

Opinion of Teachers on Inclusive Education in the Russian Federation

Ishat N. Nurlygayanov

Institute of Correctional Pedagogy, Moscow, Russia

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0370-3679>, e-mail: nilshat.ufa@gmail.com

Svetlana B. Lazurenko

Head of the Center for Inclusive Education Development of the Russian Academy of Education, Moscow, Russia

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0642-8545>, e-mail: preeducation@gmail.com

The paper presents the results of the analysis of the empirical research of teachers' opinion about the status of inclusive education in the Russian Federation. The comparative analysis was focused on the answers of teachers of special (correctional) schools (N=192), teachers working in an inclusive format (N=210) to the questions of the author's questionnaire regarding professional training and work experience, ideas about the compliance of inclusive education with the special educational needs of schoolchildren with disabilities, existing problems in the implementation of the pedagogical process and ways to overcome them, the prospects for the implementation of inclusive education. It was revealed that the opinion of teachers working in educational organizations with different models of education for children with disabilities have both common positions and specific ones. Differences to a greater extent concern the expediency of spreading inclusive education for a number of psychological and pedagogical categories of children due to the presence of significant psychological difficulties and low performance of the educational process at high cost.

Keywords: special education; inclusive education; teacher; educational process; school; disability; inclusion; special educational needs.

For citation: Nurlygayanov I.N., Lazurenko S.B. Opinion of Teachers on Inclusive Education in the Russian Federation. *Psikhologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological Science and Education*, 2024. Vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 99—109. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2024290508> (In Russ.).

Представления педагогов о реализации педагогического процесса в условиях инклюзивного образования детей с ОВЗ в России

Нурлыгаянов И.Н.

ФГБНУ «Институт коррекционной педагогики» (ФГБНУ ИКП),

г. Москва, Российская Федерация

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0370-3679>, e-mail: nilshat.ufa@gmail.com

Лазуренко С.Б.

Центр развития инклюзивного образования ФГБУ «Российская академия

образования» (ФГБУ РАО), г. Москва, Российская Федерация

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0642-8545>, e-mail: preeducation@gmail.com

В работе изложены результаты эмпирического исследования представлений педагогов о состоянии инклюзивного образования в Российской Федерации. Сравнительному анализу подверглись ответы педагогов специальных (коррекционных) школ (N=192), педагогов, работающих в инклюзивном формате (N=210), на вопросы авторской анкеты в отношении профессиональной подготовки и опыта работы, представлений о соответствии инклюзивного образования особым образовательным потребностям школьников с ОВЗ, существующих проблем реализации педагогического процесса и путей их преодоления, перспектив реализации инклюзивного образования. Выявлено, что в представлениях педагогов, работающих в образовательных организациях с разными моделями образования детей с ОВЗ, есть и общее, и специфическое. Различия в большей степени касаются целесообразности распространения инклюзивного образования для ряда психолого-педагогических категорий детей в связи с наличием существенных психологических трудностей и низкой результативности образовательного процесса при высокой его себестоимости.

Ключевые слова: специальное образование; инклюзивное образование; педагог; образовательный процесс; школа; ограниченные возможности здоровья; инклюзия; особые образовательные потребности.

Для цитаты: Нурлыгаянов И.Н., Лазуренко С.Б. Представления педагогов о реализации педагогического процесса в условиях инклюзивного образования детей с ОВЗ в России // Психологическая наука и образование. 2024. Том 29. № 5. С. 99—109. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2024290508>

Abstract

Over two decades have elapsed since the integration of inclusive processes into educational frameworks for children with disabilities commenced. Within both pedagogical and parental domains, a diverse range of opinions has emerged concerning the effectiveness and efficiency of educating children with disabilities in

inclusive settings. Presently, there exists a unique opportunity to examine the perceptions of various stakeholders involved in the educational process regarding inclusive education for these children.

The effectiveness and satisfaction derived from the educational experience are often assessed through the viewpoints of three primary participants: the child with disabilities, their parents

or legal guardians, and educators. The successful implementation of inclusive education is significantly influenced by the professional competencies of teachers, who play a crucial role in determining curriculum content, organizing the educational environment, fostering relationships with parents and students, and ensuring the overall effectiveness and outcomes of the educational process.

Thus, a comprehensive analysis and synthesis of teachers' opinions regarding the educational process were conducted to illuminate their insights into the current state of inclusive education. This analysis draws upon extensive experience in teaching distinct groups of students with disabilities, aiming to provide a clearer understanding of the challenges and successes encountered in this evolving educational landscape.

Studies conducted several years ago showed that teachers of general education schools frequently expressed negative attitudes regarding preparedness to teach and engage with children with disabilities within an inclusive framework [9; 13]. For an extended period in domestic education, certain groups of children (primarily those with moderate and profound mental retardation, severe and multiple developmental disorders) were deemed "unteachable". Democratic processes at the end of the 20th century facilitated the enactment of normative documents that actualized the constitutional right to education for all Russian citizens, without exception [5; 10; 12]. Moreover, as part of the ongoing humanization of education, the stigmatization and isolation of children with disabilities, who were traditionally confined to special schools, were gradually removed. Since this period, there has been an increase in the number of children with disabilities enrolled in educational organizations in different formats of the inclusive model. In this aspect, the authors of the article are interested in the issue of transformation of the system of teachers' views on inclusive education and the prospects for its implementation in recent years.

In the realm of international science numerous studies elucidate the philosophical and theoretical-methodological underpinnings, principles of implementation and content, advantages and limitations of inclusive education [15; 16; 17]. The unique characteristics governing

the organization and execution of specialized educational content for children with disabilities within inclusive settings are influenced by a myriad of social, cultural, psychological and pedagogical factors, which makes it impossible to simply transfer the results of empirical studies conducted in foreign countries to domestic pedagogical practice. This assertion is corroborated by the works of N.N. Malofeev [7; 8], in which the development and current state of the system of education of children with disabilities in foreign countries and Russia are meticulously disclosed. Within the domestic academic landscape there exists a body of work focusing on philosophy and methodology, alongside principles of organization and implementation of social foundations and values of participants of inclusive education [1; 3; 4; 6; 11]. Notably, our investigation necessitates particular emphasis on the works [2; 14], that scrutinize the perspectives of educators and the parental community regarding the environmental factors and conditions conducive to fostering inclusive education across the Russian Federation.

The objective of our study was to elucidate educators' perceptions regarding the alignment of inclusive education with the specific educational needs of schoolchildren with disabilities. Additionally, we sought to explore the challenges encountered within the educational process as it is implemented in an inclusive framework.

Organization of the study, characteristics of the sample and instrumentation

The research involved educators from various institutions dedicated to the education of children with disabilities across different regions of Russia. The sample comprised 192 teachers from special schools, with an average age of 46.6 years, an average teaching experience of 22.8 years, and an average of 14.7 years working specifically with children with disabilities. In contrast, 210 teachers engaged in inclusive education had an average age of 45.1 years, an average teaching experience of 21.7 years, and an average of only 8.9 years of experience working with children with disabilities. It is particularly salient to note that educators operating within the inclusive framework possess comparatively less

pedagogical experience with this demographic, a phenomenon that correlates with the gradual integration of this educational model as legislative reforms governing the educational landscape have progressed [5]. Moreover, it is intriguing to observe that over 90% of respondents reported possessing pedagogical qualifications across a spectrum of training disciplines. The remaining participants held degrees in diverse fields such as economics, management, law, and engineering. Among teachers in special schools, a substantial majority (76%) specialized in areas such as special pedagogy and psychology, while 20% had undergone retraining; only 4% lacked relevant educational credentials. In contrast, among those engaged in inclusive education, 35% possessed qualifications in defectology, 45% had pursued retraining initiatives, and 20% did not hold pertinent educational qualifications.

The research method was a questionnaire developed by the authors of the article. In the questionnaire the respondents had to provide the following information:

- 1) Age.
- 2) Specialty in the diploma.
- 3) Pedagogical experience.
- 4) Experience of pedagogical work with children with disabilities.
- 5) Education in the field of defectology (higher or secondary professional education, retraining, lack of education).
- 6) Pedagogical activity of the specialist is realized in the format (special education, inclusive education).
- 7) For which category of schoolchildren inclusive education can be recommended (categories of schoolchildren are listed in Table 1).
- 8) Parameters of the educational process in inclusive education in terms of the difficulty of their realization (ranking each parameter from 1 to 5 points, where 1 — no difficulties, 5 — significant difficulties). These parameters are presented in Table 2.

Statistical processing of the results was carried out in Statistica 12.0 program. Checking the data by Shapiro-Wilk W-test showed that they differ from normal distribution. Accordingly, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare the data. The χ^2 test was used to compare nominal data.

Results of the study

The findings from the comparative analysis elucidate the complex interplay between educators' perceptions regarding the current status and prospective advancements of inclusive education in the Russian Federation, particularly as these perceptions relate to their professional training and experiential backgrounds with children who have disabilities. With education in the field of special pedagogy and psychology, 76% of special school teachers, along with 20% of those with basic pedagogical education retrained, with more than 10 years of pedagogical experience with children with disabilities, believe that the inclusive form of education is suitable for children with a small number of special educational needs due to mild disabilities stemming from reduced functioning of analyzers and/or psychological immaturity of various genesis (with mental retardation). These specific educational needs can be adeptly accommodated within mainstream educational frameworks through the strategic establishment of additional roles for defectologists, the procurement of specialized equipment and instructional materials, and the augmentation of teachers' professional competencies. Moreover, a holistic approach involving comprehensive psychological and pedagogical support for educators, students, and their families is imperative. Notably, educators from general education institutions who have engaged in retraining in defectology (45% of respondents) and those without such qualifications (20%) convey a markedly more optimistic evaluation of their pedagogical readiness, instructional efficacy, and the overall state of inclusive education.

Consequently, educators operating within specialized institutions maintain that inclusive education significantly enhances the capacity to meet the distinct educational needs of hearing-impaired students. Conversely, instructors engaged in inclusive environments assert that this educational paradigm is equally adept at accommodating children across a diverse spectrum of psychological and pedagogical classifications. This includes not only those who are blind or visually impaired but also deaf or hearing-impaired students, as well as individuals with profound intellectual and speech impairments, alongside those experiencing severe multiple developmental disorders.

Table 1

Comparative analysis of teachers' perceptions of the recommendation of inclusive education to different categories of students with disabilities

Category of students	Teachers (inclusive education)	Teachers (special education)	χ^2	p, significance level
Visually impaired	138	112	2,32	0,1274
Blind	38	16	8,22	0,0041
Hearing impaired	78	96	12,52	0,0004
Deaf	38	2	34,48	0,0000
Musculoskeletal disorders	112	104	0,03	0,8671
Speech impairment	140	120	0,76	0,3827
Autism spectrum disorders	48	48	0,25	0,6147
Mental retardation	158	136	0,99	0,3196
Mild mental retardation	56	48	0,15	0,7031
Severe intellectual disabilities	32	0	31,79	0,0000
Multiple developmental disabilities	24	0	23,34	0,0000

The analysis of educators' perceptions regarding the substantive dimensions of inclusive education implementation elucidates a range of challenges intrinsic to this process. A prevailing consensus emerges among teachers, reflecting a shared understanding of their experiences. Through a meticulous analysis of the average values assigned to various components within the educational framework, it becomes apparent that the most pronounced difficulties are situated within the realms of logistical and methodological support for educational activities. Educators engaged in inclusive education consistently articulate concerns related to the organization of lesson activities, emphasizing the imperative for an environment that is

both accessible and conducive to developmental growth. Moreover, specialists in special education highlight significant challenges stemming from an inadequate level of professional preparedness among teaching staff. This deficiency hampers their ability to effectively deliver tailored educational content for students with disabilities and to provide essential specialized pedagogical interventions. Remarkably, teachers converge in their assessment that the fewest obstacles are encountered in fostering interactions among key stakeholders in the educational process — namely, between specialists, parents, and students — as well as in the orchestration of extracurricular activities and remedial courses.

Table 2

Comparative analysis of teachers' perceptions of the parameters of the educational process for the realization of inclusive education

Parameters of the educational process	Teachers (inclusive education)		Teachers (special education)	
	Average value	Rank	Average value	Rank
Organization of accessible environment	2,67	3	2,60	5
Material and technical equipment of the educational process	2,97	1	3,25	2
Methodological support of the educational process	2,73	2	3,29	1
Realization of extracurricular activities	2,27	6	2,54	7
Implementation of correctional courses	2,23	7	2,58	6

Parameters of the educational process	Teachers (inclusive education)		Teachers (special education)	
	Average value	Rank	Average value	Rank
Realization of subject areas	2,33	5	2,75	4
Qualification of pedagogical staff	2,47	4	2,79	3
Interaction of administration, pedagogical staff with parents (legal representatives) of students with disabilities	2,13	9	2,38	8
Interaction of pedagogical staff with students with disabilities	2,17	8	2,32	9

The results of the comparative analysis of educational process parameters using the Mann-Whitney criterion between the two samples showed that there are reliably significant differences in such an important indicator as “methodological support of the educational process”. This factor exerts a profound influence on the attainment of educational objectives and plays a pivotal role in fostering an optimal psychological climate within the educational institution.

Discussion of the results

The findings of the empirical study indicate that there are both commonalities and divergences in the perceptions of teachers of the two compared samples regarding the relevance of inclusive education to certain categories of students with disabilities. A considerable proportion of teachers advocate for the implementation of inclusive education for students with speech and locomotor impairments,

Table 3

Comparative analysis of teachers' perceptions of the importance of educational process parameters for the realization of inclusive education

Parameters of the educational process	Sum of ranks (Teachers, inclusive education)	Sum of ranks (Teachers, special education)	Mann-Whitney U-test	Z	p, significance level
Organization of accessible environment	43267,0	37736,0	19208,0	0,82	0,413
Material and technical equipment of the educational process	39711,0	41292,0	18096,0	-1,74	0,079
Methodological support of the educational process	36967,0	44036,0	14812,0	-4,59	0,000
Realization of extracurricular activities	40243,0	40760,0	18088,0	-1,78	0,075
Implementation of correctional courses	39935,0	41068,0	18142,0	-1,73	0,081
Realization of subject areas	40019,0	40984,0	18306,0	-1,59	0,119
Qualification of pedagogical staff	39767,0	41236,0	18314,0	-1,59	0,123
Interaction of administration, pedagogical staff with parents (legal representatives) of students with disabilities	40299,0	40704,0	18144,0	-1,73	0,083
Interaction of pedagogical staff with a student with disabilities	40607,0	40396,0	18452,0	-1,47	0,142

with mental retardation, visually impaired and hearing-impaired students with normal cognitive development or in combination with mental retardation. In alignment with contemporary normative frameworks, these categories of schoolchildren primarily receive an educational curriculum that is commensurate with that provided to their peers exhibiting typical developmental trajectories. Statistically significant differences observed in the perceptions of two groups of teachers about the relevance of inclusive education to the special educational needs of individual schoolchildren do not entirely encapsulate the complexities of the actual situation.

Let us delve into the perspectives of educators operating within specialized educational institutions. Not a single teacher advocates for inclusive education for students grappling with multiple developmental disorders and severe intellectual disabilities. Furthermore, less than 10% of teachers endorse an inclusive education format for blind schoolchildren, and 2 teachers recommend it for deaf schoolchildren. In contrast, the landscape shifts within the realm of inclusive education. Teachers, particularly those with limited experience working with children with disabilities, exhibit a more optimistic outlook regarding the inclusion. This optimism leads them to broaden the scope of inclusion for certain categories of students. Approximately 20% of teachers assert that inclusive education can contribute to the realization of special needs of schoolchildren with sensory impairments (blind and deaf), as well as with severe disabilities and multiple developmental disorders. However, we contend that these opinions are often formed without a solid foundation in practical experience or a comprehensive understanding of the intricacies of mental development and pedagogical principles essential for constructing an effective special education system, as well as the primary objective of the educational process in the form of social adaptation through the development of life competencies as a basis for mastering academic knowledge. Domestic special pedagogy has accumulated vast experience in the education of such groups of children, textbooks and teaching aids, didactic material and teaching

methods, corrective-developmental and rehabilitation equipment have been developed, an accessible environment has been created, and educators possess the requisite qualifications to effectively support these learners. Regrettably, within the framework of inclusive education it is not uncommon for students to be formally enrolled in an educational institution and assigned to a class, yet receive their education at home, often with significant involvement from their parents. This format of implementation of inclusive education fails to address the critical issues of socialization and integration of the child into society, and, on the contrary, can adversely affect the development of the child. Such scenarios frequently arise when schools fail to establish safe and at the same time developmental conditions, due to which parents, reluctant to pursue special education options for their child, may opt for home-based education, guided by their attitudes, rather than expediency in the organization of education and individual psychological needs of the child.

Less than 20% of respondents in both samples acknowledge that inclusive education adequately addresses the characteristics and needs of children with autism spectrum disorders and mild mental retardation. Regarding the education of children with autism spectrum disorders, this perspective is largely shaped by the prevailing traditions within domestic special education. Historically, there have been no dedicated schools or tailored educational programs for this demographic, nor have any specialized teaching methodologies or resources been developed. Furthermore, the heterogeneity of this population, characterized by varying degrees of severity of deviations in mental development, intellectual impairment, manifestation of emotional and communicative difficulties, complicates the formulation and execution of the content of education and upbringing.

In the case of children with mild mental retardation, a hybrid educational approach proves to be the most effective within the framework of inclusive education. For example, academic subjects and remedial courses are implemented in specialized classes or schools, and extracurricular activities and vocational training occur

alongside typically developing peers. Such organization of the educational process will facilitate the inclusion of a child with mild intellectual disabilities in society and his/her social adaptation. A significant number of respondents assert that the categories of children with mild mental retardation and autism spectrum disorders are more effectively trained in the system of special education. Taking into account that the majority of schoolchildren with autism spectrum disorders also have intellectual disabilities of varying severity, it is imperative that their education should be based on the application of tailored strategies of teaching disciplines and the implementation of correctional courses. The inclusive model of teaching these children in the general education classroom poses challenges in aligning and harmonizing with the curricula and subjects designed for students with normal development.

Overall, the respondents concur on the principal challenges associated with the implementation of inclusive education. These challenges predominantly pertain to material and technical resources, as well as the educational and methodological support essential for the learning process. The successful execution of educational initiatives necessitates specialized equipment that facilitates the delivery of educational content and its effective assimilation by students. This, in turn, determines their academic performance and psychological well-being. Educational objectives dictate the requisite standards for teaching and learning materials (textbooks, manuals, workbooks, didactic material). This is particularly pertinent for materials designed specifically for students with intellectual disabilities.

Teachers implementing inclusive education emphasize the organization of accessible environment as a crucial parameter of the educational process. Currently, while new schools are being constructed and existing ones are undergoing modernization, many do not fully comply with the standards outlined in regulatory documents (The State Education Standard). However, specialists from small towns and rural areas point out that the environment of special schools does not meet the normative requirements. Teachers working in the system of special education note

that the deficit and insufficient training of professional staff can be an obstacle to effective educational process. Our research indirectly corroborates this observation. Teachers working in an inclusive format often lack education in the field of special pedagogy and psychology. Although courses in these fields are included in teacher training programs across various disciplines, they tend to be superficial and do not cultivate enduring knowledge or essential competencies among students. Retraining of specialists is not always a viable solution for professional staff shortage, as the level of educational programs frequently falls short. The level of professional competence of teachers is pivotal for the success of education, ultimately shaping individuals' preparedness for active participation in the economic and social development of their country. Achieving the overarching goals of inclusive education is contingent upon ensuring that the educational system is staffed with professionals possessing specialized qualifications for teaching children with disabilities.

The insufficient attention given to the implementation of inclusive educational practices poses significant challenges in the interactions among educators, parents (or legal guardians), and students. These competencies are not merely supplementary; they constitute essential professional attributes that fundamentally influence the efficacy of pedagogical endeavors. In addition, the organization of extracurricular activities and correctional courses for students with disabilities does not present substantial difficulties for teachers. This can be attributed to the presence of specialized staff within schools, who are tasked with facilitating these initiatives.

Educators operating within the realm of special education often harbor concerns regarding the improper or inconsistent application of textbooks and teaching aids, didactic materials tailored for certain categories of students with disabilities (with intellectual disabilities, visual impairment, hearing impairment, etc.). They fear that such misapplications may adversely affect both personal and academic outcomes, thereby hindering the process of social adaptation and diminishing levels of independence in personal and professional spheres. Consequently, this

could lead to increased economic burdens associated with social security in adulthood.

Conclusion

Inclusive education has become a prevalent aspect of contemporary pedagogical practice. Educators play a pivotal role in facilitating pedagogical interactions, significantly influencing the trajectory of inclusive processes within the domestic education system. Recent research has elucidated various aspects of teachers' perceptions regarding inclusive education.

1. Inclusive education is particularly beneficial for children with disabilities resulting from mild health limitations: visually impaired, hearing impaired, speech impaired, locomotor disorders, mental retardation.

2. Children with significant or combined health limitations, complex structure of special educational needs are generally better suited for specialized educational settings.

3. The effectiveness of education implemented in an inclusive form is determined by the following factors: basic education of the teacher, experience of work with children with disabilities, material and technical equipment of the edu-

cational organization, the state of educational and methodological support of the educational process.

4. The development of innovative educational frameworks for children with disabilities necessitates a scientific basis for diversification processes. This approach aims to mitigate social and economic risks while preventing adverse effects on the health of children with special educational needs. Additionally, it seeks to uphold the quality and effectiveness of education to avoid an increase in socially maladaptive behaviors among citizens.

This study has limitations that can be clarified in further work. Firstly, the specific challenges encountered in the realm of inclusive education within small schools remain inadequately addressed. Secondly, it is essential to conduct a separate analysis of the diverse range of issues and obstacles that emerge in the implementation of inclusive education across urban and rural settings. Lastly, the unique characteristics of organizing inclusive education within the framework of collaborative interactions among various types of organizations merit thorough investigation.

References

1. Alekhina S.V. Inklyuzivnoe obrazovanie: ot politiki k praktike [Inclusive Education: from Policy to Practice]. *Psikhologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological Science and Education*, 2016. Vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 136—145. DOI:10.17759/pse.2016210112 (In Russ., abstr. in Engl.).
2. Alekhina S.V., Shemanov A.Yu. Otsenka rodityelami inklyuzivnoi obrazovatel'noi sredy shkoly i svoego uchastiya v ee sozdanii [Parents' Assessment of the Inclusive Educational Environment of the School and Their Participation in Its Creation]. *Klinicheskaya i spetsial'naya psikhologiya = Clinical Psychology and Special Education*, 2023. Vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 213—233. DOI:10.17759/cpse.2023120310 (In Russ., abstr. in Engl.).
3. Vii'shanskaya A.D., Babkina N.V. Inklyuzivnoe obrazovanie i ego realizatsiya: psikhologo-pedagogicheskoe soprovozhdenie detei s osobymi obrazovatel'nymi potrebnostyami [Inclusive education and its implementation: psychological and pedagogical support for the children with special educational needs]. *Defektologiya = Defectology*, 2022, no. 4, pp. 36—41. (In Russ.).
4. Grigor'eva M.A. Integratsiya detei s ogranichenymi vozmozhnostyami zdorov'ya v

- obshcheobrazovatel'noe prostranstvo [Integration of children with disabilities in comprehensive space]. *Spetsial'noe obrazovanie = Special Education*, 2009, no. 4(16), pp. 101—106. (In Russ.).
5. Zakon RF «Ob obrazovanii v RF» (s izmeneniyami na 2.07.2021) [The Federal Law On Amending the Federal Law On Education in the Russian Federation (effective July 2, 2021)]. Available at: http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_140174/ (Accessed 06.06.2024). (In Russ.).
6. Maksimova N.A. Inklyuzivnoe obrazovanie v Rossii: istoriya, sostoyanie i riski [Inclusive education in Russia: history, status and risks]. *Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie v Rossii = Pedagogical Education in Russia*, 2018, no. 9, pp. 113—120. (In Russ.).
7. Malofeev N.N. Spetsial'noe obrazovanie v menyayushchemsya mire. Evropa [Special Education in a Changing World. Europe]. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 2018. 447 p. (In Russ.).
8. Malofeev N.N. Ot ravnnykh prav k ravnnykh vozmozhnostyam, ot spetsial'noi shkoly k inklyuzii [From equal rights to equal opportunities, from special schools to inclusion]. *Izvestiya Rossiiskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta im.*

A.I. Gertsena = *Izvestia: Herzen University Journal of Humanities & Sciences*, 2018, no. 19, pp. 8—15. (In Russ.).

9. Nurlygayanov I.N. Predstavleniya o cheloveke s narusheniyami intellekta v sovremennom rossiiskom obshchestve [Perceptions of a person with intellectual disabilities in modern Russian society]. *Defektologiya = Defectology*, 2012, no. 5, pp. 77—83. (In Russ.).

10. Ob utverzhdenii federal'nogo gosudarstvennogo obrazovatel'nogo standarta obrazovaniya obuchayushchikhsya s umstvennoi otstalost'yu (intellektual'nymi narusheniyami). Prikaz Ministerstva obrazovaniya i nauki RF ot 19.12.2014 № 1599 [On approval of the Federal State Educational Standard for the education of students with mental retardation (intellectual disabilities). Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation № 1599 dated December 19, 2014]. Available at: <https://docs.edu.gov.ru/document/2173be39620e82f3ffdc35693b932846/> (Accessed 06.06.2024). (In Russ.).

11. Ryapisova A.G. Inklyuzivnoe obrazovanie kak sistemnaya innovatsiya [Inclusive education as a systemic innovation]. *Vestnik Novosibirskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta = Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University Bulletin*, 2017. Vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 7—20. (In Russ.).

12. Federal'nyi gosudarstvennyi obrazovatel'nyi standart nachal'nogo obshchego obrazovaniya obuchayushchikhsya s ogranichennymi vozmozhnostyami zdorov'ya (utverzhdennyi prikazom Ministerstva obrazovaniya i nauki RF ot 19.12.2014 № 1598) [Federal State Educational Standard of

primary general education of students with disabilities (approved by Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation dated December 19, 2014 № 1598)]. Available at: <https://docs.edu.gov.ru/document/e2bb03c57325d29c7fef3910a36d9a30/> (Accessed 06.06.2024). (In Russ.).

13. Shipitsyna L.M. «Neobuchaemyi» rebenok v sem'e i obshchestve. Sotsializatsiya detei s narusheniem intellekta [“Learning disabled” child in the family and society. Social engagement of Children with Intellectual Disabilities]. Saint-Petersburg: Rech, 2005. 477 p. (In Russ.).

14. Shipitsyna L.M. Integratsiya detei s ogranichennymi vozmozhnostyami zdorov'ya [Integration of children with disabilities]. *Vospitanie i obuchenie detei s narusheniyami razvitiya = Education and teaching of children with developmental disorders*, 2004, no. 2, pp. 7—9. (In Russ.).

15. Guillemot F., Lacroix F., Nocus I. Teachers' attitude towards inclusive education from 2000 to 2020: An extended meta-analysis. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 2022. Vol. 3, p. 100175. DOI:10.1016/j.ijedro.2022.100175

16. Kielblock S., Woodcock S. Who's included and Who's not? An analysis of instruments that measure teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2023. Vol. 122, p. 103922. DOI:10.1016/j.tate.2022.103922

17. Vantieghem W. et al. Professional vision of inclusive classrooms: A validation of teachers' reasoning on differentiated instruction and teacher-student interactions. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 2020. Vol. 67, p. 100912. DOI:10.1016/j.stueduc.2020

Литература

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

2. Алехина С.В., Шеманов А.Ю. Оценка родителями инклюзивной образовательной среды школы и своего участия в ее создании [Электронный ресурс] // Клиническая и специальная психология. 2023. Том 12. № 3. С. 213—233. DOI:10.17759/srpe.2023120310

3. Вильшанская А.Д., Бабкина Н.В. Инклюзивное образование и его реализация: психолого-педагогическое сопровождение детей с особыми образовательными потребностями // Дефектология. 2022. № 4. С. 36—41.

4. Григорьева М.А. Интеграция детей с ограниченными возможностями здоровья в общеобразовательное пространство // Специальное образование. 2009. № 4(16). С. 101—106.

5. Закон Российской Федерации «Об образовании в Российской Федерации» от 29.12.2012 № 273-

ФЗ (с изменениями на 2.07.2021) [Электронный ресурс]. URL: http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_140174/ (дата обращения: 06.06.2024).

6. Максимова Н.А. Инклюзивное образование в России: история, состояние и риски // Педагогическое образование в России. 2018. № 9. С. 113—120.

7. Малофеев Н.Н. Специальное образование в меняющемся мире. Европа. М.: Просвещение, 2018. 447 с.

8. Малофеев Н.Н. От равных прав к равным возможностям, от специальной школы к инклюзии // Известия Российского государственного педагогического университета им. А.И. Герцена. 2018. № 19. С. 8—15.

9. Нурлыгаянов И.Н. Представления о человеке с нарушениями интеллекта в современном российском обществе // Дефектология. 2012. № 5. С. 77—83.

10. Об утверждении федерального государственного образовательного стандарта образования обучающихся с умственной отсталостью (интеллектуальными нарушениями).

Приказ Минобрнауки России от 19.12.2014 № 1599 [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://docs.edu.gov.ru/document/2173be39620e82f3ffdc35693b932846/> (дата обращения: 06.06.2024).

11. Ряписова А.Г. Инклюзивное образование как системная инновация // Вестник Новосибирского государственного педагогического университета. 2017. Т. 1. № 1. С. 7—20.

12. Федеральный государственный образовательный стандарт начального общего образования обучающихся с ограниченными возможностями здоровья (утвержденный приказом Минобрнауки России от 19.12.2014 № 1598) [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://docs.edu.gov.ru/document/e2bb03c57325d29c7fef3910a36d9a30/> (дата обращения: 06.06.2024).

13. Шипицына Л.М. «Необучаемый» ребенок в семье и обществе. Социализация детей с нарушением интеллекта. СПб.: Речь, 2005. 477 с.

14. Шипицына Л.М. Интеграция детей с ограниченными возможностями здоровья // Воспитание и обучение детей с нарушениями развития. 2004. № 2. С. 7—9.

15. Guillemot F., Lacroix F., Nocus I. Teachers' attitude towards inclusive education from 2000 to 2020: An extended meta-analysis // International Journal of Educational Research Open. 2022. Vol. 3. P. 100175. DOI:10.1016/j.ijedro.2022.100175

16. Kielblock S., Woodcock S. Who's included and Who's not? An analysis of instruments that measure teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education // Teaching and Teacher Education. 2023. Vol. 122. P. 103922. DOI:10.1016/j.tate.2022.103922

17. Vantieghem W. et al. Professional vision of inclusive classrooms: A validation of teachers' reasoning on differentiated instruction and teacher-student interactions // Studies in Educational Evaluation. 2020. Vol. 67. P. 100912. DOI:10.1016/j.stueduc.2020

Information about the authors

Ilshat N. Nurlygayanov, PhD in Psychology, Associate Professor, Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Correctional Pedagogy, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0370-3679>, e-mail: nilshat.ufa@gmail.com

Svetlana B. Lazurenko, Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Education, Head of the Center for Inclusive Education Development of the Russian Academy of Education, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0642-8545>, e-mail: preeducation@gmail.com

Информация об авторах

Нурлыгаянов Ильшат Назифович, кандидат психологических наук, доцент, старший научный сотрудник, ФГБНУ «Институт коррекционной педагогики» (ФГБНУ ИКП), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0370-3679>, e-mail: nilshat.ufa@gmail.com

Лазуренко Светлана Борисовна, доктор педагогических наук, профессор, член-корреспондент Российской академии образования, руководитель Центра развития инклюзивного образования ФГБУ «Российская академия образования» (ФГБУ РАО), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0642-8545>, e-mail: preeducation@gmail.com

Получена 06.08.2024

Received 06.08.2024

Принята в печать 29.10.2024

Accepted 29.10.2024