

THE ROLE OF SCHOOL, FAMILY, AND SOCIETY IN ADVANCING INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

D.B.Solomons¹

Mas'ul muallif: Solomons
Donovan Benedict, International
Consultant to the Director of the
Khorezm Regional Center for
Pedagogical Skills.

Accepted: 13 Sentabr 2026
Published: 13 Sentabr 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the
author(s). Licensee Buxoro xalqaro
universiteti ilmiy axborotnomasi.

Iqtibos uchun: Solomons, D. B.
THE ROLE OF SCHOOL, FAMILY,
AND SOCIETY IN ADVANCING
INCLUSIVE EDUCATION / D. B.
Solomons // Buxoro xalqaro
universiteti ilmiy axborotnomasi.
— 2026. — T. 9, № 1. — B.
224–227.

1. International Consultant to the Director of the Khorezm Regional Center for Pedagogical Skills

Abstract. The article examines the interconnected work of the school, the family, and society in advancing inclusive education. Inclusion is interpreted not as the mechanical placement of children with special needs into a mainstream setting, but as the capacity of the education system itself to adjust to the abilities of every learner. The study comparatively explores the organisational and pedagogical potential of the school, the primary socialising function of the family, and the level of socio-cultural readiness within the wider community. Drawing on an analysis of theoretical sources together with data obtained through pedagogical observation, a staged model of partnership among the three actors is proposed. The concluding section sets out practical recommendations aimed at improving the effectiveness of inclusive education.

Keywords: inclusive education, special educational needs, school environment, family pedagogy, social partnership, tolerance, adaptive curriculum, socialisation.

INKLYUZIV TA'LIMNI RIVOJLANTIRISHDA MAKTAB, OILA VA JAMIYATNING ROLI

Annotatsiya. Maqolada inklyuziv ta'limni rivojlantirish jarayonida maktab, oila va jamiyat institutlarining o'zaro bog'liq faoliyati tahlil qilinadi. Inklyuziya alohida ehtiyojli bolalarni ta'lim muhitiga mexanik ravishda joylashtirish emas, balki ta'lim tizimining har bir o'quvchi imkoniyatiga moslashuvi sifatida talqin etiladi. Tadqiqotda maktabning tashkiliy-pedagogik salohiyati, oilaning birlamchi ijtimoiylashtiruvchi vazifasi hamda jamiyatning ijtimoiy-madaniy tayyorgarlik darajasi qiyosiy tarzda o'rganilgan. Nazariy manbalar tahlili va pedagogik kuzatuv natijalariga tayanib, uch subyekt hamkorligining bosqichli modeli taklif qilinadi. Xulosada inklyuziv ta'lim samaradorligini oshirishga qaratilgan amaliy tavsiyalar bayon etilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: inklyuziv ta'lim, alohida ta'lim ehtiyojlari, maktab muhiti, oila pedagogikasi, ijtimoiy hamkorlik, tolerantlik, moslashuvchan o'quv dasturi, ijtimoiylashuv.

РОЛЬ ШКОЛЫ, СЕМЬИ И ОБЩЕСТВА В РАЗВИТИИ ИНКЛЮЗИВНОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается взаимосвязанная деятельность школы, семьи и общества в процессе развития инклюзивного образования. Инклюзия трактуется не как механическое размещение детей с особыми потребностями в общеобразовательной среде, а как способность самой системы образования адаптироваться к возможностям каждого обучающегося. В работе сопоставительно изучены организационно-педагогический потенциал школы, первичная социализирующая функция семьи и уровень социально-культурной готовности общества. На основе анализа теоретических источников и данных педагогического наблюдения предложена поэтапная модель партнёрства трёх субъектов. В заключении сформулированы практические рекомендации, направленные на повышение результативности инклюзивного образования.

Ключевые слова: инклюзивное образование, особые образовательные потребности, школьная среда, семейная педагогика, социальное партнёрство, толерантность, адаптивная учебная программа, социализация.

Introduction. Few questions in contemporary education policy provoke as much practical disagreement as the schooling of children whose developmental profile departs from the statistical norm. The disagreement is rarely about principle - almost no one now defends segregated provision on moral grounds - but about the machinery required to make shared classrooms genuinely productive for everyone in them. Inclusive education, understood properly, is a claim about institutions rather than about children: it asserts that where a learner cannot participate, the deficiency lies in the arrangement of the setting and not in the learner.

This reframing carries an uncomfortable implication. If the setting bears responsibility, then no single institution can discharge that responsibility alone. A school may redesign its lessons impeccably and still watch a pupil withdraw because home routines contradict everything the classroom attempts; a devoted family may prepare a child thoroughly and still encounter a neighbourhood that treats difference as spectacle.

The three environments a child inhabits - school, household, and surrounding community - operate as one system, and weakness in any of them tends to neutralise strength in the others.

The present article therefore treats these three settings jointly rather than sequentially. Its aim is threefold: to clarify what each environment uniquely contributes, to identify the points at which their contributions typically fail to connect, and to propose a staged partnership model through which the connections can be built deliberately instead of left to chance.

Theoretical and Methodological Foundations. The conceptual shift underpinning inclusion is usually traced to the displacement of the medical model of disability by the social model. Under the earlier view, limitation resided in the body, and education responded with correction and specialised placement. The social model relocated limitation to the interaction between a person and an environment built around assumptions about typical bodies and typical minds. Educationally, the consequence is direct: the diagnostic question changes from what is wrong with this child to what is obstructing this child here.

Three theoretical strands inform the analysis that follows. The first is the ecological understanding of development, which situates the learner within nested and mutually influencing settings, and which supplies the article's central assumption that the relations between environments matter as much as the environments themselves. The second is the sociocultural account of learning, with its emphasis on the zone of proximal development and on mediated assistance - a framework that makes differentiated support a normal instructional practice rather than a concession granted to some pupils. The third is universal design for learning, which shifts adaptation from the individual accommodation to the initial design of instruction, so that variability is anticipated rather than retrofitted.

Methodologically, the study is qualitative and interpretive. It combines a critical reading of theoretical and policy literature with structured pedagogical observation in general-education classrooms enrolling pupils with identified special educational needs, supplemented by semi-structured conversations with teachers, parents, and school administrators. The findings are analytical rather than statistical: they aim to describe recurring mechanisms and characteristic failure points, not to estimate their prevalence across a population.

The School: Inclusion as an Organisational Competence. Of the three environments, the school is the only one that can be reformed by administrative decision, which explains why reform effort concentrates there - and why the results so often disappoint. Enrolment is comparatively easy to mandate; participation is not. Observation suggests that the distance between the two is bridged by four organisational capacities rather than by goodwill.

The first is instructional flexibility. Where a single lesson plan admits only one route to a single outcome, some pupils will inevitably fall outside it. Flexible planning offers multiple representations of content, several permissible forms of response, and assessment calibrated to individual progress rather than to a fixed cohort benchmark. Notably, teachers who adopt such planning frequently report gains among pupils never identified as having additional needs, which suggests that inclusive design improves general instructional quality rather than merely accommodating a minority.

The second is professional capability. Teachers rarely resist inclusion in principle; they resist being asked to deliver it without preparation. Where initial training treats special needs as an optional specialism, the general-education teacher enters the classroom equipped with commitment and little technique. Sustained, school-based professional development - co-planning, observation of colleagues, case discussion - proves considerably more effective than isolated seminars, precisely because it builds capacity within the working team rather than in individuals sent away to acquire it.

The third is a functioning support structure. Speech therapists, psychologists, assistant teachers, and special educators contribute little if they operate as a parallel service to which pupils are periodically dispatched. Their value emerges when their expertise is folded into ordinary classroom practice through shared planning and joint problem-solving, so that specialist knowledge circulates among the adults who see the child daily.

The fourth, and the most frequently neglected, is the social climate of the institution. Physical presence in a room confers no membership. Where peer relations are left unattended, the pupil who differs is tolerated at the margins - never excluded outright, never quite included either. Deliberate work on cooperative grouping, on how difference is discussed in class, and on the responses adults model to unfamiliar behaviour determines whether shared space becomes shared life.

The Family: The First and Most Persistent Educational Environment. The family precedes the school and outlasts it. Long before formal instruction begins, the household establishes the child's sense of competence, the vocabulary available for describing difficulty, and the expectation of whether effort is met with help or with irritation. These dispositions are not incidental background to schooling; they are the substrate on which schooling acts.

Families of children with additional needs typically pass through a demanding adaptive sequence - recognition, grief, mobilisation, and eventually a reconstructed sense of ordinary family life. Progress through that sequence is uneven, and the pedagogical stance a family adopts along the way varies accordingly. Two stances recur and both impede development. Overprotection, though affectionate in motive, forecloses the trial-and-error through which independence is acquired, and produces a child competent under supervision and helpless without it. Denial of the difficulty, by contrast, imposes expectations the child cannot meet and converts every school day into evidence of personal failure. The productive stance lies between them: realistic about constraint, insistent about growth.

The family's second function is representational. Parents accumulate longitudinal knowledge no professional possesses - what settles the child, what precipitates distress, which strategies were tried in earlier years and why they failed. Where schools treat parents as recipients of decisions, this knowledge is simply lost. Where parents participate in planning as informed partners, it becomes the most economical source of diagnostic insight available to the teaching team.

A third function deserves explicit mention: continuity. Skills acquired at school consolidate only through use in unstructured settings. A communication strategy practised for twenty minutes a week and unused at home does not become a capability. This is why home practice matters less as academic reinforcement than as the mechanism by which classroom learning becomes transferable behaviour.

Society: The Environment That Determines Whether Inclusion Endures

Societal influence operates less visibly than school policy or family practice, yet it sets the outer limit of what either can achieve. It works through three channels. The first is public attitude. A community that regards disability primarily as misfortune deserving pity produces charitable gestures and low expectations in equal measure; a community that regards it as ordinary human variation produces access. Attitudes of the former kind reach the child indirectly but unmistakably - through the hesitation of a neighbour, the wording of a local news item, the studied avoidance of a shopkeeper.

The second channel is institutional and infrastructural. Inclusion in the classroom is undermined by exclusion everywhere else. Transport that cannot be boarded, clinics without specialists, sports facilities that assume uniform physical capability, and cultural venues without accessible programming all communicate to a young person that the school was an exception rather than a precedent. Employment prospects belong to this channel too: where graduates with disabilities encounter a closed labour market, the instrumental argument for sustained educational investment weakens in the eyes of families themselves.

The third channel is normative and legal. Legislation cannot manufacture acceptance, but it establishes an enforceable floor beneath which practice may not fall, and it shifts the burden of justification from the person seeking access to the institution denying it. Its practical force, however, depends on implementation capacity - on funding formulas, inspection regimes, and the availability of trained personnel. Declaratory law without such machinery tends to produce formal compliance accompanied by unchanged practice.

Civic organisations occupy an intermediate position across all three channels. Parent associations, disability advocacy groups, and voluntary initiatives frequently function as the connective tissue between families and institutions, supplying mutual support, translating bureaucratic procedure into usable guidance, and applying the sustained pressure through which formal entitlements acquire practical meaning.

A Staged Model of Tripartite Partnership. Cooperation among the three environments is habitually endorsed and rarely specified. In practice it is usually reduced to periodic parent meetings, which serve information transfer but not joint decision-making. The model outlined below disaggregates partnership into four stages, each with its own participants, instrument, and observable outcome.

Table 1.

Stages of school-family-society partnership in inclusive education

Stage	Principal actors	Working instrument	Observable outcome
I. Assessment and shared understanding	School team, family, specialist services	Joint case conference; family developmental history	An agreed profile of strengths, barriers, and priorities
II. Individual planning	Teachers, parents, support specialists	Individual education plan with measurable short-term targets	Explicit division of responsibility between home and school
III. Coordinated implementation	Class teacher, family, assistant staff, peer group	Adapted instruction; consistent home routines; structured peer work	Consistent expectations across settings; measurable pupil progress
IV. Review and community linkage	School administration, family, civic and local bodies	Termly review; contact with local services, employers, and associations	Adjusted plan and pathways extending beyond the school

Discussion and Recommendations. Two observations follow from the analysis. The first concerns sequencing. Where partnership is attempted, it commonly begins at the third stage - implementation - because that is where pressure is felt. Instructions are issued to parents, adaptations are introduced in class, and specialists are engaged, all without a shared assessment or an agreed plan. The predictable result is contradictory expectations, each actor working competently towards a slightly different objective. Stages one and two are not preliminaries that may be compressed; they are what makes the third stage coherent.

The second concerns the asymmetry of effort. The school is institutionally obliged to participate, the family is personally compelled to, and the wider community is neither. Community engagement therefore requires an active convening role, which in practice falls to the school as the only actor with standing to initiate it. Schools that treat local services, employers, and civic associations as constituencies to be cultivated rather than as external matters achieve markedly more durable outcomes for their leavers.

On this basis four recommendations are advanced. Teacher preparation should treat differentiated instruction as core general pedagogy rather than as a specialist option, since every general-education teacher will encounter learner variability regardless of formal designation. Schools should institutionalise the case conference as a scheduled procedure with defined participation, so that joint planning does not depend on individual initiative. Parent engagement should be reconceived from information delivery to co-planning, with the family's developmental knowledge entered formally into the record. Finally, community linkage should be assigned to a named member of staff, since responsibility distributed among all is in practice exercised by none.

Conclusion. Inclusive education is best understood not as a service delivered to a category of pupils but as a

property of the environments a child moves through. The school supplies method, structure, and the daily experience of belonging; the family supplies continuity, longitudinal knowledge, and the emotional conditions under which effort remains bearable; society determines whether the competences acquired in the other two settings retain their value beyond school. None of the three can compensate for the sustained absence of another.

The practical implication is that inclusion should be planned as a system rather than pursued institution by institution. The staged model presented here is intended as one instrument for such planning: it specifies who participates at each point, through what mechanism, and towards what verifiable result. Further research would usefully test the model longitudinally, tracking whether early-stage investment in shared assessment and joint planning predicts stronger outcomes at the point of school leaving - the stage at which the coherence of the whole arrangement is finally tested.

References

- [1] Ainscow M. Towards Self-Improving School Systems: Lessons from a City Challenge. London: Routledge, 2015. 192 p.
- [2] Booth T., Ainscow M. Index for Inclusion: Developing Learning and Participation in Schools. Bristol: CSIE, 2011. 178 p.
- [3] Bronfenbrenner U. The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979. 330 p.
- [4] Epstein J. L. School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools. 2nd ed. Boulder: Westview Press, 2011. 656 p.
- [5] Florian L. The Sage Handbook of Special Education. 2nd ed. London: Sage, 2014. 1016 p.
- [6] Meyer A., Rose D. H., Gordon D. Universal Design for Learning: Theory and Practice. Wakefield: CAST Professional Publishing, 2014. 234 p.
- [7] Oliver M. The Politics of Disablement. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990. 152 p.
- [8] UNESCO. Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and Education - All Means All. Paris: UNESCO, 2020. 424 p.
- [9] United Nations. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. New York: UN, 2006.
- [10] Vygotsky L. S. Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978. 159 p.