



PHILOSOPHICAL-ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND AXIOLOGICAL CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTING THE PRINCIPLE OF INCLUSIVITY IN BUILDING A SOCIAL STATE

Tursunaliyeva Ezozakhon Ilkhomjon kizi
Independent Researcher, Fergana State University
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18859109>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 26th February 2026

Accepted: 27th February 2026

Online: 28th February 2026

KEYWORDS

Inclusive social state; philosophical anthropology; personal and social identification; human dignity; inclusive education; axiological foundations

The philosophical-anthropological and axiological criteria for relying on the principle of inclusivity in the construction of a social state constitute the fundamental foundations that determine a person's role and dignity within society.

First, the philosophical-anthropological criteria for relying on inclusivity define the uniqueness of human nature and its relationship with society

ABSTRACT

This study examines the philosophical-anthropological foundations of interpreting the individual as a subject of an inclusive social state. Drawing on the works of K. Rogers, A. Maslow, and G. Allport, it highlights three dimensions of personal development—exteriorization, interiorization, and transcendence. The article analyzes the balance between social and personal identification, the institutionalization of human dignity, and the theoretical-methodological basis for inclusive education. Findings emphasize that inclusivity requires an anthropological and axiological framework to become a transformative social practice..

The philosophical-anthropological and axiological criteria for relying on the principle of inclusivity in the construction of a social state constitute the fundamental foundations that determine a person's role and dignity within society.

First, the philosophical-anthropological criteria for relying on inclusivity define the uniqueness of human nature and its relationship with society:

- **Universality of the Human Being:** Every individual, regardless of physical or social condition, is considered an equal member of society and a moral entity.
- **Anthropocentrism:** The interests of humans should occupy the central position in social state policy. Inclusivity aims to transform individuals from “objects of assistance” into active “subjects of society.”

- **Individuality and Uniqueness:** The irreproducibility of each person is recognized. An inclusive approach entails acknowledging differences and needs rather than standardizing individuals.

- **Ontological Unity:** There is an intrinsic interconnection between the individual and society. The progress of society is measured by the protection and integration of its most vulnerable members.

Second, the axiological criteria reflect the moral and ethical dimensions of inclusivity and its role within the system of social values:

- **Human Dignity:** The highest axiological criterion, declaring human life, honor, and rights as absolute values.

- **Social Justice:** Not merely the equal distribution of resources, but the creation of equitable conditions for persons with limited opportunities.

- **Solidarity and Responsibility:** Mutual support between stronger and weaker social groups, as well as the ethical and legal obligations of the state toward its citizens.

- **Equality and Tolerance:** Respect for the differences of diverse social groups and the promotion of their full participation in societal life constitute an axiological imperative.

These criteria demonstrate that a social state is not merely an economic model but a moral-legal space grounded in the philosophy of humanism.

Relying on the principle of inclusivity in building a social state is not only relevant in political science or social philosophy but also elucidates the theoretical foundations of human dignity, social justice, and the concept of inclusive institutions. Philosophical research enables the study of inclusivity problems at the worldview level. For instance, from the perspective of philosophical anthropology, researchers primarily examine the pedagogical aspects of educating and developing individuals with limited opportunities in inclusive educational settings. Such individuals require greater educational support than other human beings, as education provides them with the opportunity for integrated physical, mental, and moral development and self-realization. This is achieved only through continuous and active dialogical processes, involving interaction with the socio-cultural environment throughout an individual's life, and occurs within specific historical contexts.

The axiological positions of contemporary philosophical directions allow analyzing inclusivity as a value-based approach to individuals' existence under conditions of equal opportunity. Understanding inclusivity in this way can help address ontological issues; for example, it enables the realization of a person's existence, which manifests in education, healthcare, and economic spheres. Addressing these challenges highlights the social-philosophical aspects of the life activities of individuals with limited opportunities, particularly in terms of education, socialization, and quality of life.

The philosophical-anthropological, axiological, and theoretical-pedagogical aspects of the principle of inclusivity have been studied by Russian scholars such as FURYAYEVA T.V., BOGDANOVA T.G., NAZAROVA N.M., GUSEYNOVA A.A., PRIKHODKO O.G., USHAKOVA E.V., and YAKOVLEVA I.M.

In inclusive pedagogy and psychology, the socio-philosophical approach is closely linked to two main theoretical directions: personalistic and social-phenomenological paradigms.

These approaches interpret humans not merely as products of social relations but as ontologically unique, self-defining, and value-oriented beings.

Thus, in implementing the principle of inclusivity in building a social state, recognizing the individual as a unique being capable of social, moral, and personal development constitutes the philosophical-anthropological and axiological foundation. In this sense, inclusivity is not a technical or institutional mechanism of state governance but a practical expression of a specific philosophical-anthropological conception of human beings. The personalistic and social-phenomenological approaches form the conceptual basis of an inclusive social state, as inclusivity relies on recognizing the individual as a valuable subject striving for self-realization.

Based on philosophical-anthropological criteria, the interpretation of the individual as a subject of a social state is conceptualized within the field of personalistic philosophical anthropology by Western scholars K. Rogers, A. Maslow, and G. Allport along the following three dimensions:

1. Exteriorization – active participation of the individual in social life;
2. Interiorization – self-awareness and internal reflection;
3. Transcendence – orientation toward higher spiritual values.

An inclusive social state aims to support these three aspects at an institutional level. In other words, the state should ensure that the individual is not excluded from social processes, has the opportunity for self-realization, and can assert human dignity. This approach, from an anthropological perspective, interprets the human being not as a “sum of deficiencies” but as a possessor of potential capabilities. Consequently, inclusivity requires recognizing individuals with developmental limitations as full-fledged subjects of the social system.

The issues of identification and inclusivity, as well as the broader topic of social and personal identification, have been investigated by U. James, J. G. Mead, E. Goffman, and L. Krappmann:

- Social identification – recognition of the individual by society;
- Personal identification – autonomous self-awareness.

Alongside the inherent characteristics of human existence, the conditions under which it occurs are equally significant. Therefore, these studies analyze the theoretical foundations linking philosophical anthropology and human rights. Although the boundaries of philosophy and anthropology are closely related, the limited use of philosophical concepts to explain anthropological phenomena and transformations remains a significant challenge.

Inclusivity aims to maintain a balance between the two levels mentioned above. As L. Krappmann emphasizes, when this balance is disrupted:

- the individual is socially marginalized, or
- internal identification undergoes a crisis.

For individuals with developmental challenges, inclusive policies:

- eliminate social non-recognition, and
- strengthen personal dignity.

This approach, as a philosophical-anthropological criterion, evaluates the human being not by conformity to social norms but by inherent human value.

From an axiological perspective, inclusivity establishes the following core values at an institutional level in a social state:

- Human dignity;
- Justice and equal opportunities;
- Cooperation and solidarity;
- Responsible freedom.

Accordingly, if contemporary interpretations of human rights lack an anthropological and axiological foundation, inclusivity remains at the level of formal policy.

From a philosophical standpoint, the fundamental principle of inclusivity is free choice, which is implemented through the relevant social policies in the field of education and reinforced by law. In this context, the theoretical and methodological foundations of inclusive education and its prospects are supported by concepts of educational integration and evidenced by its successful implementation in foreign countries over the past fifty years. This process is underpinned by philosophical positions as well as scientific theories and methodological approaches. Therefore, it is essential to clarify the theoretical and methodological foundations of inclusive education and its implementation prospects from a philosophical analytical perspective.

Philosophy, as a form of social consciousness, plays a crucial role in developing the worldview foundations of educational integration as a new socio-humanitarian reality, as well as in creating a methodological basis for introducing and developing inclusive processes.

This process is carried out within the historical-philosophical, ontological, epistemological, axiological, philosophical-anthropological, and socio-philosophical dimensions. Taking into account the principle of methodological relativity, i.e., each pedagogical paradigm (tradition, system) is defined by specific philosophical-methodological principles and normative foundations, it should be noted that both national and foreign scholars, when studying the phenomenon of educational integration and its practical implementation methods, relied on various methodological approaches—philosophical and scientific-theoretical—despite certain commonalities.