



A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES INCLUSIVE AND GENERAL EDUCATION SYSTEMS IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Mamarizaeva Farangiz Zohidjon kizi

Acting associate professor, Jizzakh Polytechnic
Institute

mamarizaevafarangiz@gmail.com

Ergashev Isroiljon Islomjon ugli

Student of the faculty Energetics engineering, Jizzakh
Polytechnic Institute

Kozimjontoshpolatov24@gmail.com

Ahmedov Eldor Musokul ugli

Student of the faculty Energetics engineering, Jizzakh
Polytechnic Institute

nargizaqlichoba@gmail.com

Abstract. *This article presents a systematic comparative analysis of Inclusive Education Systems (IES) and General Education Systems (GES), examining their structural differences, pedagogical advantages, and operational limitations. Drawing upon empirical research from 280 studies across 25 countries, UNESCO policy frameworks, and contemporary scholarly discourse, this analysis evaluates both systems through the lenses of educational equity, cost-effectiveness, and academic outcomes. The findings indicate that while IES demonstrates superior long-term social and academic outcomes for diverse learner populations, significant implementation barriers persist, including resource constraints, inadequate teacher preparation, and systemic resistance to structural transformation. Conversely, GES maintains administrative efficiency and standardized delivery mechanisms but perpetuates educational inequities and exclusionary practices. This article contributes to the ongoing discourse on educational reform by providing evidence-based recommendations for systemic transition toward inclusive paradigms.*

Keywords: *Inclusive Education, General Education, Special Education, Educational Equity, Universal Design for Learning, Differentiated Instruction, UNESCO Framework, Disability Rights*

1. Introduction

In the context of rapid globalization and increasing intercultural communication, the role of foreign language education has become more significant than ever before. Modern educational systems are continuously evolving to meet the diverse needs of learners, particularly in terms of accessibility, inclusivity, and quality. Among the most widely discussed approaches are Inclusive Education Systems (IES) and General Education Systems (GES), each offering distinct advantages and challenges in the process of teaching foreign languages.

Inclusive education emphasizes equal opportunities for all learners, regardless of their physical, intellectual, or social differences. It aims to create a learning environment where diversity is respected and supported. In contrast, general education systems often follow standardized curricula and teaching methods, which may not fully address the individual needs of every learner. Therefore, analyzing these two systems in the context of foreign language teaching is essential for identifying effective pedagogical strategies.

As Shavkat Mirziyoyev has emphasized, *“Improving the quality of education is the most important factor for the development of our society.”* This statement highlights the importance of adopting innovative and flexible educational approaches that can enhance learning outcomes for all students. In particular, foreign language teaching requires adaptive methodologies that consider learners’ abilities, backgrounds, and learning styles.

Furthermore, the concept of inclusive education is closely linked to the idea of equality in learning. As the renowned physicist Albert Einstein once stated, “Everybody is a genius. But if you judge a fish by its ability to climb a tree, it will live its whole life believing that it is stupid.”

The global educational landscape has witnessed a paradigmatic shift from segregated special education models toward inclusive education frameworks over the past four decades. This transformation is anchored in international human rights

instruments, particularly the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD, 2006) and UNESCO's Education 2030 Agenda, which mandate equitable access to quality education for all learners regardless of ability, socioeconomic status, or cultural background.

The dichotomy between Inclusive Education Systems (IES) and General Education Systems (GES) represents more than administrative categorization—it embodies fundamentally divergent philosophical orientations regarding the purpose of education, the nature of learning diversity, and the role of educational institutions in democratic societies. While GES operates on standardized curricula designed for the statistical median of learner populations, IES embraces universal design principles that accommodate neurodiversity, physical diversity, and cognitive diversity within mainstream educational environments.

This article provides a comprehensive scholarly examination of these systems, analyzing their differential characteristics, empirical evidence regarding their efficacy, and the complex trade-offs involved in systemic implementation.

2. Conceptual Framework and Definitions

2.1 Inclusive Education System (IES)

Inclusive Education Systems are defined as comprehensive educational frameworks that ensure all learners, regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic, or other conditions, have equal access to quality learning opportunities within mainstream educational settings. The UNESCO Policy Guidelines on Inclusion in Education (2009) characterize IES not as a static state but as "a process of strengthening the capacity of the education system to reach out to all learners" involving fundamental changes in "content, approaches, structures, and strategies."

Key definitional elements of IES include:

- Universal Design for Learning (UDL): Curricular frameworks that provide multiple means of engagement, representation, and expression

- Differentiated Instruction: Pedagogical approaches tailoring teaching methods to individual learner needs
- Individualized Education Plans (IEPs): Structured documentation of personalized learning goals
- Collaborative Teaching Models: Co-teaching arrangements between general and special education professionals

2.2 General Education System (GES)

General Education Systems refer to traditional educational frameworks designed to serve the majority of learners who demonstrate typical developmental trajectories without requiring substantial accommodations. GES is characterized by:

- Standardized Curriculum: Uniform learning objectives and assessment protocols
- Homogeneous Grouping: Organizational structures often segregating learners based on perceived ability
- Subject-Centered Pedagogy: Instruction prioritizing content delivery over accommodation
- Bureaucratic Efficiency: Administrative systems optimized for mass education delivery

3. Differential Analysis: Structural and Pedagogical Dimensions

A comparative analysis of Inclusive Education Systems (IES) and General Education Systems (GES) reveals significant differences in both structural organization and pedagogical approaches, particularly in the context of foreign language teaching. These differences directly influence learners' engagement, achievement, and overall language acquisition process.

From a **structural perspective**, inclusive education systems are designed to accommodate diverse learners by adapting curriculum content, teaching materials, and assessment methods. They emphasize flexibility, accessibility, and individualized learning paths. In contrast, general education systems rely on

standardized curricula, uniform teaching strategies, and fixed assessment criteria, which ensure consistency but may overlook individual learner differences.

From a **pedagogical standpoint**, inclusive education prioritizes student-centered learning, collaborative activities, and differentiated instruction. Teachers act as facilitators who adapt their methods according to students' abilities, learning styles, and needs. This approach is particularly effective in foreign language teaching, where communication skills and interactive learning are essential. On the other hand, general education systems often employ teacher-centered methods, focusing on grammar rules, memorization, and structured exercises, which may limit communicative competence but provide a strong theoretical foundation.

Moreover, inclusive classrooms foster social interaction, tolerance, and mutual respect among students, which are crucial elements in developing intercultural communicative competence. General education systems, while efficient in managing large groups, may lack such personalized interaction, especially in linguistically diverse classrooms.

Table 1. Structural and Pedagogical Comparison of IES and GES

Criteria	Inclusive Education Systems (IES)	General Education Systems (GES)
Curriculum Design	Flexible and adaptive	Standardized and fixed
Teaching Approach	Student-centered	Teacher-centered
Learning Style	Individualized and differentiated	Uniform for all learners
Assessment	Continuous and varied	Formal and standardized
Classroom Environment	Interactive and inclusive	Structured and controlled
Focus in Language Teaching	Communication and interaction	Grammar and accuracy
Student Engagement	High (active participation)	Moderate (passive learning possible)
Adaptability	High	Limited

GES reflects an industrial-model conception of education as standardized preparation for economic participation, whereas IES is grounded in human rights frameworks recognizing education as a fundamental right.

The legal imperative for inclusive education has been established through:

- UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006): Article 24 mandates inclusive education systems
- UNESCO Salamanca Statement (1994): Established that ordinary schools should accommodate all children
- Sustainable Development Goal 4: Targets inclusive and equitable quality education for all by 2030

Empirical research indicates profound disparities in teacher preparation. In the Indonesian context, 94% of schools lack special educators, and 72% have never received inclusive education training. Effective IES implementation requires pre-service training in special education methodologies, ongoing professional development, and competency in developing IEPs.

IES requires substantial systemic restructuring, including Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), collaborative consultation models, and redistribution of specialized personnel. GES maintains streamlined administrative structures but creates parallel systems of special education that prove more costly.

4. Empirical Evidence: Academic and Social Outcomes

4.1 Meta-Analytic Findings

The Harvard Graduate School of Education systematic review analyzed 280 studies from 25 countries and established that:

- Students with disabilities in inclusive settings demonstrate significantly higher academic outcomes
- Students without disabilities show either positive or neutral academic effects (81% of outcomes)

- Inclusive education correlates with improved social competence and self-concept

Specific findings include:

- Students with intellectual disabilities in inclusive settings made more progress in literacy

- Students with autism in inclusive settings scored significantly higher on academic tests

- Time in general education curriculum correlates strongly with math and reading achievement

4.2 Long-Term Outcomes

Inclusive education predicts higher post-secondary enrollment, improved employment outcomes, enhanced social participation, and reduced dependency on social services.

5. Economic Analysis: Cost-Effectiveness and Resource Implications

The OECD estimated that segregated systems cost 7-9 times more than inclusive models. World Bank research indicates that educating students with disabilities yields 2-3 times higher return on investment. Inclusive education correlates with lower crime rates, improved health outcomes, and increased civic participation.

Contemporary scholarly consensus supports the "necessary co-existence of special and inclusive education" as integrated components. Effective systems operate along an inclusive continuum from full inclusion to consultative support rather than as segregated alternatives.

Essential components include leadership commitment, collaborative culture, universal design, family partnership, and data-driven practice.

Conclusion

While GES offers administrative efficiency, it fails to meet diverse learners' needs. IES demonstrates superior outcomes and aligns with human rights

frameworks, despite implementation challenges. The evidence supports systemic transition toward inclusive education requiring substantial investment in teacher preparation, infrastructure, and restructuring—investments yielding significant returns in human capital and social cohesion.

Future research should focus on context-specific implementation strategies, longitudinal studies with rigorous controls, professional development models, and sustainable policy mechanisms.

In conclusion, both Inclusive Education Systems (IES) and General Education Systems (GES) play significant roles in the process of teaching foreign languages, each possessing its own strengths and limitations. While inclusive education promotes equality, diversity, and individualized learning, general education systems provide structure, standardization, and broader accessibility. The effectiveness of either system largely depends on how well it is adapted to the specific needs of learners and the educational context in which it is implemented.

In foreign language teaching, where communication skills, cultural awareness, and cognitive flexibility are essential, inclusive approaches offer considerable advantages by addressing learners' diverse abilities and learning styles. However, the structured nature of general education systems cannot be overlooked, as it ensures consistency and systematic knowledge acquisition. Therefore, a balanced integration of both approaches may serve as the most effective strategy in modern pedagogy.

As Shavkat Mirziyoyev has noted, *"The future of a nation depends on the education and upbringing of its youth."* This idea underlines the necessity of improving educational practices to meet contemporary demands. In this regard, combining inclusive principles with structured educational frameworks can contribute to more effective foreign language learning outcomes.

Moreover, as Nelson Mandela once stated, *"Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world."* This emphasizes that regardless of

the system applied, the ultimate goal of education - especially foreign language education - is to empower individuals, foster mutual understanding, and prepare learners for active participation in a globalized world.

Thus, the integration of inclusive and general education systems represents not only a pedagogical necessity but also a strategic direction for the future development of foreign language teaching.

References

1. Mirziyoyev, Sh. M. (2017). *We will build our great future together with our brave and noble people*. Tashkent: Uzbekistan Publishing House.
2. Mirziyoyev, Sh. M. (2018). *The consent of our people is the highest value given to our activity*. Tashkent: Uzbekistan Publishing House.
3. Einstein, A. (1954). *Ideas and opinions* (pp. 1-50). New York, NY: Crown Publishers.
4. Mandela, N. (1994). *Long walk to freedom* (pp. 617-620). Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
5. UNESCO. (2009). *Inclusive education: The way of the future* (pp. 5-15). Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
6. UNESCO. (2017). *A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education* (pp. 12-25). Paris: UNESCO.
7. Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment* (pp. 101-120). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (pp. 79-91). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
9. Piaget, J. (1950). *The psychology of intelligence* (pp. 25-40). London: Routledge.
10. Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition* (pp. 10-30). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

11. Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed., pp. 45–60). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
12. FM Zohidjon qizi, SN Ruslan o‘g‘li, YJ Alijon o‘g‘li. MILLIY VA XORIJIY ADABIYOT NAMUNALARI ASOSIDA TEXNIKA OLIY TA’LIM MUASSASALARI TALABALARIGA XORIJIY TILLARNI O‘QITISHNING SAMARADORLIGI (S. AHMADNING JIMJITLIK ASARI MISOLIDA). (2025). *ZAMONAVIY TA’LIM TIZIMINI RIVOJLANTIRISH VA UNGA QARATILGAN KREATIV G‘OYALAR, TAKLIFLAR VA YECHIMLAR*, 7(78), 139-141. <https://uzconferences.org/index.php/uzconf/article/view/682>