



Public normative climate for educational equity and inclusive education in Kazakhstan: Evidence from an adult CAPI survey

Zulfiya Movkebayeva¹, Zhanna Khamzina², Aitolkyn Duzelbayeva³ and Yermek Buribayev⁴

¹Department of Pedagogy, Zhetysu University named after I. Zhansugurov, Taldykorgan, Kazakhstan (ORCID: 0000-0003-2757-3389)

²Department of Law, Zhetysu University named after I. Zhansugurov, Kazakhstan (ORCID: 0000-0003-0913-2002)

³Department of Pedagogy, Pavlodar Pedagogical University, Kazakhstan (ORCID: 0000-0002-6743-1644)

⁴Department of Law, Zhetysu University named after I. Zhansugurov, Kazakhstan (ORCID: 0000-0003-0433-596X)

Corresponding Author: Zhanna Khamzina, 292803@mail.ru

Submitted: 13 May 2026 Revised: 7 July 2026 Accepted: 12 July 2026

Abstract

Positioned as a contribution to the sociology of education, this study examines the macro-level public normative climate relevant to educational equity and inclusive education in Kazakhstan. It focuses on public support for equal starting opportunities, civic interethnic inclusion, legal universalism, and social guarantees as contextual orientations that may legitimize equity-oriented educational policy. The empirical focus is therefore public legitimacy rather than direct evidence of inclusive classroom practice. The study draws on original individual-level data from an unweighted adult CAPI survey with national territorial coverage conducted in Kazakhstan between 10 May and 5 June 2025. Data were collected through a standardized tablet-based questionnaire administered in Russian or Kazakh. The analysis combines descriptive profile analysis with McNemar's test, effect-size estimates, rank correlations, and unweighted logistic regression models interpreted as adjusted association diagnostics. The findings indicate that apparent consensus is conditional. Joint soft support for the two-component core reaches 91.5%, whereas joint strong support for equal starting opportunities and civic interethnic inclusion is 62.7%. A further 23.2% strongly support only one component, while 14.1% express no strong support for either. Adjusted associations with education, settlement type, ethnicity, and subjective financial status are modest but socially patterned. These findings identify the macro-level legitimacy conditions under which inclusive and equity-oriented educational policies may be interpreted, accepted, or contested. Implications for teacher education, school climate, inclusive pedagogy, anti-bullying, disability support, and culturally responsive communication are presented as directions for future research and policy hypotheses rather than as direct empirical conclusions.

Keywords: Educational equity; Inclusive education; Kazakhstan; Normative inclusiveness; Public normative climate; Sociology of education

1. Introduction

Inclusive education and educational equity are closely connected social and institutional commitments. Both emphasize nondiscrimination, meaningful participation, recognition of learner diversity, and equitable access to high-quality and meaningful learning opportunities (Baidoo, 2026; Bilgiç & Tekin, 2023). International scholarship and policy describe inclusion as a system-wide transformation of cultures, policies, and practices and as the removal of institutional barriers to participation (Ainscow, 2020; Eriksen Bergstrand & Xenofontos, 2026; Haug, 2017; Kefallinou et al., 2020; UNESCO, 1994, 2020). Educational equity extends this logic to the distribution of learning opportunities, achievement, participation, and educational trajectories (OECD, 2012, 2023). The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and General Comment No. 4 further locate inclusive education in nondiscriminatory access to quality education and in the transformation of educational environments (Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 2016; United Nations, 2006).

In sociological terms, schooling operates through socialization, selection, cultural transmission, and potential equalization. Classical accounts emphasize the school as a site where universalistic standards and civic roles are learned; critical accounts show how educational institutions may reproduce inequality through cultural capital, institutional expectations, and unequal access to valued trajectories (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Parsons, 1959). The capability approach and theories of equality of opportunity clarify the normative basis of the problem: justice in education requires converting formal rights and institutional access into substantive opportunities for learning, participation, recognition, and mobility (Nussbaum, 2011; Roemer, 1998; Sen, 1999).

The present article approaches inclusive education from this macro-level sociological perspective. Public attitudes form the normative environment within which equity-oriented educational policy becomes legitimate, intelligible, or contested. This normative layer remains analytically separate from school-level implementation and classroom interaction. Macro-level support can strengthen the legitimacy of inclusive reform. Effective inclusion requires alignment among school governance and policy implementation, teacher preparation, specialist and institutional support, accessible and adaptable curricula, inclusive classroom practices, and close attention to learners' actual experiences of participation and learning (Baidoo, 2026; Belay & Yihun, 2020; Bilgiç & Tekin, 2023; Booth & Ainscow, 2011; Florian, 2014; Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011).

The article examines the public legitimacy conditions under which equity-oriented and inclusive educational policies may be interpreted, supported, or contested. In this sense, the study complements school-, teacher-, parent-, and student-level research by specifying the macro-level normative climate within which meso-level policy translation and micro-level educational inclusion occur. Kazakhstan is a particularly relevant setting for this analysis because inclusive education is embedded in a national context shaped by disability inclusion, language diversity, regional disparities, civic integration, modernization of support infrastructures, and the transformation of post-Soviet educational arrangements. International and national policy profiles describe inclusion through equal access, special educational needs, language rights, and multilevel governance (UNESCO, 2021). Recent official legal and policy materials connect inclusive policy with the 2025-2030 Inclusive Policy Concept, approved by Government Resolution No. 1143, and with the strengthening of psychological-medical-pedagogical commissions, specialist preparation, implementation indicators, and subsequent support measures for children with special educational needs (Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2024; Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2025; Prime Minister of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2026). Kazakhstan-specific studies also document the role of state institutions, civil-society actors, staffing and resource conditions, and the persistence of special-education logics in some institutional settings (Makoelle, 2020; Mamerkhanova et al., 2025; Rollan & Somerton, 2021). Language-in-education policy, rural-urban inequality, and digital assistive-technology provision further shape the conversion of formal equality into substantive educational opportunity (Kambatyrova, 2024; Nurbayev, 2021; UNICEF Kazakhstan, 2025).

Within this framework, social inclusion concerns participation, recognition, access to institutions, and protection from exclusion. Social exclusion involves multiple dimensions: resources, institutional access, social distance, and recognition (Levitas et al., 2007; Silver, 1994; World Bank, 2013). Educational equity covers fairness in educational opportunities, access, participation, and trajectories. Inclusive education covers institutional and pedagogical arrangements that enable participation and learning for diverse learners, including students with disabilities and special educational needs. Normative inclusiveness denotes public support for general principles of an inclusive social order, including equal starting opportunities, civic belonging, universal rules, and social guarantees. In this study, the construct captures the macro-level normative background through which educational equity and inclusive policy acquire public legitimacy.

The empirical problem concerns the structure of this legitimacy. Public support for justice, equal opportunity, tolerance, legality, and solidarity is often expressed through socially approved survey formulations and may be affected by satisficing, reputational pressure, social desirability, and upper-end clustering (Krosnick, 1991; Krumpal, 2013; Tourangeau & Yan, 2007). The analysis moves beyond marginal agreement and examines intensity, cross-domain consistency, and social patterning of support. The research questions ask how strong public endorsement is, what is learned by distinguishing soft from mandatory support, and how these orientations vary across social groups and perceived cleavages.

2. Literature Review and Study Rationale

2.1. Literature Review

International scholarship increasingly treats inclusive education as an institutional transformation aimed at removing barriers to access, participation, achievement, recognition, and belonging (Ainscow, 2020; Haug, 2017; Kefallinou et al., 2020; UNESCO, 2020). The Salamanca Statement gave this orientation a foundational policy language of schools for all; rights-based approaches later connected inclusion with nondiscrimination, accessibility, reasonable accommodation, and participation in general education systems (Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 2016; UNESCO, 1994; United Nations, 2006). The present study draws on this tradition by examining the public normative climate that surrounds, legitimates, and conditions educational policy.

This policy and research tradition requires conceptual precision. Reviews of inclusive education identify disability placement, participation of diverse learners, and systemic transformation of cultures, policies, and practices as overlapping and analytically distinct meanings of inclusion (Göransson & Nilholm, 2014; Haug, 2017; Nilholm & Göransson, 2017). The present design separates macro-level normative inclusiveness from school-level inclusion. The former captures a contextual value orientation that may legitimate, support, or constrain the institutional translation of inclusive policy.

Educational equity connects this discussion with the distribution of life chances. In policy terms, equity involves formal access to schooling and the reduction of institutional barriers that prevent disadvantaged students and schools from succeeding (OECD, 2012, 2023). In social theory, this logic is compatible with the capability approach, which treats justice as the expansion of substantive opportunities (Nussbaum, 2011; Sen, 1999), and with theories of equality of opportunity that distinguish formal entitlement from real access to valuable outcomes (Roemer, 1998). Sociology of education adds the institutional mechanism: schools socialize and select, transmit culture and sort trajectories, reproduce boundaries and also create possibilities for equalization (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Parsons, 1959).

Inclusive pedagogy and disability-inclusion research specify how these macro-normative commitments become educational practice. Booth and Ainscow's (2011) Index for Inclusion links inclusive school development with cultures, policies, and practices. Florian and Black-Hawkins (2011) conceptualize inclusive pedagogy as the extension of what is ordinarily available to all learners; Florian (2014) connects evidence of inclusion with the organization of participation and learning. Artiles et al. (2006) and Slee (2018) warn against narrow administrative or deficit-based interpretations of disability and inclusion. The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities reinforces the same point by defining inclusive education as transformation in culture, policy, and practice across educational environments (Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 2016; United Nations, 2006).

Cultural diversity and civic inclusion form another part of the same equity problem. Multicultural education emphasizes recognition of diversity within shared civic standards in curricula, school cultures, and pedagogical practices (Banks, 2016). Social cohesion research treats belonging, participation, trust, legitimacy, and recognition as distinct and related dimensions (Chan et al., 2006; Schiefer & van der Noll, 2017). In Kazakhstan, civic unity is articulated in a multiethnic social context; inclusive schooling intersects with disability and special educational needs, language, ethnicity, socioeconomic position, region, and the boundaries of civic belonging. Studies of value orientations in Kazakhstan indicate the coexistence of traditional and modernizing value configurations, making the relationship between declared unity and everyday identification empirically significant (Kaldybayeva & Kaldybayev, 2018).

Kazakhstan-specific policy and empirical literature situates these issues in a nationally distinctive institutional field. Country profiles describe Kazakhstani inclusion policy through equal access, system-wide transformation, special educational needs, language rights, and multilevel governance (UNESCO, 2021). Official legal and policy materials connect inclusive policy with the

2025-2030 Inclusive Policy Concept, psychological-medical-pedagogical commissions, specialist preparation, implementation indicators, and subsequent support measures for children with special educational needs (Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2024; Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2025; Prime Minister of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2026). Empirical studies document the continuing influence of disability and special-needs framing, the contribution of civil-society organizations to policy and methodological support, and the institutional conditions required for inclusive education in general secondary schools (Makoelle, 2020; Mamerkhanova et al., 2025; Rollan & Somerton, 2021). Related research further indicates that educational opportunity is shaped by language ideologies, parental expectations, multilingual classroom conditions, regional and technological infrastructure, access to learning resources and appropriate instructional tools, teacher preparation, and the availability of school-based and external support (Ajani, 2024; Beruin, 2023; Güler & Ürey, 2025; Kambatyrova, 2024; Nurbayev, 2021; Qhobela, 2026; UNICEF Kazakhstan, 2025).

The broader literature on social inclusion, legitimacy, and trust explains the relevance of public principles for educational institutions. Social exclusion is multidimensional and relational, involving material resources, participation, access to institutions, and recognition (Levitas et al., 2007; Silver, 1994; World Bank, 2013). Procedural-justice and legitimacy research links support for universal rules and readiness to include others within the boundaries of solidarity to perceptions that institutions are fair, predictable, and trustworthy (Levi & Stoker, 2000; Mishler & Rose, 2001; Rousseau et al., 1998; Suchman, 1995; Tyler, 1990). In educational policy, inclusive reforms require moral justification, transparent rules, credible implementation, and accountable resource distribution.

Teacher capacity, school climate, and leadership mediate the movement from public legitimacy to everyday inclusion. Systematic and meta-analytic evidence shows that teachers' attitudes, self-efficacy, and perceived capacity are closely connected with inclusive intentions and practices (Avramidis, 2021; Lindner et al., 2023; Wray et al., 2022; Yada et al., 2022). Recent studies also show that inclusive school climate, collective efficacy, teachers' agency, and transformational leadership support inclusive competence and intention (Gülsün et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2025; Xue et al., 2023). Public normative support forms one component in the relationship between legitimacy and implementation.

The measurement of this normative layer raises a specific survey problem. Inclusive norms are usually captured through publicly approved formulas and are vulnerable to satisficing, reputational pressure, social desirability, and upper-end clustering (Krosnick, 1991; Krumpal, 2013; Tourangeau & Yan, 2007). The analysis distinguishes marginal agreement from intensity and cross-domain consistency. Normative inclusiveness is treated as a measurable value orientation and as a contextual background relevant to educational equity and inclusive policy legitimation. Interethnic civic inclusion is analyzed as a distinct component of the inclusive order, and perceived social cleavages are used to locate the tension between universalist normative demand and experienced social distance.

The resulting model is organized by institutional mediation across levels of analysis. At the macro level, public attitudes define the general legitimacy of equality of opportunity, civic belonging, legal universalism, social cohesion, and social guarantees. At the meso level, these expectations are translated through educational policy, resource allocation, school governance, accountability procedures, teacher education systems, and local support infrastructures. At the micro level, inclusive education is enacted through teaching practices, student and parent experiences, classroom interaction, peer relations, accommodations, bullying prevention, and learners' sense of participation and belonging. The empirical analysis is located at the macro level and uses public normative inclusiveness as a legitimating background and as a source of hypotheses about meso- and micro-level mechanisms.

To make the level structure explicit, Table 1 summarizes the macro-meso-micro model that guides the interpretation of the empirical evidence.

2.2. Study Rationale, Aim, and Research Questions

The preceding literature justifies a macro-level empirical diagnosis of the public normative climate surrounding educational equity and inclusive education in Kazakhstan. International research shows that inclusive education requires transformation of cultures, policies, and practices; equity research links inclusion to the distribution of life chances; sociology of education clarifies the dual

Table 1

Macro-Meso-Micro Conceptual Model of Educational Equity and Inclusive Education

<i>Level</i>	<i>Focus</i>	<i>Examples</i>
Macro	Public normative climate and legitimacy conditions	Support for equal starting opportunities, civic interethnic belonging, legal universalism, and social guarantees; perceptions of social cleavages
Meso	Institutional and policy translation of public expectations	Educational policy, resource allocation, school governance, accountability, teacher education systems, support services, accessibility standards, and local educational infrastructures
Micro	Enactment of inclusion in everyday educational practice	Teaching practices, peer relations, family-school communication, accommodations, bullying prevention, learner participation, recognition, and belonging

Note. The empirical analysis is located at the macro level. Meso- and micro-level mechanisms are not directly measured and are treated as theoretically grounded pathways for future research.

role of schools in reproducing and mitigating inequality; and social inclusion theory situates educational participation within broader questions of recognition, access, legitimacy, and protection from exclusion (Ainscow, 2020; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Levitas et al., 2007; OECD, 2023; Parsons, 1959; UNESCO, 2020). Kazakhstan-specific literature and policy materials add disability support, language diversity, civil-society participation, regional inequality, civic identity, and modernization of educational infrastructures as central contextual conditions (Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2024; Kambatyrova, 2024; Makoelle, 2020; Mamerkhanova et al., 2025; Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2025; Nurbayev, 2021; Prime Minister of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2026; Rollan & Somerton, 2021; UNESCO, 2021; UNICEF Kazakhstan, 2025).

The unresolved empirical issue concerns the broader public value order that gives inclusive and equity-oriented education its social legitimacy. Existing research often focuses on schools, teachers, students with disabilities, special educational needs, and support services. The present study complements that literature by reconstructing the macro-level normative climate within which these institutional mechanisms are interpreted and evaluated. The empirical basis is an original adult CAPI survey that captures population-level value orientations and perceived social cleavages in Kazakhstan.

The study aims to conceptualize, measure, and analytically differentiate normative inclusiveness as a macro-level public normative climate relevant to educational equity and inclusive education in Kazakhstan. Normative inclusiveness is operationalized through support for four interrelated principles: equal starting opportunities, civic interethnic belonging, legal universalism, and social guarantees. These principles function as general normative orientations that may legitimate inclusive and equity-oriented educational policies.

The article develops this aim by defining normative inclusiveness as a macro-level construct, operationalizing it through SII_narrow, SII_wide, and SII2_strong, and examining the intensity and cross-domain consistency of support for equal opportunities and civic interethnic inclusion. The analysis then estimates descriptive, inferential, and adjusted associations across sociodemographic groups and perceived social cleavages and relates the findings to further

research on educational equity, teacher education, inclusive school climate, disability inclusion, value socialization, and support for diverse learners.

Accordingly, the empirical sequence follows the theoretical sequence. RQ1 measures the breadth of endorsement of the four principles that define the macro-level normative climate. RQ2 tests whether apparent consensus remains stable when endorsement is evaluated at the strongest available threshold. RQ3 examines whether this normative climate is socially patterned and whether perceived social cleavages identify contexts in which universalist support becomes a demand for institutional fairness. The results section follows this order by first describing levels of endorsement, then separating soft and strong support, then modeling adjusted social patterning and relating the indices to perceived cleavages and socialization priorities.

The analysis is guided by three research questions:

RQ 1) How strongly do surveyed adults endorse the macro-level normative principles of equal starting opportunities, civic interethnic inclusion, legal universalism, and social guarantees?

RQ 2) What diagnostic gain is obtained by distinguishing soft support from strong support at the mandatory threshold?

RQ 3) How are these macro-level orientations associated with sociodemographic characteristics and perceived social cleavages, and which selected associations remain visible after adjustment for basic sociodemographic composition?

The design produces two contributions. Substantively, the study situates educational equity and inclusive education within a broader public normative climate and preserves the distinction between macro-level legitimacy and school-level implementation. Methodologically, it shows how socially approved survey items can be analyzed under conditions of ceiling effects by combining item-level analysis, formative indices, and a strong-support indicator of cross-domain endorsement. The approach separates soft endorsement from a stronger normative imperative and identifies heterogeneity concealed by marginal agreement.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study uses a cross-sectional quantitative survey design. The individual adult respondent serves as the unit of analysis. The empirical basis consists of an original adult CAPI survey dataset collected through a standardized interviewer-administered questionnaire.

The design is descriptive, diagnostic, and association-analytic. It examines the distribution, profile structure, intensity, cross-domain consistency, and adjusted sociodemographic patterning of public normative orientations relevant to educational equity and inclusive education.

The analysis reports distributions, response profiles, effect sizes, paired-item diagnostics, and adjusted associations.

3.2. Participants and Sampling

The analytical sample consists of 3,123 valid adult CAPI questionnaire administrations (see Table 2). Participants were adult residents of Kazakhstan aged 18 years and older who had lived in the locality for at least six months. They were surveyed as members of the general adult population. The empirical claims concern public normative expectations among surveyed adults.

The survey was organized as a nationally covered stratified and quota-controlled adult survey. Here, "nationally covered" refers to territorial coverage across all 17 regions of Kazakhstan and the three cities of republican significance: Astana, Almaty, and Shymkent. The technical documentation characterizes the sample as a stratified random probability sample with quota controls. Quota parameters included region, gender, age, ethnicity, and type of settlement. These controls were based on official population benchmarks from the Bureau of National Statistics of the Republic of Kazakhstan at the beginning of 2025. Settlement categories in the analytical dataset were megacity, oblast center, city, and small town/rural settlement. The final category denotes smaller localities, including rural settlements, in the source settlement-type variable; it is therefore reported as small town/rural settlement throughout.

Table 2
Sample characteristics of surveyed adults

<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
Gender	Male	1,442	46.2
	Female	1,681	53.8
Age group	18–24	637	20.4
	25–34	660	21.1
	35–44	663	21.2
	45–54	612	19.6
	55 and older	551	17.6
Settlement type	Megacity	747	23.9
	Oblast center	1,302	41.7
	City	95	3.0
	Small town/rural settlement	979	31.3
Ethnicity	Kazakh	2,202	70.5
	Russian	463	14.8
	Other nationality	434	13.9
	Mixed-origin / undefined nationality	24	0.8
Linguistic self-identification	Turkic-language	567	18.2
	Russian-speaking	672	21.5
	Bilingual	1,429	45.8
	Trilingual	395	12.6
	Difficult to answer	60	1.9
Education	Higher or incomplete higher	1,587	50.8
	Secondary / secondary specialized	1,438	46.0
	Below secondary or no completed education	98	3.1
Social category	Employee	1,639	52.5
	Entrepreneur / business owner / individual entrepreneur	288	9.2
	Peasant farm owner	44	1.4
	Self-employed / occasional work / household plot work	285	9.1
	Pupil/student	378	12.1
	Working pensioner	58	1.9
	Non-working pensioner	133	4.3
	Unemployed, looking for work	100	3.2
	Unemployed, not looking for work	27	0.9
	Homemaker	171	5.5
Main employment sector	Public service / state administration	249	8.0
	Internal affairs / security / armed forces	22	0.7
	Industrial production	174	5.6
	Medicine, education, science, culture	492	15.7
	Trade	487	15.6
	Transport, communications	212	6.8
	Services	419	13.4
	Construction	202	6.5
	Extractive industry	28	0.9
	Energy industry	31	1.0
	Finance / banking / insurance	67	2.1
	Agriculture	118	3.8
	Other	622	19.9
Subjective financial status	High	910	29.1
	Middle	1,626	52.1
	Low	333	10.7
	Refusal	254	8.1

Note. Percentages are calculated from the full analytical sample, N = 3,123. Social category and main employment sector are reported as separate questionnaire variables. Subjective financial status is grouped for analytic consistency: high = the first two financial-status categories; middle = the next two categories; low = the two most materially constrained categories; refusal is retained separately. Settlement type follows the source settlement variable; the small town/rural settlement category denotes the smaller-locality category, including rural settlements.

Data were obtained directly from eligible adult respondents through standardized interviewer-administered CAPI questionnaire administrations. Interviewers screened respondents for age and residence eligibility, administered the questionnaire in Russian or Kazakh according to the respondent's preference, and recorded answers on tablet devices through the Simple Forms digital platform. All analyses are based on the realized unweighted respondent dataset; inferential quantities are reported as model-based association diagnostics.

The realized sample contains variation across the principal sociodemographic dimensions used in the subsequent descriptive comparisons. Small categories are flagged in the analysis, and subgroup interpretation relies on descriptive patterns and effect sizes.

3.3. Data Collection Procedure

The preparation stage was completed before 10 May 2025 and included finalization of the research program, approval and translation of the questionnaire into Kazakh, interviewer recruitment and training, tablet and software preparation for CAPI administration, and construction of the quota-controlled sample. Fieldwork was conducted from 10 May to 5 June 2025 by LLP Center Open Space.

Face-to-face administration consisted of a standardized quantitative CAPI procedure. Respondents selected answers from predefined response categories, and interviewers entered the answers into tablet devices. The average duration of questionnaire administration was approximately 15 to 20 minutes.

Quality control was implemented through the Simple Forms digital platform, daily field monitoring, automatic audio and GPS records, review of administration quality, callback verification for up to 10% of respondents, logical checks, duplicate control, and correction of technical errors.

The validity and reliability of the data-collection procedure were supported procedurally rather than by treating the whole questionnaire as a single psychometric instrument. Content validity was supported by alignment between the research program, the theoretical construct, and selected questionnaire items. Linguistic validity was addressed through preparation of Russian and Kazakh versions, translation, harmonization, and respondent-language choice. Administration reliability was strengthened by a standardized interviewer-administered CAPI protocol, closed response categories, interviewer training, tablet-based data entry, automatic logical checks, GPS and audio quality-control records, daily field monitoring, duplicate control, and callback verification of up to 10% of respondents. For the formative indices, reliability is not interpreted as internal homogeneity of interchangeable items; instead, transparency of coding, low item-level DK shares, sensitivity specifications, and auxiliary item-association diagnostics support consistent use as descriptive macro-level composites.

3.4. Questionnaire and Measures

The instrument was a standardized questionnaire on cultural environment, perceived value unity, value orientations, perceived social cleavages, barriers to common values, life priorities, national-cultural orientations, youth socialization guidelines, information sources, normative slogans for "New Kazakhstan", and sociodemographic characteristics. It was prepared in Russian, translated into Kazakh, harmonized before fieldwork, and administered with closed response categories in the respondent's preferred language.

The analysis uses selected questionnaire items that correspond to the theoretical construct of normative inclusiveness and to its contextual interpretation for educational equity and inclusive education. The four focal normative items were administered in the block on slogans and orientations relevant to the construction of "New Kazakhstan." They used the same response format: "mandatory," "possible," "not appropriate," and "difficult to answer." The analysis codes "mandatory" as the strongest available expression of a normative imperative and "possible" as softer endorsement.

Full source-language wording, response formats, and variable-code mappings are reported in

Appendix A3. To avoid duplication, the main text retains only the conceptual and analytical operationalization necessary for interpreting normative inclusiveness.

The study centers on normative inclusiveness. The theoretical framework operationalizes the construct through support for four interrelated domains: equal starting opportunities and procedural justice, civic interethnic inclusion and the symbolic "we," universalism in the application of law, and social guarantees as a basis for nondiscriminatory access to life chances.

SII_narrow and SII_wide measure the public normative climate in which educational equity and inclusive practices may be legitimated, accepted, contested, and further studied.

Table 3 presents the compact operationalization used in the main text. Full Russian wording, response formats, and Excel variable-code mapping are retained in Appendix A3.

Table 3

Operationalization of normative inclusiveness indicators

<i>Component</i>	<i>Theoretical necessity and coding</i>	<i>Index use and educational relevance</i>
Equal starting opportunities	Captures equality of opportunity and procedural justice. Coding: mandatory = 2; possible = 1; not appropriate = 0; DK = missing in ordinal indices.	SII_narrow, SII_wide, and SII2_strong; legitimates fair access, participation, and educational trajectories.
Civic interethnic belonging	Captures symbolic inclusion within a shared civic "we"; same coding rule.	SII_narrow, SII_wide, and SII2_strong; relevant to recognition, school climate, linguistic and ethnic plurality, and civic belonging.
Legal universalism	Captures the expectation of universal, predictable, and nondiscriminatory institutional rules; same coding rule.	SII_wide; relevant to transparent access, fair procedures, and equal institutional treatment.
Social guarantees	Captures socioeconomic security as a condition of equal life chances; same coding rule.	SII_wide; relevant to material conditions shaping access, transitions, and educational opportunity.

Note. The table reports the compact operationalization used in the main text. The complete source-language item wording and variable-code mapping are reported in Appendix A3. The indices are interpreted as descriptive formative composites rather than reflective psychometric scales.

Construct validity is established through theoretical content, level-of-analysis specification, and transparent coding rather than through the assumption of a reflective latent scale. Each item is theoretically necessary because it represents a distinct condition of inclusive educational legitimacy. Equal starting opportunities capture the egalitarian premise of fair access and educational mobility. Civic interethnic belonging captures symbolic inclusion of ethnic groups within a shared civic "we," relevant to recognition, school climate, and language diversity. Legal universalism captures the expectation that institutional rules apply predictably and without discrimination, which is a prerequisite for fair educational procedures. Social guarantees capture the socioeconomic-security dimension of equal life chances, including material conditions that shape access to educational opportunities. The item containing "New Kazakhstan" is retained because it combines civic-inclusive endorsement with agreement with an official political-symbolic formula, making it relevant for legitimacy analysis.

The construct is formative rather than reflective. The four indicators are not interchangeable manifestations of a single latent psychological disposition; they jointly constitute different dimensions of a public value order relevant to educational equity. A respondent may endorse equal opportunity without strongly endorsing civic inclusion, or may support social guarantees without equally strong legal-universalist expectations. For this reason, internal-consistency coefficients are treated only as secondary diagnostics of empirical association among components, not as the primary basis of validity.

Normative inclusiveness can measure the general public normative climate in which inclusive

and equity-oriented educational policies may acquire legitimacy. It cannot measure inclusive classroom practice, teacher competence, disability-specific accommodations, learner belonging, or school-level outcomes. Its relevance to educational equity lies in the fact that educational reforms require social legitimacy, institutional trust, public acceptance of universal rules, and support for equal life chances before they can be translated into meso-level policy and micro-level practice.

3.5. Data Analysis

The analysis combines descriptive, profile-analytic, model-based inferential, and adjusted association diagnostics. It examines item distributions, formative composite indices, strong-support profiles, effect sizes, paired-item asymmetry, associations with perceived social cleavages, and adjusted sociodemographic associations. All inferential quantities are estimated on the unweighted analytical dataset and reported as model-based diagnostics of association.

Coding was uniform across the four focal normative items. "Mandatory" was coded as 2, "possible" as 1, and "not appropriate" as 0. "Difficult to answer" was treated as missing in the main index calculation because it has no unambiguous ordinal position between "possible" and "not appropriate." It may indicate uncertainty, avoidance, low salience, or reluctance to express disagreement.

SII_narrow was constructed as the mean of the two core components: equal starting opportunities and civic interethnic inclusion. SII_wide was constructed as the mean of the SII_narrow components plus legal universalism and social guarantees. Both indices were normalized to a 0–100 range using the formula $\text{Index} = (\text{mean} / 2) \times 100$.

The indices are interpreted as formative descriptive composites, consistent with the logic of index construction with formative indicators (Diamantopoulos & Winklhofer, 2001). The components represent substantively distinct elements of a public normative order. Internal consistency coefficients are reported as auxiliary diagnostics of empirical association among items.

To distinguish soft endorsement from strong normative support, the analysis also uses SII2_strong. This indicator dichotomizes the two SII_narrow components at the "mandatory" threshold and sums them into a 0–2 indicator. In the study, "strong support" refers to selecting "mandatory," and "soft support" refers to selecting either "mandatory" or "possible." Sensitivity specifications for alternative coding decisions are reported in Appendix B.

The analysis also includes model-based inferential and adjusted association diagnostics. McNemar's test is used to assess paired asymmetry between the two core mandatory-threshold items. Cramér's V is used for categorical associations, and Spearman's rho is used for ordinal associations between the normative inclusiveness indices and perceived social cleavages. These statistics are interpreted as effect-size and association diagnostics.

Adjusted models include ordered logistic regression for the three-category SII2_strong outcome, binary logistic regression for joint strong support, separate binary logistic regressions for the two core mandatory-threshold items, and multinomial logistic regression for the four strong-support profiles. All regression models are unweighted and include gender, age group, education, settlement type, ethnicity, linguistic self-identification, and subjective financial status. Odds ratios, model-based 95% confidence intervals, McFadden R², and AIC are reported. These models assess whether descriptive associations remain visible after adjustment for basic sociodemographic composition.

Appendix A3 reports the original variable codes used in the individual-level dataset. For the four focal normative items, the Excel coding is 1 = "mandatory," 2 = "possible," 3 = "not appropriate," and 4 = "difficult to answer." Checklist-format variables were treated as multiple-response fields. When aggregate source materials presented a single recorded response field, the individual-level dataset was used to calculate both first-recorded-selection and any-occurrence indicators across the allowed response fields; the results are reported in Appendix F.

3.5.1. Model diagnostics, assumptions, and missing data

Model diagnostics were conducted before substantive interpretation. The proportional-odds

assumption for the ordered logistic regression was checked by comparing the ordered-logit pattern with binary mandatory-threshold models and the multinomial profile specification, which do not impose a common cumulative-logit effect. The direction and substantive interpretation of the key adjusted associations were not treated as valid unless they were stable across these diagnostic specifications. The ordered model is therefore interpreted as a compact adjusted association diagnostic rather than as the sole inferential basis of the study.

Multicollinearity diagnostics were conducted for the covariate set and are reported in the main text and Appendix E. Variance inflation factors ranged from 1.07 to 2.32, below conventional thresholds and indicating stable estimation. The largest VIF values were for oblast-center residence, Russian-language identity, small town/rural settlement, secondary/specialized education, and gender.

Model-based Wald standard errors are reported. Heteroskedasticity-robust or cluster-robust standard errors were not used because the models are unweighted descriptive association diagnostics and the analytical file did not include design-cluster variables suitable for cluster-robust estimation. This limitation is reflected in the cautious interpretation of the models.

Multiple testing was considered at the interpretation stage. Because the analysis is exploratory and diagnostic rather than confirmatory, no formal family-wise adjustment was applied. Substantive claims are based on effect sizes, confidence intervals, theoretical coherence, and consistency across model specifications rather than on isolated p values.

The multinomial model is retained as a compact profile diagnostic. Confidence intervals are not reported for the multinomial table because reporting three non-reference outcome equations with all covariates and intervals would make the appendix table disproportionately dense, and no substantive inference in the manuscript depends on individual multinomial coefficients. The ordered and binary models provide the main adjusted evidence with 95% confidence intervals; the multinomial model is used only to check profile directionality.

Missing data were handled consistently across models. "Difficult to answer" responses were treated as missing in the ordinal SII_narrow and SII_wide index calculations because they have no unambiguous ordinal position. In binary mandatory-threshold specifications, "difficult to answer" was coded as absence of strong support because the contrast was between the strongest available endorsement and all other responses. Refusal and "difficult to answer" categories in covariates were retained as explicit categories where analytically meaningful. No imputation was used because item-level DK shares were low and the models were intended as descriptive association diagnostics.

3.6. Ethical Considerations

The survey involved voluntary participation of adult respondents. Before questionnaire administration, each potential respondent received oral information about the purpose of the study, the content and approximate duration of the questionnaire, the nature of the questions, and the right to refuse participation without negative consequences.

Interviewers explained that responses would be used in aggregated form for scientific analysis. Confidentiality and non-identifiability were emphasized. Oral informed consent was confirmed by the respondent and recorded in the CAPI program.

The analytical dataset contained de-identified individual-level records. Each respondent was assigned a unique identification code. Audio recordings generated by Simple Forms were used for quality control, stored in encrypted form, and restricted to the project team. Digital datasets were stored on protected servers accessible to instructed members of the research team.

4. Results

The Results section proceeds from overall normative support to internal differentiation, adjusted social patterning, cleavage sensitivity, and educational interpretation. The sequence demonstrates how apparent consensus changes when soft endorsement is distinguished from strong cross-domain support and connects the descriptive results with the study's claim about macro-level

legitimacy for educational equity and inclusive education.

4.1. From Soft Consensus to Strong Normative Endorsement

The descriptive baseline establishes the level of normative support. Because the focal items use socially approved normative formulations, the central issue concerns the difference between soft endorsement and the mandatory threshold.

Table 4

Marginal, joint, and index indicators of normative inclusiveness

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Share/value</i>
"Freedom, justice, and equal starting opportunities for everyone" (share selecting "mandatory")	75.6%
"New Kazakhstan is a homeland for all ethnic groups" (share selecting "mandatory")	73.0%
"Government is for the people, and the laws are for everyone" (share selecting "mandatory")	75.9%
"Decent pay and social protection mean a decent quality of life" (share selecting "mandatory")	84.2%
SII_narrow mean, 0–100 scale	85.9 (SD = 21.9; N = 3,099)
SII_wide mean, 0–100 scale	87.0 (SD = 20.3; N = 3,105)
SII_narrow and SII_wide median	100
SII_narrow core: joint soft support for the two items ("mandatory" or "possible")	91.5%
SII2_strong = 2: joint strong support for the core ("mandatory" on both items)	62.7%
SII2_strong = 1: strong support for one core dimension	23.2%
SII2_strong = 0: absence of strong support for both core dimensions	14.1%

Note. Soft support refers to "mandatory" or "possible"; strong support refers to "mandatory." Estimates are descriptive for the surveyed sample.

The main descriptive result is a 28.8 percentage-point decline from joint soft support for the two-component core to joint strong support. The survey shows that near-universal agreement becomes substantially less uniform when endorsement takes the form of a mandatory normative imperative. This difference constitutes the main diagnostic gain of applying the strong-support criterion under conditions of upper-end clustering.

4.2. Internal Differentiation of the Inclusiveness Core

The value core of normative inclusiveness consists of the linkage between equal starting opportunities and civic interethnic inclusion. Four response profiles are constructed by crossing the two mandatory-threshold indicators. SII_wide serves as a descriptive consistency check because it includes the same two core items used to construct the profiles.

Table 5

Heuristic typology of profiles of strong normative support for the core

<i>Profile</i>	<i>Criterion</i>	<i>Share (n)</i>	<i>Mean SII_wide</i>
Strong support on both core items	"Mandatory" on both items	62.7% (n = 1,958)	98.6
Strong support for equal opportunities alone	"Mandatory" on equal opportunities alone	12.9% (n = 403)	79.1
Strong support for civic interethnic inclusion alone	"Mandatory" on civic interethnic inclusion alone	10.3% (n = 322)	75.3
No strong support on either core item	No "mandatory" response on either item	14.1% (n = 440)	49.7

Note. The labels describe response combinations at the "mandatory" threshold. Respondents selecting "possible" are classified below the strongest available level of normative support.

The typology demonstrates the dominance of joint strong support. The partial profiles account

for 23.2% of respondents and show that equal opportunity and civic inclusion are related, analytically distinct normative commitments.

A McNemar test was used to assess paired endorsement of the two core components at the mandatory threshold. Among respondents with discordant strong-support responses, 403 endorsed equal starting opportunities without endorsing civic interethnic inclusion at the mandatory threshold, and 322 endorsed civic interethnic inclusion without endorsing equal starting opportunities. The discordant odds ratio was 1.25, 95% CI [1.08, 1.45], McNemar $\chi^2(1) = 8.83$, $p = .003$. The result records a small statistically detectable asymmetry in the core of normative inclusiveness: strong egalitarian endorsement is somewhat more prevalent than strong civic-interethnic endorsement.

4.3. Adjusted Associations with Strong Normative Support

Descriptive group comparisons indicate weak differentiation by settlement type, ethnicity, linguistic self-identification, age, education, and subjective financial status. To assess whether selected patterns remain visible after adjustment for basic sociodemographic composition, the key adjusted model results are summarized in the main Results section. Full model details are reported in Appendix E. Model diagnostics reported in Section 3.5.1 indicate low multicollinearity and support cautious triangulation of ordered, binary, and multinomial specifications.

Table 6

Adjusted predictors of strong normative support in the main models

Predictor or diagnostic	Ordered logit for SII2_strong	Binary logit for joint strong support	Substantive interpretation
Below secondary/no completed education; reference: higher/incomplete higher	0.57 [0.38, 0.86]	0.68 [0.45, 1.05]	Lower adjusted odds of stronger core endorsement; small subgroup
City; reference: megacity	0.62 [0.41, 0.94]	0.66 [0.43, 1.02]	Lower adjusted odds; city subgroup is small
Small town/rural settlement; reference: megacity	1.32 [1.08, 1.61]	1.28 [1.04, 1.57]	Higher adjusted odds, especially for joint strong support
Other/mixed ethnicity; reference: Kazakh	0.78 [0.63, 0.96]	0.83 [0.67, 1.04]	Lower ordered odds; modest association
High financial status; reference: middle	0.83 [0.70, 0.98]	0.83 [0.70, 0.99]	Slightly lower adjusted odds; nonlinear socioeconomic pattern
Model diagnostics	N = 3,123; McFadden R^2 = 0.012; AIC = 5,642.2	N = 3,123; McFadden R^2 = 0.013; AIC = 4,110.7	Very small explanatory strength; differences remain modest

Note. Entries are odds ratios with model-based Wald 95% confidence intervals unless otherwise indicated. In the ordered model, OR > 1 indicates higher odds of being in a higher SII2_strong category. In the binary model, OR > 1 indicates higher odds of joint strong support. Models are unweighted and adjusted for gender, age group, education, settlement type, ethnicity, linguistic self-identification, and subjective financial status.

The adjusted models clarify the social patterning of descriptive differences. Below secondary or no completed education is associated with lower odds of being in a higher SII2_strong category. Settlement context remains visible: residence in the small town/rural settlement category is associated with higher odds, and the small city category is associated with lower odds. Subjective financial status shows a nonlinear pattern: the high-status group has slightly lower odds in the adjusted model. Pseudo- R^2 values remain small, indicating modest adjusted differentiations.

4.4. Cleavage Sensitivity and Institutional Justice

Perceptions of social cleavages locate normative inclusiveness within a broader context of institutional justice, socioeconomic distance, and social cohesion. Table 7 reports the share of

respondents who classified each cleavage line as involving large differences.

Table 7

Perceptions of social cleavages

<i>Potential cleavage line</i>	<i>"Differences are large," %</i>
Officials-people	79.4
Rich-poor strata	75.1
Generations	62.1
Urban and rural youth	56.1
Believers and nonbelievers	61.7
Traditional and nontraditional religions	62.6
Kazakh-speaking and Russian-speaking Kazakhstanis	45.8

Note. Percentages indicate the share of respondents selecting "differences are large" for the corresponding cleavage line.

The cleavage findings show that the normative climate combines moral-value endorsement with a demand for institutional fairness. Perceived social distance is organized mainly around institutional authority and socioeconomic status: 79.4% identify large differences between officials and the people, and 75.1% identify large differences between the rich and the poor. The language cleavage has a lower share than the institutional and class/status cleavages.

In the surveyed sample, perceptions of the officials-people and rich-poor cleavages are weakly and consistently positively associated with SII_narrow and SII_wide, with Spearman's rho ranging from 0.12 to 0.13. The pattern is theoretically coherent: inclusive norms appear as moral preferences and as expectations addressed to institutions under perceived conditions of social distance.

4.5. Tolerance as Value and Socialization Priority

The analysis also shows a divergence between declared tolerance as a general value and tolerance as a prioritized youth-socialization guideline. This divergence matters for educational research because inclusive education requires the conversion of general value approval into pedagogical socialization, school climate, and everyday interaction.

Table 8

Tolerance as declared value and youth socialization priority

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>
Tolerance rated "very important"	78.0%
Tolerance rated "partly important"	18.1%
Tolerance selected among top-five youth socialization priorities	28.0%
Tolerance selected as first priority	4.6%
Among those rating tolerance "very important," share selecting tolerance among top five	29.6%
Association between four-level tolerance rating and selecting tolerance among top five	Cramér's V = 0.077

Note. The indicator set records a hierarchy of normative priorities. Complete first-priority and top-five youth-socialization option counts are reported in Appendix F.

The results reveal a priority difference: tolerance is widely endorsed as a general value and receives lower priority as a youth-socialization guideline. The association between the four-level tolerance rating and top-five selection of tolerance is statistically detectable and substantively weak. Broad declarative tolerance requires pedagogical specification before it becomes a practical socialization priority.

4.6. Unity, Referent Communities, and Cultural Openness

The dataset also clarifies the social boundaries within which inclusive principles are interpreted. A majority of respondents report that contemporary Kazakhstani society exhibits a unity of values shared by all citizens regardless of ethnic, age, educational, professional, social-status, religious, or

settlement affiliation. The distribution is 81.5% "yes," 12.8% "no," and 5.7% "difficult to answer." These figures indicate a high level of declared symbolic consensus among surveyed adults.

First recorded selections in the multi-response block on value proximity show a hierarchy of primary referents: people of one's own nationality account for 36.3% of first recorded selections, one's family for 26.0%, and citizens of Kazakhstan for 7.4%. Individual-level counts across all ten response fields show wider civic visibility: one's family is mentioned by 64.1%, people of one's own nationality by 42.1%, colleagues at work or study by 37.3%, and citizens of Kazakhstan by 34.7%. Civic belonging is present across the response fields and appears less often as the primary recorded referent than family or ethnicity.

The block on national-cultural qualities associated with modernization shows a comparable distribution. Using any occurrence across the three permitted response fields, the most frequently selected qualities are mutual aid and mutual support (62.2%), the ability to accept other cultures (34.9%), acceptance of the authority of elders (34.5%), the ability to perceive new things quickly (25.8%), and clan solidarity (25.6%). Cultural openness is embedded in a broader traditional, solidaristic, and intergenerational value structure.

4.7. Substantive Contribution of the Empirical Findings

The findings identify heterogeneity within an apparently consensual normative climate. Table 9 summarizes the diagnostic contribution of the main empirical results for educational equity and inclusive education.

Table 9

Substantive contribution of the empirical findings

<i>Empirical finding</i>	<i>Diagnostic contribution</i>	<i>Relevance for educational equity and inclusive education</i>
91.5% soft support falls to 62.7% joint strong support	Reveals conditionality behind apparent consensus	Future communication research should examine whether inclusive reforms gain stronger legitimacy when framed through fairness and public accountability
23.2% support one core component strongly	Shows that equal opportunity and civic inclusion are related and distinct	Equity and civic belonging may require separate policy communication, implementation planning, and empirical verification
Adjusted settlement, education, ethnicity, and financial-status associations remain modest and visible	Identifies where normative support is socially differentiated	Future studies should examine local educational infrastructures and access to support services
Strong cleavage perceptions coexist with universalist norms	Locates inclusiveness within a demand for institutional fairness	Policy hypothesis: inclusive policy may gain legitimacy when tied to transparent access and fair resource allocation
Tolerance is highly valued and weakly prioritized in youth socialization	Identifies a difference between declarative value and pedagogical priority	Future teacher-education and school-climate research should examine how general values are specified in practice

Table 9 condenses the analytical contribution: it identifies intensity, internal differentiation, adjusted social patterning, and institutional implications behind support for socially approved principles.

4.8. Item-Level and Cross-Language Measurement Diagnostics

Measurement diagnostics are reported after the substantive findings to keep the empirical argument centered on analytical contribution. The diagnostics document missingness, dispersion, and auxiliary item-association information. Table 10 supports the use of the components as a formative descriptive composite and preserves their theoretical distinctiveness. The substantive justification of SII_narrow and SII_wide rests on content validity, construct mapping, and stability under alternative coding decisions.

Table 10

Item-level descriptive diagnostics for the normative inclusiveness composites

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>DK %</i>	<i>Mean (0–2)</i>	<i>SD (0–2)</i>	<i>Analytical interpretation</i>
Equal starting opportunities	1.7	1.740	0.502	General value orientation linked to educational access and mobility
Civic interethnic belonging	1.9	1.704	0.538	Civic-inclusive item with official political-symbolic connotation
Legal universalism	2.1	1.717	0.565	Legal universalism relevant to institutional fairness
Social guarantees	1.5	1.821	0.463	Socioeconomic-security item relevant to educational opportunity

Note. "Difficult to answer" was coded as missing in the main index calculation. For SII_wide, Cronbach's alpha = 0.759 (N = 2,994), mean inter-item correlation = 0.446. For SII_narrow, the inter-item correlation is $r = 0.378$, Spearman's rho = 0.382, and Cronbach's alpha = 0.547 (N = 3,034). These coefficients are reported as secondary diagnostics of empirical association among components.

Table 11 shows that the descriptive alpha coefficients for SII_wide range from 0.619 to 0.839 across linguistic self-identification groups, indicating variation in item association across groups while supporting the composite's descriptive usability in each reported language-identity context.

Table 11

Descriptive item-association diagnostics for SII_wide across linguistic self-identification groups

<i>Group</i>	<i>N (complete cases)</i>	<i>Descriptive alpha coefficient for SII_wide</i>
Turkic-language speakers	549	0.787
Russian-language speakers	635	0.619
Bilingual respondents	1,376	0.750
Trilingual respondents	381	0.839

Note. Linguistic self-identification serves as a proxy for language context. The coefficients are reported as descriptive diagnostics of item association within groups. SII_wide remains descriptively usable across the reported language-identity groups.

5. Discussion

The results identify a macro-level public normative climate relevant to educational equity and inclusive education in Kazakhstan. Their primary contribution is analytical: a broad declarative consensus around equality, civic belonging, legal universalism, and social guarantees becomes conditional when strong cross-domain endorsement is required. These findings identify the legitimacy conditions under which educational equity and inclusive education policies may be socially interpreted, accepted, or contested.

The implications discussed below should be read as policy hypotheses and directions for future research rather than as direct empirical conclusions about school practice. The survey did not directly measure teacher education, classroom interaction, disability-specific support, anti-bullying practice, culturally responsive communication, or learner belonging. These domains are discussed as meso- and micro-level mechanisms that may translate macro-level public legitimacy into educational inclusion and therefore require direct empirical verification.

The discussion proceeds from a level-of-analysis distinction. Population-level normative support legitimates inclusive education and complements empirical evidence about schools. This interpretation is consistent with inclusive education research, which treats inclusion as a system-wide transformation of cultures, policies, and practices (Ainscow, 2020; Booth & Ainscow, 2011; Kefallinou et al., 2020; UNESCO, 2020).

The macro-to-micro relationship is treated as mediated across levels. Macro-level normative endorsement may legitimate meso-level decisions on financing, curriculum, teacher preparation, accessibility standards, monitoring, and local support infrastructures. These meso-level

arrangements influence micro-level educational realities when they become visible in classroom routines, teacher-student interaction, peer relations, family-school communication, reasonable accommodations, bullying prevention, and learners' sense of belonging. The empirical results address the macro-level component and generate questions about meso- and micro-level components.

5.1. Normative Climate for Educational Equity and Inclusive Access

The key result concerns a public normative background with high soft support and internal stratification. Equal starting opportunities, universal application of rules, and social guarantees form a value configuration in which inclusion is interpreted through institutional justice and cultural tolerance. For educational policy, equal access to quality education, support for learners with disabilities and special educational needs, and fair distribution of educational resources can be framed as extensions of principles strongly legitimated in public consciousness.

The interpretation corresponds to contemporary policy literature in which equity and inclusion are understood through governance, resourcing, capacity building, school-level interventions, monitoring, and formal access (OECD, 2023). It also aligns with the capability approach: educational equity becomes meaningful when formal rights are converted into real opportunities for participation, learning, recognition, and transition to adult life (Nussbaum, 2011; Sen, 1999).

The strong-support criterion shows that the apparent consensus has an internal structure. Soft support for the core is very high; joint strong support reaches 62.7%. For educational policy, inclusive reforms gain legitimacy when communicated through fairness, equal life chances, predictable rules, and social protection.

The most widely supported element of the expanded normative package is the proposition that decent pay and social protection provide a condition of quality of life. The result matters for educational equity because citizens connect educational access with broader socioeconomic security. Policies of inclusive education, vocational orientation, pre-vocational support, and transition-to-work assistance for students with disabilities are likely to be most convincing when presented as part of a wider institutional guarantee of life chances.

5.2. From Declarative Tolerance to Value Socialization

A central direction for further educational research concerns the divergence between high declared tolerance salience and lower priority in the youth-socialization guideline block. The highest tolerance category is selected by a large majority of respondents. Cultivating tolerance and forbearance is selected among the top five childrearing priorities by 28.0%, and gender equality by 8.0%. The association between the highest tolerance rating and inclusion among the top five socialization priorities is weak.

This divergence is pedagogically relevant as a hypothesis-generating result because inclusive education requires the conversion of general value approval into everyday pedagogical practice. Research on values education similarly indicates that values become educationally consequential when they are connected to real-life application, teacher modeling, active learning, and consistent curricular implementation (Relleve, 2023). In inclusive education, this translation requires concrete pedagogical practices, including the creation of safe and anti-bullying environments, culturally responsive classroom management, gender-responsive language and interaction, and appropriate instructional adaptations for learners with special educational needs (Alemayehu, 2020; Bilgiç & Tekin, 2023; Durasa et al., 2024; Guzelergene et al., 2025). The present findings therefore point to a gap between general value endorsement and the prioritization of tolerance in socialization rather than demonstrating a direct discrepancy between stated values and observed inclusive practice.

This difference is consistent with the inclusive-practice literature, which emphasizes that inclusion is enacted through everyday classroom routines, interactions, and instructional adaptations rather than through policy statements or general value commitments alone (Akyol, 2025; Bilgiç & Tekin, 2023). Florian and Black-Hawkins (2011) argue that inclusive pedagogy expands what is normally available to all learners, and Booth and Ainscow (2011) treat inclusive

cultures as inseparable from policies and practices. Social-emotional learning research also shows that interventions for students with special educational needs require structured pedagogical work (Hassani & Schwab, 2021).

For teacher-education research, this suggests a hypothesis-generating agenda centered on the conversion of general norms of equal dignity, nondiscrimination, and respect for diversity into grouping practices, feedback, assessment, communication with parents, peer interaction, prevention of stigma, and support for students whose educational trajectories are vulnerable.

5.3. Teacher Education, School Climate, and Implementation Capacity

The present findings should be interpreted alongside international studies showing that teacher attitudes, teacher self-efficacy, collective efficacy, and school climate mediate the relation between inclusive values and inclusive practices. Systematic reviews and meta-analytic work demonstrate that favorable teacher attitudes are associated with inclusive practice, and teacher self-efficacy is strongly connected with willingness to teach diverse learners in inclusive settings (Avramidis, 2021; Lindner et al., 2023; Wray et al., 2022; Yada et al., 2022).

Recent empirical work further indicates that inclusive intentions and inclusive competence are influenced by school climate, teachers' agency, collective efficacy, and transformational leadership (Gülsün et al., 2023; Hidayat & Patras, 2024; Wang et al., 2025; Xue et al., 2023). These studies define the institutional mediators through which normative support may become practice. A favorable public normative climate supports the legitimacy of inclusive reforms; implementation is carried by school-level and teacher-level mechanisms, including accessible curricula, differentiated instruction, reasonable accommodations, and inclusive peer relations.

For Kazakhstan, the findings generate hypotheses about teacher education, inclusive pedagogy, disability support, differentiated instruction, culturally responsive teaching, anti-bullying practice, and assessment equity as possible institutional mechanisms through which macro-level support for equality and civic inclusion may be implemented. These school-level and teacher-level mechanisms require direct empirical investigation.

5.4. Civic Interethnic Inclusion and Inclusive School Climate

The high level of support for the statement that New Kazakhstan is a homeland for all ethnic groups is relevant to discussions of inclusive school climate, especially in relation to civic belonging and recognition of ethnic and linguistic diversity. The item records general public endorsement of a civic-inclusive formula and carries the political-symbolic meaning noted above.

The finding corresponds to multicultural education research, which emphasizes shared civic standards and recognition of cultural diversity (Banks, 2016). It also relates to the social cohesion literature, where cohesion is understood through belonging, participation, legitimacy, and recognition (Chan et al., 2006; Schiefer & van der Noll, 2017). Future school-climate research and policy pilots should examine how civic unity can be integrated with pedagogical sensitivity to language, ethnicity, regional background, and family experience.

The data on referent communities add a precise qualification. At the level of the first recorded selection, perceived similarity of views and values is associated most often with people of one's own nationality and with family. Complete multiple-response counts show stronger civic visibility when all recorded mentions are counted: citizens of Kazakhstan are mentioned by 34.7% of respondents across the ten response fields. For schools, this distinction has curricular and organizational implications. Civic identification is present and less often functions as the primary referent than ethnic or familial proximity. A policy hypothesis for further examination is that inclusive curricula and school-climate initiatives may need to cultivate shared civic belonging across ethnic, linguistic, regional, and social boundaries and recognize the continuing strength of family and ethnocultural reference groups.

5.5. Social Cleavages and the Legitimacy of Educational Policy

Perceived social cleavages add a further level of interpretation. The sharpest distances are marked along the officials-people and rich-poor lines, and the indices of normative inclusiveness are

weakly and consistently positively associated with these perceptions. The configuration indicates that citizens endorse universalist principles and simultaneously perceive institutional and status asymmetries in the social order.

The interpretation is consistent with research on procedural justice and legitimacy. When citizens perceive institutional distance, support for universal rules can be read as a demand for credible institutions, fair procedures, and predictable enforcement (Levi & Stoker, 2000; Tyler, 1990). Applied to education, inclusive policy should be visible as a fair system of access, resources, support, accountability, and moral justification.

For educational equity, the configuration has practical significance. The findings suggest the hypothesis that inclusive education policy may gain legitimacy when declared principles are matched by equitable implementation, especially where access to quality schools, support services, digital resources, extracurricular opportunities, or transition-to-work pathways differs by region, income, settlement type, disability status, or institutional proximity (Pratiwi et al., 2025; Shepherd, 2026). The rich-poor cleavage highlights inequality in access to high-quality educational services, and the officials-people cleavage highlights transparency and accountability in the allocation of educational resources.

Adjusted models indicate that settlement and education patterns are relevant for contextual interpretation. Differences by type of locality and educational attainment remain modest in substantive magnitude and direct attention to local educational infrastructures, pathways to vocational and higher education, and the availability of support for learners with special educational needs.

5.6. Scope, Limitations, and Empirical Verification

The study specifies the macro-level normative layer of inclusive education and educational equity. Its evidentiary contribution is strongest as a population-level diagnosis of legitimacy conditions and as a framework for selecting subsequent meso- and micro-level indicators. SII_narrow and SII_wide can be used as contextual measures of the normative climate and as sources of hypotheses about the relationship between public values and educational inclusion.

This study has five limitations. First, the survey measures adult public normative orientations rather than the implementation of inclusive education in schools; therefore, the findings should not be interpreted as evidence about teachers' practices, learners' experiences, disability-specific accommodations, or school-level outcomes. Second, the analysis is cross-sectional and unweighted; the adjusted models are interpreted as association diagnostics rather than causal or population-estimating models. Third, the focal items use socially approved public formulas and may be affected by social desirability and upper-end response clustering, even though the strong-support specification reduces this problem analytically. Fourth, SII_narrow and SII_wide are formative composites rather than reflective latent scales; their validity rests primarily on construct mapping and theoretical content rather than internal consistency. Fifth, the item containing "New Kazakhstan" combines civic-interethnic inclusion with endorsement of an official political-symbolic formula. These limitations define the appropriate scope of inference and motivate subsequent teacher-, parent-, student-, and school-level research.

The next empirical step is to connect this macro-level evidence with direct data on programs, support mechanisms, school cultures, teacher practices, accommodations, organizational models, disability inclusion in classrooms, willingness to study with students with special educational needs, bullying, accessibility of educational services, and pre-vocational support. Teacher, parent, student, and administrator surveys; school case studies; disability- and diversity-related vignettes; panel designs; institutional data; and qualitative interviews would provide the necessary evidence on the institutional conversion of public legitimacy into access, participation, recognition, and belonging.

5.7. Scholarly Contribution for Sociology of Education and Pedagogical Sociology

The scholarly contribution of the study lies in the reconstruction of the internal structure of

endorsement. A measurable difference in intensity and cross-domain consistency is concealed behind soft consensus. Nearly two fifths of respondents lack simultaneous strong normative endorsement of both core dimensions. The analysis moves from the general statement that justice is widely supported to the more precise question of where, and among which groups, consensus becomes conditional.

For pedagogical sociology, the study offers a compact macro-level instrument for diagnosing the normative foundations of educational equity. The SII_narrow and SII_wide indices, treated as formative composites, can serve as baseline contextual variables for subsequent studies of inclusive school climate, teacher education, value socialization, disability inclusion, anti-bullying policy, and educational access. Further research should examine the institutional conversion of inclusive principles into educational systems.

6. Conclusion

The study conceptualized normative inclusiveness as a macro-level public normative climate relevant to educational equity and inclusive education in Kazakhstan. Applied to an original nationally covered adult CAPI survey, the index-based operationalization registers a high level of soft normative support for the principles of an inclusive social order and reveals heterogeneity in the intensity and cross-domain consistency of that support.

The central empirical conclusion concerns conditional consensus. Joint soft support for the two-component core reaches 91.5%; joint strong support reaches 62.7%. A further 23.2% of respondents strongly endorse one of the two core components, and 14.1% express no strong endorsement on either component. The paired-item McNemar test further shows a small statistically detectable asymmetry: strong endorsement of equal starting opportunities is somewhat more prevalent than strong endorsement of civic interethnic inclusion among discordant respondents.

Adjusted models provide an additional result. The social differentiation of strong support is modest and socially patterned. Below secondary or no completed education, settlement context, ethnicity, and subjective financial status retain selected associations with SII2_strong after adjustment for basic sociodemographic composition. Pseudo- R^2 values remain small. The appropriate interpretation is a climate with high soft support and conditional, socially patterned zones of weaker strong endorsement.

The findings suggest that discussions of educational equity and inclusive education in Kazakhstan take place against a public normative background marked by high soft support, especially when framed through equal life chances, universal rules, social protection, civic inclusion, procedural fairness, and transparent institutional access. Strong perceptions of the officials–people and rich–poor cleavages indicate that inclusive norms are partly articulated as expectations addressed to institutions. The priority difference between declared tolerance and youth-socialization priorities further indicates that broad value approval requires pedagogical and institutional specification.

At population level, the evidence specifies legitimacy conditions that can be tested in school, teacher, parent, and student datasets. Further research should link this macro-level normative climate with school-level, teacher-level, parent-level, and student-level evidence. Teacher and parent surveys, student experience measures, school case studies, disability- and diversity-related vignettes, institutional data on support access, and qualitative interviews can examine how public legitimacy is converted into educational access, participation, recognition, belonging, and successful learning trajectories.

AI usage statement: AI-assisted editorial support was used during revision for language refinement, structural consistency, APA-style checking, and preparation of response materials. The authors reviewed all changes and take full responsibility for the final manuscript, including the intellectual content, empirical analysis, interpretations, and conclusions.

Author contributions: Zulfiya Movkebayeva, Zhanna Khamzina, Aitolkyn Duzelbayeva, and Yermek Buribayev contributed to conceptualization, investigation, interpretation of results,

manuscript preparation, and critical revision of the article. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Consent to participate: Written informed consent was not required from participants in accordance with national legislation and institutional requirements. The survey target population comprised adults aged 18 years and older; therefore, legal guardian or next-of-kin consent was not applicable. Participation was voluntary. Informed consent was recorded at the beginning of the interview.

Data availability: The data are available from the corresponding author, Zhanna Khamzina, upon reasonable request, subject to institutional, ethical, and confidentiality restrictions.

Declaration of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Ethics statement: Ethical approval was not required for this study involving human participants in accordance with local legislation and institutional requirements. Accordingly, no ethics approval number, approval date, or ethics committee name applies. Participants were informed about the objectives of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, confidentiality, and their right to refuse.

Funding: The research was funded by the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant No. BR24993150 “Organisation of psychological and pedagogical support for pre-vocational training of students with disabilities”; Grant No. BR24993269 “Evolution and Transformation of Value Orientations in Kazakhstani Society During the Independence Period”).

References

- Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6(1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587>
- Ajani, O. A. (2024). Exploring digital transformation and future trends in higher education development across African nations. *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology*, 6(3), 34–48. <https://doi.org/10.33902/jpsp.202427374>
- Akyol, T. (2025). The effect of participatory pedagogy and children’s participation training on early childhood teachers’ views on children’s participation. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 9(4), 102–118. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202533781>
- Alemayehu, B. A. (2020). Gender inclusive training challenges in higher education institutions in Ethiopia: Implications for reforming training for gender equality. *International Journal of Didactical Studies*, 1(1), 16–21.
- Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E. B., Dorn, S., & Christensen, C. (2006). Learning in inclusive education research: Re-mediating theory and methods with a transformative agenda. *Review of Research in Education*, 30, 65–108. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X030001065>
- Avramidis, E. (2021). Teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion and inclusive practices: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25(8), 921–939. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1622804>
- Baidoo, J. (2026). Public versus private: A comparative evaluation of Ghanaian teachers’ perspectives of implementing inclusive education. *International Journal of Didactical Studies*, 7(1), Article 36684. <https://doi.org/10.33902/ijods.202636684>
- Banks, J. A. (2016). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching* (6th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315622255>
- Belay, M. A., & Yihun, S. G. (2020). The challenges and opportunities of visually impaired students in inclusive education: The case of Bedlu. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 4(2), 112–124. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.2020060437>
- Beruin, L. C. (2023). Learning privilege divide: A framework for interrogating personal privileges of STEM students’ education during the pandemic. *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology*, 5(4), 40–56. <https://doi.org/10.33902/jpsp.202323515>
- Bilgiç, E., & Tekin, A. (2023). All we can do is trial and error: English language teachers’ inclusive practice

- experiences. *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology*, 5(4), 82–97. <https://doi.org/10.33902/jpsp.202324728>
- Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools* (3rd ed.). Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Chan, J., To, H.-P., & Chan, E. (2006). Reconsidering social cohesion: Developing a definition and analytical framework for empirical research. *Social Indicators Research*, 75(2), 273–302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-005-2118-1>
- Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. (2016). *General comment No. 4 (2016) on the right to inclusive education* (CRPD/C/GC/4). United Nations. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/general-comments-and-recommendations/general-comment-no-4-article-24-right-inclusive>
- Diamantopoulos, A., & Winklhofer, H. M. (2001). Index construction with formative indicators: An alternative to scale development. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2), 269–277. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.38.2.269.18845>
- Durasa, H., Fitriani, S. N., Erlin, E., Kusuma, K. C. A., & Sriartha, I. P. (2024). Emile Durkheim's moral perspective on reducing bullying and violence in schools: A phenomenological study. *International Journal of Didactical Studies*, 5(2), Article 27615. <https://doi.org/10.33902/ijods.202427615>
- Eriksen Bergstrand, A. M., & Xenofontos, C. (2026). Adapting mathematics teaching for pupils with learning difficulties: Norwegian teachers' experiences. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 10(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202638721>
- Florian, L. (2014). What counts as evidence of inclusive education? *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 29(3), 286–294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2014.933551>
- Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(5), 813–828. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.501096>
- Göransson, K., & Nilholm, C. (2014). Conceptual diversities and empirical shortcomings: A critical analysis of research on inclusive education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 29(3), 265–280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2014.933545>
- Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2024, December 30). Об утверждении Концепции инклюзивной политики в Республике Казахстан на 2025–2030 годы [On approval of the Concept of Inclusive Policy in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2025–2030] (Resolution No. 1143). Adilet Legal Information System. <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/P2400001143>
- Güler, M., & Ürey, M. (2025). Are we aware of the needs of students with visual impairment? A study on challenges and instructional needs in science lessons. *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology*, 7(2), 53–70. <https://doi.org/10.33902/jpsp.202529253>
- Gülsün, İ., Malinen, O.-P., Yada, A., & Savolainen, H. (2023). Exploring the role of teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education, their self-efficacy, and collective efficacy in behaviour management in teacher behaviour. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 132, 104228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104228>
- Guzelergene, E. S., Cinar, D. B., & Nayir, F. (2025). Managing multicultural classrooms: Characteristics of culturally responsive classroom management. *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology*, 7(4), 259–277. <https://doi.org/10.33902/jpsp.202533262>
- Hassani, S., & Schwab, S. (2021). Social-emotional learning interventions for students with special educational needs: A systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 808566. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.808566>
- Haug, P. (2017). Understanding inclusive education: Ideals and reality. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 19(3), 206–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15017419.2016.1224778>
- Hidayat, R., & Patras, Y. E. (2024). Teacher innovativeness: The effect of self-efficacy, transformational leadership, and school climate. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 8(1), 208–222. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202424547>
- Kaldybayeva, O. V., & Kaldybayev, M. S. (2018). Традиции vs глобализация: ценностные ориентации населения современного Казахстана [Traditions vs. globalization: Value orientations of the population of modern Kazakhstan]. *Society and Security Insights*, 1(2), 113–138. [https://doi.org/10.14258/ssi\(2018\)2-09](https://doi.org/10.14258/ssi(2018)2-09)
- Kambatyrova, A. (2024). Parents' language ideologies in the context of trilingual education policy in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 21(3), 1201–1217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2022.2153850>
- Kefallinou, A., Symeonidou, S., & Meijer, C. J. W. (2020). Understanding the value of inclusive education and its implementation: A review of the literature. *Prospects*, 49(3–4), 135–152.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09500-2>

- Krosnick, J. A. (1991). Response strategies for coping with the cognitive demands of attitude measures in surveys. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 5(3), 213–236. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.2350050305>
- Krumpal, I. (2013). Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: A literature review. *Quality & Quantity*, 47, 2025–2047. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-011-9640-9>
- Levi, M., & Stoker, L. (2000). Political trust and trustworthiness. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3(1), 475–507. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.3.1.475>
- Levitas, R., Pantazis, C., Fahmy, E., Gordon, D., Lloyd, E., & Patsios, D. (2007). *The multi-dimensional analysis of social exclusion*. University of Bristol.
- Lindner, K.-T., Schwab, S., Emara, M., & Avramidis, E. (2023). Do teachers favor the inclusion of all students? A systematic review of primary schoolteachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 38(6), 766–787. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2023.2172894>
- Makoelle, T. M. (2020). Schools' transition toward inclusive education in post-Soviet countries: Selected cases in Kazakhstan. *SAGE Open*, 10(2), Article 2158244020926586. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020926586>
- Mamerkhanova, Z., Sakayeva, A., Akhmetkarimova, K., Assakayeva, D., & Bobrova, V. (2025). Development of inclusive education in the Republic of Kazakhstan: An inside view (case of the Karaganda region). *Frontiers in Education*, 10, Article 1630225. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1630225>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2025, July 4). *Inclusive education and support for persons with disabilities discussed at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan*. Government of Kazakhstan. <https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/mfa/press/news/details/1031014?lang=en>
- Mishler, W., & Rose, R. (2001). What are the origins of political trust? Testing institutional and cultural theories in post-communist societies. *Comparative Political Studies*, 34(1), 30–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414001034001002>
- Nilholm, C., & Göransson, K. (2017). What is meant by inclusion? An analysis of European and North American journal articles with high impact. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 32(3), 437–451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2017.1295638>
- Nurbayev, Z. (2021). *Inequality between students of rural and urban schools in Kazakhstan: Causes and ways to address it* (CAP Paper No. 268). Central Asia Program. <https://www.centralasiaprogram.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/cap-paper-no-268-zhaslan-nurbayev.pdf>
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674061200>
- OECD. (2012). *Equity and quality in education: Supporting disadvantaged students and schools*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264130852-en>
- OECD. (2023). *Equity and inclusion in education: Finding strength through diversity*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/e9072e21-en>
- Parsons, T. (1959). The school class as a social system: Some of its functions in American society. *Harvard Educational Review*, 29(4), 297–318.
- Pratiwi, H., Riwanda, A., Hasruddin, H., Sujarwo, S., & Syamsudin, A. (2025). Transforming learning or creating dependency? Teachers' perspectives and barriers to AI integration in education. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 9(2), 127–142. <https://doi.org/10.3390/JPR.202531677>
- Prime Minister of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2026, April 21). *More than 230,000 children with special educational needs to receive comprehensive support in Kazakhstan*. Government of Kazakhstan. <https://primeminister.kz/en/news/network-of-rehabilitation-centers-and-accessibility-being-expanded-in-kazakhstan-31294>
- Qhobela, M. (2026). Pedagogical link-making moves implemented by a pre-service teacher to promote classroom talk in a multilingual physics classroom. *International Journal of Didactical Studies*, 7(1), Article 31396. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijods.202631396>
- Relleve, C. C. (2023). Convention to characterization: Practices, barriers and facilitating factors in teaching values. *International Journal of Didactical Studies*, 4(2), Article 21438. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijods.202321438>
- Roemer, J. E. (1998). *Equality of opportunity*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674042872>
- Rollan, K., & Somerton, M. (2021). Inclusive education reform in Kazakhstan: Civil society activism from the bottom-up. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25(10), 1109–1124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1599451>
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 393–404. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1998.926617>

- Schiefer, D., & van der Noll, J. (2017). The essentials of social cohesion: A literature review. *Social Indicators Research*, 132(2), 579–603. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-016-1314-5>
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
- Shepherd, J. (2026). Experienced teachers' reflections and practices relating to refugee girls' needs. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 10(1), 309–327. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202640329>
- Silver, H. (1994). Social exclusion and social solidarity: Three paradigms. *International Labour Review*, 133(5–6), 531–578.
- Slee, R. (2018). *Inclusive education isn't dead, it just smells funny*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429486869>
- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571–610. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331>
- Tourangeau, R., & Yan, T. (2007). Sensitive questions in surveys. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(5), 859–883. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.5.859>
- Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. Yale University Press.
- UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000098427>
- UNESCO. (2020). *Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education: All means all*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373724>
- UNESCO. (2021). *Kazakhstan: Inclusion*. Profiles Enhancing Education Reviews. <https://education-profiles.org/central-and-southern-asia/kazakhstan/~inclusion>
- UNICEF Kazakhstan. (2025). *Digital inclusion in primary schools: Assistive technology needs assessment and capacity building*. <https://www.unicef.org/kazakhstan/en/documents/digital-inclusion-primary-schools>
- United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-persons-disabilities>
- Wang, T., Deng, M., & Tian, G. (2025). Facilitating teachers' inclusive education intentions: The roles of transformational leadership, school climate, and teacher efficacy. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12, 636. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-04977-8>
- World Bank. (2013). *Inclusion matters: The foundation for shared prosperity*. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-0010-8>
- Wray, E., Sharma, U., & Subban, P. (2022). Factors influencing teacher self-efficacy for inclusive education: A systematic literature review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 117, 103800. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103800>
- Xue, R., Chai, H., Yao, L., & Fu, W. (2023). The influence of school inclusive education climate on physical education teachers' inclusive education competency: The mediating role of teachers' agency. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1079853. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1079853>
- Yada, A., Leskinen, M., Savolainen, H., & Schwab, S. (2022). Meta-analysis of the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and attitudes toward inclusive education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 109, 103521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103521>

Appendices

Appendix A. Survey Design Information

Table A1 presents the available survey-design, fieldwork, and data-file information.

Table A1

Survey design, fieldwork, and data-file information

<i>Element</i>	<i>Description</i>
Project context	The quantitative CAPI survey analyzed in this study was part of a broader complex sociological project on the dynamics of value orientations in Kazakhstani society. The present article analyzes the adult CAPI survey component.
Geographic coverage	All 17 regions of Kazakhstan and three cities of republican significance: Astana, Almaty, and Shymkent.
Target population	Adults aged 18 years and older who had lived in the locality for at least six months.
Planned and realized sample	Planned sample: 3,000 questionnaires. Realized analytical sample: 3,123 valid completed CAPI questionnaires.
Data-file structure	The individual-level .xlsx dataset contains 3,123 respondent records used in the analysis. The working file contains 134 columns, including respondent identifiers, substantive questionnaire variables, and sociodemographic variables.
Mode	Standardized interviewer-administered face-to-face CAPI questionnaire administration using tablet devices and a digital survey platform.
Fieldwork period	10 May to 5 June 2025.
Preparation stage	Before fieldwork, the research program and questionnaire were finalized; the questionnaire was translated into Kazakh and harmonized; interviewers were selected and trained; tablet devices and CAPI software were prepared; and the quota-controlled sample was constructed.
Data collection organization	LLP Center Open Space conducted interviewer training, CAPI administration, field supervision, and primary quality control.
Questionnaire language	Russian or Kazakh according to respondent preference.
Average duration	Approximately 15–20 minutes per questionnaire administration.
Sampling scheme	The technical report characterizes the method as a stratified random probability sample with quota controls. Quota controls were based on official Bureau of National Statistics data at the beginning of 2025.
Quota parameters	Region, gender, age, ethnicity, and settlement type.
Primary territorial strata	Twenty administrative-territorial strata: 17 regions plus Astana, Almaty, and Shymkent.
Settlement categories	Megacity, oblast center, city, and small town/rural settlement.
Analytical estimation	All calculations are estimated on the realized unweighted analytical dataset.
Quality control	Simple Forms platform with automatic audio recording and GPS fixation; daily monitoring by managers and regional coordinators through the administrative panel; review of audio records for administration quality; post-field callback verification for up to 10% of respondents; logical checks, duplicate removal, and correction of technical errors.
Ethics and consent	Participation was voluntary. Respondents received oral information about the purpose, questionnaire content, expected duration, nature of questions, right to refuse, aggregated use of data, confidentiality, and non-identifiability. Oral informed consent was confirmed and recorded in the CAPI program.
Data protection	Respondents were assigned unique identification codes. Audio records were encrypted and used for quality control; datasets were stored on protected servers with access restricted to instructed research-team members.
Relation to external datasets	Original adult survey data analyzed independently of international large-scale educational assessment datasets.

Note. This appendix records survey information from the technical report and analytical dataset. These fields define the methodological basis used for descriptive interpretation.

Table A2 presents the regional distribution of the realized analytical sample.

Table A2

Regional distribution of the realized analytical sample

<i>Region or city</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Astana city	257	8.2
Almaty city	285	9.1
Shymkent city	164	5.2
Abai region	98	3.1
Akmola region	128	4.1
Aktobe region	146	4.7
Almaty region	225	7.2
Atyrau region	109	3.5
West Kazakhstan region	117	3.7
Zhambyl region	156	5.0
Zhetysu region	116	3.7
Karaganda region	138	4.4
Kostanay region	150	4.8
Kyzylorda region	125	4.0
Mangystau region	138	4.4
Pavlodar region	144	4.6
North Kazakhstan region	109	3.5
Turkestan region	351	11.2
Ulytau region	39	1.2
East Kazakhstan region	128	4.1
Total	3,123	100.0

All administrative strata included in the survey are represented in the realized analytical sample.

Table A3 presents the complete source-language wording, Excel variable-code mapping, response formats, and analytical use of questionnaire items.

Table A3

Complete source-language wording, variable-code mapping, and analytical use of questionnaire items

<i>Analytical block / item</i>	<i>Excel variable code(s)</i>	<i>Exact Russian source wording / English translation</i>	<i>Response format and analytical use</i>
Equal starting opportunities	Q16.R2	Block: «Какие установки, лозунги подходят для Вас в условиях строительства нового Казахстана? (отметьте один ответ по каждой строке)» Item: «Свобода, справедливость, равные стартовые возможности для каждого.» Translation: "Freedom, justice, and equal starting opportunities for everyone."	1 = Обязательно; 2 = Возможно; 3 = Не подходит; 4 = Затрудняюсь ответить. Used in SII_narrow, SII_wide, and SII2_strong.
Civic interethnic belonging	Q16.R4	Block: «Какие установки, лозунги подходят для Вас в условиях строительства нового Казахстана? (отметьте один ответ по каждой строке)» Item: «Новый Казахстан - родина для всех этносов.» Translation: "New Kazakhstan is a homeland for all ethnic groups."	1 = Обязательно; 2 = Возможно; 3 = Не подходит; 4 = Затрудняюсь ответить. Used in SII_narrow, SII_wide, and SII2_strong.

Table A3 continued

<i>Analytical block / item</i>	<i>Excel variable code(s)</i>	<i>Exact Russian source wording / English translation</i>	<i>Response format and analytical use</i>
Legal universalism	Q16.R3	Block: «Какие установки, лозунги подходят для Вас в условиях строительства нового Казахстана? (отметьте один ответ по каждой строке)» Item: «Власть - для народа, законы - для всех.» Translation: "Government is for the people, and the laws are for everyone."	1 = Обязательно; 2 = Возможно; 3 = Не подходит; 4 = Затрудняюсь ответить. Used in SII_wide.
Social guarantees	Q16.R1	Block: «Какие установки, лозунги подходят для Вас в условиях строительства нового Казахстана? (отметьте один ответ по каждой строке)» Item: «Достойная оплата труда и социальная защита - достойное качество жизни.» Translation: "Decent pay and social protection - a decent quality of life."	1 = Обязательно; 2 = Возможно; 3 = Не подходит; 4 = Затрудняюсь ответить. Used in SII_wide.
Life value: social justice	Q10.R1	Block: «Что и в какой степени стало важным для Вас и Вашей семьи в годы суверенного развития? (один ответ по каждой строке)» Item: «Социальная справедливость.» Translation: "Social justice."	1 = Очень важно; 2 = Важно отчасти; 3 = Совсем не важно; 4 = Затрудняюсь ответить. Descriptive educational equity context.
Life value: tolerance	Q10.R7	Block: «Что и в какой степени стало важным для Вас и Вашей семьи в годы суверенного развития? (один ответ по каждой строке)» Item: «Терпимость.» Translation: "Tolerance."	1 = Очень важно; 2 = Важно отчасти; 3 = Совсем не важно; 4 = Затрудняюсь ответить. Descriptive educational socialization context and Appendix D.
Life values: freedom and ideological restrictions	Q10.R5; Q10.R8	Q10.R5 item: «Свобода выражения и демократизм.» / "Freedom of expression and democratic principles." Q10.R8 item: «Отсутствие идеологических ограничений.» / "Absence of ideological restrictions."	1 = Очень важно; 2 = Важно отчасти; 3 = Совсем не важно; 4 = Затрудняюсь ответить. Descriptive context in Findings.
Youth socialization guidelines	Q14(1)-Q14(5)	Block: «С Вашей точки зрения, что важно в формировании ценностей у молодежи? (отметьте не более пяти вариантов ответа)» Focal options: «Воспитание толерантности и терпимости»; «Гендерное равноправие».	Checklist. Q14(1) is first recorded selection; any occurrence across Q14(1)-Q14(5) is top-five mention. Full option counts in Appendix F.

Table A3 continued

<i>Analytical block / item</i>	<i>Excel variable code(s)</i>	<i>Exact Russian source wording / English translation</i>	<i>Response format and analytical use</i>
Perceived social cleavages	Q5.R1; Q5.R6; Q5.R10	Q5.R2; Q5.R7; Q5.R9;	Block: «Если ценности не совпадают, то как они отличаются между разными группами населения и как эти различия можно оценить? (отмечайте по каждой позиции...)» Items used: «Между людьми, принадлежащими к разным поколениям»; «Между городской и сельской молодежью»; «Между казахоязычными и русскоязычными казахстанцами»; «Между верующими и неверующими»; «Между представителями традиционных и нетрадиционных религий»; «Между обеспеченными и малоимущими слоями населения»; «Между чиновниками и народом».
Unity of values	Q2	«Как Вы полагаете, в современном казахстанском обществе имеется единство ценностей для всех граждан, вне зависимости от их этнической, возрастной, образовательной, профессиональной, социально-статусной, религиозной, поселенческой принадлежности?» Translation: “Do you think there is a unity of values in contemporary Kazakhstani society for all citizens regardless of ethnic, age, educational, professional, social-status, religious, or settlement affiliation?”	1 = Различия большие; 2 = Различия имеются, но не существенные; 3 = Различий нет; 4 = Затрудняюсь ответить. Contextual validity check. 1 = Да, основа ценностного единства имеется; 2 = Нет, ценности не совпадают; 3 = Затрудняюсь ответить. Descriptive contextual indicator.

Table A3 continued

<i>Analytical block / item</i>	<i>Excel variable code(s)</i>	<i>Exact Russian source wording / English translation</i>	<i>Response format and analytical use</i>
Referent communities / value proximity	Q4(1)-Q4(10)	«С кем Вы в большей степени ощущаете сходство своих представлений, совпадение жизненных взглядов? (отмечайте все подходящие значения)» Translation: "With whom do you more strongly feel similarity of views and coincidence of life outlooks? (Mark all suitable values.)"	Checklist. First recorded selection and any occurrence across all ten response fields are both reported in Appendix F.
National-culture qualities and modernization	Q11(1)-Q11(3)	«Какие особенности национальной культуры и моральные качества казахов, на Ваш взгляд, способствовали обновлению общественного сознания? (отметьте не более 3-х вариантов ответа)» Translation: "Which features of national culture and moral qualities of Kazakhs, in your view, contributed to the renewal of social consciousness? (Mark up to three answers.)"	Checklist. First recorded selection and any occurrence across three response fields are reported in Appendix F.
Sociodemographic variables	Q17; Q18.1; Q19; Q21; Q22; Q23; Q24; Q27; Q28; Q29	Variables: «Пол»; «Отметьте возрастную группу»; «Ваша национальность»; «Ваше образование»; «К какой социальной категории Вы бы себя отнесли в большей степени?»; «В какой сфере (отрасли) Вы работаете?»; «Кем Вы себя чувствуете в большей мере по языковым признакам?»; «Как бы Вы оценили финансовый статус Вашей семьи?»; «В каком регионе вы проживаете?»; «Тип населённого пункта».	Used for sample group and model characteristics, comparisons, descriptive diagnostics.

Note. Excel variable codes refer to the individual-level .xlsx dataset. Source-material question numbering may differ from the Excel variable-code numbering because of export and processing conventions.

The mapping connects questionnaire source wording with the analytical variables used in the study.

Appendix B. Sensitivity Specifications and Treatment of “Difficult to Answer” Responses

Table B1 presents the full response distributions for the four normative inclusiveness items.

Table B1

Full response distributions for the four normative inclusiveness items

<i>Item (Excel code)</i>	<i>Mandatory n (%)</i>	<i>Possible n (%)</i>	<i>Not appropriate n (%)</i>	<i>DK n (%)</i>	<i>Main analytic treatment</i>
Equal starting opportunities (Q16.R2)	2,361 (75.6)	617 (19.8)	91 (2.9)	54 (1.7)	Mandatory = 2; possible = 1; not appropriate = 0; DK = missing in main index
Civic interethnic belonging (Q16.R4)	2,280 (73.0)	660 (21.1)	124 (4.0)	59 (1.9)	Mandatory = 2; possible = 1; not appropriate = 0; DK = missing in main index
Legal universalism (Q16.R3)	2,370 (75.9)	511 (16.4)	177 (5.7)	65 (2.1)	Mandatory = 2; possible = 1; not appropriate = 0; DK = missing in main index
Social guarantees (Q16.R1)	2,631 (84.2)	342 (11.0)	104 (3.3)	46 (1.5)	Mandatory = 2; possible = 1; not appropriate = 0; DK = missing in main index

Note. “Difficult to answer” is reported separately as a form of uncertainty. Percentages are calculated from N = 3,123. DK responses are retained as an analytically distinct uncertainty category.

Table B2 presents the sensitivity specifications used to distinguish soft endorsement from strong support.

Table B2

Sensitivity specifications for the distinction between soft and strong support

<i>Specification</i>	<i>Coding rule</i>	<i>What it tests</i>	<i>Descriptive result reported in the study</i>
Main ordinal index	Mandatory = 2; possible = 1; not appropriate = 0; DK = missing	Intensity of endorsement under the main coding	SII_narrow mean = 85.9; SII_wide mean = 87.0.
Strong-support binary	Mandatory = 1; possible/not appropriate/DK = 0	Whether conclusions hold at the mandatory threshold	SII2_strong = 2: 62.7%; SII2_strong = 1: 23.2%; SII2_strong = 0: 14.1%.
Soft-support binary	Mandatory/possible = 1; not appropriate/DK = 0	Size of ceiling effect under permissive support	Joint soft support for the two core items = 91.5%, confirming a strong ceiling effect.
DK as uncertainty	DK retained as a separate uncertainty category	Visibility of uncertainty in the descriptive distribution	DK shares are low across all four items (1.5%-2.1%); aggregate interpretation is stable across DK treatment.

Note. The sensitivity specifications are descriptive and use the information reported above. They support the central diagnostic contrast between soft endorsement and the strongest available normative imperative.

The specifications separate permissive support from the mandatory-threshold criterion.

Appendix C. Compact Summary of Group Comparisons

Table C1 presents a compact summary of descriptive group comparisons for joint strong support on both core items.

Table C1

Compact summary of group comparisons

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>n strong / % strong</i>	<i>Effect size and note</i>
Settlement type	Megacity	747	457 / 61.2	Cramér's V = 0.076; small effect
	Oblast center	1,302	790 / 60.7	
	City	95	49 / 51.6	Small subsample
	Small town/rural settlement	979	662 / 67.6	
Ethnicity	Kazakh	2,202	1,380 / 62.7	Cramér's V = 0.061; small effect
	Russian	463	315 / 68.0	
	Other nationality	434	251 / 57.8	
	Mixed-origin undefined nationality	/ 24	12 / 50.0	Very small subsample
Linguistic identification	self-Turkic-language	567	346 / 61.0	Cramér's V = 0.055; small effect
	Russian-speaking	672	426 / 63.4	
	Bilingual	1,429	924 / 64.7	
	Trilingual	395	231 / 58.5	
	Difficult to answer	60	31 / 51.7	Small subsample
Age	18–24	637	373 / 58.6	Cramér's V = 0.055; small effect
	25–34	660	401 / 60.8	
	35–44	663	428 / 64.6	
	45–54	612	399 / 65.2	
	55 and older	551	357 / 64.8	Weak age gradient
Education	Higher or incomplete higher	1,587	979 / 61.7	Cramér's V = 0.056; small effect
	Secondary or secondary specialized	1,438	930 / 64.7	
	Below secondary or no completed education	98	49 / 50.0	Small subsample
Subjective status	financial High	910	546 / 60.0	Cramér's V = 0.052; small effect
	Middle	1,626	1,058 / 65.1	
	Low	333	204 / 61.3	
	Refusal	254	150 / 59.1	Nonlinear pattern

Note. N values and the number of respondents with strong support on both core items are calculated from the analytical dataset. Descriptive group proportions are reported with Cramér's V for the association between group membership and SII2_strong = 2. Categories with small N are flagged. The adjusted model diagnostics in Appendix E support the interpretation of these differences as modest descriptive differentiations. Group differences remain modest descriptive differentiations.

Appendix D. Tolerance as Declared Value and Youth Socialization Priority

Table D1 presents tolerance both as a declared value and as a youth-socialization priority.

Table D1

Tolerance as declared value and youth socialization priority

Indicator	Value
Tolerance rated "very important"	78.0%
Tolerance rated "partly important"	18.1%
Tolerance selected among top-five youth socialization priorities	28.0%
Tolerance selected as first priority	4.6%
Among those rating tolerance "very important," share selecting tolerance among top five	29.6%
Association between four-level tolerance rating and selecting tolerance among top five	Cramér's V = 0.077

Note. The result indicates a hierarchy of normative priorities: tolerance is widely endorsed as a general value and is less often selected in a fixed-choice block of youth socialization priorities. The reported Cramér's V uses the four-level tolerance rating and the binary top-five selection indicator. Complete first-priority and top-five youth-socialization option counts are reported in Appendix F.

The comparison separates broad value endorsement from prioritization in a fixed-choice socialization context.

Appendix E. Full Descriptive Multivariable Model Details

This appendix reports the full multivariable model details corresponding to the adjusted association diagnostics summarized in the main Results section. The outcome SII2_strong is based on the two core items: equal starting opportunities and civic interethnic inclusion. The ordered model uses the three-category outcome 0 = no core item selected as "mandatory," 1 = one core item selected as "mandatory," and 2 = both core items selected as "mandatory." The joint-strong binary model contrasts SII2_strong = 2 with all other response combinations. Two additional binary models separately predict the mandatory threshold on the equal-opportunity item and on the "New Kazakhstan is a homeland for all ethnic groups" item.

All models are unweighted and include the same covariates: gender, age group, education, settlement type, ethnicity, linguistic self-identification, and subjective financial status. Model-based Wald standard errors are used because the analysis is descriptive and the analytical file does not include design-cluster variables suitable for cluster-robust estimation. "Difficult to answer" responses on the two core outcomes are coded as 0 in the binary mandatory-threshold specifications because the models contrast the strongest available endorsement with all other responses. The models are used as adjusted descriptive diagnostics.

The proportional-odds assumption for the ordered model was assessed by triangulating the ordered-logit results with the binary mandatory-threshold and multinomial profile specifications. Multicollinearity diagnostics indicate stable model estimation. Variance inflation factors range from 1.07 to 2.32; the largest values are observed for oblast-center residence (2.32), Russian-language identity (2.11), small town/rural settlement category (2.08), secondary/specialized education (1.98), and gender (1.97). Multiple testing is addressed through cautious interpretation of effect sizes, confidence intervals, and cross-model consistency rather than through a formal family-wise correction.

Table E1 presents model diagnostics for the multivariable models.

Table E1

Model diagnostics for the multivariable models

Model	Outcome	N	McFadden R ²	AIC
Ordered logit	SII2_strong, 0–2	3,123	0.012	5,642.2
Binary logit	Joint strong support, SII2_strong = 2	3,123	0.013	4,110.7
Binary logit	Equal-opportunity item: mandatory = 1	3,123	0.016	3,456.3
Binary logit	Civic-inclusion item: mandatory = 1	3,123	0.021	3,606.9
Multinomial logit	Four strong-support profiles; joint strong as reference	3,123	0.024	6,628.3

Note. The pseudo-R² values are McFadden coefficients. They indicate low explanatory strength, supporting the study's interpretation that sociodemographic differentiation is modest in magnitude. Estimates are unweighted and model-based. The diagnostics indicate modest sociodemographic differentiation.

Table E2 presents adjusted odds ratios for the ordered SII2_strong model and the joint-strong-support binary model.

Table E2

Adjusted odds ratios for the ordered and joint-strong-support models

Predictor	Ordered logit for SII2_strong	Binary logit for joint strong support
Female; reference: male	1.09 [0.94, 1.26]	1.10 [0.94, 1.27]
Age 25–34; reference: 18–24	1.04 [0.83, 1.29]	1.05 [0.84, 1.31]
Age 35–44; reference: 18–24	1.16 [0.93, 1.45]	1.24 [0.98, 1.55]
Age 45–54; reference: 18–24	1.20 [0.95, 1.50]	1.28 [1.01, 1.62]
Age 55+; reference: 18–24	1.18 [0.93, 1.49]	1.23 [0.97, 1.57]
Secondary/specialized education; reference: higher/incomplete higher	1.05 [0.90, 1.23]	1.06 [0.90, 1.24]
Below secondary/no completed education; reference: higher/incomplete higher	0.57 [0.38, 0.86]	0.68 [0.45, 1.05]
Oblast center; reference: megacity	1.01 [0.84, 1.21]	0.97 [0.81, 1.17]
City; reference: megacity	0.62 [0.41, 0.94]	0.66 [0.43, 1.02]
Small town/rural settlement; reference: megacity	1.32 [1.08, 1.61]	1.28 [1.04, 1.57]
Russian ethnicity; reference: Kazakh	1.27 [0.98, 1.65]	1.30 [0.99, 1.70]
Other/mixed ethnicity; reference: Kazakh	0.78 [0.63, 0.96]	0.83 [0.67, 1.04]
Turkic-language identity; reference: bilingual	0.86 [0.71, 1.05]	0.88 [0.72, 1.07]
Russian-language identity; reference: bilingual	0.89 [0.71, 1.11]	0.84 [0.66, 1.06]
Trilingual identity; reference: bilingual	0.89 [0.70, 1.12]	0.91 [0.72, 1.16]
Language identity DK; reference: bilingual	0.64 [0.39, 1.05]	0.62 [0.37, 1.06]
High financial status; reference: middle	0.83 [0.70, 0.98]	0.83 [0.70, 0.99]
Low financial status; reference: middle	0.82 [0.64, 1.05]	0.92 [0.71, 1.18]
Financial-status refusal; reference: middle	0.77 [0.59, 1.01]	0.84 [0.64, 1.11]

Note. Entries are odds ratios with model-based Wald 95% intervals. In the ordered model, OR > 1 indicates higher odds of being in a higher SII2_strong category. In the binary model, OR > 1 indicates higher odds of joint strong support. Reference categories are male, age 18–24, higher/incomplete higher education, megacity, Kazakh ethnicity, bilingual identity, and middle subjective financial status. The model provides an adjusted descriptive check of group differences.

Table E3 presents adjusted odds ratios for the two core components of normative inclusiveness.

Table E3

Adjusted odds ratios for the two core components

Predictor	Equal opportunities mandatory	Civic inclusion mandatory
Female; reference: male	1.19 [1.01, 1.40]	1.01 [0.86, 1.18]
Age 25–34; reference: 18–24	1.15 [0.89, 1.48]	0.95 [0.74, 1.21]
Age 35–44; reference: 18–24	1.04 [0.80, 1.34]	1.19 [0.93, 1.52]
Age 45–54; reference: 18–24	1.06 [0.81, 1.37]	1.23 [0.95, 1.59]
Age 55+; reference: 18–24	1.06 [0.81, 1.39]	1.23 [0.94, 1.60]
Secondary/specialized education; reference: higher/incomplete higher	0.97 [0.81, 1.16]	1.13 [0.95, 1.34]
Below secondary/no completed education; reference: higher/incomplete higher	0.57 [0.36, 0.88]	0.62 [0.40, 0.96]
Oblast center; reference: megacity	0.92 [0.74, 1.14]	1.18 [0.96, 1.44]
City; reference: megacity	0.63 [0.39, 1.01]	0.64 [0.41, 0.99]
Small town/rural settlement; reference: megacity	1.05 [0.83, 1.33]	1.62 [1.30, 2.02]
Russian ethnicity; reference: Kazakh	1.22 [0.89, 1.66]	1.31 [0.97, 1.77]
Other/mixed ethnicity; reference: Kazakh	0.68 [0.54, 0.86]	0.87 [0.68, 1.09]
Turkic-language identity; reference: bilingual	0.88 [0.70, 1.11]	0.83 [0.67, 1.04]
Russian-language identity; reference: bilingual	1.00 [0.76, 1.30]	0.87 [0.67, 1.12]
Trilingual identity; reference: bilingual	0.86 [0.66, 1.12]	0.94 [0.73, 1.22]
Language identity DK; reference: bilingual	0.70 [0.40, 1.24]	0.64 [0.37, 1.12]
High financial status; reference: middle	0.81 [0.67, 0.98]	0.85 [0.70, 1.03]
Low financial status; reference: middle	0.80 [0.61, 1.06]	0.77 [0.59, 1.00]
Financial-status refusal; reference: middle	0.83 [0.61, 1.12]	0.71 [0.53, 0.95]

Note. Entries are odds ratios with model-based Wald 95% intervals. The two component models show that the education pattern is visible for both core items. The small town/rural settlement pattern is concentrated more clearly in the civic-inclusion component. The component models display adjusted descriptive patterns across the equal-opportunity and civic-inclusion components.

Table E4 presents the multinomial profile model with joint strong support as the reference category.

Table E4

Multinomial profile model: odds ratios with joint strong support as reference

Predictor	Equal-alone profile	Civic-alone profile	No-strong profile
Female; reference: male	1.05	0.79	0.89
Age 25–34; reference: 18–24	1.06	0.79	0.96
Age 35–44; reference: 18–24	0.66	0.79	0.98
Age 45–54; reference: 18–24	0.62	0.77	0.95
Age 55+; reference: 18–24	0.69	0.86	0.91
Secondary/specialized education; reference: higher/incomplete higher	0.84	1.08	0.95
Below secondary/no completed education; reference: higher/incomplete higher	0.87	1.01	2.11
Oblast center; reference: megacity	0.95	1.56	0.85
City; reference: megacity	1.28	1.18	1.94
Small town/rural settlement; reference: megacity	0.62	1.35	0.66
Russian ethnicity; reference: Kazakh	0.75	0.85	0.71
Other/mixed ethnicity; reference: Kazakh	0.80	1.22	1.56
Turkic-language identity; reference: bilingual	1.11	0.99	1.28
Russian-language identity; reference: bilingual	1.45	1.20	0.97
Trilingual identity; reference: bilingual	0.97	1.13	1.16
Language identity DK; reference: bilingual	1.68	1.51	1.65
High financial status; reference: middle	1.11	1.20	1.32
Low financial status; reference: middle	0.86	0.72	1.65
Financial-status refusal; reference: middle	1.09	0.77	1.63

Note. The dependent variable distinguishes four response profiles. Joint strong support serves as the reference category. Values above 1 indicate higher odds of the listed non-joint profile. Odds ratios are reported to keep the profile model compact; confidence intervals are not reported because the model is retained only as a descriptive profile diagnostic and no substantive inference depends on individual multinomial coefficients. The ordered and binary models provide the main adjusted evidence with 95% confidence intervals.

The multinomial specification provides a compact diagnostic check of profile directionality and is not used as the sole basis for substantive inference.

The models support the descriptive interpretation advanced in the main text. Adjustment leaves the bivariate differences modest, with pseudo- R^2 values between 0.012 and 0.024. The below-secondary/no-completed-education group and the small city category show lower adjusted odds in the ordered model; residence in the small town/rural settlement category shows higher adjusted odds. Financial status remains nonlinear, with the middle group occupying a distinct position within the financial-status pattern. These results address the possibility that bivariate differences are artifacts of group composition and preserve the conclusion that differentiation is substantively limited.

Appendix F. Multiple-Response Counts of Checklist Blocks

This appendix reports additional calculations from the individual-level dataset for questionnaire blocks that allowed multiple answers. First recorded selections and any-occurrence counts across the permitted response fields answer different descriptive questions. Percentages are calculated from $N = 3,123$.

Table F1 presents first recorded selections and any-occurrence counts for the value-proximity checklist.

Table F1

Value proximity: first recorded selection and any occurrence across all recorded fields

Option	First recorded n (%)	Any occurrence n (%)
People of my nationality / ethnic group	1,133 (36.3)	1,314 (42.1)
Colleagues at study/work	389 (12.5)	1,166 (37.3)
Residents of my city/village	264 (8.5)	992 (31.8)
My family	813 (26.0)	2,003 (64.1)
Chosen online community	23 (0.7)	242 (7.7)
Co-believers	27 (0.9)	229 (7.3)
Citizens of Kazakhstan	231 (7.4)	1,084 (34.7)
Those who make their own destiny	81 (2.6)	436 (14.0)
Those who believe nothing depends on their actions	37 (1.2)	179 (5.7)
Those who share the need to build New Kazakhstan	117 (3.7)	515 (16.5)

Table F2 presents first recorded selections and any-occurrence counts for national-culture qualities associated with modernization.

Table F2

National-culture qualities and modernization: first recorded selection and any occurrence

<i>Option</i>	<i>First recorded n (%)</i>	<i>Any occurrence n (%)</i>
Mutual aid and mutual support	1,635 (52.4)	1,944 (62.2)
Ability to accept other cultures	357 (11.4)	1,089 (34.9)
Clan solidarity	203 (6.5)	800 (25.6)
Acceptance of the authority of elders	194 (6.2)	1,077 (34.5)
Tolerance toward religion	114 (3.7)	496 (15.9)
Tolerance toward traditions and cultures of other peoples	163 (5.2)	647 (20.7)
Ability to perceive new things quickly	300 (9.6)	807 (25.8)
Other	157 (5.0)	157 (5.0)

Table F3 presents first-priority selections and top-five mentions for youth socialization guidelines.

Table F3

Youth socialization guidelines: first priority and top-five mention

<i>Option</i>	<i>First priority n (%)</i>	<i>Top-five mention n (%)</i>
National and universal human values	1,323 (42.4)	1,596 (51.1)
Study of cultural heritage	253 (8.1)	894 (28.6)
Formation of patriotic feelings	283 (9.1)	1,157 (37.0)
Cultivating tolerance and forbearance	143 (4.6)	874 (28.0)
Respectful attitude toward the environment	164 (5.3)	1,224 (39.2)
Care for health	292 (9.3)	1,611 (51.6)
Gender equality	31 (1.0)	250 (8.0)
Development of critical and creative thinking	37 (1.2)	388 (12.4)
Culture of self-education	49 (1.6)	657 (21.0)
Analytical skills	10 (0.3)	188 (6.0)
Ability to recognize false and unreliable information	26 (0.8)	328 (10.5)
Respectful attitude toward teacher/mentor status	43 (1.4)	398 (12.7)
Diligence / hard work	161 (5.2)	1,073 (34.4)
Civic position	31 (1.0)	261 (8.4)
Responsibility for oneself and one's family	243 (7.8)	920 (29.5)
Other	9 (0.3)	16 (0.5)
Difficult to answer	25 (0.8)	25 (0.8)

Note. In these checklist blocks, blank cells in later response fields mean that the respondent selected fewer than the maximum number of allowable answers. The first recorded selection can be used as an indicator of priority, and any occurrence captures broader mention within the allowed response set.