Indonesian Journal of Community and Special Needs Education

Pedagogical Strategies for Enhancing Inclusive Education in Uzbekistan: Challenges, Interventions, and Social Impact

Tagonova Guliza Bayramalievna*, Arslonova Marjona, Mirzaliyeva Guljakhon

Chirchik State Pedagogical University, Chirchik, Uzbekistan

*Correspondence: E-mail: gulizayangiyevs@gmail.com

A B S T R A C T

The study aims to assess the awareness, readiness, and attitudes of primary school teachers, parents, and community leaders toward inclusive education, identifying gaps and proposing actionable strategies. Employing a mixed-methods approach—literature analysis, structured surveys, interviews, and observations—data were collected from selected stakeholders across five public schools. Pre- and post-intervention surveys revealed a significant increase in awareness and understanding of inclusive education following targeted seminars and capacity-building sessions. Results highlighted that while legal and policy frameworks for inclusive education exist, major barriers include limited teacher training, inadequate infrastructure, and societal stigma. The study proposes a strategic model focusing on teacher training, community sensitization, and institutional capacity-building. Findings underscore the transformative potential of inclusive education not only in ensuring social equity but also in fostering national human capital development. This research contributes to the growing discourse on inclusive pedagogy in Central Asia and offers policy-relevant recommendations to scale inclusive practices nationwide.

A R T I C L E   I N F O

1. INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education has emerged as a pivotal global movement aimed at ensuring the right of all children—including those with disabilities and special educational needs (SEN)—to access quality education in mainstream settings (Buchner *et al.*, 2021). Internationally, frameworks such as the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities advocate for inclusive practices to foster social equity and empowerment. In Uzbekistan, the 2020 Presidential Decree No. PP-4860 marks a significant step toward aligning the national education system with international standards by promoting inclusive learning environments (Mannan *et al.*, 2012).

Despite legislative advancements, the implementation of inclusive education remains inconsistent due to systemic barriers such as limited pedagogical expertise, insufficient resources, and prevailing social misconceptions (Kurowski *et al.*, 2022). Previous studies by Marshall, Lindqvist, and Shmatko emphasize the importance of teacher preparedness and institutional readiness as key determinants of successful inclusive education. However, in the Uzbek context, empirical data on stakeholder perceptions, readiness, and pedagogical strategies remain limited (Nurmaganbetova *et al.*, 2020).

This study addresses this research gap by assessing the understanding and attitudes of teachers, parents, and community members regarding inclusive education in selected districts. The novelty of this research lies in its action-based approach, integrating stakeholder feedback into capacity-building interventions. The goal is to develop evidence-based strategies to improve pedagogical practices and promote social integration for students with SEN, thereby contributing to sustainable educational reform in Uzbekistan.

2. METHODS

This study employed a mixed-methods research design that combined both qualitative and quantitative approaches to analyze the perspectives and readiness of stakeholders in implementing inclusive education. The research subjects included elementary school teachers from five public schools (Schools No. 2, 6, 7, 8, and 15) in the Chirchik District, parents of students enrolled in the pilot inclusive classrooms, and community leaders or heads of local mahallas. Data were collected using four primary techniques: (1) literature analysis of both international and local scholarly works addressing inclusive education pedagogy; (2) surveys and questionnaires to assess participants' initial knowledge, attitudes, and perceived challenges; (3) structured interviews to explore deeper experiences and concerns of teachers and parents; and (4) direct observations of classroom practices and school facilities to evaluate infrastructural readiness for inclusive education. The research was conducted in three experimental stages. The first stage involved surveys and interviews with mahalla leaders to assess community awareness of inclusive education. The second stage focused on pre- and post-assessment of teachers' pedagogical readiness following a series of professional training sessions. The third stage involved assessments of parents and community engagement through interactive workshops and simulation-based awareness programs. Quantitative data were analyzed using basic statistical tools to identify significant changes before and after interventions, while qualitative data were analyzed thematically through a process of coding and interpreting participant narratives.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The baseline findings of this study revealed a significant lack of preparedness and understanding among key stakeholders regarding inclusive education. Prior to the intervention, 84% of teachers demonstrated little to no awareness of the core principles and practices of inclusive education. The remaining 16% exhibited only a partial understanding, primarily limited to surface-level familiarity with legal or policy-related terminology, rather than pedagogical implications. This lack of conceptual clarity was compounded by infrastructural limitations, as most schools involved in the study lacked basic accessibility features such as ramps, handrails, and appropriately designed restroom facilities, rendering them ill-equipped to accommodate students with special educational needs (SEN) (Azupogo *et al*., 2025; Owusu-Ansah *et al*., 2019). Moreover, parental attitudes posed another substantial barrier: many parents expressed resistance to inclusive practices, driven by prevailing misconceptions about disability and concerns that integrating children with SEN might negatively impact the learning environment or academic outcomes of their own children (Bani Odeh & Lach, 2024; MacLeod *et al*., 2017; Pratiwi *et al*., 2024; Elton-Chalcraft *et al*., 2016).

However, the post-intervention findings indicated a significant shift in awareness and attitudes. After targeted professional development training sessions, 86% of teachers not only showed improved comprehension of inclusive education but also demonstrated the ability to articulate specific strategies for inclusive classroom management and instructional differentiation. Teachers reported increased confidence in employing differentiated instruction techniques and adapting learning materials to accommodate diverse student needs (Suprayogi *et al*., 2017; Dixon *et al*., 2014; Alavinia & Farhady, 2012; Tobin & Tippett, 2014; Bi *et al*., 2023). Additionally, parental attitudes improved markedly, with 71% of surveyed parents expressing supportive views toward the integration of children with SEN into mainstream classrooms. This shift was influenced by interactive awareness sessions and community engagement activities that addressed misconceptions and emphasized the social benefits of inclusivity (Greenhalgh *et al*., 2016; Atkinson *et al*., 2011; Francisco *et al*., 2020; Estrada *et al*., 2018; Baquedano-López *et al*., 2013; Maton, 2000; Githens, 2007). Community leaders and mahalla representatives also voiced greater support for inclusive education, signalling a potential cultural shift at the local level.

The discussion of these results aligns with findings from earlier research, which highlight the centrality of sustained professional development and stakeholder engagement in the successful implementation of inclusive practices (Stifer *et al*., 2023; Waitoller & Artiles, 2013; Penuel *et al*., 2020). While the interventions implemented in this study yielded promising outcomes in a relatively short period, several challenges remain. These include the need for systemic institutional support, long-term policy enforcement, dedicated budget allocation for infrastructure development, and a comprehensive redesign of the national teacher education curriculum to integrate inclusive education training as a core component. Without such structural reforms, the sustainability and scalability of inclusive practices may remain limited. Nevertheless, the positive changes observed in teacher readiness, parental acceptance, and community involvement offer a strong foundation for future efforts to advance inclusive education in Uzbekistan.

4. CONCLUSION

The study concludes that while policy frameworks for inclusive education exist in Uzbekistan, their implementation is hindered by limited awareness, insufficient teacher training, and infrastructural constraints. Experimental interventions revealed that targeted training and community sensitization significantly enhance stakeholder readiness and acceptance of inclusive education. The study recommends the institutionalization of ongoing teacher professional development, investment in inclusive infrastructure, and nationwide campaigns to shift public perceptions. This research provides a scalable model for inclusive education implementation in developing countries, emphasizing the synergy between policy, pedagogy, and community engagement. It supports the government's vision of inclusive, equitable, and quality education for all, aligning with Sustainable Development Goal 4.

5. AUTHORS' NOTE

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. Authors confirmed that the paper was free of plagiarism.

6. REFERENCES

Alavinia, P., and Farhady, S. (2012). Teaching vocabulary through differentiated instruction: Insights from multiple intelligences and learning styles. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, *2*(4), 73.

Atkinson, J. A., Vallely, A., Fitzgerald, L., Whittaker, M., and Tanner, M. (2011). The architecture and effect of participation: a systematic review of community participation for communicable disease control and elimination implications for malaria elimination. *Malaria Journal*, *10*, 1-33.

Azupogo, U. W., Dassah, E., and Bisung, E. (2025). Navigating water and sanitation environments in schools: Exploring health risk perceptions of children with physical disabilities using drawing. *Wellbeing, Space and Society*, *8*, 100255.

Bani Odeh, K., and Lach, L. M. (2024). Barriers to, and facilitators of, education for children with disabilities worldwide: a descriptive review. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *11*, 1294849.

Baquedano-López, P., Alexander, R. A., and Hernandez, S. J. (2013). Equity issues in parental and community involvement in schools: What teacher educators need to know. *Review of Research in Education*, *37*(1), 149-182.

Bi, M., Struyven, K., and Zhu, C. (2023). Variables that influence teachers' practice of differentiated instruction in Chinese classrooms: A study from teachers' perspectives. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1124259.

Buchner, T., Shevlin, M., Donovan, M. A., Gercke, M., Goll, H., Šiška, J., and Corby, D. (2021). Same progress for all? Inclusive education, the United Nations Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities and students with intellectual disability in European countries. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, *18*(1), 7-22.

Dixon, F. A., Yssel, N., McConnell, J. M., and Hardin, T. (2014). Differentiated instruction, professional development, and teacher efficacy. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, *37*(2), 111-127.

Elton-Chalcraft, S., Cammack, P., and Harrison, L. (2016). Segregation, integration, inclusion and effective provision: a case study of perspectives from special educational needs children, parents and teachers in Bangalore, India. *International Journal of Special Education*, *31*(1), 2-9.

Estrada, M., Eroy-Reveles, A., and Matsui, J. (2018). The influence of affirming kindness and community on broadening participation in STEM career pathways. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *12*(1), 258-297.

Francisco, M. P. B., Hartman, M., and Wang, Y. (2020). Inclusion and special education. *Education Sciences*, *10*(9), 238.

Githens, R. P. (2007). Older adults and e-learning: Opportunities and barriers. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, *8*(4), 329.

Greenhalgh, T., Jackson, C., Shaw, S., and Janamian, T. (2016). Achieving research impact through co-creation in community-based health services: literature review and case study. *The Milbank Quarterly*, *94*(2), 392-429.

Kurowski, M., Černý, M., and Trapl, F. (2022). A review study of research articles on the barriers to inclusive education in primary schools. *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, *15*(2), 116-130.

MacLeod, K., Causton, J. N., Radel, M., and Radel, P. (2017). Rethinking the individualized education plan process: Voices from the other side of the table. *Disability & Society*, *32*(3), 381-400.

Mannan, H., MacLachlan, M., McVeigh, J., and EquitAble Consortium. (2012). Core concepts of human rights and inclusion of vulnerable groups in the United Nations Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities. *Alter*, *6*(3), 159-177.

Maton, K. I. (2000). Making a difference: The social ecology of social transformation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *28*(1), 25-57.

Nurmaganbetova, R., Kaldybayeva, A., Sartbekova, N., Umirbekova, A., and Akhmetshin, E. (2020). Formation of readiness of future teachers of the Republic of Kazakhstan for implementation of education in the inclusive environment. *Journal of Intellectual Disability-Diagnosis and Treatment*, *8*(2), 205-210.

Owusu-Ansah, J. K., Baisie, A., and Oduro-Ofori, E. (2019). The mobility impaired and the built environment in Kumasi: Structural obstacles and individual experiences. *GeoJournal*, *84*, 1003-1020.

Penuel, W. R., Riedy, R., Barber, M. S., Peurach, D. J., LeBouef, W. A., and Clark, T. (2020). Principles of collaborative education research with stakeholders: Toward requirements for a new research and development infrastructure. *Review of Educational Research*, *90*(5), 627-674.

Pratiwi, H., Ismail, M., and Riwanda, A. (2024). Questioning inclusive city quality: Teachers' perspectives and experiences in sexuality education for children with special needs in Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *127*, 102419.

Stofer, K. A., Hanson, D., and Hecht, K. (2023). Scientists need professional development to practice meaningful public engagement. *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, *10*(1), 2127672.

Suprayogi, M. N., Valcke, M., and Godwin, R. (2017). Teachers and their implementation of differentiated instruction in the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *67*, 291-301.

Tobin, R., and Tippett, C. D. (2014). Possibilities and potential barriers: Learning to plan for differentiated instruction in elementary science. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, *12*, 423-443.

Waitoller, F. R., and Artiles, A. J. (2013). A decade of professional development research for inclusive education: A critical review and notes for a research program. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(3), 319-356.