

## Научная статья | Original paper

# Features of inclusive dispositions of teachers in general and special education institutions

V.Z. Kantor<sup>1</sup> ✉, Yu.L. Proekt<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation

✉ v.kantor@mail.ru

### Abstract

**Context and relevance.** A well-balanced inclusive education policy, which does not imply dismantling the system of special education for children with developmental disabilities, but rather constructing its complementary interaction with the general education system, brings to the forefront the issue of forming a professional-personal foundation for such interaction. This foundation is closely related to the inclusive dispositions of teachers in both general and special education, which act as personal-meaningful premises for their collaboration. However, there is currently a lack of comparative empirical data characterizing these dispositions. **Objective.** The objective of this study was to conduct a comparative analysis of the inclusive dispositions of teachers in general and special education institutions. **Hypothesis.** The study was based on the hypothesis that both similarities and differences exist in the hierarchy of inclusive dispositions and their interrelation with other professional-personal and socio-professional characteristics of teachers working in general and special education systems. **Methods and materials.** The study involved 2106 teachers from 44 regions of Russia, including 758 teachers from general education schools and 1348 teachers from special schools. The following instruments were used for diagnostics: an original method for self-identification of a teacher's inclusive dispositions, the Wilczenski Scale for measuring attitudes toward inclusive education in an adapted Russian-language version, and an original express scale for assessing psychological readiness for inclusive education. **Results.** The hierarchy of inclusive dispositions and their correlational patterns reveal a complex interplay of general and specific features among teachers from different types of educational institutions. Notably, the status of teachers in special education institutions appears ambivalent: they exhibit more pronounced negative inclusive dispositions but demonstrate a higher level of inclusive readiness. **Conclusions.** The teaching community exhibits heterogeneity in terms of inclusive dispositions, indicating an underdeveloped cohesive personal-meaningful core within the inclusive educational environment.

**Keywords:** inclusive dispositions, inclusive education, teachers, general education institutions, special education institutions, children with disabilities, professional-personal characteristics, socio-professional characteristics

**Funding.** The study was supported by from the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation within the framework of the state assignment for the project "Comparative Analysis of Inclusive Dispositions of Teachers in General Education Organizations" (project No. VRFY-2025-0014).

**Supplemental data.** Datasets available from <https://rep.herzen.spb.ru/publication/18865>.

**For citation:** Kantor, V.Z., Proekt, Yu.L. (2025). Features of inclusive dispositions of teachers in general and special education institutions. *Psychological Science and Education*, 30(5), 35–48. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2025300503>

## Особенности инклюзивных диспозиций педагогов учреждений общего и специального образования

В.З. Кантор<sup>1</sup> ✉, Ю.Л. Проект<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Российский государственный педагогический университет им. А.И. Герцена,  
Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация

✉ v.kantor@mail.ru

### Резюме

**Контекст и актуальность.** Взвешенная инклюзивная образовательная политика, предполагающая не демонтаж системы специального образования детей с нарушениями в развитии, а выстраивание ее комплементарного взаимодействия с системой общего образования, актуализирует вопросы формирования профессионально-личностного базиса такого взаимодействия, который связан в том числе с инклюзивными диспозициями педагогов общего и специального образования как личностно-смысловыми основаниями их сотрудничества. Однако сравнительные эмпирические данные, характеризующие эти диспозиции, в настоящее время отсутствуют. **Цель.** Цель исследования заключалась в том, чтобы дать сравнительную характеристику инклюзивных диспозиций педагогов учреждений общего и специального образования. **Гипотеза.** В качестве гипотезы в исследовании выступило предположение о наличии как сходств, так и различий в иерархии инклюзивных диспозиций и их взаимосвязи с другими профессионально-личностными и социально-профессиональными характеристиками педагогов систем общего и специального образования. **Методы и материалы.** Исследование охватило 2106 педагогов из 44 регионов России — 758 педагогов общеобразовательных школ и 1348 педагогов специальных школ. Для диагностики использовались авторская методика самоидентификации инклюзивных диспозиций педагога, шкала измерения установок в отношении инклюзивного образования Wilczenski в адаптированной русскоязычной версии и авторская экспресс-шкала диагностики психологической готовности к инклюзивному образованию. **Результаты.** В иерархии инклюзивных диспозиций и их корреляционных связях имеет место сложное соотношение общего и специфического у педагогов из образовательных учреждений разных типов, причем статус педагогов учреждений специального образования амбивалентен: у них более выражены негативные инклюзивные диспозиции, но выше уровень инклюзивной готовности. **Выводы.** Педагогическое сообщество отличает гетерогенность в аспекте инклюзивных диспозиций, что свидетельствует о несформированности целостного личностно-смыслового ядра в инклюзивном образовательном пространстве.

**Ключевые слова:** инклюзивные диспозиции, инклюзивное образование, педагоги, учреждения общего образования, учреждения специального образования, дети с ограниченными возможностями здоровья, профессионально-личностные характеристики, социально-профессиональные характеристики

**Финансирование.** Работа выполнена при финансовой поддержке Минпросвещения России в рамках государственного задания по теме «Сравнительный анализ инклюзивных диспозиций педагогов общеобразовательных организаций» (проект № VRFY-2025-0014).

**Дополнительные данные.** Наборы данных доступны по адресу: <https://rep.herzen.spb.ru/publication/18865>.

**Для цитирования:** Кантор, В.З., Проект, Ю.Л. (2025). Особенности инклюзивных диспозиций педагогов учреждений общего и специального образования. *Психологическая наука и образование*, 30(5), 35–48. <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2025300503>

## Introduction

In recent decades, the development of educational systems has been increasingly shaped by the philosophy of inclusion (Kharchenko, 2020). Despite the need for further elaboration of the very concept of inclusive education (Kosaretsky, 2024), as well as the asynchrony and contradictions identified in the course of its implementation (Hanssen, Alekseeva, 2024), inclusion constitutes the strategic vector of educational policy regarding persons with disabilities (Akhlan, Khimmataliyev, Qizi, 2024).

Contrary to radical approaches that present inclusive education and special education as opposing and mutually exclusive institutions (Madhesh, 2023), with special schools being subject to total closure (Mann et al., 2024), a balanced and evidence-based educational policy is grounded in the idea of complementarity between these institutions and in the necessity of ensuring their effective coexistence.

From the perspective of H. Qu, such a policy is characterized by viewing special schools as a key resource for optimizing inclusive processes and as an integral part of the broader education system interconnected with its other components, while learning in mainstream classrooms and fostering inclusivity remain the primary goal

and the foundation for the education of children with disabilities (Qu, 2024).

In this context, the functioning of special schools becomes an inherent attribute of the implementation of inclusion in education (Cumming, Jolly, Saint-James, 2024). Defining inclusion exclusively as the placement of a child with disabilities in a mainstream school is conceptually inconsistent and must be disavowed, since special schools act as “an integral part of the entire education system’s response to inclusion” (Merrigan, Senior, 2021, p. 288).

At the same time, the complementarity of inclusive and special education is determined by the collaboration between teachers from mainstream and special schools. Such collaboration ensures mutual access to the necessary knowledge, didactic, methodological, and other resources (Shemanov, Samsonova, 2019), as well as the preservation of critically important individualized professional support for students with disabilities in mainstream schools (Šćepanović, Nikolić, Mitrović, 2024). Moreover, such cooperation contributes to improving the academic performance of these students (Alhossyan, 2023).

However, not only is the issue of cooperation in the context of inclusion not a priority for mainstream and special school teach-

ers compared with other aspects of their professional activity (Smit et al., 2024), but both groups also tend to perceive inclusive education from an outdated standpoint — through the lens of their separate professional roles, for which they were initially trained — rather than from the perspective of joint work and shared responsibility (Alabdallat, Alkhamra, Alkhamra, 2021).

In addition, while teachers from both mainstream and special schools generally acknowledge the value of collaboration, they hold different attitudes as its subjects: special school teachers consider themselves primarily responsible for supporting students with disabilities, whereas mainstream teachers focus predominantly on their subject matter (Mihajlovic, 2024). Furthermore, in their interactions under inclusive conditions, both groups encounter difficulties in establishing trustful relationships (Vostal et al., 2022).

Thus, the implementation of collaboration between mainstream and special school teachers is mediated by differences in their professional-personal positions.

An important professional-personal characteristic of teachers as subjects of the inclusive educational process lies in their inclusive dispositions (ID), which reflect the personal-meaning dimension of professional pedagogical activity in inclusive settings (Kantor, Proekt, 2024). Consequently, in the context of collaboration between mainstream and special school teachers, the degree of similarity in their inclusive dispositions becomes a matter of key significance.

However, while the inclusive dispositions of mainstream school teachers have been the subject of special empirical investigation (Lukins et al., 2023), research with a similar focus has not been conducted in relation to teachers in special schools. As a result, there is no knowledge of the extent

to which the personal-meaning foundations of collaboration between mainstream and special school teachers are formed in the process of inclusive education for children with disabilities. The situation is further complicated by the fact that available data from studies of a phenomenon not identical but related to inclusive dispositions — teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education — are highly contradictory. In some cases, differences between the attitudes of mainstream and special school teachers are observed, with the latter being more positive, while in other cases no significant differences are identified (Guillemot, Lacroix, Nocus, 2022).

The present study sought to fill this gap by providing a comparative analysis of inclusive dispositions among teachers in mainstream and special education institutions.

Achieving this aim required solving complementary research tasks, which included comparative assessments of:

- the intensity of different types of inclusive dispositions among mainstream and special school teachers;

- the structure of relationships between inclusive dispositions, teachers' views on the acceptability of educating different categories of children with developmental disabilities in mainstream schools, and their psychological readiness to work under inclusive conditions;

- the extent to which inclusive dispositions of mainstream and special school teachers are mediated by their socio-professional characteristics.

The study was based on the hypothesis that the hierarchy of inclusive dispositions and their relationships with other professional-personal and socio-professional characteristics demonstrate both similarities and differences between teachers representing mainstream and special education systems.

Ultimately, the study was intended to answer the question of the degree of homogeneity within the teaching community in terms of inclusive dispositions.

### **The method and its features, characteristics of the sample**

The study was conducted with 2106 teachers from 44 regions of the Russian Federation, who participated on the basis of voluntary informed consent. The sample included 758 teachers from mainstream schools and 1348 teachers from schools implementing adapted educational programs for students with disabilities, aged between 20 and 79 years ( $M = 44,26$ ;  $SD = 12,85$ ; 93,78% female). The two groups were comparable in terms of gender and age distribution, as well as in the length of teaching experience (age —  $M$  mainstream = 43,9;  $M$  special = 44,4;  $t = -0,87$ ;  $p = 0,38$ ; gender —  $\chi^2 = 2,37$ ;  $p = 0,12$ ; teaching experience —  $t = -0,37$ ;  $p = 0,71$ ). There were also no significant differences between groups regarding prior experience of working in inclusive settings: according to self-reports, such experience was indicated by 53,69% of mainstream teachers and 57,42% of special school teachers ( $\chi^2 = 2,73$ ;  $p = 0,10$ ).

The study employed the following instruments: a method of self-identification of teachers' inclusive dispositions (ID), requiring respondents to align themselves (direct identification) and the majority of other teachers (reflected identification) with psychological profiles representing different types of ID (Kantor, Proekt, 2024); an adapted version of the scale for measuring attitudes toward inclusive education, based on respondents' assessment of the acceptability of mainstream schooling for children with physical (sensory and motor), intellectual, communicative, and behavioral impairments (Wilczenski, 1992); a short scale

for diagnosing psychological readiness for inclusive education, consisting of four subscales: "beliefs," "values," "emotional acceptance," and "subjective assessment of readiness" (Kantor, Proekt, 2022).

The internal consistency of the scales was tested using Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficient, yielding satisfactory results (see Table 3).

The collected empirical data were processed using descriptive, comparative, and correlational analysis. Since the distribution estimates of ID-related parameters demonstrated a deviation from normality (Anderson–Darling test values in the range  $9,96 \leq A^2 \leq 109,21$ ;  $p < 0,001$ ), non-parametric statistics were applied. Specifically, Wilcoxon's  $W$  test, the Mann–Whitney  $U$  test, Pearson's  $\chi^2$  test, and Spearman's rank correlation coefficient were used. To evaluate differences in correlation strength, Fisher's  $r$ -to- $z$  transformation was applied, followed by comparison of correlation coefficients between the samples. Statistical analyses were performed using Statistica (ver. 10) and Jamovi (ver. 2.3.18).

### **Results**

The analysis of self-identification of inclusive dispositions (ID) revealed significant differences in assessments between teachers from mainstream and special education institutions, although the overall profiles of these assessments were similar (see Table 1). Both groups tended to associate themselves with the analytical disposition, which reflects an acceptance of inclusion alongside a reflective stance toward the conditions and limitations of its implementation.

At the same time, statistically significant differences were observed in the indicators of specific IDs. Special education teachers more frequently expressed doubts and negative reactions toward inclusive education (skeptical and negative

IDs), in some cases up to outright rejection of inclusion (negative ID). Mainstream teachers, by contrast, were more likely to display an indifferent ID, yet also more frequently emphasized the significance of inclusion for the humanization of education and for the personal development of all participants in educational relations (personality-oriented ID).

Less pronounced differences were found with respect to teachers' perceptions of the professional community. In both groups, with the exception of the skeptical ID, shifts were observed between self-assessments and evaluations of the majority of teachers ( $5819 \leq W \leq 10645$ ;  $p < 0,001$  and  $18928 \leq W \leq 96013$ ;  $p < 0,001$ , re-

spectively). Teachers attributed a greater prevalence of negative and indifferent IDs to the professional community than to themselves. The skeptical ID was perceived as equally characteristic of oneself and of other teachers, while the indifferent ID was the least expressed, which indicates teachers' engagement with the issues of inclusion.

According to the secondary scales of the methodology, a higher proportion of teachers in special education, compared to those in mainstream education, were characterized by a rejecting ID (529 individuals / 39,35% vs. 206 individuals / 27,13%), and this difference was statistically significant ( $\chi^2 = 30,59$ ;  $p < 0,001$ ).

Table 1

**Descriptive statistics of the indicators of inclusive dispositions in the groups of teachers working in the educational organisations of general and special education**

Disposition' type	Special education				General education				U	r <sub>nb</sub>	
	M	Me	S	R	M	Me	S	R			
Self-Identification											
Analytical	4,49	5	1,32	1	4,39	5	1,37	1	484097	0,04	
Sceptical	4,42	5	1,38	2	4,02	4	1,46	5	421818***	0,16	
Worldview	4,14	4	1,47	3	4,19	4	1,41	2	501764	−0,01	
Detocentred	4,04	4	1,54	4	4,17	4	1,48	3	484778	−0,04	
System-centred	4,03	4	1,40	5	4,09	4	1,38	4	498431	−0,02	
Person-centred	3,78	4	1,53	6	4,00	4	1,44	6	465637**	−0,08	
Negative	3,48	4	1,76	7	3,02	3	1,70	7	427630***	0,14	
Indifferent	2,50	2	1,56	8	2,70	2	1,48	8	450809***	−0,11	
Mirrored identification											
Analytical	4,27	4	1,29	2	4,19	4	1,29	2	412921	0,04	
Sceptical	4,39	5	1,31	1	4,00	4	1,37	1	368133***	0,17	
Worldview	3,92	4	1,42	3,5	3,95	4	1,32	3,5	413102	0,01	
Detocentred	3,84	4	1,47	5	3,82	4	1,37	5	412959	0,02	
System-centred	3,92	4	1,36	3,5	3,95	4	1,32	3,5	429166	−0,01	
Person-centred	3,63	4	1,45	7	3,79	4	1,38	6	411614'	−0,06	
Negative	3,78	4	1,59	6	3,29	3	1,61	7	363973***	0,17	
Indifferent	3,04	3	1,57	8	3,03	3	1,48	8	428684	−0,00	

Note: M — mean; Me — median; S — standard deviation; R — rank; U — the Mann-Whitney Test; r<sub>nb</sub> — rank-biserial correlation (effect size); «\*» — differences are significant at the 0,05 level; «\*\*» — differences are significant at the 0,01 level; «\*\*\*» — differences are significant at the 0,001 level.

Assessments of the acceptability of mainstream schooling for children with disabilities differed between the groups only with respect to children with communication difficulties (see Table 2). Schooling in mainstream settings was viewed as least acceptable for children with behavioral disorders. The overall range of scores recorded — from 10,90 to 15,87 out of a possible 24 — rather reflects teachers' doubts about the feasibility of inclusive education for children with disabilities.

At the level of respondents' meaning-related attitudes toward themselves as inclusive teachers, significant differences were found across all examined parameters. These results indicate that special education teachers demonstrate a higher degree of readiness for implementing inclusive practices. This can be clearly attributed to the professional consciousness of special education teachers (defectologists), for whom an emotional-value attitude toward children with disabilities and recognition of their right to quality educa-

tion and social integration constitute core attributes.

An analysis of the correlational structures of ID indicators showed that a more rigid structure of interrelations was observed among special education teachers (see Table 3). For them, supportive and rejecting IDs were opposed to each other, yet strongly linked to beliefs about inclusive education, acceptance of its values, subjective assessment of readiness to work in inclusive settings, and emotional acceptance of children with disabilities.

In contrast, among mainstream teachers, the components of ID were less interrelated. In particular, meaning-related attitudes toward children with disabilities could manifest similarly both among teachers who share inclusive values and among those who reject them (correlations were not significant). At the same time, subjective assessments of readiness to work in inclusive settings and beliefs about the necessity of inclusive education were expressed by teachers characterized by

Table 2

**Descriptive statistics of the indicators of meaningful attitudes towards inclusive education in the groups of teachers working in the educational organisations of general and special education**

Meaningful attitudes	Special education			General education			U	r <sub>tb</sub>
	M	Me	S	M	Me	S		
Toward students								
Physical	13,23	13	5,02	13,33	13	4,72	507446	−0,01
Academic	12,96	13	4,65	13,26	13	4,51	492757	−0,04
Behavioral	10,90	11	4,67	10,88	11	4,77	501764	0,01
Social	15,87	16	3,85	15,47	16	4,28	479792'	0,01
Toward oneself as a teacher								
Readiness Self-evaluation	6,46	6,64	1,41	5,77	5,73	1,48	370317***	0,28
Beliefs	5,55	5,57	1,16	5,30	5,29	1,20	446466***	0,13
Emotional adoption	5,88	6,25	1,60	5,65	5,75	1,52	451179***	0,12
Inclusion Values	7,09	7,25	1,54	6,47	6,50	1,55	386551***	0,24

Note: M — mean; Me — median; S — standard deviation; U — the Mann-Whitney Test; r<sub>tb</sub> — rank-biserial correlation (effect size); «\*» — differences are significant at the 0,05 level; «\*\*\*» — differences are significant at the 0,001 level.



a supportive ID and who more often regarded mainstream schooling of children with disabilities as acceptable regardless of the type of developmental impairment. Overall, the group of mainstream teachers demonstrated weaker correlations between indicators of inclusive dispositions. Significant intergroup differences were found in the strength of associations between supportive ID and beliefs ( $Z = 4,89$ ,  $p < 0,001$ ), emotional acceptance ( $Z = 2,91$ ,  $p < 0,01$ ), inclusive values ( $Z = 3,22$ ,  $p < 0,001$ ), as well as assessments of the acceptability of mainstream schooling for children with physical impairments ( $Z = 2,82$ ,  $p < 0,01$ ), intellectual impairments ( $Z = 3,20$ ,  $p < 0,001$ ), and communication difficulties ( $Z = 2,82$ ,  $p < 0,01$ ).

Unlike mainstream teachers, special education teachers' ID indicators were more frequently associated with age: younger teachers displayed more positive perceptions of inclusive education. In the mainstream group, age mediated teachers' attitudes toward children with disabilities but was not related to their self-perceptions as subjects of inclusive education.

At the same time, an important factor mediating teachers' IDs was prior experience of working in inclusive settings: teachers with such experience demonstrated more positive meaning-related attitudes toward inclusion, and this applied to both groups. Emotional acceptance of children with disabilities, however, was not linked to prior inclusive teaching experience, which may indicate the greater role of teachers' personal traits — such as responsiveness and emotional competence — in fostering acceptance of such children, regardless of previous experience of interaction.

## Discussion

The search for an institutional balance between mainstream and special education

systems for children with disabilities, in the context of implementing inclusion, brings to the fore the discourse on the necessity of combining the philosophy and values of inclusive education with the strategies and programs of special education. Within this context, the paradigm of inclusive special education has been proposed (Kauffman, Hornby, 2025). One of the decisive factors in achieving such a balance is the interaction and cooperation between mainstream and special school teachers, which must be grounded, among other things, in the unity of their value-meaning orientations toward inclusive education.

Existing empirical evidence concerning the attitudes of mainstream and special school teachers toward inclusion suggests the preferential status of special school teachers in this regard (Hernandez, Hueck, Charley, 2016). The findings of the present study, however, confirm a previously identified opposite tendency: due to their professional experience and deeper understanding of the educational needs of children with disabilities, teachers in the special education system, in fact, demonstrated less support for inclusive education compared with mainstream school teachers (Kutepova et al., 2021). As the results showed, special education teachers were more likely to exhibit skeptical and negative IDs. This indirectly reflects the position of the Russian scholarly tradition in defectology, according to which “however much the number of children ready for inclusion may grow, they will not constitute the majority within the group of children with disabilities; therefore, this form of joint learning and upbringing cannot be the only one,” and “inclusion is one form of integration, useful for children with disabilities whose development is close to the age norm,” whereas “other children with disabilities need a carefully dosed



Таблица 3 / Table 3  
**Relationship between the indicators of inclusive dispositions in the groups of teachers working in the educational organizations of general and special education**

Indicators	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Supportive Inclusive Disposition	—	-0,29***	0,41***	0,43***	0,30***	0,15***	0,42***	0,61***	0,01	0,10**	0,04	-0,02
2. Rejecting Inclusive Disposition	-0,30***	—	-0,16***	-0,15***	-0,04	-0,19***	-0,18***	-0,34***	-0,04	-0,07*	-0,13***	-0,04
3. Physical	0,51***	-0,32***	—	0,70***	0,52***	0,18***	0,27***	0,42***	0,03	0,06	0,04	-0,13***
4. Academic	0,54***	-0,25***	0,69***	—	0,61***	0,33***	0,28***	0,44***	0,00	0,05	0,12**	-0,10**
5. Behavioral	0,35***	-0,14***	0,44***	0,57***	—	0,30***	0,22***	0,31***	0,04	0,04	0,07	-0,10**
6. Social	0,27***	-0,20***	0,37***	0,44***	0,42***	—	0,26***	0,29***	0,06	0,18***	0,17***	-0,07*
7. Readiness Self-evaluation	0,43***	-0,27***	0,34***	0,35***	0,21***	0,27***	—	0,58***	0,21***	0,64***	0,25***	0,01
8. Beliefs	0,73***	-0,48***	0,55***	0,55***	0,36***	0,30***	0,59***	—	0,03	0,24***	0,10**	-0,03
9. Emotional adoption	0,14***	-0,25***	-0,01	-0,04*	-0,07*	0,06*	0,19***	0,16***	—	0,21***	0,04	0,07*
10. Inclusion Values	0,24***	-0,15***	0,17***	0,16***	0,04*	0,24***	0,65***	0,35***	0,21***	—	0,16***	0,05
11. Experience in Inclusive Settings	0,16***	-0,12***	0,15***	0,10***	0,10***	0,10***	0,27***	0,16***	-0,02	0,12***	—	0,08*
12. Age	-0,10***	0,08**	-0,22***	-0,16***	-0,10***	-0,12***	-0,06*	-0,10**	-0,03	0,02	0,001	—
Cronbach's alpha	0,85	0,84	0,90	0,88	0,91	0,83	0,92	0,86	0,73	0,72	—	—

Note: M — mean; Me — median; S — standard deviation; U — The Mann-Whitney Test; «\*» — correlations are significant at the 0,05 level; «\*\*» — correlations are significant at the 0,01 level; «\*\*\*» — correlations are significant at the 0,001 level. The correlation coefficients for the general education teachers group are presented above the main diagonal, while those for the special education teachers group are shown below it.

integration corresponding to their capacities and limitations” (Kukushkina, Goncharova, Malofeev, 2023).

Thus, professional-personal barriers to ensuring complementary collaboration between mainstream and special school teachers become apparent. The revealed differences in their pedagogical culture, expressed through inclusive dispositions, may hinder such collaboration. This interpretation corresponds with empirically supported findings regarding special school teachers, highlighting their “limited willingness to collaborate with colleagues from ‘regular schools’” (Göransson et al., 2020, p. 1). Moreover, the fact that these barriers are located at the dispositional level underscores the complexity of the problem: since professional dispositions generally serve as “a mediating mechanism for building a professional strategy” (Abakumova, Savchenko, 2008, p. 30), the divergence in inclusive dispositions between mainstream and special school teachers predetermines the divergence of their professional strategies within the inclusive educational space. Furthermore, when subjective values and meanings that teachers from the two systems associate with inclusion do not align, the so-called “personal chemistry” between them is hardly possible — yet this factor has been identified as essential for fostering effective interprofessional collaboration in the implementation of inclusive education (Paulsrud, Nilholm, 2020).

At the same time, the results of this study once again confirmed the previously noted (Dignath et al., 2022) significance of inclusive teaching experience for shaping positive IDs. According to the data obtained, regardless of the institutional-educational setting in which they work, teachers with such experience demonstrated clearly positive meaning-related orientations, both in evaluating the

acceptability of mainstream education for children with various developmental impairments and in perceiving themselves as inclusive teachers. Another important characteristic is teacher age: younger teachers in special education proved to be more receptive to the ideas of inclusion and more willing to make efforts to expand the educational opportunities of children with disabilities, confirming the results of other studies (Charitaki, Kypriotaki, Alevriadou, 2023).

The analysis of correlational relationships provides grounds for raising the question of whether working in specialized educational institutions fosters more structured and less flexible conceptions of inclusion, whereas mainstream teachers are characterized by greater variability in IDs, potentially shaped by the influence of personal and organizational factors.

## Conclusion

The conducted comparative empirical study of the prevalence of different types of inclusive dispositions (ID), the specific features of the correlational structures of their interrelations, and the ways in which these dispositions are mediated by the socio-professional characteristics of mainstream and special education teachers has yielded a body of new data. These findings broaden and deepen our understanding of the regularities of teachers’ professional-personal development as participants in inclusive educational relations. In light of the results obtained, additional important guidelines emerge for implementing a differentiated approach to supporting teachers of different categories in their “entry” into inclusion, which reflects the practical significance of the study.

Furthermore, the study’s findings, fully consistent with its substantive aims and

confirming the proposed hypothesis, allow the following conclusions to be drawn:

The teaching community is characterized by heterogeneity in terms of IDs, which complicates the formation of a personal-meaning basis for developing a coherent inclusive educational environment.

A complex relationship exists between the general and the specific in both the hierarchy of IDs and their interrelations with other professional-personal and socio-professional characteristics of teachers working in different segments of the education system.

From the standpoint of the institutionalization of inclusion, the professional-personal status of special education teachers is marked by ambivalence: on the one hand, compared with mainstream teachers, they display stronger IDs that hinder the implementation of the principle of inclusion in education, but on the other hand, they

exhibit greater readiness to work under inclusive conditions.

Thus, the study has provided an answer to the key research question.

In this context, one of the promising directions for further inquiry is clearly defined. It concerns the specification of understandings of the IDs of special education teachers in terms of differentiating their defectological profiles, that is, the empirical examination of these dispositions in a comparative framework with respect to teachers working with schoolchildren with developmental impairments across different nosological groups.

**Limitations.** The study had certain limitations due to internal disproportionality of the teacher sample in terms of gender, as well as the uneven representation of different regions. As a result, it was not possible to conduct a comparative analysis along these dimensions.

#### Список источников / References

1. Абакумова, И.В., Савченко, Н.А. (2008). Профессиональные диспозиции как компонент личностного становления. *Российский психологический журнал*, 5(1), 23–32. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.21702/rpj.2008.1.2>
1. Abakumova, I.V., Savchenko, N.A. (2008). Professional Dispositions as a component of personal formation. *Russian Psychological Journal*, 5(1), 23–32. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.21702/rpj.2008.1.2>
2. Кантор, В.З., Проект, Ю.Л. (2022). Ценностно-мотивационный профиль личности педагога инклюзивной образовательной организации. *Известия Российского государственного педагогического университета им. А.И. Герцена*, (4), 243–257. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.33910/1992-6464-2022-206-243-257>
2. Kantor, V.Z., Proekt, Yu.L. (2022). The value-motivational profile of a teacher in an inclusive educational organization. *Izvestiya of the Russian State Pedagogical University named after A.I. Herzen*, (4), 243–257. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.33910/1992-6464-2022-206-243-257>
3. Кантор, В.З., Проект, Ю.Л. (2024). Инклюзивные диспозиции и компетенции педагогов общеобразовательных организаций: проблемы взаимосвязи. *Интеграция образования*, 28(3), 384–399. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.15507/1991-9468.116.028.202403.384-399>
3. Kantor, V.Z., Proekt, Yu.L. (2024). Inclusive dispositions and competencies of general education teachers: Issues of interrelation. *Integratsiya obrazovaniya (Integration of Education)*, 28(3), 384–399. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.15507/1991-9468.116.028.202403.384-399>
4. Кантор, В.З., Проект, Ю.Л. Данные эмпирического исследования инклюзивных диспозиций педагогов общего и специального образования [Датасет]. Репозиторий Российского государственного педагогического университета им. А.И. Герцена. Санкт-Петербург. 2025. <https://rep.herzen.spb.ru/publication/18865>
4. Kantor, V.Z., Proekt, Yu.L. (2025). Data of the empirical study of inclusive dispositions of teachers in general and special education institutions. Data set. Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia Repository. (In Russ.). St. Petersburg. 2025. <https://rep.herzen.spb.ru/publication/18865>
5. Косарецкий, С.Г. (2024). Тренды «инклюзивного образования» в современном мире: международные дискуссии и

- перспективы для России. *Психологическая наука и образование*, 29(5), 14–30. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2024290502>
- Kosaretsky, S.G. (2024). Trends in “inclusive education” in the modern world: International debates and prospects for Russia. *Psychological Science and Education*, 29(5), 14–30. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2024290502>
6. Кукушкина, О.И., Гончарова, Е.Л., Малофеев, Н.Н. (2023). Инклюзивное образование: взгляд дефектологов отечественной научной школы. *Альманах Института коррекционной педагогики*, 52(5), 34–42. (In Russ.). URL: <https://alldf.ru/ru/articles/almanac-52/inclusive-education-the-view-of-defectologists-of-the-national-scientific-school> (дата обращения: 29.01.2025).  
Kukushkina, O.I., Goncharova, E.L., Malofeev, N.N. (2023). Inclusive education: The perspective of defectologists of the national scientific school. *Al'manakh Instituta Korreksionnoi Pedagogiki (Almanac of the Institute of Correctional Pedagogy)*, 52(5), 34–42. (In Russ.). URL: <https://alldf.ru/ru/articles/almanac-52/inclusive-education-the-view-of-defectologists-of-the-national-scientific-school> (viewed: 29.01.2025).
  7. Харченко, Н.Л. (2020). Инклюзивная образовательная философия как социально-педагогический феномен. *Наука и Школа*, (2), 52–59. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.31862/1819-463X-2020-2-52-59>  
Kharchenko, N.L. (2020). Inclusive educational philosophy as a socio-pedagogical phenomenon. *Nauka i Shkola*, (2), 52–59. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.31862/1819-463X-2020-2-52-59>
  8. Шеманов, А.Ю., Самсонова, Е.В. (2019). Специальное образование как ресурс инклюзивного образовательного процесса. *Психологическая наука и образование*, 24(6), 38–46. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2019240604>  
Shemanov, A.Yu., Samsonova, E.V. (2019). Special education as a resource for the inclusive educational process. *Psychological Science and Education*, 24(6), 38–46. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2019240604>
  9. Akhlan, R.N.R., Khimmataliyev, D.O., Qizi, O.N.P. (2024). The Importance and Role of Inclusive Education in Educational Institutions. *Proceeding of International Conference on Special Education in South East Asia Region*, 3(1), 400–405. <https://doi.org/10.57142/picsar.v3i1.557>
  10. Alabdallat, B., Alkhamra, H., Alkhamra, R. (2021). Special Education and General Education Teacher Perceptions of Collaborative Teaching Responsibilities and Attitudes Towards an Inclusive Environment in Jordan. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, Article 739384. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.739384>
  11. Alhossyan, F. (2023). Collaboration Between Special and General Education Teachers: A Systematic Review. *Information Sciences Letters*, 12(4), 1021–1029. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18576/isl/120424>
  12. Charitaki, G., Kypriotaki, M., Alevriadou, A. (2023). Greek Adaptation of the Teachers' Attitudes Towards Teaching All Students (ATTAS-mm) Scale. *Equity in Education & Society*, 3(1), 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/27526461231177457>
  13. Cumming, T.M., Jolly, J.L., Saint-James, A. (2024). Australia at an Educational Crossroads: Special Schools and Inclusive Education. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, Article 1422089. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1422089>
  14. Dignath, C., Rimm-Kaufman, S., van Ewijk, R., Kunter, M. (2022). Teachers' Beliefs About Inclusive Education and Insights on What Contributes to Those Beliefs: A Meta-analytical Study. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34, 2609–2660. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09695-0>
  15. Göransson, K., Bengtsson, K., Hansson, S., Klang, N., Lindqvist, G., Nilholm, C. (2020). Segregated Education as a Challenge to Inclusive Processes: A Total Population Study of Swedish Teachers' Views on Education for Pupils with Intellectual Disability. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 26(14), 1367–1382. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1810789>
  16. Guillemot, F., Lacroix, F., Nocus, I. (2022). Teachers' Attitude Towards Inclusive Education from 2000 to 2020: An Extended Meta-analysis. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 3, 2666–3740. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2022.100175>
  17. Hanssen, N.B., Alekseeva, A.A. (2024). Inclusion and Inclusive Education in Russia: Analysis of Legislative and Strategic Documents at the State Level between 2012–2014. *Education Sciences*, 14(3), 312. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14030312>
  18. Hernandez, D.A., Hueck, S., Charley, C. (2016). General education and special education teachers' attitudes towards inclusion. *Journal of the American Academy of Special Education Professionals*. FALL, 11, 79–93. URL: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1129749> (viewed: 30.04.2025).
  19. Kauffman, J.M., Hornby, G. (2025). Extremism and the potential dismantling of special education: Or moving forward with inclusive special education. *Support for Learning*, 00, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9604.12519>

20. Kutepova, E.N., Suntsova, A.S., Alekseeva, A.A., Hanssen, N.B., Harju-Luukkainen, H. (2021). Teachers' attitudes towards policy and practice of inclusion and inclusive education in Russia. In N.B. Hanssen, S.-E. Hanssen, K. Ström (Eds.), *Dialogues between Northern and Eastern Europe on the Development of Inclusion: Theoretical and Practical Perspectives* (pp. 116–131). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367810368-11>
21. Lukins, J., Bhana Lopez, N., Sallese, M.R., Andresen, J. (2023). Fostering inclusive dispositions: Integrating disability studies in teacher education. *Journal of Special Education Preparation*, 3(3), 4–15. <https://doi.org/10.33043/JOSEP.3.3.4-15>
22. Madhesh, A. (2023). The concept of inclusive education from the point of view of academics specialising in special education at Saudi universities. *Humanities & Social Sciences Communications*, 10, Article 278. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01802-y>
23. Mann, G., Carrington, S., Lassig, C., Mavropoulou, S., Saggars, B., Poed, S., Killingly, C. (2024). Closing special schools: lessons from Canada. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 51, 1729–1747. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-023-00661-5>
24. Merrigan, C., Senior, J. (2021). Special schools at the crossroads of inclusion: Do they have a value, purpose, and educational responsibility in an inclusive education system? *Irish Educational Studies*, 42(2), 275–291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2021.1964563>
25. Mihajlovic, C. (2024). Perceptions of collaboration between general and special educators in physical education. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 41(2), 306–329. <https://doi.org/10.1123/apaq.2023-0104>
26. Qu, X. (2024). Making sense of policy development of inclusive education for children with disabilities in China. *International Journal of Chinese Education*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2212585X241234332>
27. Paulsrud, D., Nilholm, C. (2020). Teaching for inclusion — a review of research on the cooperation between regular teachers and special educators in the work with students in need of special support. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 27(4), 541–555. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1846799>
28. Šćepanović, M., Nikolić, S., Mitrović, N. (2024). Perspective chapter: Individual support services in inclusive education — Pros et Contrats (Polemic). IntechOpen. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.114080>
29. Smit, R., Roggensinger, A., Matic, M., Moll, E. (2024). Teachers' noticing in inclusive and special school systems: The same or different? *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2024.2421109>Проект
30. Vostal, M., Brooks, R.V., Horner, C.G., LaVenja, K.N. (2022). A qualitative exploration of trust between general and special educators: Implications for collaboration in the preparation of teacher candidates. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 6(1), Article 100359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2022.100359>
31. Wilczenski, F.L. (1992). Measuring attitudes toward inclusive education. *Psychology in the Schools*, 29(4), 306–312. <https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6807>

### Information about the authors

Vitaliy Z. Kantor, Grand PhD in Pedagogy, Professor, Professor of the Chair of Fundamentals of Defectology and Rehabilitation, Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9700-7887>, e-mail: v.kantor@mail.ru

Yuliya L. Proekt, PhD in Psychology, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Chair of Psychology of Professional Activity and IT in Education, Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1914-9118>, e-mail: proekt.jl@gmail.com

### Информация об авторах

Виталий Зорахович Кантор, доктор педагогических наук, профессор, профессор кафедры основ дефектологии и реабилитологии, Российский государственный педагогический университет им. А.И. Герцена (ФГБОУ ВО РГПУ им. А.И. Герцена), Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9700-7887>, e-mail: v.kantor@mail.ru

Юлия Львовна Проект, кандидат психологических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры психологии профессиональной деятельности и информационных технологий в образовании, Российский государственный педагогический университет им. А.И. Герцена (ФГБОУ ВО РГПУ им. А.И. Герцена),

Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1914-9118>, e-mail: proekt.jl@gmail.com

### ***Contribution of the authors***

V.Z. Kantor — idea; definition of theoretical and methodological foundations; conducting the research; summarizing and scholarly editing of the research materials.

Yu.L. Proekt — data collection; mathematical and statistical analysis of empirical data; analysis and interpretation of research results..

All authors participated in the discussion of the results and approved the final text of the manuscript.

### ***Вклад авторов***

В.З. Кантор — идея исследования; определение его теоретико-методологических основ; проведение исследования; обобщение и научное редактирование материалов исследования.

Ю.Л. Проект — сбор данных; математико-статистическая обработка эмпирических данных; анализ и интерпретация результатов исследования.

Все авторы приняли участие в обсуждении результатов и согласовали окончательный текст рукописи.

### ***Conflict of interest***

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

### ***Конфликт интересов***

Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

### ***Ethics statement***

Written informed consent for participation in this study was obtained from the participants.

### ***Декларация об этике***

Письменное информированное согласие на участие в этом исследовании было предоставлено респондентами.

Поступила в редакцию 07.04.2025

Поступила после рецензирования 13.05.2025

Принята к публикации 03.10.2025

Опубликована 31.10.2025

Received 2025 04.07.

Revised 2025 05.13.

Accepted 2025 10.03.

Published 2025.10.31.