

Trends of “Inclusive Education” in the Modern World: International Discussions and Prospects for Russia

Sergey G. Kosaretsky

Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8905-8983>, e-mail: skosaretski@hse.ru

The article examines the trends in the development of the concept of “inclusive education” in the documents of international organizations, discussions in academic publications regarding this concept, its evolution and implementation. The prospects for the implementation of the highlighted trends in Russian education in the current socio-political context of Russia and taking into account the discourses of contextualization and decolonization of the concept of inclusive education are discussed. The contradictions between the global trends of inclusive education and the situation of development of Russian education and the state are revealed. The interpretations of the Russian case of the development of inclusive education are proposed as an example of the implementation of a global concept promoted by international organizations in specific socio-cultural and institutional conditions.

Keywords: inclusive education; special educational needs; diversity; international organizations.

Funding. The reported study was funded by Russian Science Fond (RFBR), project number 24-28-20225, <https://rscf.ru/project/24-28-20225>.

For citation: Kosaretsky S.G. Trends of “Inclusive Education” in the Modern World: International Discussions and Prospects for Russia. *Psikhologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological Science and Education*, 2024. Vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 14—30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2024290502> (In Russ.).

Тренды «инклюзивного образования» в современном мире: международные дискуссии и перспективы для России

Косарецкий С.Г.

ФГАОУ ВО «Национальный исследовательский университет

«Высшая школа экономики» (ФГАОУ ВО «НИУ ВШЭ»),

г. Москва, Российская Федерация

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8905-8983>, e-mail: skosaretski@hse.ru

В статье рассматриваются тренды развития концепта «инклюзивное образование» в документах международных организаций, дискуссии в академических публикациях в отношении данного концепта, его эволюции и имплементации. Обсуждаются перспективы реализации выделенных трендов в российском образовании в актуальном социально-политическом контексте России и с учетом дискурсов контекстуализации и деколонизации концепта инклюзивного образования. Вскрываются противоречия между глобальными трендами инклюзивного образования и ситуацией развития российского образования и государства. Предлагаются интерпретации российского кейса развития инклюзивного образования как примера внедрения глобального концепта, продвигаемого международными организациями в специфических социокультурных и институциональных условиях.

Ключевые слова: инклюзивное образование; особые образовательные потребности; различия; международные организации.

Финансирование. Исследование выполнено за счет гранта Российского научного фонда № 24-28-20225, <https://rscf.ru/project/24-28-20225>.

Для цитаты: Косарецкий С.Г. Тренды «инклюзивного образования» в современном мире: международные дискуссии и перспективы для России // Психологическая наука и образование. 2024. Том 29. № 5. С. 14—30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2024290502>

Introduction

The year 2024 marks the 30th anniversary of the adoption of the Salamanca Declaration on Principles, Policy, and Practice in Special Needs Education, which established the global significance of inclusive education [82]. Russia joined the Salamanca process by signing the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2012, a successor to the Declaration [84], and continues to implement policies to uphold its core prin-

ciples. This process has been accompanied by ongoing analysis and discussion. Most researchers agree that substantial progress has been made both legislatively and practically; however, the process is incomplete and does not always proceed smoothly [1; 48; 51; 57].

It is noteworthy that the assessment and debate on inclusive education have primarily centered on basic international approaches, which is justified, given that inclusive educa-

tion represents one of the most significant post-Soviet educational reforms, rooted in the adoption of foreign concepts.

However, in our view, the evolution of the inclusive education concept and current international discussions regarding its implementation are not fully considered [16; 17; 18; 19; 33; 62; 67]. On the other hand, any discourse on the implementation of inclusive education must necessarily reflect the significant changes in the Russian context—both in terms of educational policy and broader societal developments. As Anastasia Liasidou notes, “Change possibilities can be feasible only when we are aware of the context and time-specific ‘discursive contours’ within which policy agendas are conceived and implemented” [59, p. 238]. We find successful examples of such contextualized approaches in Russian studies on the earlier stages of inclusion policy implementation [1; 51; 53].

In this article, we aim to address some of these gaps. First, we will outline the trends in the evolution of the inclusive education concept, as reflected in documents from international organizations. Next, we will explore the academic discussions surrounding inclusive education and its evolving trends. Finally, we will examine the prospects for implementing these trends within the current socio-political context of Russia.

We hope that this publication will provide valuable insights for Russian research on inclusive education and contribute to the ongoing dialogue regarding its further development. Moreover, our conclusions may also hold significance for the broader international discussion on the implementation of inclusive education across various socio-cultural and institutional contexts.

Trends in the development of the concept of inclusive education

Let us begin by examining the trends in the global development of the concept of

inclusive education in recent years. Initially, the concept of inclusive education was primarily focused on promoting the inclusion of students with special needs, particularly those with disabilities or psychological developmental challenges. However, over time, it has expanded to encompass other student groups. These include differences related to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, language, culture, religion, mental and physical abilities, social class, and immigration status, all of which can create risks of exclusion, discrimination, marginalization, limited access to education, and barriers to achieving high educational outcomes. The concept of “diversity” now occupies a central place in the policy documents of leading international organizations, such as UNESCO and OECD, and is actively promoted by these bodies [25; 70; 79].

Accordingly, inclusive education now aims to create conditions where these differences do not serve as obstacles to receiving a quality education. In recent years, a significant trend has been the merging of the concepts of “inclusion” and “equity,” emphasizing that all students should have the opportunity to achieve their best, irrespective of the circumstances of their birth [70].

A current focus is on the multiple intersections between these differences, which create unique needs for students. This intersectionality approach highlights the interdependence of various aspects of an individual’s identity, stressing the importance of addressing diversity, equality, and inclusion in education systems comprehensively. This approach aims to ensure complementarity and prevent inconsistencies in educational goals [70; 85]. For example, migrant status, often implicitly linked to ethnic minority status, is frequently associated with lower socio-economic status. However, when combined with gender, it can lead to different risks and

opportunities for school well-being, depending on the context [20].

The discourse of diversity, as promoted by international organizations, aims to enact significant changes in education systems, particularly in terms of staffing for inclusive education. It emphasizes the importance of not only attracting qualified personnel but also promoting teacher diversity by hiring teachers with disabilities, teachers with migration experience, and teachers from indigenous communities for inclusive classrooms and schools [24]. Significant changes are also expected in the content of education, especially regarding the traditions and knowledge of indigenous peoples [27]. In this regard, the discourse of inclusion and diversity is increasingly integrated with the discourse of decolonization [31; 35].

Inclusion, within this framework, is increasingly recognized as a principle that not only acknowledges differences but also supports and welcomes diversity among all students. Individual differences are viewed not as issues to be resolved but as opportunities to enrich the educational environment for everyone [17].

In recent years, as the range of differences requiring consideration in inclusive education has expanded—along with their intersections—the idea has emerged that inclusive education should not be confined to specific categories of students. Instead, it should be designed for all students, considering the unique identities and needs of each child. The aim is to ensure high standards of educational quality and the well-being of all students [16; 24; 76]. Achieving this requires schools to do more than just offer joint education for all children, which was the original focus of early inclusive education declarations. Schools must transform all aspects of their operations to meet the individual needs of each student and foster the realization of their full potential [52; 70].

In this context, the concept of an “inclusive school” has been further developed and enriched with the idea of a “friendly school” (or “Child-Friendly School”). This model, promoted by international organizations over the past decade, is one that recognizes and encourages the fulfillment of children’s fundamental rights. It actively responds to diversity, creates safe conditions for its expression, identifies excluded children to integrate them into the educational process, and works in the best interests of the child, helping to realize their potential [15; 37; 40; 80].

This trend places greater emphasis on individual values, such as identity, culture, talent, abilities, interests, and needs [75]. Furthermore, the concept of inclusive education is increasingly integrated with the notion of personality-oriented, personalized education, which has been widely promoted in the policy documents of these same international organizations and aligns with their visions for the future of education [54; 74].

Controversial issues in the theory, policy and practice of educational inclusion

The evolution of the concept of inclusive education toward “broadening and deepening” may appear straightforward. However, this is far from the case. In fact, we are witnessing a growing body of critical literature, not only questioning the progress made in implementing inclusive education models but also challenging their foundational principles [29; 50; 54]. It is noted that, after a decade of implementing inclusive education policies, there is a sense that a broad consensus on key positions has been reached. Yet, in practice, achieving this consensus remains elusive, and there is more ambiguity than clarity [16; 39].

Despite the signing of numerous international agreements and conventions by countries, and the declared commitment to

the principles of inclusion, the practical implementation of these goals has proven to be much more complex. Many approaches to inclusive pedagogy are viewed as politically or idealistically driven, overly utopian, and detached from practical realities—especially in secondary education. As a result, they require reevaluation and refinement [18; 54; 67]. Although definitions of inclusive education are outlined in international documents and embedded in the legislation of various countries, significant differences in these concepts, as well as in the associated rights and mechanisms for their enforcement, persist [17; 24; 56; 67; 70]. It is acknowledged that most countries and education systems have developed their own definitions of inclusion, reflecting their unique histories, priorities, and educational objectives [25].

Even more varied are the interpretations of “special educational needs” and specific groups or conditions in national regulations, policies, and academic publications. Some countries provide detailed categorizations, while others avoid classification to prevent stigmatization [24; 70]. Assigning the formal status of a “student with special educational needs” has advantages, such as enabling targeted resource allocation and specialized support, including individual learning plans and adapted curricula. However, this status can also lead to labeling, which may lower expectations, reduce academic performance and self-esteem, and hinder peer relationships [56; 67]. Meanwhile, the effort to address individual differences without stigmatization, marginalization, or privilege raises concerns about its practicality [54]. While recognizing differences is often associated with the risk of stigmatization, failing to acknowledge them can result in missed opportunities [68]. Thus, finding a balance between recognizing differences and avoiding stigmatization, as well as determining an optimal level of differentiation that does not lead to isolation, is crucial.

Globally, no single model for educating children with special needs has emerged. Instead, we observe a combination of segregation, integration, and inclusive elements. In some countries, education within general schools with adapted conditions is the norm, while in others, a significant proportion of specialized institutions still exists. Additionally, some schools have both general education classes and specialized classes for students with special needs. These specialized classes do not appear marginalized, and discussions continue regarding their role and limitations within the inclusive education framework [42; 63].

There is also no consensus regarding the impact of inclusive education on academic achievement, social-emotional development, socialization, and employment outcomes for individuals with special needs. Some studies and reviews present evidence of the comparative advantages of inclusive classrooms [24; 26; 44; 49]. These benefits are seen for both students with and without special educational needs in inclusive schools [72], which is significant given that a common argument against inclusion is the fear of negative effects on the academic performance of students without special needs [64].

However, other studies reveal no substantial positive or negative effects of inclusion on academic achievement or overall psychosocial adjustment [30]. The outcomes vary depending on the type of special needs, the specific characteristics of inclusive education, and the socioeconomic composition of the classrooms where students with special needs are integrated [72; 55; 34; 60; 73].

It is argued that both positive and negative effects must be understood within the complex interplay of individual, class, and school-level factors, alongside varying interpretations of what constitutes inclusive education and specific types of outcomes. As Norwich suggests, the nuanced political and practical

issues within inclusive education highlight the need to avoid simplistic, generalized conclusions. Instead, there is a demand for more detailed research on inclusive education [69], a particularly relevant need for the Russian Federation, where evidence-based approaches to inclusive education are still in their early stages [11].

The intensification of discussions surrounding inclusive education and the rise of critical perspectives are, in our opinion, not merely situational. Rather, they reflect a broader crisis in several global political constructs that have shaped educational policy since the late 20th and early 21st centuries, with inclusive education being one of the most prominent examples. Initially, inclusive education was closely associated with human rights. Education, as one of the fundamental human rights, was seen as a means to combat discrimination and isolation [15; 38; 41], with the ultimate aim of integrating children with special needs into society as active citizens, fully and equally participating in social and political processes and realizing their own life goals. This position was first articulated at the international level in the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education, the Salamanca Declaration, and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which consolidated this understanding and established corresponding universal requirements for national policies [82; 84].

Inclusive education soon became a striking example of the "global agenda" shaped and promoted by international organizations in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, as educational policies expanded beyond national boundaries. The mechanisms through which global institutions influence national policies and reforms in education vary widely, with their impact depending on local contexts [21; 66; 71]. While the implementation of international agreements by individual countries remains voluntary, many

nations have found themselves with specific obligations—more to the global community than to their own citizens—and their adherence is monitored. It has been argued that in this way, global inclusive education is being imposed on countries without considering the unique historical, political, educational, and cultural factors of each nation [61]. This process is often seen as one-sided, with developed countries of the Global North imposing their models on the Global South, and is regarded as a version of "knowledge colonization" [19], a top-down transfer of "northern concepts" [86, p. 163].

In Russia, the direct activities of international organizations in promoting inclusive education have been less pronounced compared to regions such as Transcaucasia [65] and Central Asia. Nevertheless, like most countries, Russia has been influenced by international organizations and the relevant agreements over the past few decades.

The adoption of international laws comes with a set of values that are not always readily accepted within the social and organizational cultures of post-socialist societies. This often leads to a formal, rather than genuine, implementation of the laws that have been ratified. In some cases, excessive radicalism in reform efforts can occur, as seen in the Czech Republic, where the maximalist interpretations of international recommendations led to the notion that support for students in need of special education in regular schools necessitated the complete elimination of the special education system [75].

Even publications from leading authorities in the Global North now acknowledge the limitations of universal solutions and emphasize the importance of understanding contextual factors, including attitudes, beliefs, social relations, and the cultural, demographic, and economic characteristics of the territories where educational inclusion is being implemented [17].

It is also recognized that much of the research on children with special educational needs and inclusive education has focused on highly developed countries. This limits the ability to generalize findings and underscores the need to expand research to include different contexts [33; 47; 62].

Finally, there are attempts to move beyond the clear “genetic link” between inclusive education and human rights. A large-scale study of educational reforms in 215 countries from 1970 to 2018 found increasing attention to inclusion; however, reforms explicitly framed in the language of “rights” have been decreasing [23].

Russian context

When comparing the development of the inclusive education system in modern Russia with global trends, it becomes apparent that the situation is more complex than some critics suggest, particularly those focusing on its incompleteness and the unresolved legacy of the Soviet model of segregation and discrimination as primary causes [48; 81]. Many features of Russia’s current state of affairs reflect problems that are not unique to the Soviet or Socialist space but are shared by countries in Europe, Asia, and Latin America. These issues include contradictions in legislation, the attitudes and competencies of teachers and parents, financing programs and methodological support for practices, monitoring and statistics, and the balance between segregation, integration, and inclusive components. Furthermore, a general tension exists between the idealism of the global concept of inclusion and the realities faced by educational systems and society.

On one hand, the legacy of the Soviet system undeniably persists and continues to influence inclusive education, but it is far from being solely restricted to mechanisms of segregation, and these mechanisms differ

depending on the specific contexts of individual countries.

On the other hand, many of the challenges in implementing the global concept of inclusive education in Russia are not due to inherent flaws in the concept itself but stem from the nature of reforms during the transitional period. The policy on inclusive education has exhibited characteristics typical of educational and broader social reforms in Russia: top-down implementation, with little regard for coordinating the interests of different groups, particularly beneficiaries; a declaration of guarantees, rights, and opportunities without reliable mechanisms for enforcement; and a rushed push for implementation and oversight without sufficiently developing the necessary details [43]. The education budget is limited, and cost optimization policies often occur at the expense of the social sector. Regarding inclusive education, the inability of countries to provide a comprehensive foundation for implementation (resources, personnel, equipment) is considered a significant limitation of the concept, often cited as a reason to delay or even avoid fulfilling the rights of children with special needs [7; 65]. The discourse of “inclusion for all” is contrasted with “inclusion for some,” which focuses on delivering the highest possible quality of education to children with special needs in specialized environments [58].

If we are to responsibly discuss the future of inclusive education in Russia within the global agenda, the situation becomes even more complicated. As we have indicated, the concept of inclusive education emerged not merely as an educational (pedagogical) concept, but as a political one—an element of the human rights discourse of the 20th and early 21st centuries, aimed at combating discrimination. Like any political concept, inclusion touches upon values, ideals, interests, and questions of power and resource distribution, inevitably creating tension [22; 58].

When examining the history and future prospects for the development of inclusive education in Russia, these factors cannot be overlooked. Attempting to alleviate this tension through purely technocratic solutions is unlikely to succeed. In fact, such solutions can be blocked or fail to achieve the desired outcome without a clear understanding of the interactions among key actors and the broader context. This is particularly crucial given the historical changes unfolding in Russia and their impact on education. These changes go beyond the declared sovereignty of educational policy or the evolving relationships with international organizations advocating for an inclusive agenda.

The principles of prioritizing human and children’s rights, considering minority interests, valuing differences and diversity, and promoting variability and individualization in education — core to the concept of inclusion — were novel in the context of Soviet ideology and became central in post-Soviet educational policy. While these ideas led to the development of several innovative pedagogical concepts (such as “pedagogy of cooperation,” “pedagogy of support” by O. Gazman, and “personally-oriented learning” by I. Yakimanskaya), and practices (e.g., “School of Self-Determination” by A. Tubelsky), they were not widely adopted by mainstream schools or pedagogical theory, and ultimately did not become embedded in the broader pedagogical culture.

Today, there is a growing critical attitude in society toward these values, whether explicitly or implicitly supported at the official level [11]. Notably, the issue of minority interests, the importance of their “voice,” and the protection of their rights is not prioritized; in fact, it is somewhat marginalized. Similarly, the discourse surrounding unique group and individual identities and differences is not supported in official narratives but is instead tabooed.

In this context, it is unsurprising that Russia continues to employ the original “narrow” definition of inclusion, which primarily focuses on children with disabilities and limited health capabilities. This definition is likely to remain dominant in the foreseeable future. An expanded definition of inclusion, which would consider other student groups with diverse characteristics and needs shaped by their social and cultural environments, is neither present in Russian legislation nor reflected in the tools used to assess inclusive environments, the criteria for identifying best practices in general inclusive education, or in new initiatives and memoranda [2; 10; 14].

For example, with regard to children from migrant backgrounds, the requirements are framed within an assimilation model rather than an inclusive one [4]. Although children from indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities have retained important rights related to language instruction and cultural recognition in national regions, their actual conditions, quality of education, and well-being are rarely addressed in official agendas or expert discussions. The concept of “multiculturalism” [8] has not been adopted in Russian education, and domestic versions of multicultural education continue to follow assimilationist narratives based on a homogenized vision of Russian identity [5].

Socio-economic status is also not regarded as a risk factor for poor educational outcomes, nor is it considered a basis for targeted support measures [6]. The methodology of intersectionality — especially considering the “feminist background” of the concept [28] — is unlikely to gain traction in the Russian context. In today’s Russia, the notion of separating from society to nurture group and especially individual “identities” is viewed as a “black sheep.” As a result, the policy of homogenization is likely to persist and intensify.

The prospects for consolidating the current interpretation of inclusion in Russian

education, defined as creating conditions to realize each student's potential by focusing on individual characteristics and needs, appear dim. The topic of individualization or personalization of education — adapting the learning environment and teaching methods to the interests and abilities of each child — appears increasingly rare in state educational policy documents. Moreover, this direction is not supported organizationally, scientifically, or methodologically. The movement toward a more humanized educational process, one that fosters a friendly and comfortable environment for students, is interpreted as pandering to a consumerist view of education and is associated with the “market-service approach” to education [3].

In the global discourse on inclusive education, the “voices” of parents, their rights, and their choices are significant [9]. Over the past decade, Russia has gradually developed a culture that supports the participation of public organizations of parents of children with disabilities and special educational needs in shaping policy, presenting their views, and contributing to government decisions. However, the privileged status of the “voice of parents” and “voice of children” over the “voice of teachers” is causing growing tension within the teaching community. This dynamic is linked to the discourse of “education as a service,” and the government has recently shown concern about maintaining balance, introducing initiatives to protect teachers' rights [12].

Conclusion

The analysis reveals significant contradictions between global trends in educational inclusion and the current state of development in Russian education, as well as broader societal and state dynamics. There is reason to believe that Russian education will not move toward adopting the expanded concept of inclusive education in the near future. Instead,

the model of educational inclusion will likely continue to focus exclusively on children with special needs, combining elements of inclusion, integration, and segregation.

The movement toward fostering an inclusive culture and creating a welcoming environment within educational institutions will remain secondary to the focus on specialization and enhancing the quality of support for children with special educational needs in regular schools. This will occur without substantial changes to the values or daily practices of schools and teachers.

The cultural and political foundations of the global concept of inclusive education — values such as “human rights,” “civil society,” “children's rights,” “diversity,” and “individualization” — were uncritically borrowed and insufficiently integrated into Russian educational policy. These will likely be replaced by traditional values of state paternalism, prioritizing public interests over individual ones and emphasizing support for families and children. This shift has become increasingly relevant in light of both external and internal challenges.

A promising topic for further discussion is whether the Russian situation should be interpreted as an example of unfinished educational reform in Russia (and more broadly, in post-socialist countries) or as a case of the ongoing contextualization and decolonization of inclusive education worldwide. This approach suggests a search for new foundations for inclusive education beyond the framework of “human rights.”

At the same time, perhaps even more important for future research and discussion is the question of how these processes affect the primary beneficiaries — children with special needs. It remains to be seen whether, in the evolving framework of inclusive education, these children will continue to be prioritized or if their needs will be overlooked in the rush for reform, risking the proverbial “throwing the baby out with the bathwater.”

References

1. Alekhina S.V. et al. K voprosu otsenki inklyuzivnogo protsessa v obrazovatel'noi organizatsii: pilotazhnoe issledovanie [Towards an evaluation of the inclusive process in an educational organisation: a pilot study] [Electronic resource]. *Psikhologo-pedagogicheskie issledovaniya = Psychological and pedagogical research*, 2019. Vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 121—132. DOI:10.17759/psyedu.2019110410 (In Russ.).
2. Alekhina S.V. Inklyuzivnoe obrazovanie: ot politiki k praktike [Inclusive education: from policy to practice] [Electronic resource]. *Psikhologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological science and education*, 2016. Vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 136—145. DOI:10.17759/pse.2016210112 (In Russ.).
3. Kabyshev S.V. Prioritet obshchenatsional'nykh interesov — osnova razvitiya sistemy obrazovaniya [Electronic resource] [Priority of national interests is the basis for the development of the education system]. *Parlamentskaya Gazeta = Parliamentary Newspaper*, 2023. URL: <https://www.pnp.ru/social/prioritet-obshhenatsionalnykh-interesov-osnova-razvitiya-sistemy-obrazovaniya.html> (Accessed 23.05.2024). (In Russ.).
4. Kozlova M.A. Moral'nye obosnovaniya upravleniya (etno)kul'turnym raznoobraziem v obrazovatel'nom prostranstve [Moral justifications for managing (ethno) cultural diversity in the educational space]. *Zhurnal issledovaniya sotsial'noi politiki = The Journal of Social Policy Research*, 2022, no. 4. DOI:10.17323/727-0634-2022-4-591-606 (In Russ., abstr. in Engl.).
5. Kozlova M.A. Obrazovatel'naya inklyuziya detei migrantov v ideologicheskikh ustanovkakh shkol'nykh uchitelei [Educational inclusion of migrant children in the ideological attitudes of school teachers]. *Vestnik gosudarstvennogo universiteta Dubna. Seriya: Nauki o cheloveke i obshchestve = Bulletin of Dubna State University. Series: Sciences of Man and Society*, 2020, no. 4, pp. 3—17. DOI:10.37005/2687-0231-2020-0-12-3-17 (In Russ., abstr. in Engl.).
6. Kosaretskii S.G. Obrazovatel'naya politika Rossiiskoi Federatsii postsovetskogo perioda v otnoshenii trudnosti v obuchenii i ravenstva obrazovatel'nykh vozmozhnostei [Educational policy of the Russian Federation of the post-Soviet period in relation to learning difficulties and equality of educational opportunities] [Electronic resource]. *Psikhologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological Science and Education*, 2023. Vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 21—33. DOI:10.17759/pse.2023280502 (In Russ.).
7. Lubovskii V.I. Inklyuziya-tupikovyi put' dlya obucheniya detei s ogranichennymi vozmozhnostyami [Electronic resource] [Inclusion-topic path for teaching children with disabilities]. *Spetsial'noe obrazovanie = Special education*, 2016, no. 4, pp. 77—86. URL: [https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/inklyuziya-tupikovyy-](https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/inklyuziya-tupikovyy-put-dlya-obucheniya-detey-s-ogranichennymi-vozmozhnostyami)
8. Malakhov V.S. Politika razlichii: kul'turnyi plyuralizm i identichnost' [The Politics of Difference: Cultural Pluralism and Identity]. Ed. by V.S. Malakhova. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2023. 288 p. (In Russ.).
9. Malofeev N.N. U istokov otechestvennogo inklyuzivnogo obrazovaniya [Electronic resource] [At the origins of domestic inclusive education]. *Al'manakh № 52 «Inklyuzivnoe obrazovanie: osmyslenie pozitsii i nakoplenno go opyta» = Almanac № 52 «Inclusive Education: Comprehension of positions and accumulated experience»*, 2023. Vol. 5. URL: <https://alldf.ru/ru/articles/almanac-52/at-the-beginning-of-russian-inclusive-education> (Accessed 24.05.2024). (In Russ.).
10. Polozhenie o XI Vserossiiskom konkurse «Luchshaya inklyuzivnaya shkola Rossii — 2024» [Electronic resource] [Regulations on the XI All-Russian Competition "The Best Inclusive School of Russia — 2024"]. Moscow: Ministerstvo prosveshcheniya Rossiiskoi Federatsii, 2024. 24 p. URL: <https://lish.mgppu.ru/src/docs/%D0%9F%D0%9E%D0%9B%D0%9E%D0%96%D0%95%D0%9D%D0%98%D0%95.pdf> (Accessed 15.05.2024). (In Russ.).
11. Roditel'skie komitety vyskazalis' protiv variativnosti v shkole i za novye FGOS [Electronic resource] [Parents' committees spoke out against variability in school and in favour of the new FSES]. *Gazeta pedagogov = Educators' newspaper*, 2018. URL: <https://gazeta-pedagogov.ru/roditelskie-komitety-vyskazalis-protiv-variativnosti-v-shkole-i-zanovye-fgos/?ysclid=1wq9yal9fc602139773> (Accessed 28.05.2024). (In Russ.).
12. Federal'nyi zakon ot 29.12.2012 N 273-FZ (red. ot 29.12.2023) «Ob obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federatsii» [Federal law from 29.12.2012 N 273-FZ (ed. from 29.12.2023) "On Education in the Russian Federation"] (with amendments and additions, effective from 01.05.2024) [Electronic resource]. Konsul'tantPlyus. URL: https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_140174/ (Accessed 21.05.2024). (In Russ.).
13. Yudina T.A., Alekhina S.V. K probleme dokazatel'noi psikhologicheskoi otsenki sotsial'noi kompetentnosti shkol'nikov v inklyuzivnom obrazovanii [To the problem of evidence-based psychological assessment of social competence of schoolchildren in inclusive education] [Electronic resource]. *Sovremennaya zarubezhnaya psikhologiya = Modern foreign psychology*, 2022. Vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 41—50. DOI:10.17759/jmpf.2022110404 (In Russ.).
14. Yaroslavtseva O., Dubov G. Na forume ASI v Surgute predstavili model' tranzitnogo planirovaniya v inklyuzii [Electronic resours] [At the ASI forum in Surgut presented a model of transit planning in

- inclusion]. *Agentstvo strategicheskikh initsiativ = Agency for Strategic Initiatives*, 2024. URL: <https://asi.ru/news/199289/> (Accessed 18.05.2024). (In Russ.).
15. Ainscow M., César M. Inclusive education ten years after Salamanca: Setting the agenda [Electronic resource]. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 2006. Vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 231—238. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23421604> (Accessed 24.05.2024).
16. Ainscow M. Inclusion and equity in education: Making sense of global challenges. *Prospects*, 2020a. Vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 123—134. DOI:10.1007/s11125-020-09506-w
17. Ainscow M. Promoting inclusion and equity in education: lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 2020b. Vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 7—16. DOI:10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587
18. Amor A.M. et al. International perspectives and trends in research on inclusive education: A systematic review. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2019. Vol. 23, no. 12, pp. 1277—1295. DOI:10.1080/13603116.2018.1445304
19. Ariles A.J. Inclusive education in the 21st century disruptive interventions. *The Educational Forum*, 2020. Vol. 84, no. 4, pp. 289—295. DOI:10.1080/00131725.2020.1831821
20. Bakhshaei M., Henderson R.I. Gender at the intersection with race and class in the schooling and wellbeing of immigrant-origin students. *BMC women's health*, 2016. Vol. 16, pp. 1—15. DOI:10.1186/s12905-016-0328-0
21. Ball S.J., Junemann C., Santori D. *Edu. net: Globalisation and education policy mobility*. London: Routledge, 2017. 186 p. DOI:10.4324/9781315630717
22. Barton L. Inclusive education: romantic, subversive or realistic? *International journal of inclusive education*, 1997. Vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 231—242. DOI:10.1080/1360311970010301
23. Bromley P., Nachtigal T., Kijima R. Data as the new panacea: trends in global education reforms, 1970—2018. *Comparative Education*, 2024, pp. 1—22. DOI:10.1080/03050068.2024.2336371
24. Brussino O. Mapping policy approaches and practices for the inclusion of students with special education needs. OECD Education Working Papers, no. 227. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2020. 93 p. DOI:10.1787/600fbad5-en
25. Cerna L. et al. Promoting inclusive education for diverse societies: A conceptual framework. OECD Education Working Papers, no. 260. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2021. 58 p. DOI:10.1787/94ab68c6-en
26. Cole S. et al. A longitudinal study to determine the impact of inclusion on student academic outcomes. Center on Education and Lifelong Learning, Indiana University, 2019.
27. Conrad J., Hardison-Stevens D. Grandmother Cedar as educator: Teacher learning through Native knowledges and sovereignty curriculum. *American Educational Research Journal*, 2024. Vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 211—247. DOI:10.3102/00028312231214455
28. Crenshaw K. Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *Feminist legal theories*. Routledge, 2013, pp. 23—51.
29. Cruz R.A., Firestone A.R., Love M. Beyond a seat at the table: Imagining educational equity through critical inclusion. *Educational Review*, 2024. Vol. 76, no. 1, pp. 69—95. DOI:10.1080/00131911.2023.2173726
30. Dalgaard N.T. et al. The effects of inclusion on academic achievement, socioemotional development and wellbeing of children with special educational needs. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 2022. Vol. 18, no. 4. DOI:10.1002/cl2.1291
31. Day A. et al. (eds.). *Diversity, Inclusion, and Decolonization: Practical Tools for Improving Teaching, Research, and Scholarship*. Bristol: Bristol University Press, 2022.
32. Dessemontet R.S., Bless G., Morin D. Effects of inclusion on the academic achievement and adaptive behaviour of children with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 2012. Vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 579—587. DOI:10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01497
33. Deyrich M.C., Kohout-Diaz M. Inclusive education policy and experience: Global and local perspectives. *European Journal of Education*, 2023. Vol. 58, no. 2. DOI:10.1111/ejed.12559
34. Dyssegaard C.B., Larsen M.S. Evidence on inclusion. Department of Education: Aarhus University. Copengagen: Danish Clearinghouse for Educational Research, 2013. 55 p.
35. Elder B. Decolonizing inclusive education: A collection of practical inclusive CDS-and DisCrit-informed teaching practices. *Disability and the Global South*, 2020. Vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1852—1872.
36. Farrell P. The impact of research on developments in inclusive education. *International Journal of inclusive education*, 2000. Vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 153—162. DOI:10.1080/136031100284867
37. Fauziati E. Child friendly school: principles and practices. The First International Conference on Child — Friendly Education, 2016, pp. 95—101.
38. Felder F. Inclusive education, the dilemma of identity and the common good. *Theory and Research in Education*, 2019. Vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 213—228. DOI:10.1177/1477878519871429
39. Felder F. The value of inclusion. *Journal of philosophy of education*, 2018. Vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 54—70. DOI:10.1111/1467-9752.12280
40. Fitriani S., Qodariah L. A Child-Friendly School: How the School Implements the Model. *International*

- Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 2021. Vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 273—284.
41. Florian L. Inclusion: special or inclusive education: future trends. *British journal of special education*, 2008. Vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 202—208. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-8578.2008.00402.x
42. Florian L. On the necessary co-existence of special and inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2019. Vol. 23, no. 7—8, pp. 691—704. DOI:10.1080/13603116.2019.1622801
43. Froumin I., Kosaretsky S. Transformation of School Education System in Russia: 2007—2017. Leading and Transforming Education Systems: Evidence, Insights, Critique and Reflections / J. Michelle, A. Harris (ed.). Singapore: Springer, 2020, pp. 149—163.
44. Gee K., Gonzalez M., Cooper C. Outcomes of inclusive versus separate placements: A matched pairs comparison study. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 2020. Vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 223—240. DOI:10.1177/1540796920943469
45. Gordon J.S. Is inclusive education a human right? *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 2013. Vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 754—767. DOI:10.1111/jlme.12087
46. Gray P., Norwich B., Webster R. Review of research about the effects of inclusive education: A summary [Electronic resource]. SEN. Policy Research Forum. URL: <https://senpolicyresearchforum.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/Review-of-inclusion-effects-research-final-Feb-21-.pdf> (Accessed 21.05.2024).
47. Grech S. Disability, poverty and development: Critical reflections on the majority world debate. *Disability & Society*, 2009. Vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 771—784. DOI:10.1080/09687590903160266
48. Hanssen N.B., Alekseeva A.A. Inclusion and Inclusive Education in Russia: Analysis of Legislative and Strategic Documents at the State Level between 2012—2014. *Education Sciences*, 2024. Vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 312. DOI:10.3390/educsci14030312
49. Hehir T. et al. A summary of the evidence on inclusive education. Cambridge: ABT Associates, 2016.
50. Hernández-Saca D.I., Voulgarides C.K., Etscheidt S.L. A Critical Systematic Literature Review of Global Inclusive Education Using an Affective, Intersectional, Discursive, Emotive and Material Lens. *Education Sciences*, 2023. Vol. 13, no. 12, 1212. DOI:10.3390/educsci13121212
51. Iarskaia-Smirnova E., Goriainova A. Inclusive education in today's Russia: Room for manoeuvre. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 2022. Vol. 74, no. 3, pp. 426—448. DOI:10.1080/09668136.2021.1918062
52. Jarvis J. et al. Inclusive School Communities Project: Final Evaluation Report. Flinders University: Research in Inclusive and Specialised Education (RISE), 2020.
53. Kalinnikova Magnusson L., Walton E. Challenges arising from the special education legacy in Russia and South Africa: A cross-case analysis. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 2023. Vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 488—505. DOI:10.1080/03057925.2021.1932421
54. Koutsouris G., Bremner N., Stentiford L. Do we have to rethink inclusive pedagogies for secondary schools? A critical systematic review of the international literature. *British Educational Research Journal*, 2024, pp. 260—286. DOI:10.1002/berj.3926
55. Krämer S., Möller J., Zimmermann F. Inclusive education of students with general learning difficulties: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 2021. Vol. 91, no. 3, pp. 432—478. DOI:10.3102/0034654321998072
56. Krischler M., Powell J.J.W., Pit-Ten Cate I.M. What is meant by inclusion? On the effects of different definitions on attitudes toward inclusive education. *European journal of special needs education*, 2019. Vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 632—648. DOI:10.1080/08856257.2019.1580837
57. Kutepova E. et al. Teachers' attitudes towards policy and practice of inclusion and inclusive education in Russia. Dialogues between Northern and Eastern Europe on the Development of Inclusion. N.B. Hanssen, S.-E. Hansén, K. Ström (ed.). London: Routledge, 2021, pp. 117—133.
58. Leijen Ä., Arcidiacono F., Baucal A. The dilemma of inclusive education: Inclusion for some or inclusion for all. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2021. Vol. 12, 633066. DOI:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.633066
59. Liasidou A. Politics of inclusive education policy-making: the case of Cyprus 4784 (excluding references). *International journal of inclusive education*, 2008. Vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 229—241. DOI:10.1080/13603110600996921
60. Lindsay G. Educational psychology and the effectiveness of inclusive education/mainstreaming. *British journal of educational psychology*, 2007. Vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 1—24. DOI:10.1348/000709906X156881
61. Martini M. et al. In search of a global community: a multivocal critique of UNESCO's education commons discourse. *Journal of Education Policy*, 2024. pp. 1—17. DOI:10.1080/02680939.2024.2339914
62. Mendoza M., Heymann J. Implementation of inclusive education: A systematic review of studies of inclusive education interventions in low-and lower-middle-income countries. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 2024. Vol. 71, no. 3, pp. 299—316. DOI:10.1080/1034912X.2022.2095359
63. Merrigan C., Senior J. Special schools at the crossroads of inclusion: do they have a value, purpose, and educational responsibility in an inclusive education system? *Irish Educational Studies*, 2023. Vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 275—291. DOI:10.1080/03323315.2021.1964563
64. Mezzanotte C. The Social and Economic Rationale of Inclusive Education: An Overview of the Outcomes

- in Education for Diverse Groups of Students. OECD Education Working Papers, No. 263. OECD Publishing, 2022. DOI:10.1787/bff7a85d-en
65. Mikayilova U. Inclusive education reform/s in Azerbaijan: An attempt at critical policy analysis. *Azerbaijan Journal of Educational Studies*, 2019. Vol. 3, pp. 37—48.
66. Mundy K. et al. (ed.). Handbook of global education policy. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2016. 605 p.
67. Nilholm C. Research about inclusive education in 2020—How can we improve our theories in order to change practice? *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 2021. Vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 358—370. DOI:10.1080/08856257.2020.1754547
68. Norwich B. Addressing tensions and dilemmas in inclusive education: Living with uncertainty. London: Routledge, 2013. 200 p. DOI:10.4324/9780203118436
69. Norwich B. Research about inclusive education: Are the scope, reach and limits empirical and methodological and/or conceptual and evaluative? *Frontiers in Education*, 2022. Vol. 7, 937929. DOI:10.3389/educ.2022.937929
70. OECD. Equity and Inclusion in Education: Finding Strength through Diversity. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2023. DOI:10.1787/e9072e21-en
71. Portnoi L.M. Policy borrowing and reform in education: Globalized Processes and Local Contexts. 1st ed. Nature America incorporated. New York: Springer, 2016. 271 p.
72. Ruijs N.M., Peetsma T.T.D. Effects of inclusion on students with and without special educational needs reviewed. *Educational research review*, 2009. Vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 67—79. DOI:10.1016/j.edurev.2009.02.002
73. Scharenberg K., Rollett W., Bos W. Do differences in classroom composition provide unequal opportunities for academic learning and social participation of SEN students in inclusive classes in primary school? *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 2019. Vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 309—327. DOI:10.1080/09243453.2019.1590423
74. Schwab S., Sharma U., Hoffmann L. How inclusive are the teaching practices of my German, Maths and English teachers? — psychometric properties of a newly developed scale to assess personalisation and differentiation in teaching practices. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2022. Vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 61—76. DOI:10.1080/13603116.2019.1629121
75. Štech S., Smetáčková I. Teacher and parental views on inclusive education policy lending in the Czech Republic. *European Journal of Education*, 2023. Vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 233—244. DOI:10.1111/ejed.12557
76. Stegemann K.C., Jaciw A.P. Making It Logical: Implementation of Inclusive Education Using a Logic Model Framework. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 2018. Vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 3—18.
77. Stepaniuk I. Inclusive education in Eastern European countries: a current state and future directions. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2019. Vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 328—352. DOI:10.1080/13603116.2018.1430180
78. Symeonidou S. (ed.). Evidence of the Link between Inclusive Education and Social Inclusion: A Review of the Literature. Odense: European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2018.
79. UNESCO. A Guide for Ensuring Inclusion and Equity in Education [Electronic resource]. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2017. 46 p. URL: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000248254> (Accessed 21.05.2024).
80. UNESCO. Embracing Diversity: Tool kit for creating inclusive learning friendly environment. Paris: UNESCO, 2015. 344 p.
81. UNESCO. Global Education Monitoring Report 2021 — Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia — Inclusion and education: All means all. Paris: UNESCO, 2021. 184 p.
82. UNESCO. The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. Paris: UNESCO, 1994.
83. UNICEF. Child friendly schools Manual. New York: UNICEF, 2009. 244 p. URL: <https://www.unicef.org/media/66486/file/Child-Friendly-Schools-Manual.pdf> (Accessed 21.05.2024).
84. United Nations. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. 2016. URL: <http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/facts.shtml.2006> (Accessed 19.05.2024).
85. Varsik S., Gorochovskij J. Intersectionality in education: Rationale and practices to address the needs of students' intersecting identities: OECD Education Working Papers, No. 302. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2023. DOI:10.1787/dbb1e821-en
86. Werning R. [Hrsg.] et al. Keeping the promise? Contextualizing inclusive education in developing countries. Bad Heilbrunn: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt, 2016. 185 p. DOI:10.25656/01:12353

Литература

1. Алехина С.В. Инклюзивное образование: от политики к практике [Электронный ресурс] // Психологическая наука и образование. 2016. Т. 21. № 1. С. 136—145. DOI:10.17759/pspe.2016210112

2. Алехина С.В. и др. К вопросу оценки инклюзивного процесса в образовательной организации: пилотажное исследование [Электронный ресурс] // Психолого-педагогические исследования. 2019. Т. 11. № 4. С. 121—132. DOI:10.17759/psyedu.2019110410

3. Кабышев С.В. Приоритет общенациональных интересов — основа развития системы образования [Электронный ресурс] // Парламентская газета. 2023. URL: <https://www.pnp.ru/social/prioritet-obshhenacionalnykh-interesov-osnova-razvitiya-sistemy-obrazovaniya.html> (дата обращения: 23.05.2024).
4. Козлова М.А. Образовательная инклюзия детей мигрантов в идеологических установках школьных учителей // Вестник государственного университета Дубна. Серия: Науки о человеке и обществе. 2020. № 4. С. 3—17. DOI:10.37005/2687-0231-2020-0-12-3-17
5. Козлова М.А. Моральные обоснования управления (этно)культурным разнообразием в образовательном пространстве // Журнал исследования социальной политики. 2022. № 4. DOI:10.17323/727-0634-2022-20-4-591-606
6. Косарецкий С.Г. Образовательная политика Российской Федерации постсоветского периода в отношении трудностей в обучении и равенства образовательных возможностей [Электронный ресурс] // Психологическая наука и образование. 2023. Т. 28. № 5. С. 21—33. DOI:10.17759/pse.2023280502
7. Лубовский В.И. Инклюзия — тупиковый путь для обучения детей с ограниченными возможностями [Электронный ресурс] // Специальное образование. 2016. № 4. С. 77—86. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/inklyuziya-tupikovyy-put-dlya-obucheniya-detey-s-ogranichenymi-vozmozhnostyami> (дата обращения: 13.05.2024).
8. Малахов В.С. Политика различий: культурный плюрализм и идентичность / Под ред. В.С. Малахова. М.: Новое литературное обозрение, 2023. 288 с.
9. Малофеев Н.Н. У истоков отечественного инклюзивного образования [Электронный ресурс] // Альманах № 52 «Инклюзивное образование: осмысление позиций и накопленного опыта». Т. 5. 2023. URL: <https://alldef.ru/ru/articles/almanac-52/at-the-beginning-of-russian-inclusive-education> (дата обращения: 24.05.2024).
10. Положение о XI Всероссийском конкурсе «Лучшая инклюзивная школа России — 2024» [Электронный ресурс]. М: Министерство просвещения Российской Федерации, 2024. 24 с. URL: <https://lish.mgppu.ru/src/docs/%D0%9F%D0%9E%D0%9B%D0%9E%D0%96%D0%95%D0%9D%D0%98%D0%95.pdf> (дата обращения: 15.05.2024).
11. Родительские комитеты высказались против вариативности в школе и за новые ФГОС [Электронный ресурс] // Газета педагогов. 2018. URL: <https://gazeta-pedagogov.ru/roditelskie-komitety-vyskazalis-protiv-variantivnosti-v-shkole-i-za-novye-fgos/>?ysclid=lwq9yal9fc602139773 (дата обращения: 28.05.2024).
12. Федеральный закон от 29.12.2012 № 273-ФЗ (ред. от 29.12.2023) «Об образовании в Российской Федерации» (с изм. и доп., вступ. в силу с 01.05.2024) [Электронный ресурс] // КонсультантПлюс. URL: https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_140174/ (дата обращения: 21.05.2024).
13. Юдина Т.А., Алехина С.В. К проблеме доказательной психологической оценки социальной компетентности школьников в инклюзивном образовании [Электронный ресурс] // Современная зарубежная психология. 2022. Т. 11. № 4. С. 41—50. DOI:10.17759/jmfp.2022110404
14. Ярославцева О., Дубов Г. На форуме АСИ в Сургуте представили модель транзитного планирования в инклюзии [Электронный ресурс] // Агентство стратегических инициатив. 2024. URL: <https://asi.ru/news/199289/> (дата обращения: 18.05.2024).
15. Ainscow M., C sar M. Inclusive education ten years after Salamanca: Setting the agenda [Электронный ресурс] // European Journal of Psychology of Education. 2006. Vol. 21. № 3. P. 231—238. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23421604> (дата обращения: 24.05.2024).
16. Ainscow M. Inclusion and equity in education: Making sense of global challenges // Prospects. 2020a. Vol. 49. № 3. P. 123—134. DOI:10.1007/s11125-020-09506-w
17. Ainscow M. Promoting inclusion and equity in education: lessons from international experiences // Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy. 2020b. Vol. 6. № 1. P. 7—16. DOI:10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587
18. Amor A.M. et al. International perspectives and trends in research on inclusive education: A systematic review // International Journal of Inclusive Education. 2019. Vol. 23. № 12. P. 1277—1295. DOI:10.1080/13603116.2018.1445304
19. Artiles A.J. Inclusive education in the 21st century disruptive interventions // The Educational Forum. 2020. Vol. 84. № 4. P. 289—295. DOI:10.1080/00131725.2020.1831821
20. Bakhshaei M., Henderson R.I. Gender at the intersection with race and class in the schooling and wellbeing of immigrant-origin students // BMC women's health. 2016. Vol. 16. P. 1—15. DOI:10.1186/s12905-016-0328-0
21. Ball S.J., Junemann C., Santori D. Edu. net: Globalisation and education policy mobility. London: Routledge, 2017. 186 p. DOI:10.4324/9781315630717
22. Barton L. Inclusive education: romantic, subversive or realistic? // International journal of inclusive education. 1997. Vol. 1. № 3. P. 231—242. DOI:10.1080/1360311970010301
23. Bromley P., Nachtigal T., Kijima R. Data as the new panacea: trends in global education reforms, 1970—

- 2018 // *Comparative Education*. 2024. P. 1—22. DOI:10.1080/03050068.2024.2336371
24. *Brussino O.* Mapping policy approaches and practices for the inclusion of students with special education needs // *OECD Education Working Papers*. No. 227. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2020. 93 p. DOI:10.1787/600fbad5-en
25. *Cerna L. et al.* Promoting inclusive education for diverse societies: A conceptual framework // *OECD Education Working Papers*. No. 260. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2021. 58 p. DOI:10.1787/94ab68c6-en
26. *Cole S. et al.* A longitudinal study to determine the impact of inclusion on student academic outcomes. Center on Education and Lifelong Learning, Indiana University, 2019.
27. *Conrad J., Hardison-Stevens D.* Grandmother Cedar as educator: Teacher learning through Native knowledges and sovereignty curriculum // *American Educational Research Journal*. 2024. Vol. 61. № 2. P. 211—247. DOI:10.3102/00028312231214455
28. *Crenshaw K.* Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics // *Feminist legal theories*. Routledge. 2013. P. 23—51.
29. *Cruz R.A., Firestone A.R., Love M.* Beyond a seat at the table: Imagining educational equity through critical inclusion // *Educational Review*. 2024. Vol. 76. № 1. P. 69—95. DOI:10.1080/00131911.2023.2173726
30. *Dalgaard N.T. et al.* The effects of inclusion on academic achievement, socioemotional development and wellbeing of children with special educational needs // *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. 2022. Vol. 18. № 4. DOI:10.1002/cl2.1291
31. *Day A. et al. (eds.)*. Diversity, Inclusion, and Decolonization: Practical Tools for Improving Teaching, Research, and Scholarship. Bristol: Bristol University Press, 2022.
32. *Dessementet R.S., Bless G., Morin D.* Effects of inclusion on the academic achievement and adaptive behaviour of children with intellectual disabilities // *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*. 2012. Vol. 56. № 6. P. 579—587. DOI:10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01497
33. *Deyrich M.C., Kohout-Diaz M.* Inclusive education policy and experience: Global and local perspectives // *European Journal of Education*. 2023. Vol. 58. № 2. DOI:10.1111/ejed.12559
34. *Dyssegaard C.B., Larsen M.S.* Evidence on inclusion. Department of Education: Aarhus University, Copengagen: Danish Clearinghouse for Educational Research, 2013. 55 p.
35. *Elder B.* Decolonizing inclusive education: A collection of practical inclusive CDS-and DisCrit-informed teaching practices // *Disability and the Global South*. 2020. Vol. 7. № 1. P. 1852—1872.
36. *Farrell P.* The impact of research on developments in inclusive education // *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2000. Vol. 4. № 2. P. 153—162. DOI:10.1080/136031100284867
37. *Fauziati E.* Child friendly school: principles and practices // *The First International Conference on Child — Friendly Education*. 2016. P. 95—101.
38. *Felder F.* Inclusive education, the dilemma of identity and the common good // *Theory and Research in Education*. 2019. Vol. 17. № 2. P. 213—228. DOI:10.1177/1477878519871429
39. *Felder F.* The value of inclusion // *Journal of philosophy of education*. 2018. Vol. 52. № 1. P. 54—70. DOI:10.1111/1467-9752.12280
40. *Fitriani S., Qodariah L.* A Child-Friendly School: How the School Implements the Model // *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*. 2021. Vol. 10. № 1. P. 273—284.
41. *Florian L.* Inclusion: special or inclusive education: future trends // *British journal of special education*. 2008. Vol. 35. № 4. P. 202—208. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-8578.2008.00402.x
42. *Florian L.* On the necessary co-existence of special and inclusive education // *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2019. Vol. 23. № 7-8. P. 691—704. DOI:10.1080/13603116.2019.1622801
43. *Froumin I., Kosaretsky S.* Transformation of School Education System in Russia: 2007—2017 // *Leading and Transforming Education Systems: Evidence, Insights, Critique and Reflections / J. Michelle, A. Harris (ed.)*. Singapore: Springer, 2020. P. 149—163.
44. *Gee K., Gonzalez M., Cooper C.* Outcomes of inclusive versus separate placements: A matched pairs comparison study // *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*. 2020. Vol. 45. № 4. P. 223—240. DOI:10.1177/1540796920943469
45. *Gordon J.S.* Is inclusive education a human right? // *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*. 2013. Vol. 41. № 4. P. 754—767. DOI:10.1111/jlme.12087
46. *Gray P., Norwich B., Webster R.* Review of research about the effects of inclusive education: A summary [Электронный ресурс]. SEN. Policy Research Forum. URL: <https://senpolicyresearchforum.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/Review-of-inclusion-effects-research-final-Feb-21-.pdf> (дата обращения: 21.05.2024).
47. *Grech S.* Disability, poverty and development: Critical reflections on the majority world debate // *Disability & Society*. 2009. Vol. 24. № 6. P. 771—784. DOI:10.1080/09687590903160266
48. *Hanssen N.B., Alekseeva A.A.* Inclusion and Inclusive Education in Russia: Analysis of Legislative and Strategic Documents at the State Level between 2012—2014 // *Education Sciences*. 2024. Vol. 14. № 3. P. 312. DOI:10.3390/educsci14030312
49. *Hehir T. et al.* A summary of the evidence on inclusive education. Cambridge: ABT Associates, 2016.

50. *Hernández-Saca D.I., Voulgarides C.K., Etscheidt S.L.* A Critical Systematic Literature Review of Global Inclusive Education Using an Affective, Intersectional, Discursive, Emotive and Material Lens // *Education Sciences*. 2023. Vol. 13. № 12. 1212. DOI:10.3390/educsci13121212
51. *Iarskaia-Smirnova E., Goriainova A.* Inclusive education in today's Russia: Room for manoeuvre // *Europe-Asia Studies*. 2022. Vol. 74. № 3. P. 426—448. DOI:10.1080/09668136.2021.1918062
52. *Jarvis J. et al.* Inclusive School Communities Project: Final Evaluation Report. Flinders University: Research in Inclusive and Specialised Education (RISE), 2020.
53. *Kalinnikova Magnusson L., Walton E.* Challenges arising from the special education legacy in Russia and South Africa: A cross-case analysis // *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*. 2023. Vol. 53. № 3. P. 488—505. DOI:10.1080/03057925.2021.1932421
54. *Koutsouris G., Bremner N., Stentiford L.* Do we have to rethink inclusive pedagogies for secondary schools? A critical systematic review of the international literature // *British Educational Research Journal*. 2024. P. 260—286. DOI:10.1002/berj.3926
55. *Krämer S., Möller J., Zimmermann F.* Inclusive education of students with general learning difficulties: A meta-analysis // *Review of Educational Research*. 2021. Vol. 91. № 3. P. 432—478. DOI:10.3102/0034654321998072
56. *Krischler M., Powell J.J.W., Pit-Ten Cate I.M.* What is meant by inclusion? On the effects of different definitions on attitudes toward inclusive education // *European journal of special needs education*. 2019. Vol. 34. № 5. P. 632—648. DOI:10.1080/08856257.2019.1580837
57. *Kutepova E. et al.* Teachers' attitudes towards policy and practice of inclusion and inclusive education in Russia // *Dialogues between Northern and Eastern Europe on the Development of Inclusion / N.B. Hanssen, S.-E. Hansén, K. Ström (ed.)*. London: Routledge, 2021. P. 117—133.
58. *Leijen Á., Arcidiacono F., Baucal A.* The dilemma of inclusive education: inclusion for some or inclusion for all // *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2021. Vol. 12, 633066. DOI:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.633066
59. *Liasidou A.* Politics of inclusive education policy-making: the case of Cyprus 4784 (excluding references) // *International journal of inclusive education*. 2008. Vol. 12. № 3. P. 229—241. DOI:10.1080/13603110600996921
60. *Lindsay G.* Educational psychology and the effectiveness of inclusive education/mainstreaming // *British journal of educational psychology*. 2007. Vol. 77. № 1. P. 1—24. DOI:10.1348/000709906X156881
61. *Martini M., Moscovitz H., Fernández Ugalde R., Hansen M., Hughson T., Marfán J., Tozan O.* In search of a global community: a multivocal critique of UNESCO's education commons discourse // *Journal of Education Policy*. 2024. P. 1—17. DOI:10.1080/02680939.2024.2339914
62. *Mendoza M., Heymann J.* Implementation of inclusive education: A systematic review of studies of inclusive education interventions in low-and lower-middle-income countries // *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*. 2024. Vol. 71. № 3. P. 299—316. DOI:10.1080/1034912X.2022.2095359
63. *Merrigan C., Senior J.* Special schools at the crossroads of inclusion: do they have a value, purpose, and educational responsibility in an inclusive education system? // *Irish Educational Studies*. 2023. Vol. 42. № 2. P. 275—291. DOI:10.1080/03323315.2021.1964563
64. *Mezzanotte C.* The Social and Economic Rationale of Inclusive Education: An Overview of the Outcomes in Education for Diverse Groups of Students // *OECD Education Working Papers*. No. 263. OECD Publishing, 2022. DOI:10.1787/bff7a85d-en
65. *Mikaylova U.* Inclusive education reforms in Azerbaijan: An attempt at critical policy analysis // *Azerbaijan Journal of Educational Studies*. 2019. Vol. 3. P. 37—48.
66. *Mundy K. et al. (ed.)*. Handbook of global education policy. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2016. 605 p.
67. *Nilholm C.* Research about inclusive education in 2020 — How can we improve our theories in order to change practice? // *European Journal of Special Needs Education*. 2021. Vol. 36. № 3. P. 358—370. DOI:10.1080/08856257.2020.1754547
68. *Norwich B.* Addressing tensions and dilemmas in inclusive education: Living with uncertainty. London: Routledge, 2013. 200 p. DOI:10.4324/9780203118436
69. *Norwich B.* Research about inclusive education: Are the scope, reach and limits empirical and methodological and/or conceptual and evaluative? // *Frontiers in Education*. 2022. Vol. 7, 937929. DOI:10.3389/feduc.2022.937929
70. *OECD.* Equity and Inclusion in Education: Finding Strength through Diversity. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2023. DOI:10.1787/e9072e21-en
71. *Portnoi L.* Policy borrowing and reform in education: Globalized Processes and Local Contexts. 1st ed. Nature America incorporated. New York: Springer, 2016. 271 p.
72. *Ruijs N., Peetsma T.* Effects of inclusion on students with and without special educational needs reviewed // *Educational research review*. 2009. Vol. 4. № 2. P. 67—79. DOI:10.1016/j.edurev.2009.02.002
73. *Scharenberg K., Rollett W., Bos W.* Do differences in classroom composition provide unequal opportunities for academic learning and social participation of SEN students in inclusive classes in primary school? // *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. 2019. Vol. 30. № 3. P. 309—327. DOI:10.1080/09243453.2019.1590423

74. Schwab S., Sharma U., Hoffmann L. How inclusive are the teaching practices of my German, Maths and English teachers? — psychometric properties of a newly developed scale to assess personalisation and differentiation in teaching practices // *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2022. Vol. 26. № 1. P. 61—76. DOI:10.1080/13603116.2019.1629121
75. Štech S., Smetáčková I. Teacher and parental views on inclusive education policy lending in the Czech Republic // *European Journal of Education*. 2023. Vol. 58. № 2. P. 233—244. DOI:10.1111/ejed.12557
76. Stegemann K.C., Jaciw A.P. Making It Logical: Implementation of Inclusive Education Using a Logic Model Framework // *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*. 2018. Vol. 16. № 1. P. 3—18.
77. Stepaniuk I. Inclusive education in Eastern European countries: a current state and future directions // *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2019. Vol. 23. № 3. P. 328—352. DOI:10.1080/13603116.2018.1430180
78. Symeonidou S. (ed.). Evidence of the Link between Inclusive Education and Social Inclusion: A Review of the Literature. Odense: European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education. 2018.
79. UNESCO. A Guide for Ensuring Inclusion and Equity in Education [Электронный ресурс]. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2017. 46 p. URL: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000248254> (дата обращения: 21.05.2024).
80. UNESCO. Embracing Diversity: Tool kit for creating inclusive learning friendly environment. Paris: UNESCO, 2015. 344 p.
81. UNESCO. Global Education Monitoring Report 2021 — Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia — Inclusion and education: All means all. Paris: UNESCO, 2021. 184 p.
82. UNESCO. The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. Paris: UNESCO, 1994.
83. UNICEF. Child friendly schools Manual [Электронный ресурс]. New York: UNICEF, 2009. 244 p. URL: <https://www.unicef.org/media/66486/file/Child-Friendly-Schools-Manual.pdf> (дата обращения: 21.05.2024).
84. United Nations. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities [Электронный ресурс]. 2016. URL: <http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/facts.shtml>. 2006 (дата обращения: 19.05.2024).
85. Varsik S., Gorochevskij J. Intersectionality in education: Rationale and practices to address the needs of students' intersecting identities: OECD Education Working Papers. No. 302. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2023. DOI:10.1787/dbb1e821-en
86. Werning R. [Hrsg.] et al. Keeping the promise? Contextualizing inclusive education in developing countries. Bad Heilbrunn: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt, 2016. 185 p. DOI:10.25656/01:12353

Information about the authors

Sergey G. Kosaretsky, PhD in Psychology, Director, Center of General and Extracurricular Education, Institute of Education, Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8905-8983>, e-mail: skosaretski@hse.ru

Информация об авторах

Косарецкий Сергей Геннадьевич, кандидат психологических наук, директор центра общего и дополнительного образования имени А.А. Пинского Института образования, ФГАОУ ВО «Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики» (ФГАОУ ВО «НИУ ВШЭ»), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8905-8983>, e-mail: skosaretski@hse.ru

Получена 26.07.2024

Принята в печать 29.10.2024

Received 26.07.2024

Accepted 29.10.2024