Н. М. НАЗАРОВА

Компаративный анализ реализации парадигмы инклюзивного образования в России и за рубежом

В последние годы инклюзия широко внедряется в систему российского образования, становясь ее значимым компонентом. Инклюзивное обучение как масштабный социально-образовательный проект, имеющий в основе теоретических позиций зарубежное происхождение, сегодня своеобразно осмысливается и с трудностями реализуется в российском образовании. Допускаемые при этом ошибки заставляют задуматься об их причинах, об идентичности реализуемой отечественной и зарубежной модели совместного обучения обычных обучающихся и тех, кто пришел в систему массового образования, имея ограничения жизнедеятельности вследствие психофизических нарушений или отклонений в развитии. Зарубежная парадигма инклюзивного образования, реализуемая в течение более пятидесяти лет, по мере своего развития претерпела изменения, настраиваясь на запросы социума, ресурсные возможности, задачи системы образования. Отечественная парадигма инклюзивного образования, сформировавшаяся в начале текущего столетия, пока неизменна в своей реализации.

Анализ соответствия отечественной инклюзивной практики инвариантным установлениям признаваемой в мире парадигмы инклюзии позволяет увидеть, что интеграционные процессы в отечественном образовании протекают своеобразно и противоречиво, характеризуясь как позитивными, так и негативными сторонами. Несмотря на законодательные установления и декларируемые общие с мировыми концептуальные позиции, реально действующая в России практика руководствуется отличающейся от международной, собственной инклюзивной парадигмой. Одной из причин различия в реализации парадигмы инклюзивного обучения является тот факт, что российская школа и педагогика пропустили в своем развитии за прошедшие десятилетия (советский и постсоветский периоды) важный этап – освоение философии, теории и практики реформаторской педагогики, как это осуществляла зарубежная школа и педагогика, построив на этом свою парадигму инклюзивного обучения.

Проведенный компаративный анализ позволил не только выявить недостатки, допускаемые при внедрении инклюзивных процессов и ценностей, но и способствует нахождению верных решений при адаптации зарубежных инклюзивных целей и ценностей к реалиям отечественного образования.

Ключевые слова: дети с особыми образовательными потребностями, инклюзивное образование, социально-образовательный проект, парадигма инклюзии, компаративный анализ

Ссылка для цитирования:

Назарова Н. М. Компаративный анализ реализации парадигмы инклюзивного образования в России и за рубежом // Перспективы науки и образования. 2020. № 2 (44). С. 354-365. doi: 10.32744/pse.2020.2.28

N. M. NAZAROVA

Comparative analysis of the inclusive education paradigm implementation in Russia and abroad

In recent years, inclusion has been widely introduced into the system of the Russian education, becoming its significant component. Today, inclusive education, as a large-scale socio-educational project which has a theoretical base of foreign origin, is oddly comprehended and implemented with difficulties in the Russian education. The made mistakes make us think about their causes, about whether the current domestic and foreign joint education models for ordinary students and for those who joined the mass education system having disability caused by psychophysical or developmental disorders are identical. Being implemented for more than 50 years, the foreign paradigm of inclusive education has undergone changes alongside its development, adjusting to the needs of the society, resource opportunities and the tasks of the education system. The domestic paradigm of inclusive education, which emerged at the beginning of this century, is still unchanged in its implementation.

The analysis of the domestic inclusive practice compliance with the invariant establishments of the world-recognized inclusion paradigm allows us to see that integration processes in the domestic education are peculiar and contradictory, characterized by both positive and negative sides. Despite the legislative regulations and declared common vision with the rest of the world, the actual practice in Russia is guided by its own inclusive paradigm, which is different from the international one. One of the reasons for the differences in the implementation of inclusive education paradigm is the fact that the Russian school system and pedagogy have missed an important stage in their development within the past decades (Soviet and post-Soviet periods). This stage includes the learning of philosophy, reformist pedagogy theory and practice, as it was done by the foreign schools and pedagogy that build their inclusive education paradigm based on this.

The conducted comparative analysis allowed us not only to identify the weaknesses in the implementation of inclusive processes and values, but also it helped to find the right solutions for the adaptation of foreign inclusive goals and values to the realities of domestic education.

Key words: children with special educational needs, inclusive education, socio-educational project, inclusion paradigm, comparative analysis

For Reference:

Nazarova N. M. Comparative analysis of the inclusive education paradigm implementation in Russia and abroad. *Perspektivy nauki i obrazovania – Perspectives of Science and Education*, 44 (2), 354-365. doi: 10.32744/pse.2020.2.28

Introduction

In recent decades, inclusive education has become a new reality and an important component of the Russian education system. Introduced from abroad as a large-scale socio-educational project, it is oddly interpreted and implemented with difficulties in the Russian education.

Today its modest success makes us think about the reasons, about whether the current domestic and foreign joint education models for ordinary students and for those who joined the mass education system having disability caused by psychophysical or developmental disorders are identical. The foreign literature analysis showed that over the past fifty years the foreign paradigm of inclusive education has undergone certain changes both in theory and in practice, while the domestic paradigm of inclusive education is still unchanged in its implementation. Inclusive trends in the Russian education became noticeable only at the beginning of the first decade of the 21st century, while the foreign education system had repeatedly improved its paradigm of co-educational training and its implementation in practice by that time.

It seems necessary to analyze and compare the inclusive education paradigm implementation in domestic and foreign practice in order to not only identify the shortcomings and mistakes made in our country when introducing inclusive processes and values, but also to find the right solutions for adapting foreign inclusive goals and values to the realities of domestic education.

Literature review

Foreign studies and concepts of integrated (inclusive) education are based on the philosophical ideas of postmodernism, existentialism, pragmatism, and phenomenology. The philosophy of existentialism has allowed us to form a new look at a person with disabilities, at his personal and social existence. In the works of foreign researchers (H. Eberwein, O. Speck) it is noted that the central core of the human "I" is existence, in the context of which each person is a one-of-a-kind, unique and free individual who "builds" himself and his own life, who is responsible for his actions towards himself and the world [44; 56]. Sharing the position of foreign authors (Bronfenbrenner U., Speck O.), Russian specialists (N.N. Malofeev, N.M. Nazarova, T.V. Furyaeva and others) believe that social and educational conditions should be aimed at making the life of people with disabilities the most environmentally friendly, independent, responsible and the person himself should become an equal member of the society with a proactive attitude, fulfilling his potential in this society [13; 23; 36]. Today the concept of disabled people's autonomous and independent lifestyle that is formed on this basis defines approaches to establishing goals, objectives and content of inclusive education.

Over the past fifty years, reform pedagogy, relying on the ideas of pragmatism, phenomenology and existentialism, ensured the development of theoretical foundations and pedagogical technologies and the creation of modern pedagogy of inclusive education. Numerous foreign scientists, for example, U. Bronfenbrenner [41], H. Eberwein [44], H. Schwalb [52], K. Theunissen [55], O. Speck [57] contributed to its creation. Russian scholars have developed approaches to the inclusion implementation that are consistent with the

Russian realities and educational traditions. The foreign scientific potential of inclusive education was taken into account and the developed approaches were also aligned with the foreign ones in terms of key positions (TG Bogdanova [3], N.N. Malofeev [20], E. N. Morgacheva [20], N. M. Nazarova [23], O. G. Prikhodko [31], etc.). Thus, the modern personalistic approach is also traced in the works of Russian researchers - V.I. Lubovsky [10], N.N. Malofeev [12] as a theoretical basis. It was developed by the foreign researchers of educational integration and combines several areas: the position of humanistic psychology [16; 25] and the concept of the social theory of autopoiesis. The pedagogical concept of the socio-phenomenological approach (within the interactive approach framework) is most fully represented in the works of E. Hoffmann [4], K. Mollenhauer [54] and others. According to T.V. Furyaeva, in teaching practice the phenomenological direction is expressed through the understanding of child's nature, the experiences of his sensuous life, which exist in a certain socially determined spatiotemporal and linguistic environment [36]. According to O. Speck, inclusive educational environment seems to be optimal for the development of a child with disability [57]. A functional school in sociology [27] and several psychological theories: the ecological theory of human development of the American psychologist W. Bronfenbrenner [41], psychological theory of the field, living space of K. Levin [9] are also "feeding" the Russian and foreign theories of integrated learning.

Taking into account the existence of methodological relativity principle, according to which a particular pedagogical paradigm (tradition, system) is determined by certain (often different) philosophical and methodological settings and norms, it can be stated that domestic and foreign researchers when studying the phenomenon of educational integration and its implementation methods in educational practice, in some cases rely on methodological, philosophical, and scientific-theoretical positions differing from each other (although having much in common). Domestic researchers, when studying the theory and practice of integrated education, use the ideas of Marxist philosophy as a methodological basis of Soviet psychology, which were presented in the works of L.S. Vygotsky, P.P. Blonsky, A.R. Luria, S.L. Rubinshtein, A. N. Leontiev and the ideas of Soviet defectology presented in the research of T.A. Vlasova, Zh.I. Shif, V.I. Lubovsky [10], S.A. Zykov, R.M. Boskis. These ideas are about the problems that are significant for special pedagogy and special psychology - cultural-historical psychology, activity theory, the concept of development patterns consistency in ontogenesis and dysontogenesis conditions. Starting from the 90s of the XX century, domestic researchers V.I. Lubovsky, N.N. Malofeev, while analyzing the practice of special education for children with disabilities and criticizing the existing special education in the country for isolating children with disabilities from the society and their healthy peers, offered to introduce inclusive education carefully, gradually and responsibly, keeping in mind the Russian realities and domestic education traditions [10; 15]. The task was to develop a national program of inclusive education. The Institute for Correctional Pedagogy of the Russian Education Academy of has become a scientific center for the development of the Russian concept of integrated and inclusive education. A number of researchers have joined it to build various models of inclusive and integrated learning, with the consideration of foreign models, both at the Institute of Correctional Pedagogy of the Russian Education Academy and in the other educational and scientific-practical institutions.

The analysis of the real possibilities to introduce inclusive education in Russia has allowed the scientists to conclude that the Russian social, economic and regulatory features do not allow direct copying and transfer of foreign inclusion models. There is a need for a long period of the inclusive education gradual introduction, during which the country must

create, master and adopt the inclusive education paradigm that is adequate to the Russian realities and provide all those conditions without which a high-quality inclusive education is impossible [15].

Materials and methods

The constructivist methodology, which is used to analyze various spheres, phenomena and objects of reality, seems to be productive in the modern scientific knowledge.

We use one of the philosophical analysis models, social constructionism, to analyze the features of the inclusive education paradigm implementation, that was formed abroad and in our country by now. Its methodology in social sciences has been developed by a number of researchers (P. Bourdieu, K. Gergen, T. Lukman, N. Luman, J. Shotter and others). From the standpoint of social constructionism, inclusive learning is the process and result of the social construction of the desired future education system, built on the principles of democratization, humanization, tolerance and equality.

The social construction of the concerned educational model has started at the beginning of the 19th century in the Western European countries. Its further focused development happened when the social desires were in adequacy with the socio-economic, technical and technological conditions of these countries and when their social communities also aspired for the joint education of ordinary children and children with disabilities. That was the stage of the American and European civilizations' successful development. It started from the 60s of the 20th century, in the context of history, culture and the European religious mentality that was present in the most economically and socially developed countries - USA, Nordic countries and some others.

The reviewed socio-educational construct went through several stages in its development. The formation, refinement, and improvement of its fundamental ideas, principles and conditions took place at each stage thanks to the interactive and communicative processes, both within the project itself and in its systemic relationships with the outside world, under the conditions of accepting collective and individual responsibility for the designed and implemented project. We have identified the following stages in the inclusive education development: "romantic" (the first half of the 19th century) which happened under the influence of the humanistic ideas of the Enlightenment; inclusive phenomena in the educational structures of reform pedagogy (the '80s of the 19th century - the first half of the 20th century), the regulatory stage (the '60s – '90s of the 20th century), the stage of "inclusion without borders" (the '90s of the twentieth century - the first decade of the 21st century) and the modern one - the stage of common sense and reasonable pragmatism. Russia has begun to introduce inclusive models in education at the stage of "inclusion without borders" [21].

Research results

The analysis of the inclusive learning paradigms, both foreign and domestic, allows us to state that socio-cultural, socio-political and economic realities of modern civilization are the determining factors in the formation of these paradigms and are the prerequisites for putting them into practice. Among them are crisis phenomena in the world economy and a shortage of natural resources, growing migration flows and unemployment, terrorism, aging

population, the deterioration of the environmental situation on our planet, and some others. All of them lead to a shortage of state resources allocated for social needs. The shortage of these resources changed state's social obligations towards people with disabilities (the elderly, adults and children with disabilities and health problems).

Such regulatory instruments as: curtailing the special education system for people with special educational needs, its reduction and merging into the mass education system (inclusive education) - were gradually applied as measures aimed at mitigating the created discriminatory conditions for the life of the considered population categories. A lot of the government expenses on socio-pedagogical accompanying of children with special educational needs were also shifted to the family, public and amateur organizations (for example, the number of special boarding schools was reduced).

These measures are supported by new sociocultural ideals and moral values, such as the observance of the equal educational rights for people with disabilities; the right to choose a place, method and language of instruction; access to education; living conditions improvement for people with psychophysical impairments, and some others.

Empirically, the foreign inclusion paradigm has developed a number of invariant regulatory, socio-cultural and psychological-pedagogical conditions for the viability, effectiveness and overall success of inclusive education. They are as follows:

- reliance on the consistency principle in the planning, organization and implementation of inclusive processes;
- evolutionary, non-violent implementation of inclusive practices in education;
- acceptance and desirability of inclusion among the population, understanding it as a social value and a new cultural reality;
- compliance with regulatory and legal provisions in inclusive processes by all participants;
- sufficient and regular funding for all components of inclusive education;
- observance of the each participant's right to choose place, form, method and language of instruction in the educational process;
- obligatory early medical, psychological and pedagogical assistance to children with problematic development and to their families (during infancy and early childhood);
- maintenance and development of the special (correctional) education system, expansion of its institutions' status and functionality;
- creation of comfortable special educational conditions for children with special educational needs, considering the specifics of his psycho-physical limitations;
- creative use of organizational, didactic and methodological ideas of reform pedagogy in the inclusive and integrated learning processes [24; 36; 44; 57].

When put into practice, these ideas of the foreign inclusion paradigm remained unchanged. Although by now, compared to the beginning of the current century, the paradigm has undergone a number of changes in the technology for implementing this socio-educational project, and has moved from the "inclusion without borders" stage to the "common sense and pragmatism." The pattern of such a transition is driven by the factors below.

Numerous and diverse practices of inclusive education in different countries have shown that the mass education system inevitably has and will have certain boundaries and frameworks for inclusive processes. Despite compliance with the law, significant funding for inclusive processes and largely achieved social tolerance, not every child with disabilities can be educated well and socially adapted in inclusive conditions. The mass education system

cannot endlessly adapt its educational process to the diverse types, forms and combinations of deviations in the children's development and their corresponding special educational needs in a way that does not negatively impact the resolution of general educational problems for ordinary children. It has become apparent that the inclusion of children with severe and multiple developmental disabilities in inclusive groups or classes benefit neither them nor ordinary students. Accessibility sacrifices quality. Criticism of "inclusion without boundaries" is presented in the works of B. Ahrbeck [39], M. Brodkorb [40], W. Dworschak [43], S. L. Ellger-Ruettgardt [45].

In addition, the richness and diversity of educational practice has expanded the inclusive learning concept. Any educational structure of mass or special education, that includes into its educational process those students who differ in their psychophysical characteristics and in the nature of their special educational needs from the majority of students, can be considered inclusive.

The modern foreign paradigm of inclusive education is implemented in the format of the inclusive education multivariance and the participation in it of children with mild developmental disorders. These disorders are offset by high-quality correctional and developmental assistance that is provided to such children from the early childhood. Preservation and further development of the special education system for children in need is ensured. We can state that inclusion is only a part, and not the entire education system.

In countries with a long and successful experience in implementing inclusive processes, one can observe the adherence to all most important ideas of the inclusive learning paradigm. The organization and implementation of inclusive processes are carried out in an inclusively oriented sociocultural space with the establishment of intra-systemic and inter-systemic relationships, network interaction of all structures that are involved in the inclusive process. The introduction of inclusive practices into education was carried out gradually, basically, from the bottom up, giving the educational system the time for its own restructuring, determining the sources of opportunities, developing norms and rules of an inclusive culture. Only after all of these there was a legal consolidation of inclusive innovations created and mastered by the pedagogical community. The early start of work with parents (from the moment a child's limitation is detected), which includes the formation of their understanding of the child's needs and development of their skills for corrective and developmental work with him in the family environment, has enabled them to make a conscious choice of an educational path and institution for their child (whether it should be an inclusive school or a special (correctional) school).

Russian education has launched the "inclusive education" socio-educational project relatively late, from the beginning of the 2000s, relying on the concept of "inclusion without borders" that was already final and popular abroad at that time [20; 21]. Soon, inclusion was considered as one of the important directions of the Russian educational policy [12; 13].

When comparing the realities of domestic inclusive processes with the ideas of invariant conditions for the foreign inclusion paradigm, we can see their failure in a number of ways. It should be emphasized that even though the professional community of the Russian education specialists, who focus on people with special educational needs, unconditionally accepts the above invariant ideas of the foreign inclusive paradigm, they do not agree with the reality of this ideas' implementation in educational practice.

First of all, the condition for the evolutionary transition to inclusive education is not respected. Inclusion began to be introduced at an accelerated pace and administratively, with the possibility of saving costs on education. Special schools were closed in many

regions, and children with special educational needs were placed in regular schools that did not have special conditions for them. According to the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, more than a hundred special (correctional) educational institutions were closed in the country from 2009 to 2014. Today, in accordance with the official statistics, more than half of all children with special educational needs are in the mass education system, where special educational conditions are not always created for them. This is much more than in the European countries. Appeals of parent organizations to the authorities somewhat suspended the accelerated closures of special schools.

The Federal Education Law allows children with health limitations and disabilities, as well as their parents, to choose a place and form of education - in a special (correctional) educational institution, in an inclusive educational institution, in a special (integration) class in a general academic school or studying at home. Statistics show that in previous years, the vast majority of parents sought to place their child in a mass educational institution (without taking into account the availability of special educational conditions for the child at school). Recently, there has been an outflow of children with special educational needs of certain categories from inclusive classes. They moved either to integrated classes in the general school (classes that work under the special school programs) or to special (correctional) schools. This is due to the regular disappointment of parents with the results of inclusive education, in which, due to the lack of necessary conditions, a child with special educational needs does not progress in his development. As a result, the number of children in special (correctional) educational institutions is growing, and the number of such schools due to their forced closure or because of merging with mass educational institutions is decreasing. The observed phenomenon indicates that the process of increasing the meaningfulness of choosing an educational institution by parents who have children with special educational needs has begun. However, parents often make such a choice when their child has received negative experience in studying in a regular (inclusive) class.

Experts both in Russia and around the world understand that providing infants and young children with health limitation with early comprehensive, corrective and developmental care and making their parents competent in this matter can prevent the occurrence and development of secondary developmental disorders, prevent manifestations of life activity restrictions, and subsequently restrictions of the ability to work. It can prepare him for future inclusive education and, therefore, significantly improve his development pathway. The simultaneous early start of parents preparation for a meaningful and adequate choice of the educational route for their child is not a small matter.

However, in Russia, early comprehensive correctional and developmental assistance to infants and young children with developmental delays or disabilities is still not a widespread and generally accessible sphere of educational services, all the more it is not a compulsory part of the education system. Although early diagnosis of developmental disorders in children is prevailing in the field of medicine, nevertheless, there is no early start of comprehensive psychological and pedagogical assistance as its logical continuation in Russia. There are very few psychological and pedagogical support services for families raising such children.

Inclusive education, an expensive socio-educational project (that is what it really was supposed to be) has paradoxically become a way to save expenses on education in the context of the economic crisis and the demographic "pitfall" in a number of Russian regions. The closure of special (correctional) institutions entailed the release of numerous buildings that belonged to the special education system and the possibility of using them for other purposes. Some of the special education teachers and especially special education day

care workers, support staff of special (correctional) institutions, who worked the afternoon shift, turned out to be unnecessary. At the same time, expenses spent on children in a special institution, in a boarding school, in the afternoon were put on the family budget. Inclusive educational institutions, with rare exceptions, due to a lack of funds, do not have that full-fledged team of specialists, who, in accordance with the Education Law, should provide inclusive training, a sufficient amount of correctional and other specialized work to the children with special educational needs. There is significant dissatisfaction with the financing of inclusive education in the parental community.

The widespread attachment of “special institutions” and units to educational complexes (holdings) in some cases leads to their dismantling, or does not provide special educational conditions for children with special needs in primary and secondary schools, since the school is often not ready for this neither financially nor in terms of staffing. Also when setting staffing and organizational priorities, such schools prefer to meet the needs of ordinary children.

Numerous sociological surveys of inclusive schools’ teachers and parents of children with special educational needs show that a significant number of teachers involved in inclusive education “accept” children with disabilities, but do not know the methods and techniques of teaching such children. Many of them have erroneous ideas about such children, referring to this group as just children with poor health. 70% of teachers have significant difficulties in teaching students with disabilities [1].

The inclusive learning paradigm is based on a common system of values (values-goals and values-means).

The analysis of the national general schools’ real values and the values that were formed in the foreign paradigm of inclusive education shows their inconsistency.

The priority goal-value of the modern mass education system is academic success. Inclusive education, not excluding the different levels of academic competence of their pupils (in accordance with their capabilities), sees their preparation for socio-cultural inclusion, social and labor integration, and an independent and productive life as a priority value. The axiological study of individual and personal priorities presented to the participants in the educational process shows that the national general school, where inclusive education is built in today, is traditionally focused not on the individuals, but on the results (such as the number of school contests’ and sports competitions’ winners, the success in passing the BSE (Basic State Exam) and USE (the Unified State Exam), the percentage of students admitted to universities). There is no social partnership, it is replaced by the competition based on normative assessment and, in fact, comparison of students among themselves according to their intellectual capabilities. This is the basis for the school to socially prioritize the most intelligent, the best learners (where a child with physical and / or intellectual disabilities, as a rule, does not belong to, and gradually becomes a marginal). For the foreign inclusion paradigm, the value of each child’s personality is unconditional, no matter how impaired he is, regardless of his academic, sporting or other successes.

In the context of inclusive education for children with disabilities (often for their parents), first of all, the important thing is not the result, but the process - the opportunity to study like everyone else in a regular school, be with everyone and not worse than others. You can also see that didactocentrism remains in the general school. Inclusive education is distinguished by child-centrism: a real, (rather than declarative), individual and differentiated approach to each child and to an adapted program of his development, upbringing and education; by the desire to evaluate his results not according to the norms, but in a person-centered way.

The lack of common values gives rise to many educational and socio-psychological problems in the implementation of inclusive education, since the decades-old system of school values that is accepted by the general schools is in conflict with the values of inclusive education.

Discussion and conclusion

A comparison of the inclusive education paradigm implementation abroad and in Russia revealed significant differences.

The integration processes in domestic education are peculiar and contradictory, characterized by both positive and negative sides. Despite the legislative provisions on inclusive education and the declared general conceptual positions that are common with the world, the actual practice in Russia is guided by its own inclusive paradigm, different from the international one. It is characterized by the regulation of inclusive processes “from above”, it prevails over “grassroots” integration activity, which is functioning in the absence of generally accessible early correctional and developmental assistance to children with developmental problems and also in the absence of sufficient funding. There is also the presence of poor special educational conditions and a lack of viewing inclusion as a desired future element of the education system by the society and the pedagogical community. The implemented concept of “inclusion without borders” in conditions of material insufficiency and social unwillingness discredits the very idea of inclusion and the humanistic values embodied in it, making it difficult for society to master its moral foundations.

One of the reasons for the differences in the implementation of inclusive education paradigm is the fact that the Russian school system and pedagogy have missed an important stage in their development within the past decades (Soviet and post-Soviet periods). This stage includes the learning of philosophy, reformist pedagogy theory and practice, as it was done by the foreign schools and pedagogy. The foreign pedagogy did not only built on this its inclusive learning paradigm, but it also creatively used the pedagogical technologies and the psychological context of the educational process.

In conclusion, it can be noted that the comparative analysis of the inclusive education paradigm implementation in Russia and abroad allows us to expand our understanding of the theoretical foundations of inclusive education, the patterns of inclusive processes’ development, their stages, dependence on various factors, as well as to identify possible strategies and ways to normalize the development of inclusive practice.

The results of this study can be used to conduct further research aimed at improving inclusive processes in the Russian education, as well as in the construction and implementation of inclusive educational models, structures, technologies, for assessing the results of the inclusive education implementation and development.

REFERENCES

1. Afanasyeva Yu.A. Analysis of the resources of special (correctional) educational institutions to ensure an inclusive process in educational institutions. *Current problems of the theory, history, methodology of inclusive education: a collection of scientific articles based on the materials of the VII International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar (March 2-3, 2015)*. Moscow, Moscow State Pedagogical University, 2015, pp.135-147.
2. Bogdanova T.G. Psychological assistance to children and adolescents with hearing impairment in the context of inclusive education. *Continuing inclusive education: theory, history, methodology: materials of the XI international theoretical and methodological seminar (March 25, 2019)*. Moscow, Paradigm Publ., 2019, pp. 54-60.

3. Bogdanova T.G., Huseynova A.A., Nazarova N.M. et al. Pedagogy of inclusive education / Ed. N.M. Nazarova. Moscow, INFRA-M Publ., 2018. 333 p.
4. Hoffman E. Ritual of interaction: essays on face-to-face behavior / Per. from English, Ed. N.N. Bogomolova and D.A. Leontiev. Moscow, Sense Publ., 2009. 319 p.
5. Demyanova-Nazarieva G.V., Nazarev R.S. Problems of the implementation of inclusive education. *Continuing inclusive education: theory, history, methodology: materials of the XI International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar (March 25, 2019)*. Moscow, Paradigm Publ., 2019. pp. 39-43.
6. Klyuchko O.I., Perminova V.G. The implementation of inclusive education in Germany. *The modern scientific apparatus for the study, training and socialization of people with disabilities: materials of the X international theoretical and methodological seminar (Moscow, March 14, 2018)*. Moscow, Paradigm Publ., 2018, pp. 65-80.
7. Kruglova N.V. Psychological and pedagogical foundations of the formation of an inclusive education system in the Republic of Belarus. *Continuing inclusive education: theory, history, methodology: materials of the XI International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar (March 25, 2019)*. Moscow, Paradigm Publ., 2019, pp. 215-219.
8. Kulakova E.V., Lyubimova M.M., Lyubimov M.L. Inclusive education: what needs to be done for its successful implementation. *Social pedagogy in Russia*, 2016, no. 6, pp. 14-24.
9. Levin K. Field Theory in the Social Sciences. Saint-Petersburg, 2000. 314 p.
10. Lubovsky V.I. Integrated education of children with disabilities: advantages and disadvantages. *Current problems of the theory, history, methodology of inclusive education: a collection of scientific articles based on the materials of the VII International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar (March 2-3, 2015)*. Moscow, MGPU Publ., 2015. pp. 5-14.
11. Lubovsky V.I. Keys to inclusion criteria. *Theory, history and methodology of psychological and pedagogical support for children with special educational needs: materials of the VIII International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar. T.1. (March 14, 2016)*. Moscow, Paradigm Publ., 2016. pp. 11-14.
12. Malofeev N.N. Co-education and training – a natural stage in the development of the education system / N.N. Malofeev, M.M. Markovich, N. D. Shmatko. *Management of a preschool educational institution*, 2010, no. 6 (64), pp. 8-23.
13. Malofeev N.N. Why integration into education is logical and inevitable. *Almanac of IKP RAO*, 2007, no. 11, p.2.
14. Malofeev N.N., Shmatko N.D. Domestic models of integrated education for children with developmental disabilities and the danger of mechanical transfer of Western integration models. *Materials of the international scientific-practical conference on the problems of integrated education for people with disabilities (with special educational needs): "Actual problems of integrated education"*. Moscow, Human rights, 2001. pp. 47-55.
15. Malofeev N.N. The current state of correctional pedagogy. *Defectology*, 1996, no. 1, pp. 3-10.
16. Maslow A. Psychology of being. Moscow, 1997. 304 p.
17. Maturana U., Varela F. Tree of knowledge. Moscow, Progress-Tradition Publ., 2001. 222 p.
18. Morgacheva E.N. History of Special Education in the USA. Moscow, MGPU Publ., 2003. 262 p.
19. Morgacheva E.N. The formation of integrated and inclusive education in Russia in the 90s. XX century. *Current problems of the theory, history, methodology of inclusive education: a collection of scientific articles based on the materials of the VII International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar (March 2-3, 2015)*. Moscow, MGPU Publ., 2015. pp. 73-80.
20. Morgacheva E.N. The development of integrative and inclusive trends abroad in the second half of the twentieth century. *Continuous inclusive education: theory, history, methodology: materials of the XI international theoretical and methodological seminar (March 25, 2019)*. Moscow, Paradigm Publ., 2019. pp. 195-205.
21. Nazarova N.M. Inclusive education: historical dynamics and perspectives. *Pedagogy*, 2015, no. 9, pp. 55-63.
22. Nazarova N.M. The modern vector of the development of continuous inclusive education. *Bulletin of the Perm State Humanitarian and Pedagogical University. Series No. 1. Psychological sciences*, 2017, vol. 2, In 2 parts, Part 1. 2017, pp. 107-114.
23. Nazarova N.M. The Phenomenology of Collaborative Learning: Integration and Inclusion. Monograph. Scientific publication. Moscow, Publishing House "Perot", 2018. 240 p.
24. Nazarova N.M. Inclusive Education in Modern Japan. *Continuing Inclusive Education: Theory, History, Methodology: Materials of the XI International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar (March 25, 2019)*. Moscow, Paradigm Publ., 2019, pp. 209-215.
25. Allport G. Becoming Person: Elect. Transactions / Transl. from English, ed. D.A. Leontiev. Moscow, Meaning Publ., 2002. 446 p.
26. Paltov A.E. Opportunities for inclusive education. *Continuing inclusive education: theory, history, methodology: materials of the XI International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar (March 25, 2019)*. Moscow, Paradigm Publ., 2019, pp. 33-39.
27. Parsons T. On the structure of social action. Moscow, Ak. proekt. Publ., 2000. 880 p.
28. Penin G.N. Inclusive Education: Traditions and Challenges of the New Age. Special Pedagogy and Special Psychology: *Current Problems of Theory, History and Methodology: Materials of the Third International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar. In 2 parts. Part 1*. Moscow, MSU Publ., 2011, pp. 29-37.
29. Penin G.N., Krasilnikova O.A. Inclusion: from legislative initiative to practical implementation. *Current problems of the theory, history, methodology of inclusive education: a collection of scientific articles based on the materials of the VII International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar (March 2-3, 2015)*. Moscow, MGPU Publ., 2015, pp. 110-116.

30. Popova T.M. Social integration of children with disabilities as a leading goal of integrated education. *Contemporary problems of the theory, history, methodology of inclusive education: a collection of scientific articles based on the materials of the VII International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar (March 2-3, 2015)*. Moscow, MSU Publ., 2015, pp. 123-128.
31. Prikhodko O.G. Foreign experience of inclusive education of children with disabilities. *Current problems of the theory, history, methodology of inclusive education: a collection of scientific articles based on the materials of the VII International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar (March 2-3, 2015)*. Moscow, Moscow State Pedagogical University, 2015, pp. 68-73.
32. Rogers K. The Formation of Man. A Look at Psychotherapy), Moscow, Progress Publ., 1994. 479 p.
33. Solntseva L.I. Models of integrated learning for children with visual impairments. *Defectology*, 1997, no. 2, pp. 8-14.
34. Rubtsov V.V., Alekhina S.V., Haustov A.V. Continuity of inclusive education and psychological and pedagogical support for persons with special educational needs [Electronic resource]. *Psychological and pedagogical research*, 2019, vol. 11, no. 3, pp.1-14. DOI: 10.17759/psyedy.2019110301
35. Filatova I.A. Regulatory framework for inclusive education. *Continuing inclusive education: theory, history, methodology: Materials of the XI International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar (March 25, 2019)*. Moscow, Paradigm Publ., 2019, pp. 17-21.
36. Furyaeva T.V. Pedagogy of integration abroad. Monograph. Krasnoyarsk, Publishing House KSPU, 2005. 215 p.
37. Khitryuk V.V. Inclusive education as a social institution: structural-functional analysis. *Contemporary problems of the theory, history, methodology of inclusive education: a collection of scientific articles based on the materials of the VII International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar (March 2-3, 2015)*. Moscow, Moscow State Pedagogical University, 2015, pp. 36-42.
38. Anastasiou D., Kauffman J. M., Di Nuovo S. Inclusive education in Italy. Description and reflections on full inclusion. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 2015, no. 30, pp. 429-443.
39. Ahrbeck B. Inklusion. Eine Kritik. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer. 2016.
40. Brodkorb M. Warum totale Inklusion unmöglich ist. Ueber schulische Paradoxien zwischen Liebe und Leistung. *Sonderpaedagogische Foerderung heute*, 2014, no. 59, pp. 22-447.
41. Bronfenbrenner U. The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1979.
42. Dudley-Marling C., Burns M.B. Two perspectives on inclusion in the U.S. *Global Education Review*, 2014, no. 1, pp. 14-31.
43. Dworschak W. Bildungsstatistik und Inklusion – eine kritische Betrachtung. *Zeitschrift fuer Heilpaedagogik*, 2017, no. 68, pp. 31-43.
44. Eberwein H. (Hrsg.) Integrationspaedagogik. 5 Auflage. Beltz Verlag. Weinheim und Basel. 1999.
45. Ellger-Ruettgardt S.L. Inklusion. Vision und Wirklichkeit. Stuttgart. Kohlhammer. 2016.
46. Felder M., Schneiders K. Inklusion kontrovers. Herausforderungen fuer die soziale Arbeit. Schwalbach/ts: Wochenschau Verlag. 2016.
47. Feyerer. E. Inklusive Lehrer innenbildung. Oesterrech geht neue Wege. Gemeinsam leben. *Zeitschrift fuer Inklusion*, 2015, no. 23, pp. 3-18.
48. Hillenbrand C. Inklusion und Lehrerbildung. Der Auftrag inklusiver Lehrerbildung. Empirische Befunde und Konsequenzen fuer die Lehrerbildung. *Zeitschrift fuer Bildungsverwaltung*, 2016, no. 32, pp. 23-27.
49. Kauffman J.M., Badar J. It is instruction over plase – not the other way around. *Phi-Delta Kappan*, 2014, vol. 98, pp. 55-59.
50. Kulig W., Theunissen G. Empowerment. // Hedderich I., Biewer G., Hollenweger J., Heimlich U. (Hrsg.): Handbuch Inklusion und Sonderpaedagogik. Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt, 2016, pp. 113-118.
51. Leonhardt A., Pospischil M. (Hrsg.). Internationale Ansaetze zur schulischen Inklusion.: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt. Bad Heilbrunn, 2018, 208 p.
52. Leonhardt A.(Hrsg.) Inklusion im Foerderschwerpunkt Hoeren. Verlag W. Kohlhammer. Stuttgart. 2018. 253 p.
53. Mays D. Wir sind Team. Verlag Reinhardt. Muenchen-Basel, 2016. 142 p.
54. Mollenhauer K. Vergessene Zusammenhaenge: ueber Kultur und Erziehung. Juventa-Verlag. 1983.
55. Schwalb H., Theunissen K. (Hrsg.). Inklusion, Partizipation und Empowerment in der Behindertenarbeit. Verlag Kohlhammer, 2018, 255 p.
56. Speck O. System Heilpaedagogik: eine oekologisch reflexive Grundlegung. Basel, Reinhardt, 2003.
57. Speck O. Was ist ein inklusives Schulsystem? *Vierteljahresschrift fuer Heilpaedagogik und ihre Nachbargebiete (VHN)*, 2016, no. 85, pp. 185-195.
58. Textor A. Einfuehrung in die Inklusionspaedagogik. Bad Heilbrunn, Klinkhardt, 2015.

Информация об авторе
Назарова Наталья Михайловна
 (Россия, г. Москва)

Профессор, доктор педагогических наук, заведующая кафедрой психолого-педагогических основ специального образования Института специального образования и комплексной реабилитации Московский городской педагогический университет
 E-mail: nazarova.nathalie@yandex.ru
 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8052-9849

Information about the author
Natalia M. Nazarova
 (Russia, Moscow)

Professor, Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Head of the Department of Psychological and Pedagogical Foundations of Special Education, Institute of Special Education and Comprehensive Rehabilitation Moscow City University
 E-mail: nazarova.nathalie@yandex.ru
 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8052-9849