



Исследование специфики реализации образовательной инклюзии в вузах Казахстана и Мексики

А. Д. КАРИЕВ, Х. Г. ВАРГАС-ЭРНАНДЕС, И. У. ШАРОФУТДИНОВ, Г. Б. ТОРЕМУРАТОВА

АННОТАЦИЯ

Введение. Включение в систему высшего образования основывается на концепции ЮНЕСКО «Образование для всех», направленной на обеспечение равного доступа к образованию для каждого обучающегося. Для успешной реализации данной парадигмы необходимы данные не о среднем уровне понимания процессов обеспечения образовательной инклюзии в университетах, а важно изучение индивидуального аспекта социально-педагогической практики — реального опыта преподавателей в конкретных условиях и университетах. В этой связи реализуется сотрудничество между Казахским национальным педагогическим университетом имени Абая (Казахстан) и Технологическим институтом имени Хосе Марио Молины Паскеля и Энрикеса (Мексика). Выявление сходств и различий в позициях по вопросам социально-педагогических барьеров, с которыми сталкиваются лица с ограниченными возможностями здоровья в университетах, способствует определению стратегических направлений потенциальной инклюзивной политики, объединяющей образовательные и методические ресурсы казахстанских и мексиканских ученых и преподавателей.

Целью данной работы является выявление специфики реализации образовательной инклюзии в университетах Казахстана и Мексики для развития сотрудничества в совершенствовании инклюзивных практик.

Материалы и методы. Для изучения проблемы была разработана анкета и проведено анкетирование 343 преподавателей Казахского национального педагогического университета имени Абая (Казахстан) и Технологического института имени Хосе Марио Молины Паскеля и Энрикеса (Мексика). Для интерпретации результатов анкетирования использовались количественные и качественные методы. Ответы на вопросы анкеты были получены в период с февраля по ноябрь 2025 года и оценивались либо как положительные, свидетельствующие о тенденции к снижению социально-педагогических барьеров в сфере инклюзии, либо как отрицательные, указывающие на наличие данных барьеров. Методом сбора информации выступили открытые вопросы, что позволило в дальнейшем проследить динамику общественного мнения относительно приоритетности подходов в инклюзивном образовательном процессе. Были использованы методы обобщения и группировки данных опроса, а также статистические методы их анализа.

Результаты. Математическая обработка данных показала наличие статистически значимых различий по второму вопросу («Число студентов с особыми образовательными потребностями в вашем университете больше или меньше 100?») ($F_{эмп} = 2,33$), четвертому («Какую поддержку, по вашему мнению, нуждаются студенты с особыми потребностями?») ($F_{эмп} = 2,201$), пятому («Предоставляет ли ваш университет рекомендации и методические указания, охватывающие вопросы обучения таких студентов, и в какой форме?») ($F_{эмп} = 2,284$) и тринадцатому вопросу («Достаточно ли современные технологии, используемые в вашем университете, для инклюзивного обучения?») ($F_{эмп} = 2,709$). Данное исследование является одним из примеров, который может способствовать достижению общих целей другими университетами и развитию партнерства для обмена подходами и практиками с целью совершенствования совместной деятельности. Впервые были изучены и проанализированы аспекты инклюзивности в системе высшего образования Казахстана и Мексики. На основе опроса преподавателей высших учебных заведений двух стран описаны основные социально-педагогические барьеры, с которыми сталкиваются студенты с ограниченными возможностями здоровья в университетах.

Заключение. Сопоставление различных точек зрения преподавателей относительно социально-педагогических барьеров в процессе реализации образовательной инклюзии в университетах Казахстана и Мексики способствует пониманию степени доступности образования для лиц с ограниченными возможностями здоровья в исследуемых странах, что уточняет ключевые положения предлагаемого соглашения о партнерстве между университетами и может служить основой для последующих специализированных исследований.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА

инклюзия, инклюзивное образование, высшее образование, студенты, лица с особыми образовательными потребностями

Для цитирования: Кариев А. Д., Варгас-Эрнандес Х. Г., Шарофутдинов И. У., Торемуратова Г. Б. Исследование специфики реализации образовательной инклюзии в вузах Казахстана и Мексики // Перспективы науки и образования. 2026. № 4. С. 395–410. <https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2026.4.26>

Поступила: 23.02.2026 | Одобрена: 12.05.2026 | Опубликовано: 31.08.2026



Лицензия «С указанием авторства — С сохранением условий». Позволяет перерабатывать, исправлять и развивать произведения при условии указания авторства и лицензирования производных работ на аналогичных условиях.



A Study of the Specifics of Implementing Educational Inclusion in Universities in Kazakhstan and Mexico

A. D. KARIYEV, J. G. VARGAS-HERNANDEZ, I. U. SHAROFUTDINOV, G. B. TOREMURATOVA

ABSTRACT

Abstract. Inclusion in the higher education system is based on the UNESCO concept of "Education for All", aimed at ensuring equal access to education for each student. For the successful implementation of this paradigm, data are needed not on the average understanding of the processes of ensuring educational inclusion in universities, but it is important to study the individual aspect of social and pedagogical practice - the real experience of teachers in specific circumstances and universities. In this regard, cooperation is being implemented between the Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University (Kazakhstan) and the José Mario Molina Pasquel y Enríquez Technological Institute (Mexico). Finding common and different positions on issues of social and pedagogical barriers faced by persons with disabilities in universities helps to identify strategic directions for potential inclusive policies that unite the educational and methodological resources of Kazakh and Mexican scientists and teachers.

The purpose of this article is to identify the specifics of implementing educational inclusion in universities of Kazakhstan and Mexico in order to develop cooperation in improving inclusive practices.

Materials and Methods. To study the problem, a questionnaire was developed and a survey was conducted among 343 teachers of the Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University (Kazakhstan) and the José Mario Molina Pasquel y Enríquez Technological Institute (Mexico). Quantitative and qualitative methods were used to interpret the questionnaire results. Responses to the questions proposed in the questionnaire were received between February and November 2025 and were assessed either as affirmative, indicating a tendency to reduce socio-pedagogical barriers in the field of inclusion, or as negative, showing the presence of these barriers. The method of collecting information is an open question. Thus, it is possible to further trace the dynamics of the community of opinions regarding the priority of approaches in the inclusive educational process. We used generalization and grouping of survey data, as well as statistical methods for their analysis.

Results of the study. Mathematical processing of the data showed the presence of a statistically significant difference regarding the second question ("Is the number of students with special educational needs at your university more or less than 100?") ($\varphi^*_{\text{emp}}=2.33$), the fourth ("In your opinion, what kind of support for students with special needs do students need?") ($\varphi^*_{\text{emp}}=2.201$), the fifth ("Does your university provide you with recommendations and guidelines that cover the issues of teaching such students and in what form?") ($\varphi^*_{\text{emp}}=2.284$) and the thirteenth question ("Are the modern technologies used at your university sufficient for inclusive learning?") ($\varphi^*_{\text{emp}}=2.709$). This study is one of the examples that will help other universities achieve common goals and build partnerships to exchange approaches and practices in order to improve joint activities. For the first time, aspects of inclusiveness in the higher education system of Kazakhstan and Mexico were studied and analyzed. Based on a survey of teachers from higher education institutions in the two countries, the main social and pedagogical barriers faced by students with disabilities in universities are described.

Conclusion. Comparison of different opinions of teachers regarding social and pedagogical barriers in the process of implementing educational inclusion in universities in Kazakhstan and Mexico facilitates understanding of the degree of accessibility of education for individuals with disabilities in the countries under study, which specifies the main provisions of the proposed partnership agreement between universities and can become a source for subsequent specialized research.

KEYWORDS

inclusion, inclusive education, higher education, students, individuals with special educational needs

For Citation: Kariyev, A. D., Vargas-Hernandez, J. G., Sharofutdinov, I. U., & Toremuratova, G. B. (2026). A Study of the Specifics of Implementing Educational Inclusion in Universities in Kazakhstan and Mexico. *Perspektivy nauki i obrazovaniya = Perspectives of Science and Education*, (4), 395–410. <https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2026.4.26>

Received: 23 February 2026 | Approved: 12 May 2026 | Published: 31 August 2026



This is an open access article distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike International License (CC-BY-SA 4.0) that allows others to share the work with an acknowledgement of the work's authorship and initial publication in this journal

INTRODUCTION

In higher education, inclusion is based on the UNESCO principle of "Education for All" and the provision that all students should have the same conditions for receiving a quality education. According to the logic of UNESCO experts and sociologists such as K. M. Gbebe (2023), inclusive education helps to eliminate discrimination on any grounds, including gender and health status. The UNESCO concept separates vulnerable categories of the population, while guaranteeing equal access to education for both students with disabilities and students with special needs [1].

In higher education, inclusion is associated with the creation of an economically sustainable system for the inclusion of people with disabilities in the full process of service and production. M.B. Carstensen, P. Emmenegger (2023) confirm this statement by the fact that the global transition to an economy based on knowledge available to all ultimately contributed to financial and economic indicators, which also affects the social integration of people with different needs and capabilities [2].

Strategic design of a higher education ecosystem that promotes learning and scientific development should be based on the characteristics and socio-cultural differences of interacting cultural spaces, including the emotional and cultural intelligence of teachers, as pointed out by K. C. Nwosu, V. P. Wahl (2022) and other researchers [3].

Inclusive education for the development of economic, cultural, technical and scientific knowledge, skills, competencies and abilities helps to form socially significant attitudes in young people. As K. Bitar and F. Hoosen (2023) argue, the problem is not in the attitudes that the younger generation forms, but in the quality of these attitudes [4]. Developing this idea, many researchers study the difficulties that persons with disabilities face in the education system, designating these difficulties as "barriers".

Thus, A.T. Fajzrakhmanova (2014) identifies the main groups of barriers faced by students with relevant academic needs: 1) physical, which include inadequate infrastructure of educational institutions; organization of education for students with disabilities and special needs; socio-psychological, which covers interpersonal relationships between individuals with disabilities with principals, teachers and classmates; cognitive, including difficulties in mastering educational material at the same speed, content and sequence [5]. L. Hopkins (2011) identifies barriers in the following groups: 1) physical; 2) behavioral; 3) social; 4) cultural; 5) political [6]. A. Moriña (2017) identifies "the fear of disclosing one's disability, doing twice as much to advance half as much" as the main barriers [7].

Social and pedagogical barriers faced by individuals with disabilities influence their behavior and have unexpected manifestations. Thus, in the work of L. Mullins and M. Preyde (2013) ten students with "hidden disabilities" participated, and the following barriers were identified: negative social culture, organizational aspects and the desire for physical manifestation of their disability in order to reduce the number of questions from the population about the reality of their disability [8]. Hadjikakou and D. Hartas (2008) also studied the issue of inclusion of students with hidden disabilities. The study revealed a dilemma for students – to disclose or not to disclose the fact of having a disability [9]. A study by J.M. Martin (2010) shows that 54 students with hidden disabilities responded that they need to hide their illness, since their previous experience of disclosure caused them harm [10].

At the same time, teachers can reduce the level of social and pedagogical barriers, in particular, R.K. Haitembu and R. Maarman note that it is necessary to form the worldview of teachers directly in their perception of the social identity and non-identity of students [11]. Thus, the decisive role of the teacher in reducing the severity of the problems faced by students with disabilities in the higher education system is emphasized. At the same time, in order to reduce the social and pedagogical barriers faced by individuals with disabilities, it is necessary to study the opinions of teachers about their essence, the practice of implementing educational strategies for individuals with disabilities in the process of ensuring educational inclusion in universities. Moreover, it is important to obtain data not on the average understanding of the processes of ensuring educational inclusion in universities, but it is necessary to study the individual aspect of social and pedagogical practice - the real experience of teachers in specific circumstances and universities. It is also important to find commonalities and differences in the positions of teachers on issues of educational inclusion in order to achieve further agreements, including in the regulatory aspect.

Therefore, this paper presents a joint study by employees of the Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University (Kazakhstan) and the José Mario Molina Pasquel y Enríquez Technological Institute (Mexico). This study is included in the cooperation program between these universities. This cooperation began after the joint participation of scientific representatives in the International Conference "Actual Problems of Global Scientific Research and Pedagogy", which was held in Almaty (Kazakhstan) from 12 to 15 November 2018. Joint scientific cooperation is of national importance for two countries interested in concluding special bilateral agreements. For example, a Memorandum of Understanding is currently being implemented between the Kazakhstan Academy of Public Administration and the Mexican Institute named after Matias Romero on the joint training of highly qualified diplomats. A similar agreement is expected between the Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University and the José Mario Molina Pasquel y Enríquez Technological Institute to implement a joint inclusive educational process.

In order to clarify the key provisions of the proposed agreement, joint research is currently being conducted by staff from the two designated educational institutions, which allows identifying strategic directions for potential inclusive policies that combine the educational and methodological resources of Kazakh and Mexican scholars and teachers. This study is one example that will help other universities interested in developing a cooperation program to achieve common goals and build partnerships in the field of specific educational issues to exchange approaches and practices in order to improve joint activities.

Accordingly, the purpose of this study is to identify the specifics of the implementation of educational inclusion in universities in Kazakhstan and Mexico in order to develop cooperation in the field of improving inclusive practices.

The subject of the study is the socio-pedagogical barriers expressed in the awareness of teachers about the presence of students with disabilities, their number, internal attitudes and methodological guidelines for the implementation of inclusive practices, understanding of the problems faced by persons with disabilities of a regulatory, educational and infrastructural nature in the process of implementing educational inclusion in two studied educational institutions – the José Mario Molina Pasquel y Enríquez Technological Institute and the Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University. In accordance with the stated goal, it is necessary to solve the following research questions: "What is the socio-pedagogical context of how Kazakhstani and Mexican teachers understand the barriers faced by students with disabilities?" "Are the opinions of teachers of the two universities regarding the priority of approaches in the inclusive educational process similar or different?"

The answer to these questions will help identify indicators and trends in the perception of inclusivity by teachers of the two universities under study, which may be important for the implementation of the proposed interstate agreement within the framework of joint inclusive educational activities and can serve as a proposal for other social institutions to analyze the commonality of views on individual issues. In addition, this kind of research will help universities with similar inclusive practices to draw conclusions about possible socio-pedagogical barriers in order to develop research hypotheses in their universities.

Since different groups of students with disabilities need different learning conditions, the following hypothesis arises: the specifics of the implementation of educational inclusion in universities in Kazakhstan and Mexico appear as specific socio-pedagogical barriers that will not allow achieving joint goals and building partnerships to exchange approaches and practices in order to improve joint activities.

A limitation has been introduced into the study. This paper presents a comparative analysis of teachers' opinions on inclusiveness in two universities in Kazakhstan and Mexico, which is explained by joint work within the framework of a partnership agreement.

The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2006. The purpose of this convention is to protect and guarantee full and equal access to all human rights. Article 24 "Education" states that "persons with disabilities have an equal right to education, free from discrimination and based on equal opportunity." [UNESCO (2006). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities-2.html>]

Currently, there are many studies devoted to the classification and assessment of barriers to the education of students with disabilities in the education system.

A. Moriña (2017) notes that the most significant barriers in higher education are related to the negative attitude of teachers. In many cases, students stated that the professor doubted that they had a disability, did not adapt the course projects and questioned their ability to study at the university [7]. J. Quinn (2013) [12], A. Lombardi, K. Murray and J. Kovitt (2016), considering students with special educational needs, note that this group of students drop out of university more often than others [13].

Research in the field of educational inclusion, carried out at the level of school education, is indicative, since they can illustrate general problems with the higher education system. Thus, the study of S. Stech and I. Smetackova (2023) showed that parents of students with special educational needs believe that there is not enough systemic support for inclusion. Parents are forced to act as intermediaries between other participants in the process, but often do not have sufficient information and are not respected by teachers as experts on their children [14]. D. Murdoch and A. R. English (2023), noting the crucial role of teachers in reducing the barriers faced by people with disabilities, emphasize that not only attitudes must change, but also communication styles, which require recognition of the capacity of all students to improve, as well as a flexible approach to the curriculum that allows teachers to listen to and respond to different students [15].

Numerous studies have found that the attitudes of those directly involved (teachers, parents, peers) in interactions with students with disabilities are shaped by the specific type and degree of impairment experienced by these children. The most positive attitudes were found towards children with physical impairments, followed by children with sensory impairments and intellectual disabilities [16].

One study highlights another important barrier, which is that the educational organization records that a child, for example, has autism spectrum disorders, while not paying attention to the fact that he or she is also a child with many other characteristics (for example, disability and refugee status) [17]. As a result, the recognition of the learning process as a process and a state of awareness that goes beyond the usual organizational frameworks and structures will become increasingly widespread. This understanding has now become a fundamental feature that determines the way of life of modern society [18].

Research conducted in the Republic of Kazakhstan demonstrates a number of material, technical, pedagogical and subject-specific problems that teachers face in the context of inclusive education. One of the main problems identified in the study was the insufficient level of teacher training courses to prepare for teaching in inclusive education [18].

A survey of school principals, teachers, specialists and parents in 12 inclusive schools in Kazakhstan showed that there are significant barriers for persons with disabilities in the area of uniform understanding of terminology, teaching and assessing students' knowledge, skills and abilities, as well as coordination of inclusive education [19].

Inclusive education should not replace traditional forms of assistance to people with disabilities that were developed within the framework of special education. True inclusiveness does not oppose, but unites two education systems, general and special, making their boundaries flexible and facilitating cooperation between them [13], [20].

In an inclusive educational environment, an additional problem for teachers is the task of organizing an educational process that takes into account the significantly different intellectual, sensory, physical and communicative development needs of each child [21]. To create a new form of educational system, which is based on the so-called "social model of disability", it is necessary to take into account the general patterns of personal, social and mental development of children with special educational needs [22; 23].

Today, statistical data on students with special educational needs in universities of post-Soviet countries indicate that the creation of an inclusive education system does not fully meet the requirements, regardless of readiness from the point of view of legislation. In the Russian Federation, for example, 450 thousand children with special educational needs receive a school education. And only 15 thousand of them continue their education in universities. The reason for this discrepancy is

the unpreparedness of universities to teach this group of students. There are national universities in Russia, but only 150 of them offer special education [5].

The 21st century is marked by the recognition that only individual self-realization is the primary goal of social progress. This shift in public consciousness has led to the development of an educational model based on modern practice [24]. One of the important aspects of this model is the concept of "inclusive education". In Kazakhstan, inclusive education is still in the development stage, which requires decisions at the state level for its implementation. The need to develop inclusiveness in education is the focus of the State Program for the Development of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2020-2025 [25]. Kazakhstan is implementing reforms at all levels. However, the terminology used in the field of inclusive education has not undergone significant changes since the collapse of the USSR [18].

In general, studies that involve surveys of teachers in the field of educational inclusion can be divided into two categories: 1) the attitude of teachers who currently work in the inclusive education system, 2) the attitude of teachers who are considering working in inclusive education [12].

The works of scientists confirm the importance of taking into account the private opinion of teachers regarding the implementation of inclusive education [26].

We consider inclusive (integrated) education as the highest form of growth, taking into account all of the above. Such education is aimed at realizing the human right to receive quality education at the place of residence in accordance with his cognitive abilities and in conditions adequate to his state of health [27].

Based on the declaration of the importance of inclusive education in international educational documents, along with the formation of a strategy for improving the accessibility and quality of education for persons with disabilities, we further focus on specific aspects, taking into account important conditions for improving the practice of joint actions in Kazakhstan and Mexico. Our study also assesses the attitudes of teachers who work with students with disabilities and examines the presence of effective practices at the universities studied.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The sample included 343 teachers from the universities under study, 205 of whom were women and 138 of whom were men. Of these, 181 people teach at the Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, and 162 people teach at the José Mario Molina Pasquel y Enríquez Technological Institute. The survey was distributed to respondents via corporate email as part of a joint research program in the field of inclusion between the two universities.

This study began in 2018 and is currently part of the development of inclusion in the higher education system and the development of unified methodological approaches regarding the proposed joint educational activities for Kazakh and Mexican students at the universities under study. All teachers have more than ten years of teaching experience, 83% have a candidate or doctorate degree.

The questionnaire was developed in accordance with the following aspects of the study of the features of the implementation of educational inclusion in universities in Kazakhstan and Mexico: teachers' awareness of the presence of people with disabilities; their ideas about the set of professional skills, knowledge, qualities for working with people with disabilities; areas of support for people with disabilities; satisfaction with the conditions created at the university for teaching students with disabilities; personal significance of supporting students with disabilities at the university.

An important technological element in the development of the questionnaire was that all questions were open-ended and allowed respondents to make additional comments.

Questions for the survey on the state of inclusiveness in higher education:

Date:

Place, organization:

University:

Respondent:

1. Are there students with disabilities at your university or not?
2. Is the number of students with special educational needs at your university more or less than 100?
3. What special professional skills, knowledge, and qualities should a teacher have to work with people with disabilities?
4. In your opinion, what kind of support do students with special needs need?
5. Does your university provide you with recommendations and guidelines that cover the issues of teaching such students and in what form?
6. In your opinion, what special training is required to work with students with special needs?
7. Should a selection be carried out in the area of professional suitability of people with special educational needs for a certain profession?
8. Is the legislative framework in your country sufficient to implement full-fledged inclusive education?
9. Does your university fully ensure the right to education for students with disabilities?
10. Are there the necessary educational resources to implement elements of inclusiveness in the educational programs of your university?
11. Do you think that a department should be created at your university that will provide access to education for students with disabilities?
12. Is it necessary for an inclusive approach to differ from standard teaching methods?
13. Are the modern technologies used at your university sufficient for inclusive teaching?
14. Are inclusive practices at your university accessible to all people with disabilities on an equal basis, regardless of the structure of the defect?
15. Is the criterion of a special pedagogical approach to students with disabilities in the inclusive educational process the main one for you personally?

The study was carried out in several stages, based on the issues identified during the literature review. The first questions were aimed at identifying the contingent of students with special educational needs and disabilities in universities in Mexico and Kazakhstan. The next part of the questions was aimed at identifying the respondents' opinions on the accessibility of higher education for individuals with special educational needs and disabilities in Kazakhstan and Mexico. The final part of the questionnaire was devoted to questions regarding the conditions created in universities in Mexico and Kazakhstan to ensure the necessary educational conditions for individuals with special educational needs and to identify the most effective inclusive practices.

Quantitative and qualitative methods were used to interpret the questionnaire results. The answers to the questions proposed in the survey were received between February and November 2025 and assumed either affirmative answers, indicating a tendency to reduce social and pedagogical barriers in the field of inclusion in this university, or negative ones, showing the presence of these barriers. Thus, it is possible to trace the specificity of the community of opinions regarding the priority of approaches in the inclusive educational process.

We used the generalization and grouping of survey data, as well as statistical methods of data analysis, namely: the Fisher angular transformation criterion (ϕ), designed to compare two independent or related samples in the case when the measurement results are presented on a nominal scale.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Tables 1 and 2 show the number of affirmative and negative answers according to the given order of questions in the questionnaire.

Table 1 Affirmative answers of respondents from universities in Kazakhstan and Mexico to the questionnaire questions

Name of the university	Questionnaire question															
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Kazakhstani university	99	54,7	88	48,6	86	47,5	94	51,9	85	47	99	54,7	83	45,9		
Mexican university	78	48,1	99	61,1	68	42	65	40,1	96	53	84	51,9	68	42		
	8		9		10		11		12		13		14		15	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Kazakhstani university	96	53	98	54,1	93	51,4	97	53,6	85	47	83	45,9	92	50,8	88	48,6
Mexican university	93	57,4	89	54,9	86	53,1	80	49,4	71	43,8	98	54,1	94	58	75	46,3

Table 2 Negative answers of respondents from universities in Kazakhstan and Mexico to the questionnaire questions

Name of the university	Mexican university															
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Kazakhstani university	82	45,3	93	51,4	95	52,5	87	48,1	96	59,3	82	45,3	98	54,1		
Mexican university	84	51,9	63	38,9	94	58	97	59,9	66	40,7	78	48,1	94	58		
	8		9		10		11		12		13		14		15	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Kazakhstani university	85	47	83	45,9	88	48,6	84	46,4	96	53	98	60,5	89	49,2	93	51,4
Mexican university	69	42,6	73	45,1	76	46,9	82	50,6	91	56,2	64	39,5	68	42	87	53,7

Mathematical processing of data using Fisher's angular transformation criterion showed the presence of statistically significant differences regarding the second ($\varphi^*_{\text{emp}}=2.33$), fourth ($\varphi^*_{\text{emp}}=2.201$), fifth ($\varphi^*_{\text{emp}}=2.284$) and thirteenth questions ($\varphi^*_{\text{emp}}=2.709$). Accordingly, different opinions were received on these positions in two universities and further work is required to achieve positive dynamics in the community of opinions regarding the priority of approaches in the inclusive educational process.

As our research has shown, not all university teachers are well aware of the contingent of students with special educational needs. Thus, from Table 1 it is clear that out of 181 teachers in Kazakhstan, 99 answered the question in the affirmative, and out of 162 teachers in Mexico, 78 are similarly aware of students with disabilities. Teachers in Mexico referred more to externally observable signs ("poor study habits", "deficiencies in learning"), while in Kazakhstan they used the names of diagnoses of people with disabilities and linked inclusion with working with people with preserved intelligence who have musculoskeletal, speech, hearing and vision disorders. In general, in both countries, a qualitative analysis of the first and second questions shows the presence of a contingent of students with special educational needs, but not all teachers are inclined to talk about this problem. This may indicate a weak interest of respondents in issues of a special approach to students with special educational needs and may affect the availability and quality of education.

Since pedagogical competence is important in the implementation of inclusive education, the survey asked about the professional skills that an inclusive education teacher should have. In response to this question, the teachers of the University of Mexico particularly emphasized the need for socially important moral qualities: respect (18 people), empathy (9 people), solidarity (7 people), as well as knowledge of the given subject (4 people), the ability to work in a team (4 people). From the point of view of the respondents, it is important to train teachers (pedagogical) in the field of conflict management (10 people), justice and equality (22 people), critical thinking (3 people), development of social-emotional skills: (knowledge of Braille and sign systems for the deaf) - 13 people, development of interpersonal communication skills (5 people).

Teachers from Kazakhstan spoke primarily about the development of professional competence, the need for a high general level of pedagogical culture, knowledge of defectology, psychology and inclusive education, skills in the field of psychological and pedagogical support for students with special educational needs. Among personal qualities, teachers from Kazakhstan especially noted tolerance and psychological stability (22 people). That is, the answers to this question from teachers in both countries are similar, but Mexicans focus more on personal qualities, and Kazakh teachers - on the importance of special knowledge, skills and abilities.

The next question in the questionnaire required not only professional reflection from the participants, but also specialized knowledge about the specifics of supporting children with special educational needs, since they had to answer the question about the need for specialized assistance for students with special educational needs.

Teachers from Mexico pointed out the need for psychological assistance and determining the family and economic status of students with special needs, training in working with special equipment (26 people). However, some of the responses were not specific enough: *"If there were people with such needs, yes"*, *"I cannot answer this question because it would depend on the type of need that the student requires"*, *"I have not identified students as having special educational needs. I do not know if there is a program that informs teachers about whether students are being assessed in relation to these needs"*. There were also negative responses to this question. Teachers from Kazakhstan particularly emphasized the need for specialized assistance, in particular, methodological and psychological (38 people).

In response to the fifth question of the questionnaire about the provision of recommendations and guidelines by the university that cover the issues of teaching such students and the form of this guidance, teachers from Kazakhstan demonstrated varying degrees of awareness of the existence of such instructions or guidelines for teaching individuals with special educational needs in the university, as did teachers from Mexico.

Similarly, the opinions of teachers from Kazakhstan and Mexico were divided regarding the question of special training for working with students with special needs. Both groups have a clear understanding of the need for additional training for teachers in the field of working with special education (99 teachers from Kazakhstan and 84 teachers from Mexico).

An analysis of the respondents' answers to the seventh question, about the selection in the area of professional suitability of individuals with special educational needs for a particular profession, shows the coincidence of the opinions of the study participants from both countries on this issue: most of them believe that there should be the ideal professional selection of people with special needs for a particular profession (83 and 68 teachers from Kazakhstan and Mexico, respectively). At the same time, the participants of the study from Kazakhstan consider it necessary to conduct a special diagnostic of the suitability of people with special educational needs for a certain profession (33 people), but point out that each student has the right to receive an education in the chosen specialty, *"each student should choose a profession in accordance with his/her abilities."* Some of the participants emphasize the need to rely on the degree of demand for a given profession in society (13 people).

Teachers from Mexico emphasize to a greater extent the need for equal opportunities for the professional development of all students, paying attention to the issues of organizing the subject-spatial environment, infrastructure development (51 people). Some respondents also found this question difficult.

The answers to the eighth question are more characterized as affirmative by teachers from both countries (96 teachers from Kazakhstan and 93 teachers from Mexico), that is, teachers evaluate the legislative framework in their country positively for the implementation of full-fledged inclusive education.

Concerning the ninth question "Does your university fully ensure the right to education for students with disabilities?", various opinions were received. Some respondents emphasized the need for a resource and consulting center and the need for resources or consultations in organizing education (44 people from both groups of respondents). In general, the ratio of affirmative and negative answers shows a range of opinions on this issue.

When answering the question about the necessary educational resources for the introduction of inclusive elements in the educational programs of your university, polar opinions were observed. Some study participants spoke in detail about the positive experience of other universities, others referred to their own lack of awareness of this issue, and still others answered negatively, emphasizing the inadequacy of the material and technical base for overcoming the social and pedagogical barriers faced by people with disabilities.

When answering the question about the need to create a department at the university that will provide access to education for students with disabilities, teachers demonstrated a variety of opinions. Those who answered affirmatively, operated on the importance of a separate structural unit, whose jurisdiction includes work with people with disabilities. Another part said that it was more important to create common material and technical conditions, conduct training for teachers, and, ultimately, time should pass for better acceptance of people with disabilities by the teaching staff – that is, they insisted on the importance of taking other measures (such responses were assessed as negative).

In answering the twelfth question about the differences between the inclusive approach and standard teaching methods, many teachers had difficulty emphasizing the specific features of the structure of the students' disability (27 people from both groups). At the same time, some teachers asked themselves: "To what extent will the presence of an established health limitation reduce the social and pedagogical barriers that students face?" Let us give an example of one of the answers:

"Inclusion is the ability to listen to the student and select an approach individually, taking into account all of his or her characteristics, and not just health limitations. It does not matter whether he or she has an official diagnosis or not."

In general, teachers consider the availability of modern technologies in universities for inclusive education differently. In response to this question, some teachers spoke about the implementation of high-quality distance education (56 people), while others emphasized the priority of home schooling (36 people). Those who answered affirmatively spoke about the availability of technology, equipment, and special software.

At the same time, when answering the fourteenth question, teachers said that inclusive practices at the university are not always available to all people with disabilities on an equal basis, regardless of the structure of the defect, which are negative answers. Approximately equal numbers of negative and affirmative answers to this question were received in each of the universities. The respondent's answer is quite illustrative:

"For students with disabilities, we use distance technologies. We have students with autism spectrum disorder. It is difficult to work with them. They attend classes, but are not sufficiently involved in learning."

The survey showed that about half of the teachers consider the criterion of a special pedagogical approach to students with disabilities in the inclusive educational process to be the main one for them personally.

This situation indicates the need to focus on the legal and technological issues of the joint inclusive educational process within the framework of the agreement between the universities under study. This means that the preamble of the agreement should contain an exhaustive terminological component for the general attitude to inclusive education in the Kazakh and Mexican languages at universities.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The analysis is not limited to identifying the opinions of respondents from universities in Kazakhstan and Mexico. It also considers the development of partnerships and joint inclusive educational activities. The data obtained coincide with the results of an autonomous study among teachers of the studied universities in the period from 2018 to 2023. A distinctive feature of this study is a joint survey of Kazakh and Mexican teachers, which is unique in terms of bilateral relations, including in the field of education.

It was revealed that the respondents have methodological developments, and they are ready to implement them in inclusive educational activities. The main aspects requiring an in-depth approach to the implementation of joint inclusive activities affect the legal provisions of the proposed partnership agreement, which would regulate the scope of powers and rules for effective interaction with both students with disabilities from Kazakhstan and students with disabilities from Mexico. The study also showed that differences in the perception of inclusive education do not depend on the country and university of a particular respondent, since disparate opinions were obtained only on a number of questions. In addition, the respondents' answers indicate the possibility of inclusive education without taking into account the presence of obvious or hidden health restrictions in students. However, the implementation of joint inclusive educational activities in the studied universities of Kazakhstan and Mexico requires the development of a mechanism for disseminating knowledge accessible to a wide range of university teachers and special conditions as, for example, the presence of sign language interpretation or typographic translation of each lecture. In addition, the introduction of an inclusive educational system, according to respondents, does not interfere with the main educational process, which indicates the likelihood of the effectiveness of such activities within the framework of a partnership agreement between the two studied universities of Kazakhstan and Mexico.

As a result of the analysis of the received responses, it can be concluded that the provision of educational services to persons with special educational needs is currently considered one of the most pressing problems facing modern higher education. And one of the main reasons is that every year this category of people needs to receive high-quality and affordable education. In this regard, one of the complex tasks arises in ensuring the accessibility of education, that is, the necessary material and technical equipment, appropriate personnel and educational and methodological support, architectural accessibility, as well as medical and sanitary support.

According to the statistics provided by the respondents on the number of students, most of them are persons of the 1st and 3rd disability groups: with visual impairment, hearing impairment, musculoskeletal system impairment. These students with saved emotional profile have preserved intelligence, there is no mental retardation, which is an indispensable condition for studying at a university, preserving intelligence and cognitive function.

The data from the presented study show the relevance of work to ensure high-quality inclusive education in universities and the need for more attention to this problem, which coincides with the conclusions of A. Moríña [7], Quinn [12], Lombardi, Murray & Kowitt [13], Faizrakhmanova [5].

There are social barriers to the implementation of inclusive education in universities in Kazakhstan and Mexico, as indicated in the work of Hopkins (2011) [6]. One of these barriers, which is also confirmed by the data of our study, is social, including insufficient theoretical and practical training of teachers to implement the training and education of individuals with special educational needs, the need for methodological support and special training, which is also noted in the works of Lautenbach F., Heyder A. [22], M.T. Korsgaard, V. Larsen, M. Wiberg [28].

The quality of educational inclusion in universities in Kazakhstan and Mexico cannot be considered in isolation from the real employment opportunities for people with disabilities (as confirmed by data from longitudinal public opinion surveys) [29], while the economic support for employers, piloted in Kazakhstan, serves as one of the key tools that closes the "education → employment" chain [30].

In this work, for the first time, a comparative analysis of the opinions of teachers on inclusiveness in the higher education system of Kazakhstan and Mexico was carried out, in particular, it was established that it is necessary to pay more attention to the theoretical and practical training of university teachers for the implementation of inclusiveness, to develop the most effective practices in this area, which include comparative policies, instructions or guidelines for teaching individuals with special educational needs in a university, regulatory and methodological support, a resource center, etc.

CONCLUSION

This study is comparative and pedagogical and reflects the opinions of teachers in Kazakhstan and Mexico regarding the social and pedagogical barriers faced by people with disabilities in specific universities. The work shows that, in general, both countries pay attention to issues of inclusion and there are effective practices in this area.

Mathematical processing of data using Fisher's angular transformation criterion showed the presence of a statistically significant difference regarding the second question ("Is the number of students with special educational needs at your university more or less than 100?") ($\varphi^*_{emp}=2.33$), the fourth ("In your opinion, what kind of support for students with special needs is required by students?") ($\varphi^*_{emp}=2.201$), the fifth ("Does your university provide you with recommendations and guidelines that cover the issues of teaching such students and in what form?") ($\varphi^*_{emp}=2.284$) and the thirteenth question ("Are the modern technologies used at your university sufficient for inclusive teaching?") ($\varphi^*_{emp}=2.709$).

The following socio-pedagogical barriers were identified: weak interest of respondents in issues of providing a special approach to students with special educational needs, insufficient awareness of recommendations and guidelines that cover issues of teaching such students, insufficient training of teachers to work with students with special needs, incomplete compliance of the material and technical base for overcoming the socio-pedagogical barriers faced by people with disabilities, indirect connection between the presence of an established health limitation and the reduction of socio-pedagogical barriers faced by students, incomplete availability of inclusive practices in the university for all people with disabilities on an equal basis, regardless of the structure of the defect.

The analysis is not limited to the analysis of the opinions of respondents from universities in Kazakhstan and Mexico. It also considers the development of partnerships and joint inclusive educational activities. A distinctive feature of this study is a joint survey of Kazakh and Mexican teachers, which is a starting point for achieving bilateral relations, including in the field of education. However, for the joint implementation of inclusive educational activities within the framework of the proposed agreement between the universities under study, it is necessary to overcome the terminological disunity at the level of both universities, improve the legal procedures regulating such activities and ensure the application of effective practices of inclusive education.

An assessment of the commonality of opinions of teachers on social and pedagogical barriers shows their difference in relation to questions about the number of students with special educational needs at the university, the specifics of supporting students with special needs, providing recommendations and guidelines that cover issues of teaching such students, the sufficiency of modern technologies used at the university for inclusive education. Mathematical processing of the data confirmed the presence of a statistically significant difference in the answers interpreted as "affirmative" and as "negative" between teachers from Mexico and Kazakhstan.

This situation indicates the need to focus on the legal and technological issues of the joint inclusive educational process within the agreement between the universities under study. The preamble of the agreement should contain a comprehensive terminological component for a common attitude towards inclusive education in Kazakh and Mexican languages in universities. Professional training and practice should be consistent with the goals and strategy of the proposed agreement between the Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University and the José Mario Molina Pasquel y Enríquez Technological Institute. The prospects for the study are for the scientific community to further explore potential partnerships between different universities around the world and to form a unified inclusive educational system through a survey of a wider range of faculty, leaders and university administrators.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors express their gratitude to the reviewers whose comments have helped improve the quality of the manuscript [авторы выражают признательность рецензентам, чьи комментарии позволили улучшить качество рукописи].

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Gbebe K. M. Inclusive education at the centre of human development issues in Togo // *European Journal of Education*. 2023. Vol. 58. No. 2. P. 289–298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12555>
2. Carstensen M. B., Emmenegger P. Education as social policy: new tensions in maturing knowledge economies // *Social Policy & Administration*. 2023. Vol. 57. No. 2. P. 109–121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12888>
3. Nwosu K. C., Wahl W. P. Teachers' emotional intelligence as a predictor of their attitude, concerns and sentiments about inclusive education: teacher professional-related factors as control variables // *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*. 2022. Vol. 23. No. 2. P. 38–51. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12578>
4. Bitar K., Hoosen F. The youth transformative participatory evaluator education and training approach: the EvalYouth experience // *New Directions for Evaluation*. 2023. Vol. 2023. No. 177. P. 65–73. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.20547>
5. Fajzrahmanova A. T. On organization of the inclusive educational environment in higher educational institutions of the Russian Federation // *Life Science Journal*. 2014. Vol. 11. No. 11. P. 59–62.
6. Hopkins L. The path of least resistance: a voice-relational analysis of disabled students' experiences of discrimination in English universities // *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2011. Vol. 15. No. 7. P. 711–727.
7. Moriña A. Inclusive education in higher education: challenges and opportunities // *European Journal of Special Needs Education*. 2017. Vol. 32. No. 1. P. 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2016.1254964>
8. Mullins L., Preyde M. The lived experience of students with an invisible disability at a Canadian university // *Disability & Society*. 2013. Vol. 28. No. 2. P. 147–160.
9. Hadjidakou K., Hartas D. Higher education provision for students with disabilities in Cyprus // *Higher Education*. 2008. Vol. 55. No. 1. P. 103–119.
10. Martin J. M. Stigma and student mental health in higher education // *Higher Education Research & Development*. 2010. Vol. 29. No. 3. P. 259–274.
11. Haitembu R. K., Maarman R. The Namibian inclusive education policy's response to gender nonconforming learners // *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*. 2022. Vol. 23. No. 2. P. 116–125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12584>
12. Quinn J. Drop-out and completion in higher education in Europe among students from under-represented groups: аналитический доклад. Brussels: European Commission, Network of Experts on Social Aspects of Education and Training, 2013.
13. Lombardi A., Murray C., Kowitt J. Social support and academic success for college students with disabilities: do relationship types matter? // *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*. 2016. Vol. 44. No. 1. P. 1–13.
14. Stech S., Smetackova I. Teacher and parental views on inclusive education policy lending in the Czech Republic // *European Journal of Education*. 2023. Vol. 58. No. 2. P. 46–57. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12557>
15. Murdoch D., English A. R. Feeling heard: inclusive education, transformative learning, and productive struggle // *Educational Theory*. 2021. Vol. 70. No. 5. P. 565–582. <https://doi.org/10.1111/edth.12449>
16. Cameron D. L. Teacher preparation for inclusion in Norway: a study of beliefs, skills, and intended practices // *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2017. Vol. 21. No. 10. P. 1028–1044. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1326177>
17. Bešić E., Paleczek L., Rossmann P., Krammer M., Gasteiger-Klicpera B. Attitudes towards inclusion of refugee girls with and without disabilities in Austrian primary schools // *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2020. Vol. 24. No. 5. P. 463–478. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1467976>
18. Абильдина С. К., Жакипбекова С. С., Айтжанова Р. М., Бейсембаева А. А., Айдарбекова К. А. Сравнительный анализ понятийного аппарата инклюзивного образования // *Вестник Карагандинского государственного университета. Серия «Педагогика»*. 2018. № 3 (91). С. 78–86. URL: https://pedagogyyestnik.ksu.kz/apart/srch/2018_pedagogics_3_91_2018.pdf (дата обращения: 05.05.2026).
19. Makoele T. M. Language, terminology, and inclusive education: a case of Kazakhstani transition to inclusion // *SAGE Open*. 2020. Vol. 10. No. 1. P. 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020902089>
20. Ainscow M., Slee R., Best M. Editorial: the Salamanca Statement: 25 years on // *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2019. Vol. 23. No. 7–8. P. 671–676. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1622800>
21. Агавелян С. Д., Аубакирова А. Д., Жомартова Э. И., Бурдина Е. И. Отношение учителей к инклюзивному образованию в Казахстане // *Интеграция образования*. 2020. Т. 24. № 1. С. 8–19. <https://doi.org/10.15507/1991-9468.098.024.202001.008-019>

22. Lautenbach F., Heyder A. Changing attitudes to inclusion in preservice teacher education: a systematic review // *Educational Research*. 2019. Vol. 61. No. 2. P. 231–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2019.1596035>
23. Шкутина Л. А., Рымханова А. Р., Мирза Н. В., Алшынбекова Г. К. Человеческий ресурс является ключевым фактором успешной реализации системы инклюзивного образования // *Вестник Новосибирского государственного педагогического университета*. 2017. Т. 7. № 1. С. 21–33. <https://doi.org/10.15293/2226-3365.1701.02>
24. De Leeuw R. R., De Boer A., Minnaert A. What do Dutch general education teachers do to facilitate the social participation of students with SEBD // *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2020. Vol. 24. No. 11. P. 1194–1217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1514081>
25. Шалбаева Д., Жетписбаева Б. А., Акбаева Г. Н., Асанова Д. Н. Организационно-педагогические условия реализации образовательного процесса в рамках инклюзивного образования в Республике Казахстан // *Европейский журнал современного образования*. 2021. Т. 10. № 3. С. 711–725. <https://doi.org/10.13187/ejced.2021.3.711>
26. Alzahrani N. The development of inclusive education practice: a review of literature // *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*. 2020. Vol. 12. No. 1. P. 68–83. <https://doi.org/10.20489/intjces.722380>
27. Атшыбаева Н., Егенисова А., Бутабаева Л., Абусейтов Б., Жорабекова А., Баймуханбетов Б., Уайдуллакызы Э. Компетенции, предоставляемые учащимся с ограниченными возможностями в рамках инклюзивного образования // *Всемирный журнал образовательных технологий: текущие проблемы*. 2021. Т. 13. № 4. С. 696–706. <https://doi.org/10.18844/wjet.v13i4.6256>
28. Korsgaard M. T., Larsen V., Wiberg M. Thinking and researching inclusive education without a banister – visiting, listening and tact as a foundation for collective research on inclusive education // *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2020. Vol. 24. No. 5. P. 496–512. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1469680>
29. Martinez R., & Mutseekwa C. Where Can Persons with Disabilities Work? An Analysis of Opinion Dynamics and Employment Opportunities: a Longitudinal Study // *Economic Consultant*. 2025. No. 4. P. 72–83. DOI: 10.46224/ecoc.2025.4.5
30. Martinez R., & Mutseekwa C. Economic Support for Employers in Hiring and Retaining Persons with Disabilities: A Case Study of Kazakhstan // *Economic Consultant*. 2026. No. 2. P. 62–82. DOI: 10.46224/ecoc.2026.2.4

REFERENCES

1. Gbebe K. M. Inclusive education at the centre of human development issues in Togo. *European Journal of Education*, 2023, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 289–298. DOI: 10.1111/ejed.12555
2. Carstensen M. B., Emmenegger P. Education as social policy: new tensions in maturing knowledge economies. *Social Policy & Administration*, 2023, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 109–121. DOI: 10.1111/spol.12888
3. Nwosu K. C., Wahl W. P. Teachers' emotional intelligence as a predictor of their attitude, concerns and sentiments about inclusive education: teacher professional-related factors as control variables. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 2022, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 38–51. DOI: 10.1111/1471-3802.12578
4. Bitar K., Hoosen F. The youth transformative participatory evaluator education and training approach: the EvalYouth experience. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 2023, vol. 2023, no. 177, pp. 65–73. DOI: 10.1002/ev.20547
5. Fajzrahmanova A. T. On organization of the inclusive educational environment in higher educational institutions of the Russian Federation. *Life Science Journal*, 2014, vol. 11, no. 11, pp. 59–62.
6. Hopkins L. The path of least resistance: a voice-relational analysis of disabled students' experiences of discrimination in English universities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2011, vol. 15, no. 7, pp. 711–727.
7. Moriña A. Inclusive education in higher education: challenges and opportunities. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 2017, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 3–17. DOI: 10.1080/08856257.2016.1254964
8. Mullins L., Preyde M. The lived experience of students with an invisible disability at a Canadian university. *Disability & Society*, 2013, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 147–160.
9. Hadjidakou K., Hartas D. Higher education provision for students with disabilities in Cyprus. *Higher Education*, 2008, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 103–119.
10. Martin J. M. Stigma and student mental health in higher education. *Higher Education Research &*

- Development*, 2010, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 259–274.
11. Haitembu R. K., Maarman R. The Namibian inclusive education policy's response to gender nonconforming learners. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 2022, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 116–125. DOI: 10.1111/1471-3802.12584
 12. Quinn J. Drop-out and completion in higher education in Europe among students from under-represented groups: analytical report. *Brussels, European Commission, Network of Experts on Social Aspects of Education and Training*, 2013.
 13. Lombardi A., Murray C., Kowitt J. Social support and academic success for college students with disabilities: do relationship types matter? *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 2016, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 1–13.
 14. Stech S., Smetackova I. Teacher and parental views on inclusive education policy lending in the Czech Republic. *European Journal of Education*, 2023, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 46–57. DOI: 10.1111/ejed.12557
 15. Murdoch D., English A. R. Feeling heard: inclusive education, transformative learning, and productive struggle. *Educational Theory*, 2021, vol. 70, no. 5, pp. 565–582. DOI: 10.1111/edth.12449
 16. Cameron D. L. Teacher preparation for inclusion in Norway: a study of beliefs, skills, and intended practices. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2017, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 1028–1044. DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2017.1326177
 17. Bešić E., Paleczek L., Rossmann P., Krammer M., Gasteiger-Klicpera B. Attitudes towards inclusion of refugee girls with and without disabilities in Austrian primary schools. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2020, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 463–478. DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2018.1467976
 18. Abildina S. K., Zhakipbekova S. S., Aitzhanova R. M., Beisembaeva A. A., Aidarbekova K. A. Comparative analysis of the conceptual framework of inclusive education. *Bulletin of Karaganda State University. Pedagogy Series*, 2018, no. 3 (91), pp. 78–86. Available at: https://pedagogy-vestnik.ksu.kz/apart/srch/2018_pedagogics_3_91_2018.pdf (accessed 5 May 2026). (In Russ.)
 19. Makoelle T. M. Language, terminology, and inclusive education: a case of Kazakhstani transition to inclusion. *SAGE Open*, 2020, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1–8. DOI: 10.1177/2158244020902089
 20. Ainscow M., Slee R., Best M. Editorial: the Salamanca Statement: 25 years on. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2019, vol. 23, no. 7–8, pp. 671–676. DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2019.1622800
 21. Agavelyan S. D., Aubakirova A. D., Zhomartova E. I., Burdina E. I. Teachers' attitude toward inclusive education in Kazakhstan. *Integration of Education*, 2020, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 8–19. DOI: 10.15507/1991-9468.098.024.202001.008-019 (In Russ.)
 22. Lautenbach F., Heyder A. Changing attitudes to inclusion in preservice teacher education: a systematic review. *Educational Research*, 2019, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 231–253. DOI: 10.1080/00131881.2019.1596035
 23. Shkutina L. A., Rymkhanova A. R., Mirza N. V., Alshynbekova G. K. Human resources as a key factor in the successful implementation of the inclusive education system. *Bulletin of Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University*, 2017, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 21–33. DOI: 10.15293/2226-3365.1701.02 (In Russ.)
 24. De Leeuw R. R., De Boer A., Minnaert A. What do Dutch general education teachers do to facilitate the social participation of students with SEBD. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2020, vol. 24, no. 11, pp. 1194–1217. DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2018.1514081
 25. Shalbaeva D., Zhetpisbaeva B. A., Akbaeva G. N., Asanova D. N. Organizational and pedagogical conditions for the implementation of the educational process within the framework of inclusive education in the Republic of Kazakhstan. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 2021, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 711–725. DOI: 10.13187/ejced.2021.3.711 (In Russ.)
 26. Alzahrani N. The development of inclusive education practice: a review of literature. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*, 2020, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 68–83. DOI: 10.20489/intjecse.722380
 27. Atshybaeva N., Egenisova A., Butabaeva L., Abuseitov B., Zhorabekova A., Baimukhanbetov B., Uaidullakzy E. Competencies provided to students with disabilities within the framework of inclusive education. *World Journal on Educational Technology: Current Issues*, 2021, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 696–706. DOI: 10.18844/wjet.v13i4.6256 (In Russ.)
 28. Korsgaard M. T., Larsen V., Wiberg M. Thinking and researching inclusive education without a banister – visiting, listening and tact as a foundation for collective research on inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2020, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 496–512. DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2018.1469680
 29. Martinez R., & Mutseekwa C. Where Can Persons with Disabilities Work? An Analysis of Opinion Dynamics and Employment Opportunities: a Longitudinal Study. *Economic Consultant*, 2025, no. 4, pp. 72–83. DOI: 10.46224/ecoc.2025.4.5
 30. Martinez R., & Mutseekwa C. Economic Support for Employers in Hiring and Retaining Persons with Disabilities: A Case Study of Kazakhstan. *Economic Consultant*, 2026, no. 2, pp. 62–82. DOI: 10.46224/ecoc.2026.2.4

Авторы**Кариев Адлет Дюсембаевич**

(Республика Казахстан, Алматы)

Кандидат педагогических наук, ассоциированный
профессор кафедры начального образования,
постдокторантКазахский национальный педагогический университет
имени Абая

E-mail: adlet.kariyev@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7789-9080

Scopus Author ID: 5720222355

Хосе Г. Варгас-Эрнандес

(Мексика, Сапопан)

Кандидат экономических наук, доктор экономических наук,
Профессор-исследователь, член системы Национального
исследования Мексики

Национальный технологический институт Мексики

E-mail: jvargas2006@gmail.com

jose.vargas@zapopan.tecmm.edu.mx

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0938-4197>

Scopus Author ID: 6603325396

Шарофутдинов Икболжон Усмонжон угли

(Республика Узбекистан, Фергана)

Доктор философии (PhD) по педагогическим наукам,
старший преподаватель кафедры прикладной математики
и информатики

Ферганский государственный университет

E-mail: iqbol0766@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0969-7249

Scopus Author ID: 59680949900

Торемуратова Гулназ Барлыкбаевна

(Республика Узбекистан, Нукус)

Ассистент преподаватель кафедры истории и
общественных наук

Университет инновационных технологий

E-mail: gulnaztoremuratova@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0009-0000-4115-1591

Authors**Adlet D. Kariyev**

(Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty)

Cand. Sci. (Education), Associate Professor of Department of
Primary Education, Postdoctoral fellow
Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University

Email: adlet.kariyev@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7789-9080

Scopus Author ID: 5720222355

José G. Vargas-Hernández

(Mexico, Zapopan)

PhD in Economics, PhD in Public Administration,
Dr. in Economic Studies, Research professor member of the
National System of researchers of Mexico
National Institute of Technology of Mexico

Email: jvargas2006@gmail.com

jose.vargas@zapopan.tecmm.edu.mx

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0938-4197>

Scopus Author ID: 6603325396

Ikboljon U. Sharofutdinov

(Republic of Uzbekistan, Fergana)

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Pedagogical Sciences,
Senior Lecturer at the Department of Applied Mathematics and
Informatics

Fergana State University

Email: iqbol0766@gmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0969-7249>

Scopus Author ID: 59680949900

Gulnaz B. Toremuratova

(Republic of Uzbekistan, Nukus)

An assistant teacher

Department of History and Social sciences

University of Innovation Technologies

Email: gulnaztoremuratova@gmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-4115-1591>**Вклад авторов****Кариев Адлет Дюсембаевич:** концептуализация,
методология, создание рукописи и её редактирование,
руководство исследованием, администрирование проекта**Хосе Г. Варгас-Эрнандес:** верификация данных,
формальный анализ, проведение исследования,
создание черновика рукописи, создание рукописи и её
редактирование**Шарофутдинов Икболжон Усмонжон угли:** верификация
данных, формальный анализ, проведение исследования,
администрирование данных, визуализация**Торемуратова Гулназ Барлыкбаевна:** верификация
данных, формальный анализ, проведение исследования,
ресурсы, администрирование данных, визуализация© Кариев Адлет Дюсембаевич, Хосе Г. Варгас-Эрнандес,
Шарофутдинов Икболжон Усмонжон угли,
Торемуратова Гулназ Барлыкбаевна, 2026

Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов

Authors contribution**Adlet D. Kariyev:** Conceptualization, Methodology,
Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision, Project administration**José G. Vargas-Hernández:** Validation, Formal analysis,
Investigation, Writing - Original Draft,
Writing - Review & Editing**Ikboljon U. Sharofutdinov:** Validation, Formal analysis,
Investigation, Data Curation, Visualization**Gulnaz B. Toremuratova:** Validation, Formal analysis,
Investigation, Resources, Data Curation, Visualization© Adlet D. Kariyev, José G. Vargas-Hernández,
Ikboljon U. Sharofutdinov, Gulnaz B. Toremuratova, 2026

The authors declared no conflicts of interest