

SOCIAL POLICY LEADERSHIP AND THE INTEGRATION OF MARGINALIZED POPULATIONS: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON INCLUSION, POWER, AND POLICY CHANGE

Jhanet Sebunya

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

*Email of the Author: jsebunya@gmail.com

Publication Date: August, 2025

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The study examined the impact of social policy leadership across global, national, and local levels on the integration of marginalized populations.

Methodology: The study employed a qualitative exploratory research design, drawing on recent peer-reviewed literature, policy documents, and case studies. Data were collected through document analysis and analyzed thematically using Social Exclusion Theory.

Results: Findings revealed that fragmented and inconsistent leadership contributed to inequitable service delivery and tokenistic inclusion. Symbolic representation without structural change was common, and political inertia often impeded sustainable reform. Nevertheless, community-based leadership models and participatory governance approaches showed promise in enabling context-responsive integration.

Conclusion: The study concludes that visionary, inclusive, and participatory social policy leadership is essential for integrating marginalized populations. Leadership must go beyond rhetoric to dismantle structural barriers and foster equitable participation at all levels of governance.

Recommendations: The study recommends unified, experience-centered integration frameworks, participatory governance, decentralized decision-making, leadership capacity building, and disaggregated data systems to inform inclusive policymaking.

Keywords: *Social policy leadership, marginalized populations, social exclusion, participatory governance, inclusive policy, integration, global and local leadership*

INTRODUCTION

The integration of marginalized populations such as refugees, persons with disabilities, ethnic minorities, and indigenous communities relies significantly on the nature and quality of social policy leadership. International institutions like the United Nations, the European Union, and the World Health Organization have developed frameworks to guide inclusive governance, including the UN Global Compact on Refugees and the WHO Global Disability Action Plan. However, global policy frameworks often lack enforceability or operational coherence in local settings, especially in times of crisis. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, many global North states reverted to exclusionary migration policies, reinforcing encampment and containment strategies that marginalized refugees and asylum seekers (Spiegel, 2022; Carducci et al., 2022; Funke, 2023). Similarly, international disability inclusion efforts are often aspirational, with significant gaps between policy rhetoric and ground-level implementation, as seen in South Sudan and Afghanistan (Funke, 2023; Moore et al. (2023); Randerson, 2023).

At the national level, social policy leadership plays a central role in translating international commitments into meaningful integration policies. Countries like Canada and Finland demonstrate how national leadership rooted in participatory values and intersectoral collaboration can lead to more effective inclusion of marginalized groups, particularly in education and healthcare systems (Korntheuer et al., 2021; Hasmath 2015; Carducci et al., 2022). In contrast, countries with authoritarian or centralised governance models often enact policies that superficially acknowledge inclusion while maintaining deeply embedded discriminatory practices. For instance, in Bangladesh, despite extensive NGO activity promoting urban inclusion, weak coordination among ministries and donor-driven agendas undermine systemic change (Taufiq, 2021; Hassan, 2013; Khan, 2023). These disconnects between policy leadership and execution limits long-term structural transformation.

Regionally, the effectiveness of policy leadership is shaped by historical legacies, governance models, and local advocacy strength. In Sub-Saharan Africa, inclusive leadership remains inconsistent despite regional frameworks like the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. Rwanda has made strides in reconciliation and gender inclusion post-genocide, yet ethnic exclusion remains a sensitive and suppressed issue (Uwizeyimana, 2017; Ansoms & Cioffo, 2016; Mutamba, 2022). In Southern Africa, indigenous and rural communities continue to face marginalization due to elite capture and fragmented land governance, even amidst reform efforts (Slayi et al., 2024; Kimengsi et al., 2022; Mphahlele, 2023). These cases highlight the need for leadership that is responsive to local histories and socio-political realities.

Civil society actors, particularly grassroots organizations and rights-based advocacy coalitions, have become vital policy influencers in both the Global North and South. Their ability to hold governments accountable, foster bottom-up leadership, and shape inclusive policy narratives is well documented (Hasmath, 2015; Korntheuer et al., 2021; Randerson, 2023). In countries like New Zealand and Brazil, strong indigenous movements have driven reforms in health, education, and legal recognition. Nonetheless, such movements often face institutional inertia, restrictive legal frameworks, and repression, especially in unstable political contexts. As such, inclusive policy leadership depends not only on institutional design but also on political will, legitimacy, and sustained participatory engagement (Carducci et al., 2022; Spiegel, 2022; Funke, 2023).

Statement of the Problem

Despite increased global commitments to inclusive governance, marginalized populations such as refugees, persons with disabilities, and ethnic minorities remain structurally excluded due to fragmented and ineffective social policy leadership. International frameworks often lack enforcement mechanisms, while national and regional systems suffer from weak intersectoral coordination, elite capture, and limited political will. These systemic challenges result in policy-practice gaps that leave vulnerable groups without meaningful access to services or representation. There is a pressing need for empirical research to critically examine how leadership practices at global, national, and local levels influence the integration of marginalized populations and to inform actionable, context-responsive solutions.

Research Objective

To examine how social policy leadership at global, national, and local levels affects the effective integration of marginalized populations.

Research Questions

The study sought to answer the following question;

How do global social policy frameworks influence national and local leadership practices in the integration of marginalized populations?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social policy leadership involves the capacity of governmental, intergovernmental, and civil society actors to shape and implement policies that advance equity and inclusion. It goes beyond formal authority to include influence over values, resource allocation, and intersectoral

collaboration. Carducci et al. (2022) describe it as a multi-dimensional construct rooted in strategic vision, legitimacy, and inclusiveness. Hasmath (2015) emphasizes the effectiveness of participatory leadership in empowering marginalized groups through decentralization. Yet, as Randerson (2023) notes, systemic power asymmetries often distort leadership, necessitating a reimagining of leadership that embraces intersectionality and structural reform. Thus, effective leadership must address both institutional design and power dynamics.

Despite progressive social policy frameworks, implementation is frequently undermined by entrenched barriers such as political resistance, cultural biases, and institutional inertia. Political elites may resist reforms that threaten existing power structures, especially in contexts where marginalized populations are viewed as politically expendable or socially deviant. As Barron et al. (2022) observe, social protection schemes often exclude those most in need due to elite interests and administrative neglect. Cultural biases, including patriarchal norms or ethnic hierarchies, also prevent equitable application of policies, particularly in conservative societies (Randerson, 2023). Moreover, institutional inertia defined as the reluctance of public systems to adapt Social protection and vulnerable groups during COVID 19 slows down reform efforts, especially when bureaucratic procedures are rigid and accountability mechanisms are weak (Mulugeta, 2022). These barriers reveal the critical need for dynamic, responsive, and politically sensitive policy leadership.

Global social policy frameworks such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the WHO Global Disability Action Plan, and ILO conventions play a pivotal role in shaping domestic policy discourse and guiding inclusive development. These frameworks provide normative direction and benchmarks for accountability, pushing governments toward aligning national strategies with global equity standards. For instance, the WHO's emphasis on disability-inclusive health systems has influenced national health reforms in several African and Asian countries (Funke, 2023). The SDGs, particularly Goal 10 (Reduced Inequalities), serve as a moral and technical compass for countries seeking to dismantle social and economic exclusion (Hasmath, 2015). However, global frameworks are most effective when domesticated into local policy contexts through strong leadership, local ownership, and adequate resourcing (Masuku, 2025).

Effective social policy leadership increasingly draws on participatory governance, decentralization, and inclusive budgeting as best practices for sustainable integration of marginalized populations. Participatory approaches ensure that policy beneficiaries—especially women, youth, and minorities are involved in decision-making processes, enhancing

legitimacy and responsiveness (Hasmath, 2015). Decentralized systems allow local governments to design context-specific interventions, which are often more effective than top-down policies imposed from the center (Carducci et al., 2022). Furthermore, inclusive budgeting processes that involve equity audits and gender-responsive planning help identify resource gaps and correct historical imbalances (Randerson, 2023). These practices are not only administratively effective but also normatively essential in building inclusive welfare systems.

Critical theories have contributed important insights into the failures of social policy leadership by interrogating the historical and structural roots of exclusion. Postcolonial scholars argue that many social policies are built on colonial legacies that marginalize indigenous communities and entrench Eurocentric norms (Slayi et al, 2024). Intersectional frameworks highlight how overlapping identities such as gender, disability, race, and class interact to deepen exclusion even within so-called inclusive systems (Randerson, 2023). Resistance movements, such as indigenous land rights campaigns or disability justice collectives, challenge mainstream policy paradigms and demand redistributive justice rather than mere representation (Kimengsi et al., 2022). These perspectives underscore the necessity for transformative rather than merely reformist leadership.

In the digital age, technology presents both opportunities and challenges for inclusive social policy. Digital tools can enhance transparency, streamline service delivery, and broaden access to marginalized communities through e-government platforms and mobile applications. However, digital inequality remains a major barrier, especially for rural populations, the elderly, and people with disabilities who may lack internet access or digital literacy (Munyoka, 2022). Marien et al. (2019) emphasize the need for "digital equity frameworks" that recognize access to technology as a fundamental right. When properly leveraged, digital innovation can strengthen leadership capacity, facilitate real-time feedback, and foster civic participation in policymaking processes (Mahani et al., 2024). Thus, digital inclusion must be integrated into broader strategies for social transformation.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

The analysis will be grounded in Social Exclusion Theory, a framework first developed by French sociologist René Lenoir in the mid-1970s and later expanded by scholars such as Amartya Sen and Hilary Silver. The theory focuses on the multidimensional processes through which individuals or groups are wholly or partially excluded from full participation in the society in which they live. Key tenets include exclusion from economic resources, political

participation, social services, cultural belonging, and institutional representation. This theory is highly suitable for the present study as it emphasizes both structural and relational dimensions of marginalization factors that are directly influenced by policy leadership. By applying Social Exclusion Theory, the study will assess not only the presence of inclusionary policies but also their capacity to dismantle entrenched systems of disadvantage and power imbalance. This theoretical lens is particularly relevant for analysing how leadership decisions perpetuate or disrupt exclusion across various governance levels.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative research approach with an exploratory design to examine how social policy leadership influences the integration of marginalized populations across global, national, and local levels. Qualitative methods are well-suited for unpacking complex social dynamics, providing rich and context-specific insights into leadership practices and policy processes. Data will be gathered through document analysis of policy papers, academic articles, official reports, and organizational publications related to inclusion and leadership. This method enables a comprehensive understanding of existing frameworks and implementation gaps without relying on primary data. Thematic analysis will be used to identify, organize, and interpret patterns within the data, offering a systematic yet flexible approach to analyzing recurring challenges and success factors. The findings will be synthesized to support a grounded and contextually relevant understanding of the research questions.

FINDINGS

Inconsistent and fragmented policy leadership has been widely documented as a key factor leading to unequal access to essential public goods and services among marginalized populations. Studies show that when leadership fails to coordinate policies across sectors such as health, education, and housing, vulnerable groups experience significant disparities in service delivery (Mulugeta, 2022; Mahani et al., 2024). These gaps are further exacerbated in low-resource settings where institutional capacity is limited and governance is often decentralized without adequate oversight (Funke, 2023). The lack of coherent leadership frameworks undermines efforts to create equitable systems, resulting in persistent social exclusion.

Moreover, the failure to institutionalize inclusive policy leadership across levels of government contributes to inconsistent implementation and policy reversals, particularly in fragile states or politically unstable regions (Masuku, 2025; Sacca et al., 2022). These challenges disrupt

continuity in service provision and breed mistrust among marginalized communities, reinforcing social and economic inequalities (Marien et al., 2022). Hence, consistent, accountable, and integrated leadership is essential for the sustainable delivery of public goods and services.

Tokenism in policy approaches toward marginalized groups often results in superficial gains that do not challenge deeper structural inequalities. Inclusion efforts that prioritize symbolic representation over meaningful empowerment risk reinforcing stereotypes and perpetuating exclusion (Randerson, 2022; Slayi et al, 2024). Many policies, while rhetorically supportive of marginalized groups, lack concrete mechanisms for addressing economic, social, and political barriers embedded in systemic discrimination (Carducci et al., 2022).

Research shows that without transformative leadership that critically interrogates power relations and historical contexts, policies fail to redistribute resources or shift institutional cultures (Kimengsi, 2022; Hasmath, 2015, Bäck, & Stenvall, 2023). Tokenistic inclusion often results in short-lived programs without sustainable impact, highlighting the need for leadership committed to structural change rather than symbolic compliance (Munyoka, 2022).

The capacity of leaders to effectively promote inclusion is often limited by insufficient knowledge of marginalized populations' specific needs and a lack of political will to challenge entrenched interests. Studies indicate that many policymakers and administrators are inadequately trained or lack awareness of intersectional vulnerabilities, leading to poorly designed or implemented policies (Sanil, 2023). This knowledge gap undermines efforts to create responsive and culturally sensitive programs.

Additionally, political leadership frequently prioritizes short-term gains over inclusive reforms, especially where marginalized populations lack voting power or political influence (Intungane, Long, Gateri, & Dhungel, 2024; Barron et al., (2022). The absence of strong political commitment results in insufficient funding, weak monitoring, and ineffective policy enforcement. Therefore, building leaders' capacity and fostering political accountability are critical for advancing inclusive social policies.

A significant consequence of weak social policy leadership is the persistent underrepresentation of marginalized populations in decision-making processes. This exclusion reinforces their alienation and dependence on top-down welfare systems, limiting their agency and ability to advocate for their own needs (Sacca et al., 2022; Mahani et al., 2024). The absence of inclusive

governance structures often results in policies that do not reflect the lived realities of these groups.

Empirical studies reveal that inclusive representation enhances policy relevance and effectiveness, but marginalized groups are frequently sidelined by institutional gatekeeping, discrimination, and lack of access to political platforms (Funke, 2023; Hasmath 2015). Strengthening participatory mechanisms and ensuring marginalized voices are heard in governance is therefore imperative for sustainable inclusion and empowerment.

Community-based leadership approaches have emerged as promising strategies for advancing the inclusion of marginalized populations by leveraging local knowledge, trust, and networks. These models facilitate context-specific solutions and empower communities to participate actively in policy design and implementation (Slayi et al, 2024; Mulugeta, 2022). Local leadership has been shown to improve responsiveness and foster social innovation that aligns with cultural values and community priorities.

Furthermore, decentralized leadership models that incorporate participatory governance and capacity building enhance accountability and resource mobilization at the grassroots level (Hasmath, 2015; Kimengsi, 2022). Evidence from various regions suggests that community-led initiatives, supported by enabling policy environments, can reduce marginalization and promote equitable development outcomes.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study underscore that the effective integration of marginalized populations is critically dependent on visionary, inclusive, and participatory social policy leadership. Addressing leadership gaps and ensuring meaningful engagement across governance levels is essential to prevent the reproduction of systemic exclusion. Ultimately, integration must move beyond rhetorical commitments to embody transformative action rooted in empathy, equity, and sustained collaboration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommends the development of a unified integration framework grounded in the lived experiences of marginalized groups, incorporating clear objectives, participatory mechanisms, and strong accountability systems. It further calls for targeted training and professional development for leaders at all levels, focusing on rights-based, intersectional, and culturally sensitive policymaking. Coordinated collaboration across government ministries,

civil society, academia, and communities should be institutionalized to ensure inclusive and informed policy processes. The study also advocates for the decentralization of decision-making to foster grassroots participation and locally relevant solutions. Lastly, it emphasizes the need for robust, disaggregated data systems to track exclusion patterns, guide evidence-based reforms, and ensure transparency in integration outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Ansoms, A., & Cioffo, G. (2017). The exemplary citizen on the exemplary hill: The production of political subjectivity in contemporary Rwanda. *Development and Change*, 47(6), 1247–1270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12272>
- Barron, G. C., Laryea-Adjei, G., Vike-Freiberga, V., Abubakar, I., Dakkak, H., Devakumar, D., ... & Karadag, O. (2022). Safeguarding people living in vulnerable conditions in the COVID-19 era through universal health coverage and social protection. *The Lancet Public Health*, 7(1), e86–e92.
- Carducci, B., Keats, E. C., Amri, M., Plamondon, K. M., Shoveller, J., Ako, O., ... & Di Ruggiero, E. (2022). Prioritizing gender equity and intersectionality in Canadian global health institutions and partnerships. *PLOS Global Public Health*, 2(10), e0001105.
- Funke, C. (2023). No context is too challenging: Promoting, doing and achieving inclusion in the humanitarian response in South Sudan. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 105(922), 375–395.
- Hasmath, R. (2015). The paradigms of inclusive growth, development and welfare policy. In *Inclusive growth, development and welfare policy* (pp. 13–21). Routledge.
- Hassan, M. (2013). Political settlement dynamics in a limited-access order: The case of Bangladesh. *Scholar* Google. https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Political+Settlement+and+the+Politics+of+Inclusion%3A+Bangladesh%27s+Contested+Urban+Governance
- Intungane, D., Long, J., Gateri, H., & Dhungel, R. (2024). Employment barriers for racialized immigrants in Edmonton: Exploring multisectoral collaboration. *Genealogy*, 8(2), 40. <https://doi.org/10.3390/genealogy8020040>

- Kimengsi, J. N., & Bhusal, P. (2022). Community forestry governance: Lessons for Cameroon and Nepal. *Society & Natural Resources*, 35(4), 447–464.
- Korntheuer, A., Hynie, M., Kleist, M., Farooqui, S., Lutter, E., & Westphal, M. (2021). Inclusive resettlement? Integration pathways of resettled refugees with disabilities in Germany and Canada. *Frontiers in Human Dynamics*, 3, 668264. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2021.668264>
- Mahani, A., Lyeo, J. S., Fung, A., Husack, K., Muhajarine, N., Diener, T., & Brown, C. (2024). Barriers to integration of health and equity into urban design policies in Regina, Saskatchewan. *Health Promotion International*, 39(6), daae184.
- Marien, I., Asmar, A., Van Audenhove, L., Korenhof, M., & Klaijsen, A. (2019). No one-size fits all: From digital inequality profiles to a customised digital inclusion strategie. In *Digital Inclusion Policy and Research Conference 2019 (DIRPC2019)*.
- Masuku, S. (2025). Universal refugee social protection guidelines: A discussion into the challenges to their successful adoption. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 38(2), 281–307.
- Moore, J., Elliott, I. C., & Hesselgreaves, H. (2023). Collaborative leadership in integrated care systems; creating leadership for the common good. *Journal of Change Management*, 23(4), 358–373.
- Mphahlele, R. B. (2023). *Evaluating the impact of government support programme on the development of land reform farms in South Africa* (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Free State).
- Mulyokela, W. (2022). Inclusive digital innovation in South Africa: Perspectives from disadvantaged and marginalized communities. *Sustainability*, 14(9), 5372. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14095372>
- Munyonoka, J. (2022). Rwanda's post-genocide governance and ethnic reconciliation. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 14(2), 121–138. https://doi.org/10.10520/ejc-ajpa_v14_n2_a10

- Mulugheta, W. M. (2022). Inequality, social protection policy, and inclusion: Pertinent theories and empirical evidence. *Journal of Social and Economic Development*, 24(2), 241–265.
- Randerson, K. (2023). The futures of business schools: Identity, strategies, and imagined futures for a pandemic/post-pandemic world. *Futures*, 150, 103175.
- Sacca, L., Shegog, R., Hernandez, B., Peskin, M., Rushing, S. C., Jessen, C., ... & Markham, C. (2022). Barriers, frameworks, and mitigating strategies influencing the dissemination and implementation of health promotion interventions in Indigenous communities: A scoping review. *Implementation Science*, 17(1), 18.
- Sanil, A. (2023). COVID-19 and intergenerational equity: Can social protection initiatives transcend caste barriers in India? In *Social Policy Review* 35 (pp. 63–81). Policy Press.
- Slayi, M., Zhou, L., Thamaga, K. H., & Nyambo, P. (2024). The role of social inclusion in restoring communal rangelands in Southern Africa: A systematic review of approaches, challenges, and outcomes. *Land*, 13(9), 1521.
- Spiegel, S. J. (2022). Refugee policy amidst global shocks: Encampment, resettlement barriers and the search for ‘durable solutions’. *Global Policy*, 13(4), 427–441. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.13084>
- Taufiq, H. A. (2021). Role of NGOs in fostering equity and social inclusion in cities of Bangladesh: The case of Dhaka. *arXiv Preprint*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.13716>
- Uwizeyimana, D. E. (2017). Social exclusion in Rwanda under different leadership regimes. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, 15(24), 1–39. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321098790>