can never address fundamental inequalities in societies that make it difficult for some young people to break with the restrictions imposed by their home circumstances (Dyson & Raffo, 2007).

Such discussions point to the danger of separating the challenge of school improvement from considering the impact of wider social and political factors. This danger is referred to by those who recommend more holistic reforms that connect schools, communities, and external political and economic institutions (e.g. Anyon, 1997; Crowther, Cummings, Dyson and Millward, 2003; Levin, 2005; Lipman, 2004). These authors conclude that focusing solely on improving individual schools is insufficient. Rather, such efforts must be part of a larger overarching plan for system-wide reform that must include all national, district, institutional and society stakeholders.

An obvious possibility is to combine the two perspectives by adopting strategies that seek to link attempts to change the internal situations of schools with efforts to improve local areas. This approach is a feature of the highly acclaimed Harlem Children's Zone (Whitehurst & Croft, 2010), a neighbourhood-based education and social services system for the children of low-income families in New York. The programme combines education components (e.g. early childhood programmes with parenting classes; public charter schools); health components (including nutrition programmes); and neighbourhood services (one-on-one counseling for families; society centres; and a centre that teaches job-related skills to teenagers and adults). Dobbie and Fryer (2009) describe the Children's Zone as 'arguably the most ambitious social experiment to alleviate poverty of our time' (p.1). Having carried out an in-depth analysis of statistical data regarding the impact of the initiative, they conclude:
'. . . high-quality schools or high quality schools coupled with society investments generate the achievement gains.

Society investments alone cannot illustrate the results.' (p. 25)
Our recommendations are based on this combined approach. However, we are well aware that pressures created by national policies can lead to strategic dilemmas in so doing, particularly when schools feel obliged to demonstrate rapid increases in test and examination scores.

The analysis we have made of how external factors limit the possibilities for developing equitable schools offers vivid illustrations of the problems involved (see Ainscow et al, 2012). In so doing, they make a convincing case for analyzing the wider context within which schools work. We have had considerable experience conducting such analyses in school districts. This has convinced us that transforming educational provision about local neighborhoods and services depends on clarifying local priorities and ways of developing sustainable responses to these. To do this, it is necessary to engage in forms of contextual analysis that probe beneath the surface of headline performance indicators in order to understand how local dynamics shape particular outputs; and to clarify the essential underlying factors at work and assign which of these factors can be acted upon and by whom.

This marks a shift in thinking about local transformation from a surface-level, quick-fix response - concerned with manipulating headline figures - to a deeper response, which aims to achieve sustainable and long-term developments by addressing issues in context. In this way, the purpose is to produce a rich and actionable understanding of local issues. To help achieve this, the analysis may be bounded in one of three ways – none of which are mutually exclusive:
• By the unit of action – for example, a contextual analysis might focus on issues in an administratively defined area, such as a district or local authority, where structures are already in place that can be used to drive action. • By geographical and social boundaries – the analysis might focus on issues in an area that has clear physical boundaries, for example, main roads, or imagined boundaries, such as a housing estate that residents strongly clarify with – or some combination of the two. • By issues – the analysis might focus on understanding a particular issue, such as poor school attendance or teenage gang membership. In these instances, while retaining a local focus, the analysis might extend beyond a particular neighborhood or administrative area.
We have found that sometimes a contextual analysis may highlight issues that shape local circumstances but which local actors are not in a position to change – for example, the global recession leading to the decline of local industry. However, the analysis should clarify how this shapes local processes and dynamics; what is locally actionable, and what unit(s) of action can be utilized to develop an appropriate response.

In order to understand the complex dynamics at work in an area and explore outcome data, it is necessary to enable people who live and work there to talk about their understanding of local issues. We have found that a loose study framework can help to provide the freedom needed for this while also ensuring that the data generated can be usefully compared and used to create shared understandings and strategies (Ainscow et al, 2012).

3.6 Rethinking Relationships

In thinking about how the strategies we have outlined in this study might be used more widely, it is essential to recognize that they do not offer a set of techniques that can simply be lifted and transferred to other contexts. Rather, they offer an overall approach to improvement driven by a set of values and use processes of contextual analysis to create strategies that fit particular circumstances. The approach is also distinctive because it is mainly led from within schools to make more effective use of existing expertise and creativity.

We argue that closing the gap in outputs between those from more and less advantaged backgrounds will only happen when what happens to children outside as well as inside schools changes. This means changing how families and communities work, and enriching what they offer to children. In this respect we have seen encouraging experiences of what can happen when what schools do is aligned in a coherent strategy with the efforts of other local players – employers, society groups, universities and public services (Ainscow, 2012; Cummings, Dyson & Todd, 2011). This does not necessarily mean schools doing more, but it does imply partnerships beyond the school, where partners multiply the impacts of each other's efforts.

All of this has implications for the various essential stakeholders within education systems. In particular, teachers, especially those in senior positions, have to see themselves as having a wider responsibility for all children and young people, not just those who attend their schools. They also have to develop patterns of internal organization that enable them to have the flexibility to cooperate with other schools and with stakeholders beyond the school gate (Chapman et al., 2008). It means, too, that those who administer area school systems have to adjust their priorities and ways of working in response to improvement efforts that are led from within schools.

Governments have an essential role in all of this. Over the last twenty years, evidence from English experience suggests that attempts to command and control from the center stifle as many local developments as they stimulate (Ainscow & West, 2006; Gray, 2010; Whitty 2010). Consequently, the central government must act as an enabler, encouraging developments, disseminating good practice, and holding local leaders accountable for output. This depends on the currency of knowledge exchange and, therefore, requires cultural change. This requires a new approach to national policy that can respond to local factors while also providing a unifying understanding of Equity (E) that can help create coherence and foster collaboration across reform efforts (Ainscow, 2005).

4. Research Methodology

This part gives a brief account about the detailed picture of the most relevant study methodology, tools and sample of the study, which is exclusively drawn to pursue this study.

The researchers used descriptive-analytical and qualitative methods, namely problem-solving-based learning and learning-by-doing. They were adopted to analyze the role of using Equity (E) among students to achieve equality: " to what extent using Equity (E) among students can achieve equality?".

4.1 Research Methods, Tools and Sample of the Study

The study exclusively depended on descriptive-analytical and qualitative methods, namely problem-solving-based learning and learning by doing based on the typical performance of the students inside the classroom.

The observation and test are tools to analyze the students' performance inside the classroom centered around daily written and spoken class activities to investigate the hypothesis " to what extent using Equity (E) among students can achieve equality?". The sample of this study is drawn from first year students of King Khalid University who study English as a requirement to fulfill a bachelor's degree- Academic Year: 2024-2025.

Accordingly, the researchers depended on their analysis of the students' activities taken from their course book to clarify to "what extent using Equity (E) among students can achieve equality?". Pair work and group work were used as analysis tools to sort out students according to their weak and strong levels to help weak students (WS).

5. Results and Discussion

The researchers will use the descriptive-analytical and qualitative methods namely, problem-solving-based learning as well as learning by doing on the common performance of the students inside the classroom in terms of analyzing their activities which

are taken from their course book to investigate the following hypothesis: " to what extend using Equity (E) among students can achieve equality?"

Test and Observation Analysis of Statements:

Hypothesis	Hypothesis One	Hypothesis Two	Hypothesis Three	Hypothesis Four	Hypothesis Five
Frequencies	**9**	**8**	**7**	**9**	**8**
Percentages	**90%**	**80%**	**70%**	**90%**	**80%**

Statement One: Weak students (WS) are demotivated.
According to the chart, it is shown that the hypothesis is that weak students (WS) need to be encouraged to raise their motivation to be in Equity (E) with their colleagues to achieve equality among them.

Statement Two: Weak students (WS) are shy.
According to the chart, it is shown that the hypothesis is that weak students (WS) need to break down the barrier by involving themselves in face-to-face activities.

Statement Three: Weak students (WS) are poor in vocabulary.
According to the chart, hypothesis three shows that weak students (WS) must read simplified literature to increase their vocabulary.

Statement Four: Weak students (WS) are negligent.
According to the chart, the hypothesis is that weak students (WS) need to be encouraged to stick to their duties.

Statement Five: Weak students (WS) are always lagging.
According to the chart, it is shown that hypothesis five that weak students (WS) must be serious in their studies.

Hypothesis	Hypothesis Six	Hypothesis Seven	Hypothesis Eight	Hypothesis Nine	Hypothesis Ten
Frequencies	**9**	**7**	**8**	**7**	**9**
Percentages	**90%**	**70%**	**80%**	**70%**	**90%**

Statement Six: Weak students (WS) need to build self-confidence.
According to the chart, it is shown that hypothesis six that weak students (WS) should build some kinds of self-confidence.

Statement Seven: Weak students (WS) cannot write a sentence correctly.
According to the chart, it is shown that the hypothesis is that weak students (WS) are in need to know the grammar rules.

Statement Eight: Weak students (WS) cannot understand the meaning of words.
According to the chart, it is shown that hypothesis eight weak students (WS) need to understand the contextual meaning of words.

Statement Nine: Weak students (WS) cannot read a text correctly.
According to the chart, it is shown that hypothesis nine weak students (WS) need to practice reading in terms of pronunciation, skimming, and scanning.

Statement Ten: Weak students (WS) cannot speak fluently.
According to the chart, it is shown that hypothesis 10 weak students (WS) need to practice speaking in terms of self-confidence, vocabulary, pronunciation and speech following.

Students 'compositions were considered secondary data regarding the test as the tool. Analysis focused on students' written mistakes, sorted out carefully and categorized according to the grammar rules. We have discovered that weak students (WS) face different problems in terms of writing skills, such as capitalization, punctuation, cohesion, coherence, spelling, and word selection.

6. Executive Summary

The analysis of the statements has demonstrated that weak students (WS) need help to raise their levels, motivation and self-confidence. They should be helped in reading and understanding the meaning of words in their contexts and skimming and scanning the text. They should be helped in how to speak fluently in terms of pronunciation, following ideas, understanding, responding, giving feedback, and ending the speech. Relatedly, weak students (WS) should be helped in developing their writing skills such as dealing with capitalization, punctuation, spelling, cohesion and coherence, word selection and how they develop their good handwriting.

Funding: This research received no external funding.
Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

[1] Ainscow, M. (2005). Developing inclusive education systems: what are the levers for change? Journal of Educational Change, 6, 109-124.
[2] Ainscow, M. (2010). Achieving excellence and equity: reflections on the development of practices in one local district over 10 years. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 21 (1), 75-91.
[3] Ainscow, M. (2012). Moving knowledge around: strategies for fostering Equity (E) within educational systems. Journal of Educational Change, 13(3), 289-310.
[4] Ainscow, M.; Booth, T. & Dyson, A. (2006) Inclusion and the standards agenda: negotiating policy pressures in England, International Journal of Inclusive Education, 10 (4-5), 295-308.
[5] Ainscow, M.; Booth, T. & Dyson, A. with Farrell P.; Frankham, J.; Gallannaugh, F.; Howes, A. & Smith, R. (2006). Improving schools, developing inclusion. London: Routledge. Ainscow, M.; Dyson, A., Goldrick, S. and West, M. (2012) Developing equitable education systems. London: Routledge.
[6] Ainscow, M. and Howes, A. (2007). Working together to improve urban secondary schools: a study of practice in one city. School Leadership and Management 27, 285–300.
[7] Ainscow, M.; Muijs, D. and West, M. (2006). Collaboration as a strategy for improving schools in challenging circumstances. Improving Schools 9(3), 192-202.
[8] Ainscow, M.; Nicolaidou, M. and West, M. (2003). Supporting schools in difficulties: The role of school-to-school cooperation. NFER Topic 30, 1-4.
[9] Ainscow, M. and West, M. (eds) (2006). Improving urban schools: leadership and collaboration. Open University Press. Ainscow, M.; West, M. and Nicolaidou, M. (2005). Putting our heads together: a study of
[10] headteacher collaboration as a strategy for school improvement. In Clarke, C. (Ed.). Improving schools in difficult circumstances. London: Continuum.
[11] Anyon, J. (1997). Ghetto schooling: A political economy of urban educational reform. New York: Teachers College.
[12] Brighouse, T. (2007). The London Challenge - a personal view. In T. Brighouse and L. Fullick (eds.). Education in a global city. London: Institute of Education Bedford Waystudys. Chapman, C.; Ainscow, M.; Bragg, J.; Gallannaugh, F.; Mongon, D.; Muijs, D. and West, M. (2008). New models of leadership: Reflections on ECM policy, leadership and practice. Nottingham: NCSL.
[13] Chenoweth, K, (2007). It's being done: Academic success in unexpected schools. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press. Crowther, D.; Cummings, C.; Dyson, A. & Millward, A. (2003). Schools and Area Regeneration. Bristol, The Policy Press. Cummings, C.; Dyson, A. and Todd, L. (2011). Beyond the school gate: can full service and extended schools overcome disadvantage? London: Routledge.
[14] Dobbie, W. and Fryer, R.G. (2009). Are high-quality schools enough to close the achievement gap? Evidence from a bold social experiment in Harlem. Cambridge: Harvard University. Dyson, A., Howes, A. and Roberts, B. (2004). What do we really know about inclusive schools? A systematic review of the study evidence, in: D. Mitchell (Ed.). Special educational needs and inclusive education: major themes in education. London, Routledge Falmer.
[15] Dyson, A. and Raffo, C. (2007). Education and disadvantage: the role of society-orientated schools. Oxford Review of Education 33 (3), 297-314. Gray, J. (2010). Probing the limits of systemic reform: the English case. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan and D. Hopkins (eds.), Second international handbook of educational change. Dordrecht: Springer. Hopkins, D.; Reynolds, D. and Gray, J. (2005). School improvement lessons from study. London: DfES. Kerr, K. and West, M. (Eds.) (2010). Insight 2: Social inequality: can schools narrow the gap? Macclesfield: British Education Study Association. Levin, B. (2005). Thinking about developments in schools in challenging circumstances. presented at the American Educational Study Association, Montreal, April. Lipman, P. (2004). High stakes education: inequality, globalisation and urban school reform. New York: Routledge.
[16] Miles, S. and Ainscow, M. (2011). Responding to diversity in schools. London: Routledge.
[17] Mourshed, M.; Chijioke, C. and Barber, M. (2010). How the world's most improved school systems keep getting better. McKinsey & Company. Muijs, D.; Ainscow, M.; Chapman, C. and West, M. (2011). Collaboration and networking in education. London: Springer.
[18] Muijs, D.; West, M. and Ainscow, M. (2010). Why network? Theoretical perspectives on networking. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 21 (1), 5-26.
[19] OECD (2007). No more failures: ten steps to Equity (E) in education. Paris: OECD.
[20] OECD (2010), PISA 2009 Results: Overcoming Social Background – Equity (E) in Learning Opportunities and Output (Volume II). Paris: OECD.
[21] Sammons, P. (2007). School effectiveness and equity: making connections. Reading: CfBT.

[22] Stringfield, S. (1995). Attempting to improve students' learning through innovative programs – the case for schools evolving into high reliability organizations. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 6 (1), 67-96.
[23] UNESCO (2010). EFA global monitoring report: Reaching the marginalized. Paris: UNESCO/Oxford University Press. West, M. and Ainscow, M. (2010) Improving schools in Hong Kong: a description of the improvement model and some reflections on its impact on schools, teachers and school principals. In S. Huber (Ed.), School leadership - International Perspectives. London: Springer.
[24] Whitehurst, G. J. and Croft. M. (2010). The Harlem Children's Zone, promise neighborhoods, and the broader, bolder approach to education. Washington: The Brookings Institution.
[25] Whitty, G. (2010). Marketization and postmarketization in education. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan and D. Hopkins (eds.). Second international handbook of educational change. Dordrecht: Springer. Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. (2000). The spirit level. London: Allen Lane.
[26] PROMOTING EQUITY (E) IN EDUCATION
[27] Revista de Investigación en Educación. ISSN: 1697-5200 / eISSN 2172-3427