

## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

## GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Normo‘minova Gulhayo Shavkatovna  
Assistant, Department of Pedagogy  
Samarkand State Pedagogical Institute

### Abstract

This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of the concepts, core goals, and operational objectives of inclusive education. It underscores the critical importance of providing equitable educational opportunities for all children, specifically focusing on those with disabilities and diverse special educational needs (SEN). The paper traces the historical evolutionary trajectory of inclusive education, mapping the shift from institutional isolation to modern inclusive practices through foundational concepts such as deinstitutionalization, normalization, integration, and mainstreaming. Furthermore, it examines the structural role of inclusive education in building a democratic, empathetic, and supportive society. It highlights the systemic changes required in school infrastructure, curriculum design, and teacher training to ensure that every learner can actively participate, feel a sense of belonging, and develop their full potential.

**Keywords:** Inclusive education, special needs education, integration, mainstreaming, normalization, deinstitutionalization, equal opportunities, disabilities, social inclusion, educational support, Universal Design for Learning.

### 1. Introduction and Conceptual Framework

“Inclusive education is a process of addressing and responding to the diverse needs of all learners through increasing participation in learning, cultures, and communities, and reducing exclusion within and from education” (UNESCO, 1994). This foundational definition establishes that education is not a privilege

## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

distributed based on ability, but a fundamental human right. Inclusion demands that the general education system takes responsibility for all children, transforming its structural, pedagogical, and philosophical identity to accommodate diversity. Historically, educational systems operated on a medical model of disability. This model viewed functional limitations as personal deficits requiring segregation in specialized, isolated environments. Inclusive education replaces this with a social-rights model. It posits that disability is a product of interaction between an individual and an unaccommodating environment. Therefore, inclusion is the practice of educating children with disabilities alongside their non-disabled peers in the same general education classrooms. This ensures access, participation, and achievement for everyone, regardless of their intellectual, physical, or socio-economic differences.

Through inclusive education, all members of the school community—teachers, students, administrators, and parents—develop a deep sense of mutual belonging. It rejects the historical practice of separating children into isolated institutions, which fractures social cohesion and reinforces stigma. Instead, it positions the classroom as a microcosm of a democratic, diverse society.

### **2. Historical Context: From Segregation to Inclusion**

By nature, human societies have frequently exhibited caution, fear, and uncertainty toward individuals who diverge significantly from established cultural or physical norms. Throughout history, children with special educational needs have faced neglect, severe isolation, and institutional segregation. Early special education models—such as boarding institutions, asylum-style schools, and completely separate classrooms—were structural extensions of this isolationist philosophy.

Over the past four decades, a series of progressive paradigm shifts emerged to dismantle these oppressive structures. To fully comprehend the modern

## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

framework of inclusive education, one must analyze five interrelated historical concepts that served as stepping stones:

### 2.1 Deinstitutionalization

This movement emerged mid-20th century as a direct challenge to the institutionalization of individuals with psychiatric and physical disabilities. Deinstitutionalization demanded an end to placing children in cold, clinical, and isolated institutions under the guise of "medical care" or "treatment." It advocated for removing individuals from confinement and embedding them into community-based social and familial environments, establishing that children thrive best when raised within a family and local community.

### 2.2 Normalization

Originating in Scandinavia through the work of Bengt Nirje and later expanded by Wolf Wolfensberger, normalization refers to making the daily patterns, educational settings, and living conditions of a person with disabilities as close to the culturally normal standards of society as possible. It asserted that individuals with special needs should have routines, choices, and developmental opportunities identical to those of their peers.

### 2.3 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

LRE became a cornerstone of educational law, particularly through the United States' Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). This principle states that a student with a disability should have the opportunity to be educated with non-disabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate. It mandates that specialized or separate placement should occur only when the nature or severity of the disability prevents successful education in regular classes, even with the use of supplementary aids and services.

## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

### 2.4 Integration

Integration marked the initial physical transition of children with special needs out of separate schools and into mainstream school buildings. However, integration differed fundamentally from inclusion. In an integrated model, the child was expected to adapt to the existing, unchanged school structure. If the child could not "fit in" or keep up with the rigid standard curriculum, they were often returned to segregated settings.

### 2.5 Mainstreaming

Mainstreaming refers specifically to the practice of placing students with mild or moderate disabilities into regular classrooms during specific time periods, often for non-academic subjects or specific academic areas where they could perform at grade level. It relied on individualized planning to foster academic and social adjustment but still viewed the regular classroom as a place where the child had to earn their entry, rather than a place where they inherently belonged.

Modern inclusive education supersedes all these concepts. While integration and mainstreaming focused on fixing the child to fit the school, inclusion focuses on fixing the school to welcome the child.

### 3. The Core Goals of Inclusive Education

The overarching goal of inclusive education is the realization of "Education for All" (EFA) by guaranteeing equal opportunities for every single child within a unified system. In an equitable, democratic society, education serves as the primary engine for social mobility and human rights execution. The broad goals of this system are detailed below:

**Fostering Unconditional Belonging and Shared Humanity:** Schools must welcome all individuals with open hearts. A truly inclusive school is a community where pain, vulnerabilities, and learning difficulties are openly shared and

## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

supported, while happiness, breakthroughs, and diverse successes are collectively celebrated.

**Strengthening Human Dignity and Deconstructing Stereotypes:** Inclusion aims to protect and elevate the inherent dignity of every student. By bringing diverse populations into daily contact, it systematically dismantles social prejudices, refutes harmful stereotypes, and fosters an understanding that no human being is perfect, yet every human being is valuable.

**Cultivating Intercultural and Inter-ability Empathy:** Inclusion provides non-disabled students with daily opportunities to interact directly with peers who experience the world differently. This continuous contact teaches children to look past superficial differences, cultivating deep empathy, authentic acceptance, and genuine respect for human variance.

**Constructing a Realistic Social Microcosm:** Experiencing an inclusive school environment allows students with disabilities to become full members of their local community from an early age. It helps them navigate the complexities, expectations, and competitive elements of a diverse society while accurately recognizing and developing their unique strengths and boundaries.

**Maximizing Individual Self-Esteem:** A foundational goal of inclusion is providing the emotional, psychological, and academic scaffolding necessary for every child to develop robust self-esteem. High self-worth is the vital prerequisite for living an independent, self-determined, and dignified adult life.

#### 4. Operational Objectives and Implementation Frameworks

To translate these high-level philosophical goals into daily classroom realities, educational institutions must pursue specific, highly structured operational

## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

objectives. These objectives target infrastructure, pedagogical strategies, teacher competency, and community engagement.

### 4.1 Systemic Identification and Proactive Enrollment

The primary objective of an inclusive system is the early identification of children with diverse learning needs, followed by their immediate enrollment in local general education schools. This requires moving away from delayed medical diagnoses and moving toward proactive, school-based assessments that evaluate a child's functional and educational support requirements.

### 4.2 Application of Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

To meet the special educational needs of both disabled and non-disabled children within the same space, educational design must be flexible. This objective is met through the implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), a framework based on three core principles:

**1. Multiple Means of Engagement:** Stimulating interest and motivation for learning through diverse instructional styles (e.g., gamification, collaborative groups, independent projects).

**2. Multiple Means of Representation:** Presenting information and course content in various formats (e.g., text, audio, video, tactile graphics, hands-on models) to ensure accessibility for students with sensory or cognitive differences.

**3. Multiple Means of Action and Expression:** Allowing students to demonstrate their knowledge and competencies through flexible assessments (e.g., oral presentations, visual portfolios, digital assignments, instead of solely relying on traditional written exams).

## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

### 4.3 Differentiated Instruction and Curricular Adaptation

Inclusion does not imply that every student must perform identical tasks at the exact same pace. The modern objective is the systematic execution of differentiated instruction. Teachers must alter the content, process, products, and learning environment to match individual readiness levels. This involves implementing **Individualized Education Plans (IEPs)** for students requiring intense support, specifying accommodations such as extended testing time, assistive technologies (e.g., screen readers, speech-to-text software), and scaffolded assignments.

### 4.4 Continuous Professional Development for Educators

A school cannot be truly inclusive if its teaching staff lacks confidence and pedagogical competence. A critical objective is the continuous pre-service and in-service training of teachers. Educators must be equipped with modern skills in classroom management, cooperative teaching models (such as co-teaching alongside special education specialists), diagnostic teaching techniques, and positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS).

### 4.5 Development of Collaborative Educational Ecosystems

Inconclusive education cannot succeed in isolation. Schools must establish strong, collaborative networks linking general teachers, special educators, speech therapists, psychologists, parents, and community leaders. Parents must be treated as equal partners in the design and execution of their child's educational journey, ensuring consistency between home and school environments.

## 5. Challenges and Structural Barriers to Inclusion

While the theoretical benefits of inclusive education are universally acknowledged, the practical execution faces severe, deeply entrenched structural and systemic barriers across various global contexts.

## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

**Attitudinal Barriers:** The most pervasive obstacles are negative social attitudes, misconceptions, and low expectations held by teachers, parents of non-disabled children, and school administrators. When educators view a student with a disability as a liability or a burden that slows down the classroom, the child experiences psychological exclusion, even if they are physically present.

**Environmental and Architectural Barriers:** Many mainstream schools remain physically inaccessible. The lack of wheelchair ramps, elevators, accessible restrooms, tactile paving for visually impaired students, and appropriate acoustic treatment for hearing-impaired learners directly compromises a child's independence and right to equal access.

**Rigid, Standardized Curricula:** Educational systems that prioritize hyper-competitive, standardized testing and uniform curriculum delivery present a major barrier to inclusion. When success is measured solely through narrow, high-stakes academic metrics, teachers are disincentivized from dedicating time to children who require adaptive pacing or non-traditional assessment methods.

**Resource Deficits and Underfunding:** True inclusion requires financial investment in assistive devices, modified textbooks, specialized teaching aids, and lowered teacher-to-student ratios. In many regions, underfunded public schools are overcrowded, leaving teachers without the physical time or structural support required to address individual student diversities.

### 6. Conclusion

Inclusive education represents a vital evolution away from historical paradigms of isolation, medicalized institutionalization, and discriminatory segregation. By systematically integrating the core values of deinstitutionalization, normalization, and the least restrictive environment, modern inclusion redefines the school as an

## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

equitable, democratic sanctuary where every child—regardless of intellectual, physical, or sensory differences—is inherently welcomed and valued. The ultimate goal of this educational reform extends far beyond academic achievements; it aims to construct the foundations of a tolerant, empathetic, and unified society. Achieving this vision requires a collective shift from viewing disability as a personal deficit to recognizing it as an asset to human diversity. This transformation demands structural overhauls, including the adoption of Universal Design for Learning, comprehensive teacher professional development, the elimination of architectural and attitudinal barriers, and the establishment of robust collaborative networks between schools and families. Ultimately, inclusive education operationalizes the democratic truth that a society's ethical integrity and strength are evaluated by how it embraces, educates, and elevates its most vulnerable members. Investing in inclusive schools ensures that we build a world where everyone belongs, everyone contributes, and everyone can realize their full potential.

### References

1. Ainscow, M. (2005). Developing inclusive education systems: What are the levers for change? *Journal of Educational Change*, 6(2), 109-124.
2. Forlin, C. (2010). *Teacher education for inclusion: Changing paradigms and innovative approaches*. Routledge.
3. Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1996). Inclusion, school restructuring, and the remaking of American society. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(4), 762-797.
4. National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE). *Report on Inclusive Education Practice and Policy Frameworks*. New Delhi: NCTE.
5. Nirje, B. (1969). The normalization principle and its human management implications. In R. Kugel, & W. Wolfensberger (Eds.), *Changing Patterns in Residential Services for the Mentally Retarded*. Washington, D.C.: President's Committee on Mental Retardation.

## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

6. UNESCO (1994). The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. Paris: UNESCO / Ministry of Education and Science, Spain.
7. UNICEF (2014). Conceptualizing Inclusive Education and Contextualizing it within the UNICEF Mission. Companion Technical Booklet, New York: UNICEF.
8. Wolfensberger, W. (1972). The Principle of Normalization in Human Services. Toronto: National Institute on Mental Retardation.