Психологическая наука и образование
2022. Т. 27. № 5. С. 69—84
doi: https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2022270506
ISSN: 1814-2052
ISSN: 2311-7273 (online)

Psychological Science and Education
2022. Vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 69—84
doi: https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2022270506
ISSN: 1814-2052
ISSN: 2311-7273 (online)

Approach to Modeling Inclusive Environment in Educational Organization

Svetlana V. Alekhina
Moscow State University of Psychology & Education, Moscow, Russia
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9374-5639, e-mail: ipio.mgppu@gmail.com
Elena V. Samsonova
Moscow State University of Psychology & Education, Moscow, Russia
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8961-1438, e-mail: samsonovaev@mgppu.ru
Alexey Yu. Shemanov
Moscow State University of Psychology & Education, Moscow, Russia
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3925-3534, e-mail: ShemanovAYu@mgppu.ru

The article focuses on the problem of modeling inclusive educational environment as a complex system object in which the system-forming relation is the connection between support and active participation of all participants of the educational environment, taking into account the diversity of educational needs. The empirical research data presented in the article illustrate the theoretical provisions that special educational conditions as support measures for students with disabilities can become the basis for their active participation in the educational process, provided that a subjective request for support is formed based on the reflection of the students' own interests and difficulties. The sample included 8 institutions of secondary vocational education (N=1811 students, 17.3% of them with a status of disability or SEN). Throughout the sample, forms of work organized in a vocational educational organization (VEO) and support options were significantly less demanded by students ($p<0.05$) as compared to the opportunities provided. The level of difficulties recognition in the students varied between "never"/"rarely" and "rarely"/"sometimes". The found paradoxical statistically significant ($p<0.01$) positive relationship (from weak to moderate) between the experienced level of support and the student's desire to leave VEO is discussed. Strategies for modeling the inclusive educational environment are considered, and prospects for studying its technological support are outlined.

Keywords**:** inclusive educational environment, systemic approach, modeling, system-forming factor, participation, support, agency, special educational needs.

Funding. The study was carried out within the framework of the state task of the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation dated 04/08/2022 No. 073-00110-22-02 "Scientific and methodological support for the development of an inclusive educational environment in the system of general and vocational education".

Acknowledgements. The authors are grateful to L.M. Prokopyeva for her help in collecting data for the study and in conducting statistical analysis.

For citation: Alekhina S.V., Samsonova E.V., Shemanov A.Yu. Approach to Modeling Inclusive Environment in Educational Organization. *Psikhologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological Science and Education*, 2022. Vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 69—84. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2022270506 (In Russ.).

Подход к моделированию инклюзивной среды образовательной организации

Алехина С.В.
ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет» (ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9374-5639, e-mail: ipio.mgppu@gmail.com
Самсонова Е.В.
ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет» (ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8961-1438, e-mail: samsonovaev@mgppu.ru
Шеманов А.Ю.
ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет» (ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3925-3534, e-mail: ShemanovAYu@mgppu.ru

Представлена проблема моделирования инклюзивной образовательной среды как сложного системного объекта, где системообразующим отношением выступает связь условий поддержки и активного участия всех субъектов образовательной среды с учетом разнообразия образовательных потребностей. Полученные в эмпирическом исследовании данные иллюстрируют теоретические положения о том, что специальные условия в качестве мер поддержки обучающихся с ограниченными возможностями здоровья (ОВЗ) могут становиться основой их активного участия в образовательном процессе при условии формирования субъектного запроса на поддержку на основе рефлексии своих интересов и трудностей. Выборка исследования включала 8 организаций среднего профессионального образования (N=1811 студентов, из них 17,3% со статусом инвалидности или ОВЗ). Установлено, что на всей выборке организуемые в профессиональной образовательной организации (ПОО) формы работы и варианты поддержки были востребованы студентами значительно меньше ($p<0,05$) предоставленных возможностей. Уровень признания студентами имеющихся трудностей был между «никогда» и «редко» или «редко» и «иногда». Обсуждается обнаруженная парадоксальная статистически значимая ($p<0,01$) положительная связь (от слабой до умеренной: $\rho=0,264$; $\rho=0,482$) между переживаемым уровнем поддержки и желанием студента уйти из ПОО. Рассмотрены стратегии моделирования инклюзивной образовательной среды и намечены перспективы исследования ее технологического обеспечения.

Ключевые слова: инклюзивная образовательная среда, системный подход, моделирование, системообразующий фактор, участие, поддержка, субъектность, особые образовательные потребности.

Финансирование. Исследование выполнено в рамках государственного задания Министерства просвещения Российской Федерации от 08.04.2022 № 073-00110-22-02 «Научно-методическое сопровождение развития инклюзивной образовательной среды в системе общего и профессионального образования».

Благодарности. Авторы выражают признательность Л.М. Прокопьевой за помощь в сборе данных для исследования и в проведении их статистического анализа.

Для цитаты: *Алехина С.В., Самсонова Е.В., Шеманов А.Ю.* Подход к моделированию инклюзивной среды образовательной организации. Психологическая наука и образование, 2022. Том 27 . No 5 . С . 69—84 . DOI: https://doi.org/10.17759/pse .2022270506

Introduction

The education system of the Russian Federation is striving for inclusiveness, having legislated this right and providing it with strategic documents, namely with interdepartmental comprehensive plans for the development of inclusive education until 2030. One of the objectives of these documents is to develop a basic model of an inclusive educational organization, considering the specifics of all levels of education [11; 12; 13]. At the same time, the model should become the basis for discussing the characteristics of an inclusive environment with all stakeholders, as well as for designing a real environment and building a system for its dynamic assessment and measurement. From our point of view, the solution of the problem of modeling an inclusive educational environment (IEE) is faced with inconsistency, complexity, and the systemic nature of the object itself.

The purpose of this article is to define an approach for theoretical understanding of the concept of IEE and building a basic model of IEE at the level of an educational organization (EO), as well as to illustrate the main characteristics of this approach based on empirical research.

As part of the conceptual and theoretical stage of modeling [20], we analyzed the papers devoted to the study of IEE. This analysis made it possible to conditionally combine them into two divergent approaches.

Within the framework of the first of them, the attention of scientists is mostly drawn to the component composition of the environment [3; 4; 32; 33; 35]. At the same time, the educational environment is considered rather as a set of components that characterize different aspects of the inclusiveness of the environment, which can be assessed by factor analysis [32]. So, when choosing several criteria of inclusiveness (accessibility, variability, tolerance, etc.) and a number of components of the environment (subject, software-technological, social, etc.), its inclusiveness will be determined through the assessment of each component for each criterion separately and summation the results obtained. The question of on what basis the criteria for inclusiveness are chosen is decided in advance and acts as a prerequisite for the analysis of the environment. With this approach to the definition of the inclusiveness of the educational environment, the whole of it appears as a simple sum of its parts, where the quality that unites it is introduced by the external reflection of the researcher and is not considered as a *new qualitative state* generated by relationships within the very set of elements of the educational environment [33].

In this case, the actor who is “placed” in it, the teacher or student, also turns out to be an agent external to the environment, who can more or less successfully use the conditions given to him. A similar type of functioning of the components of the environment of the agents of educational activity, in which these components are set as only *external conditions* for the activities of the actors, V.A. Yasvin suggests calling it an educational *space*, not an educational *environment* [26, p. 33—34].

Within the framework of the second methodological approach to the definition of the concept of the educational environment, the emphasis is on whether the elements of the environment form a whole system. The principle of system consistency is clearly formulated in the work of A.V. Petrovsky and M.G. Yaroshevsky: “System consistency is an explanatory principle of scientific knowledge, requiring the study of phenomena in their dependence on the internally connected whole that they form, acquiring new properties inherent in this whole ... [16, p. 350]” (quoted from: [7, p. 6]).

The turn to the systemic methodology of the analysis of IEE is because the main methodological paradigm of modern Russian federal state educational standards is the systemic-ac-

tivity approach to teaching, which has become the dominant of Russian pedagogy since 1985. This was an attempt to explicitly combine the principle of system consistency, which was developed in the studies of the classics of our domestic psychology (such as B.G. Ananiev, B.F. Lomov, M.G. Yaroshevsky, A.V. Petrovsky and others), and the activity approach (which has always been implicitly systemic), developed by L.S. Vygotsky, L.V. Zankov, D.B. Elkonin, V.V. Davydov and many others. But, accepting the principle of system consistency as explicit, it should also be recognized that some relationships and connections between elements in the system as an interconnected whole should be system-forming [19].

What, within the framework of the second approach, can be considered a backbone component for an inclusive educational environment?

The basic documents on inclusive education state that "the ultimate goal of inclusive education is that each individual can have an effective *participation* in society and develop their potential" [18, p. 6], which implies that both in international documents on inclusive education and in studies on this topic, high importance is attached to the participation of students in IEE and their involvement in common activities (see also [9; 25; 29; 30; 31; 35; 36; 37; 38; 39]). The importance of participation in the modern world is also evidenced by the degree of generalization of this concept in relation to the understanding of the current cultural situation, which the American philosopher Henry Jenkins describes as a culture of participation [6].

We assume that the *system-forming quality* for an inclusive educational environment is the active inclusion in the educational process of all its participants (teachers, special educators, students with special educational needs, their normatively developing peers, parents) as agents of their activity who are able to change and rebuild the environment, developing themselves and transforming the totality of external conditions in the environment into their actual capabilities, taking into account the diversity of needs.

With such an understanding of the systemic property of an inclusive educational environment, in our opinion, the concept of the environment as providing opportunities (affordance, according to J.J. Gibson) for the activity of the subject, proposed by V.A. Yasvin [26, p. 32]. He considers as its systemic property the creation in the educational environment of the possibilities for the implementation by each student of his agentic position. In this case, the environment acts not without regard to the actor, but in relation to her/him, it acts as a whole system that includes the agent acting in it, and the environment is defined as providing to the actor with the affordances to work in it. Thus, the characteristics of the environment are transformed from external conditions into directions of active, conscious participation in its transformation in the course of the agent's realization of her/himself, her/his intentions and goals, together with other acting actors of education [26].

For the principle of active participation as a system-forming principle of creating an inclusive educational environment to become a real basis for its modeling, the next step is to conceptualize and operationalize this principle.

We consider the conceptualization of the principle of participation based on the cultural-historical concept of L.S. Vygotsky. According to this concept, the child's cultural development occurs in the process of assimilation of historically developed forms and methods of activity. It means the result of the action of the environment is largely determined by the degree to which a person comprehends this environment, the meaning in which it acts for him, which leads to the birth of a person as a social individual, i.e. to human socialization. The process of comprehension and rethinking of the surrounding world by a person requires certain means, the main of which is L.S. Vygotsky considers communication, since it is it that causes a person to need to use various signs (linguistic, graphic, mathematical, artistic, etc.), which ensure the formation of higher mental functions in a person, contributing to the emergence of new ways of thinking, mastering cultural means of behavior. In this sense,

the educational environment acts as a system of cultural signs, which for the students should appear as a means of controlling their mental functions and building relationships with the world, with people around them, with themselves [5]. This happens if the organization of the educational environment maintains the position of active participation in the educational activities of students together with teachers and other actors of the environment, in which these actors consciously use the available resources [31].

Support becomes especially important to ensure the participation of students with disabilities, since, due to the limited resources available to them in the surrounding cash environment, the degree of their independent participation is reduced. The principle of active participation of students with disabilities in IEE is widely discussed in the works of many domestic researchers [3; 10; 15; 16; 24; 25]. At the same time, the authors rightly point out the problem of a formal attitude to the construction of an inclusive environment as a system of conditions for students with disabilities who find themselves passive in it, since they are "placed" in the conditions prepared for them, without taking part in their creation, but being only consumers of these conditions [3; 25]. Sharing this position, we believe that participation in this case should be understood primarily as the activity of students in building their individual educational route, independently choosing their extracurricular activities, realizing their interests and difficulties, and requesting the necessary types of support.

In the preface to the book by D.A. Leontiev and co-authors S.V. Alekhina writes: "At the heart of the inclusive practice of education is the principle of support, which requires the organization of psychological support for both students with disabilities and all those who work with them. Of all the possible ways of solving this problem, the most effective are those in which the student's personal potential and his internal coping resources are actualized" [1, p. 4].

Thus, the role of the system-forming relation of the IEE is the connection of support and participation, which turns environmental conditions into affordances for the educational activities of its actors.

The operationalization of the IEE model as a research task can go in several directions. One of them is the inclusion of actors of the environment, focused on its change, in the study of the environment itself together with researchers. This type of research is called participatory [24; 28]. The Institute of Problems of Inclusive Education (IPIE) MSUPE conducted a similar study as part of testing the methodology for self-assessment of the inclusiveness of the school environment of an educational organization to develop it [2]. Another direction of operationalization of the matter of modeling can be the analysis of the correlation between support and participation of students in the educational process. To concretize this correlation, we use data from another study of the IPIE MSUPU, some of the results of which are given below.

Methods and Sample of the Empiric Study

The study was conducted by the Institute of Problems of Inclusive Education of Moscow State University of Psychology and Education in eight institutions of secondary vocational education (SVE) in the Pskov region and the Krasnoyarsk Territory. Representatives of the administration, teachers and students of educational institutions of secondary vocational education participated in the study. For this work, the answers to the online questionnaire for students were selected. The sample consisted of 1811 students, of which 17.3% have a status of disability. Some of the results are shown on the example of two vocational organizations. We reviewed research data from a college from the Pskov region (189 students, of which 11.1% are students with disabilities) and a technical school from the Krasnoyarsk Territory (188 students, of which 49.5% are with disabilities), which differ significantly from each other in the profile of education and the number of students with disabilities (there is a statistically significant difference in the number of students with disabilities according to the Fisher angular test, $p<0.01$).

The questionnaire for SVE students consists of 20 closed questions. The Likert scale was used in the answers to some questions (explanations are given in the description of the results). For analysis, we chose those questions that allow us to correlate the support conditions created in SVE organizations with the degree of participation and demand for these conditions by students. The questions concerned interests, difficulties, forms of activity offered by the organization and participation of students in them, the possibility of contacting the staff of professional educational organizations for support and help, and real requests from students, and one of the questions was about the desire to change the educational organization.

The processing of the obtained quantitative data was carried out using the Excel program on a comparative analysis of questionnaire forms. When working with the data, the following were used: grouping, average values, frequency distribution, correlation analysis (using of the Spearman correlation coefficient ρ), comparative analysis: a comparison of a college and a technical school in terms of the number of students with disabilities was carried out using the Fisher angular criterion; comparison between groups of respondents on relevant questions, as well as within the same group between answers to the question of the possibility of participation and actual participation was carried out using non-parametric Mann-Whitney and Wilcoxon tests.

Results and Discussion

The data presented in Table 1 show that when certain conditions are created in an organization aimed at supporting their initiative and activity, they are far from being fully demanded by students, i.e. do not become real opportunities for them, as agents of the educational process, to exercise their activity and participation (Table 1).

The questions proposed in the questionnaire made it possible to identify, using the examples of VEO (a college from the Pskov region and a technical school from the Krasnoyarsk Territory), possible factors that may influence the participation of students (Tables 2, 3).

A comparison of tables 2 and 3 shows that students show a higher degree of participation in those areas of the activity that are more interesting to them. College students seem to be more interested in individual and group forms of learning activities (judging by the relatively higher demand for individual projects — 28% of 69.3% (Table 3), as well as a more pronounced interest in forms of work in small groups (Table 2)), and the students of the technical school are more interested in social work and activities related to active communication (holidays, sports, volunteering) (Table 3). The areas of interest of SVE students are also indicated by the higher figures of their participation in various forms of work in comparison with the perceived opportunities for participation (Table 3). It can be seen from these data that the lowest participation opportunity to actual participation ratios, indicative of greater interest in participation, in the case of the college are for individual projects and participation in work teams (opportunity to actual participation ratios of less than 3 and 4, respectively), which, apparently, is more related to educational activity, and in the case of a technical school is more related to social work and the sphere of communication (the ratio of opportunities to real participation is less than 3).

Thus, it can be noted that in the organization of various forms of participation, it is necessary to correlate them with the interests of students. This requires the involvement of students in the planning of their educational trajectory, which includes activities to realize their interests and difficulties, as well as ways to implement and overcome them. However, the proportion of students participating in such planning, both in the entire sample (13.8%) (Table 1), and in college (11.1%) and technical school (17.6%) (Table 3), is small.

Difficulties proposed for assessing their presence in VEO on a scale of their manifestation (the Likert scale was used: never — 1, rarely — 2, sometimes — 3, often — 4), are noted by students in the meaning from “never” to “rarely” and “sometimes”. Moreover, if learn-

Table 1

Relation between the Forms of Work Organized in VEO for Student Participation and the Actual Participation of Students in These Forms

Indicate in which forms of work you have the opportunity to participate and in which you are already participating	Opportunity to participate (OP), %	Already participating (AP), %	OP/AP
in individual projects	67.9	22.2	3.06
in planning (individualization) of their educational trajectory	50.5	13.8	3.66
in volunteer movement	60.4	15	4.03
in work teams	51.1	13.4	3.81
in student council	56	14.1	3.97
in managing council	45.3	11.3	4.01
in design of the object-spatial environment	49	11.8	4.15
in circles of additional education	58.3	15.3	3.81
in the work of the admissions committee	41.6	10.8	3.85
in holding events for peers of their own and other institutions	55.1	13.3	4.14
in celebrations and concerts	62.3	17.8	3.5
in sport events	64.8	19.9	3.26
in career guidance events	51.1	11.5	4.44
in professional skill competitions, Abilympics, WorldSkills	53	13.5	3.92
in organization of new circles and sport sections	49	10.7	4.58
in Programs “Vocational training without borders”	44.2	10.5	4.21
in socially significant projects	48.8	11	4.44
in presenting interesting information about VEO on their pages in social networks	55.3	12.5	4.24

Note: All differences between opportunities to participate and actual participation were statistically significant using the Mann—Whitney and Wilcoxon tests ($p<0.01$).

Table 2

Comparison of the Interest of College and Technical School Students in Pedagogical Technologies

Indicate which pedagogical technologies arouse your interest in the classroom and in extracurricular activities	College, %	Technical school, %
Project work	28.6	26.1
Distant learning	50.3*	34.0*
Portfolio	4.8	8.5
Individual tasks	28.6	25.0
Performing tasks in small groups	35.4**	24.5**
Doing tasks in pairs	44.4	45.7
Research work	20.6	22.3
Professional samples	19.0	26.1

Note: An asterisk indicates statistically significant differences between college and technical school on the relevant question at $p<0.01$; two asterisks — at $p<0.02$ according to the Mann—Whitney and Wilcoxon criteria.

Table 3

Opportunity to Participate in Various Forms of Work and the Real Demand for these Forms in two VEOs

Indicate in which forms of work you have the opportunity to participate and in which you are already participating	VEO					
	College			Technical school		
	Opportunity to participate (OP), %	Already participating (AP), %	OP/AP	Opportunity to participate (OP), %	Already participating (AP), %	OP/AP
in individual projects	69.3	28.0*	2.475	66.5	17.6*	3.78
in planning (individualization) of their educational trajectory	53.4	11.1	4.81	53.7	17.6	3.05
in volunteer movement	74.1[a]	16.9*	4.38	62.2[a]	25.5*	2.44
in work teams	60.3	15.3	3.94	55.3	18.6	2.97
in student council	57.1	15.3	3.73	51.6	19.7	2.62
in managing council	48.1	9.5**	5.06	49.5	19.7**	2.51
in design of the object-spatial environment	48.7	10.6	4.59	50.5	16.0	3.16
in circles of additional education	61.9	13.2**	4.69	56.4	29.3**	1.92
in the work of the admissions committee	44.4	8.5*	5.22	44.7	16.5*	2.71
in holding events for peers of their own and other institutions	61.4	11.6*	5.29	59.6	19.7*	3.02
in celebrations and concerts	68.8	15.9**	4.33	63.8	27.1**	2.35
in sport events	70.9	16.4*	4.32	70.2	26.6*	2.64
in career guidance events	57.1	9.5	6.01	52.7	14.9	3.54
in professional skill competitions, Abilympics, WorldSkills	57.1	13.2	4.32	51.1	19.1	2.68
in organization of new circles and sport sections	50.3	8.5	5.92	51.6	11.7	4.41
in Programs “Vocational training without borders”	45.0	8.5	5.29	48.9	14.9	3.28
in socially significant projects	54.0	9.5	5.68	53.2	14.4	3.69
in presenting interesting information about VEO on their pages in social networks	57.7	9.0*	6.41	53.7	16.5*	3.25

Note: Opportunities to participate in college and technical school and actual participation in college and technical school were compared in pairs; statistically significant differences, according to the Mann—Whitney and Wilcoxon tests, between opportunities for participation in college and technical school are marked with the letter “a”: [a] ($p<0.05$), and between actual participation in college and technical school are marked with one asterisk ($p<0.05$) and two ($p<0.01$).

ing difficulties in VEO ranged on average in the range from “rarely” to “sometimes”, then communication difficulties ranged from “never” to “rarely” (Table 4).

Perhaps these difficulties are not significant for students, or they do not want to admit them in their answers. If the difficulties listed for evaluation are not relevant for

Table 4

The Frequency of Students' Difficulties across the Sample

Indicate how often you experience difficulties	Never, %	Rarely, %	Some-times, %	Often, %
when studying several disciplines	26.7	39.5	28.6	5.2
when memorizing learning material	18.3	37.8	34.2	9.7
in preparation for homework	30.1	40.3	22.5	7.1
speaking at the blackboard	24.1	34.7	25.3	15.8
when writing tests	17.2	39.2	32.3	11.3
during industrial training	37.6	38.6	19.2	4.6
in the movement around the educational building	69.4	18.6	8.3	3.7
communicating with other students	61.3	23.5	10	5.1
in communication with students with disabilities	63.2	23.1	9.4	4.3
in communication with students from migrant families	70.4	18.4	7.5	3.7
when interacting with teachers	52.7	29.8	13.8	3.7
in communication with the other sex	62.7	22.1	10.5	4.6
in self-regulation of emotions and behavior	56.3	25.8	13	5

students, then the wording of the difficulties themselves needs joint reflection with students. At the same time, if difficulties are not reflected or recognized by students, then a request for support is not formed (formulating a request would mean recognizing the difficulty in front of oneself and peers). This is shown by the data in Table 5, obtained for the entire sample, from which it is clear that students have the opportunity to seek support from various specialists, but in reality, this is done by a relatively small proportion of them.

At the same time, the frequency of requests for advice and assistance to teachers, the class teacher and masters of industrial training far exceeds the frequency of requests to support specialists (psychologist, social educator, teaching or technical assistant, educator).

Analysis of the data for the two selected VEO shows that the frequency of requests for help from teachers was rather higher ($p = 0.062$) in the college (42.9%) than in the technical school (33.5%), and in the technical school it was significantly higher ($p<0.01$) the rate of referral to a social educator (32.4%) and educator (28.2%) than in college (19% and 16.9%, respectively), which confirms our assumption that the difference may be associated with the great interest of college students in activities related to the educational process (for example, in individual projects: college — 28.0%, technical school — 17.6%, $p<0.05$), and in technical school it is associated with great interest in social work (volunteer movement: college — 16.9%, technical school — 25.5%, $p<0.05$) and activities involving communication — festive, sports and other events (college: 15.9% and 16.4 %, technical school: 27.1%, $p<0.01$ and 26.6%, $p<0.05$, respectively).

At the same time, the degree of recognition of learning difficulties in the forms of learning activity was also higher in college (when studying some disciplines, speaking at the blackboard, writing test papers, interacting with teachers, $p<0.05$), while in the technical school, apparently, difficulties in social communication were more pronounced, judging by a significantly higher ($p<0.01$) than in college level of seeking help from social educators and educators/caregivers and greater difficulties in communicating with students from migrant families ($p<0.05$).

Table 5

Comparison of Students' Answers about the Opportunity to Receive Support and Assistance in VEO and its Actual Receipt

Indicate the consultations and assistance of which workers in VEO you have the opportunity to receive, and you have already received in the current academic year	Opportunity, %	Actual Receipt, %
Administrator	60.1	19.5
Social educator	64.9	19.4
Psychologist	65.3	19.2
Class teacher / curator / department head	65.7	41.5
Teaching assistant	42.2	13
Educator/caregiver	49.8	18.9
Technical assistant	44.2	12.3
Masters of industrial training	64.9	34
Teachers	63.9	37.3

Note: All differences between opportunities to receive support and actual receipt were statistically significant by the Mann—Whitney and Wilcoxon tests ($p<0.05$).

It should be noted that in both VEOs there is a significant moderate negative relationship (correlation) between the difficulties of students and the support of teachers. The relationship of support and difficulties in studying several disciplines, preparing homework, passing industrial training and interacting with teachers in college is moderately negative ($0.3<\rho<0.5$), in other cases it is slightly negative ($\rho<0.3$). At the technical school, there was a moderate negative relationship between difficulties in interacting with teachers and support for teachers. The correlation between these indicators in technical school and in college shows that the less support, the greater the difficulties. In particular, there was a moderate negative relationship between difficulties in communicating with teachers and students' perception of support in college ($\rho=-0.460$, $p<0.01$) or technical school ($\rho=-0.351$, $p<0.01$). Similar data from studies by other authors show that difficulties in communicating with teachers are one of the barriers to the formation of a sense of inclusion in students [37].

In both VEOs, a statistically significant positive relationship (correlation) was also found between the provision of support and the desire of students to change organizations ($\rho=0.482$, $p<0.01$, college; $\rho=0.264$, $p<0.01$, technical school), which looks like a paradox: the greater the support, the greater the desire to change the place of study. Moreover, the positive relationship between the provision of support and the desire to change the place of study is *moderate* in college though weak in technical school. This paradox may turn out to be illusory given the findings of the previous analysis, which argue in favor of a lack of association between support and interests or recognized and perceived difficulties of students. If we assume that support is provided either not at the students' own request, or in a volume insufficient to overcome difficulties, or in the absence of motivation to study and overcome difficulties, which are often not recognized by students, then the desire to change the place of study may be caused not the presence of support, but the lack of its connection with interests and needs. In this case, support will simply be an external statement for the student of his difficulties, which, in the absence of his own request, may prompt him to such an unconstructive strategy for getting out of this situation as a desire to leave.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it should be noted that the design of an inclusive educational environment actualizes the long-standing issue of education. It is the issue of the agency of its participants, sharpening it in the concept of active participation. In this article, we did not set the main task of conducting an empirical study on this topic. Moving in the logic of modeling an inclusive educational environment as a whole system, at the conceptualization stage, we identified two approaches. The first approach considers an inclusive educational environment as a simple sum of adjacent components; such an approach in itself does not lead to solving the problem of building an inclusive educational environment, since it does not achieve the goal of including the participants in the environment as its agents, capable of turning external conditions of support into their actual opportunities. This task is solved within the framework of a different approach, which is based on the definition of a system-forming relationship between the conditions of support and the active participation of all actors of the educational environment in joint activities.

The empirical results of our study illustrate the theoretical position formulated above that the special conditions created in VEO aimed at supporting the initiative and activity of students are in demand in those forms of activity in which students show interest or consciously recognize their difficulties, which illustrates the theoretical provisions of the article on the collected empirical material.

Throughout the sample, despite the significant differences between the VEOs, a common characteristic was clearly observed, namely the degree of real participation of students in the forms of work was noticeably less than the degree of awareness of the possibilities of participation (in the ratio from about 3.08 to 4.58). As these studies have shown, it is in the forms of participation that reflect the interests and perceived needs of students that the conditions of support provided to a greater extent turn into realizable opportunities and ensure inclusion in joint activities.

From our point of view, to move from the conditions created in the educational institution to the opportunities for active participation of students in the educational process, special work is needed to identify, together with students, their interests, difficulties and to form an educational request. In this case, support for the agency of students will be provided, and not only external conditions will be created to meet certain educational needs. Such work requires the use of certain psychological and pedagogical technologies (for example: the technology of jointly distributed activities of teachers and students [9; 17; 22], the technology of a reflexive-activity approach [8], the technology of forming a reflexive movement in theatrical pedagogy within the framework of an inclusive plastic theater [15; 16], the technology of including students in the design of an individual educational route [23]).

The task of building an inclusive educational environment raises many questions. Further research will be focused on the analysis of the correlation of indicators of inclusiveness within the framework of the whole system and the development of technological support within the framework of an approach based on the system-forming relationship between the created special conditions, forms of psychological and pedagogical support and the active participation of all subjects of the educational environment in joint activities.

References

1. Alekhina S.V. Predislovie [Foreword]. In: Leont'ev D.A., Aleksandrova L.A., Lebedeva A.A. Razvitie lichnosti i psikhologicheskaya podderzhka uchashchikhsya s OVZ v usloviyakh inklyuzivnogo professional'nogo obrazovaniya [Personal development and psychological support for students with disabilities in the context of inclusive vocational education]. Moscow: Smysl, 2017. 79 p. (In Russ.).

2. Alekhina S.V., Mel'nik Yu.V., Samsonova E.V., Shemanov A.Yu. Otsenka inklyuzivnogo protsessa kak instrument proektirovaniya inklyuzii v obrazovatel'noi organizatsii [Evaluation of the inclusive process as a tool for designing inclusion in an educational organization] [Elektronnyĭ resurs]. *Psikhologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological science and education*, 2021. Vol. 26,

no. 5, pp. 116—126. DOI:10.17759/pse.2021260509 (In Russ.).
3. Bliznyuk O.A., Senchenkov N.P. Ponyatiya “inklyuzivnaya obrazovatel’naya sreda”, “inklyuzivnoe obrazovatel’noe prostranstvo”: skhodstva i razlichiya [The concepts of “inclusive educational environment”, “inclusive educational space”: similarities and differences]. *Chelovek i obrazovanie* [*Man and education*], 2020, no. 4(65), pp. 112—115. (In Russ.).
4. Boginskaya Yu.V. Inklyuzivnaya obrazovatel’naya sreda doshkol’nogo obrazovatel’nogo uchrezhdeniya i nachal’noi shkoly: kompleksnyi podkhod [Elektronnyĭ resurs] [Inclusive educational environment of a preschool educational institution and elementary school: an integrated approach]. *Gumanitarnye nauki* [*Humanitarian sciences*], 2015, no. 4(32), pp. 47—53. Available at: https://www.elibrary.ru/download/elibrary_25075809_14145638.pdf (Accessed 31.08.2022). (In Russ.).
5. Vygotskii L.S. Pedagogicheskaya psikhologiya [Pedagogical psychology]. Moscow: Pedagogika, 1991. 480 p. (In Russ.).
6. Dzhenkins G. Konvergentnaya kul’tura. Stolknovenie starykh i novykh media [Convergent culture. The collision of old and new media]. Moscow: RIPOL Klassik, 2019. 384 p. (In Russ.).
7. Zhulanova I.V., Medvedev A.M. Sistemno-deyatel’nostnyi podkhod kak metodologicheskoe osnovanie proektirovaniya obrazovatel’noi situatsii podgotovki uchitelei i psikhologov [System-activity approach as a methodological basis for designing an educational situation for the training of teachers and psychologists] [Elektronnyĭ resurs]. *Internet-zhurnal “Naukovedenie”* [*Internet journal “Naukovedenie”*]. 2014. Iss. 5(24), 81PVN514, pp. 1—21. Available at: http://naukovedenie.ru/PDF/81PVN514.pdf (Accessed 31.08.2022). (In Russ.).
8. Zaretskii V.K., Zaretskii Yu.V. Sub”ektnaya pozitsiya rebenka v preodolenii uchebnykh trudnostei (sluchai iz praktiki) [Subjective position of the child in overcoming educational difficulties (a case from practice)]. *Konsul’tativnaya psikhologiya i psikhoterapiya = Consultative psychology and psychotherapy*, 2012. Vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 110—133. (In Russ.).
9. Inklyuzivnoe obrazovanie: put’ v budushchee: spravochnyi document [Inclusive education: the way to the future: background paper] [Elektronnyi resurs]. *Mezhdunarodnaya konferentsiya po obrazovaniyu. 48-ya sessiya*. Organizatsiya Ob”edinennykh Natsii po voprosam obrazovaniya, nauki i kul’tury. Mezhdunarodnyi tsentr konferentsii. Zheneva, 25—28 noyabrya 2008 g. [*International conference on education. 48th session*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. International Conference Center]. Geneva, November 25—28, 2008. URL: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000162787_rus/PDF/162787rus.pdf.multi (Accessed 31.08.2022). (In Russ.).
10. Konokotin A.V. Vklyuchenie detei s osobymi obrazovatel’nymi potrebnostyami i normativno razvivayushchikhsya detei v sovmestnoe reshenie uchebnykh zadach (na primere resheniya zadach na ponimanie mul’tiplikativnykh otnoshenii) [Inclusion of children with special educational needs and normatively developing children in the joint solution of educational problems (on the example of solving problems for understanding multiplicative relations)]. *Kul’turno-istoricheskaya psikhologiya = Cultural-historical psychology*, 2019. Vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 79—88. DOI:10.17759/chp.2019150408 (In Russ.).
11. Mezhvedomstvennyi kompleksnyi plan meropriyatii po povysheniyu dostupnosti srednego professional’nogo i vysshego obrazovaniya dlya invalidov i lits s ogranichennymi vozmozhnostyami zdorov’ya, v tom chisle proforientatsii i zanyatosti ukazannykh lits (utv. Pravitel’stvom RF 21.12.2021 № 14000p-P8) [Interdepartmental comprehensive action plan to increase the accessibility of secondary vocational and higher education for people with disabilities and persons with health limitations, including career guidance and employment of these persons (approved by the Government of the Russian Federation on December 21, 2021 No. 14000p-P8)] [Elektronnyĭ resurs]. URL: https://legalacts.ru/doc/mezhvedomstvennyi-kompleksnyi-plan-meroprijatii-po-povysheniiu-dostupnosti-srednego-professionalnogo/ (Accessed 06.09.2022). (In Russ.).
12. Mezhvedomstvennyi kompleksnyi plan meropriyatii po razvitiyu inklyuzivnogo obshchego i dopolnitel’nogo obrazovaniya, detskogo otdykha, sozdaniyu spetsial’nykh uslovii dlya obuchayushchikhsya s invalidnost’yu, s ogranichennymi vozmozhnostyami zdorov’ya na dolgosrochnyi period (do 2030 goda) (utv. Pravitel’stvom RF 22.12.2021 № 14068p-P8) [Interdepartmental comprehensive action plan for the development of inclusive general and additional education, children’s recreation, the creation of special conditions for students with disabilities, with health limitations for the long term (until 2030) (approved by the Government of the Russian Federation on December 22, 2021 No. 14068p-P8)] [Elektronnyĭ resurs]. URL: https://sudact.ru/law/mezhvedomstvennyi-kompleksnyi-plan-meropriiatii-po-razvitiiu-inkliuzivnogo/ (Accessed 06.09.2022). (In Russ.).
13. Minprosveshcheniya Rossii podvelo pervye itogi realizatsii mezhvedomstvennogo kompleksnogo plana [The Ministry of Education of Russia summed up the first results of the implementation of the interdepartmental comprehensive plan] [Elektronnyĭ resurs]. *Ministerstvo prosveshcheniya RF. Novosti* [*Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation. News*]. Available at: https://edu.gov.ru/press/5564/minprosvescheniya-rossii-podvelo-pervye-itogi-realizacii-mezhvedomstvennogo-kompleksnogo-plana (Accessed 31.08.2022). (In Russ.).

14. Ob obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federatsii: Federal'nyi zakon Rossiiskoi Federatsii ot 29 dekabrya 2012 g. № 273-FZ [On education in the Russian Federation: Federal Law of the Russian Federation of December 29, 2012 No. 273-FZ] [Elektronnyĭ resurs]. *Rossiiskaya gazeta* [*Rossiyskaya Gazeta*]. Available at: http://www.rg.ru/2012/12/30/obrazovanie-dok.html (Accessed 31.08.2022). (In Russ.).
15. Popova N.T., Popova E.A. Razvitie individual'noi vyrazitel'nosti aktera s ogranichennymi vozmozhnostyami zdorov'ya v gruppovom teatral'nom treninge: sintez esteticheskikh i reabilitatsionnykh zadach [Development of individual expressiveness of an actor with disabilities in group theatrical training: synthesis of aesthetic and rehabilitation tasks]. *Aktual'nye problemy psikhologicheskoi reabilitatsii lits s ogranichennymi vozmozhnostyami zdorov'ya: sb. nauch. st.* [*Actual problems of psychological rehabilitation of persons with disabilities: Sat. scientific Art*]. Red. A.M. Shcherbakova. Moscow: MGPPU, 2013, pp. 80—96. (In Russ.).
16. Popova N.T., Shemanov A.Yu. Tvorcheskie inklyuzivnye praktiki stanovleniya sub"ektnosti: podkhod k kontseptual'nomu obosnovaniyu [Creative inclusive practices of the formation of subjectivity: an approach to the conceptual justification]. *Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Seriya: Filosofiya. Psikhologiya. Sotsiologiya* [*Bulletin of the Perm University. Series: Philosophy. Psychology. Sociology*], 2021. Iss. 3, pp. 376—385. DOI:10.17072/2078-7898/2021-3-376-385 (In Russ.).
17. Rubtsov V.V., Ivoshina T.G. Proektirovanie razvivayushchei obrazovatel'noi sredy shkoly [Designing the developing educational environment of the school] [Elektronnyĭ resurs]. Moscow: Izd-vo MGPPU, 2002. 272 p.. URL: http://psychlib.ru/mgppu/RPr/RPr-001.htm#$p1 (Accessed 31.08.2022). (In Russ.).
18. Rukovodyashchie printsipy politiki v oblasti inklyuzivnogo obrazovaniya [Guiding principles of policy in the field of inclusive education] [Elektronnyĭ resurs]. Organizatsiya Ob"edinennykh Natsii po voprosam obrazovaniya, nauki i kul'tury. 2009. 38 p.. Available at: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000177849_rus (Accessed: 31.08.2022). (In Russ.).
19. Sadovskii V.N. Sistema [System]. In: *Novaya filosofskaya entsiklopediya* [*New Philosophical Encyclopedia*]. Vol. 3. Nauch.-red. sovet: V.S. Stepin, A.A. Guseinov, G.Yu. Semigin, A.P. Ogurtsov. Moscow: Mysl', 2010, pp. 552—553. (In Russ.).
20. Sovetov B.Ya., Yakovlev S.A. Modelirovanie system [Systems Modeling]. 7-e izd. Moscow: Yurait, 2019. 343 p. (In Russ.).
21. Sovmestnaya uchebnaya deyatel'nost' i razvitie detei: kollektivnaya monografiya [Joint educational activity and development of children: a collective monograph]. Reds. V.V. Rubtsov, I.M. Ulanovskaya. Moscow: FGBOU VO MGPPU, 2021. 352 p. (In Russ.).
22. Tekhnologii razrabotki individual'nogo obrazovatel'nogo marshruta dlya obuchayushchikhsya s ogranichennymi vozmozhnostyami zdorov'ya: metodicheskie rekomendatsii [Technologies for developing an individual educational route for students with disabilities: methodological recommendations] [Elektronnyĭ resurs]. Avt. koll.; ruk. avt. koll. E.V. Samsonova. Moscow: MGPPU, 2020. 192 p. Available at: http://psychlib.ru/resource/pdf/documents/tri-2020/tri-2020.pdf (Accessed 10.08.2022). (In Russ.).
23. Khitryuk V.V. Inklyuzivnaya gotovnost' pedagoga: motivatsionno-konativnyi komponent [Inclusive readiness of a teacher: motivational-conative component]. *Vesnik MDPU imya I.P. Shamyakina* [*Bulletin of MDPU named after I. P. Shamyakina*], 2015, no. 1(45), pp. 98—103. (In Russ.).
24. Shuklina E.A. Partisipatornye issledovaniya v sfere obrazovaniya: osobennosti i perspektivy [Participatory research in the field of education: features and prospects] [Elektronnyĭ resurs]. *Vestnik Surgutskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta* [*Bulletin of the Surgut State Pedagogical University*], 2015, no. 2(35), pp. 5—12. Available at: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/partisipatornye-issledovaniya-v-sfere-obrazovaniya-osobennosti-i-perspektivy (Accessed 25.08.2022). (In Russ.).
25. Yakshina A.N., Levan T.N. Realizatsiya printsipa souchastiya v obrazovatel'noi praktike: obzor sovremennykh issledovanii i proektov po razvitiyu professional'nykh kompetentsii pedagoga [Implementation of the principle of participation in educational practice: a review of modern research and projects on the development of professional competencies of a teacher] [Elektronnyĭ resurs]. *Sovremennoe doshkol'noe obrazovanie* [*Modern preschool education*], 2021, no. 4(106), pp. 4—21. DOI:10.24412/1997-9657-2021-4106-4-21 (In Russ.).
26. Yasvin V.A. Shkol'naya sreda kak predmet izmereniya: ekspertiza, proektirovanie, upravlenie [School environment as a subject of measurement: expertise, design, management]. Moscow: Narodnoe obrazovanie, 2019. 448 p. (In Russ.).
27. Allen K.A., Kern M.L., Vella-Brodrick D., Hattie J., Waters L. What schools need to know about fostering school belonging: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 2018. Vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 1—34. DOI:10.1007/s10648-016-9389-8
28. Chevalier J.M., Buckles D.J. Participatory Action Research: Theory and Methods for Engaged Inquiry. UK: Routledge, 2013. DOI:10.4324/9781351033268
29. Chevallier-Rodrigues E., Savournin F., Courtinat-Camps A., Brossais E., de Leonardis M. Being different or similar? An exploration of inclusive education from the point of view of French adolescents. *Disability & Society*, 2021, pp. 1—23. DOI:10.1080/09687599.2021.1907547
30. Connor D.J. & Cavendish W. 'Sit in my seat': Perspectives of students with learning disabilities

about teacher effectiveness in high school inclusive classrooms. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2020. Vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 288—309. DOI:10.1080/13603116.2018.1459888
31. Goldan J., Schwab S., Hoffmann L. A matter of resources? — Students' Academic Self-concept, Social Participation and School-Wellbeing in Inclusive Education. *International Perspectives on Inclusive Education*, 2021. Vol. 15, pp. 89—100. DOI:10.1108/S1479-363620210000015008
32. Guo Y., Sawyer B.E., Justice L.M., Kaderavek J.N. Quality of the Literacy Environment in Inclusive Early Childhood Special Education Classrooms. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 2013. Vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 40—60. DOI:10.1177/1053815113500343
33. Jose J.P., Shanuga C. Inclusive Properties of School Interactional Milieu: Implications for Identity Construction and Social Exclusion. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*, 2018. Vol. 10(1), pp. 98—113. DOI:10.1177/2455328X17745174
34. Li L., Ruppar A. Conceptualizing Teacher Agency for Inclusive Education: A Systematic and International Review. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 2021. Vol. 44(1), pp. 42—59. DOI:10.1177/0888406420926976
35. Love H.R., Horn E. Definition, Context, Quality: Current Issues in Research Examining High-Quality Inclusive Education. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 2021. Vol. 40(4), pp. 204—216. DOI:10.1177/0271121419846342
36. Sharma U., Woodcock S., May F., Subban P. Examining Parental Perception of Inclusive Education Climate. *Frontiers in Education*, 2022. Vol. 7: 907742. DOI:10.3389/feduc.2022.907742
37. Subban P., Woodcock S., Sharma U., May F. Student experiences of inclusive education in secondary schools: A systematic review of the literature. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2022. Vol. 119, 103853. DOI:10.1016/j.tate.2022.103853
38. Tomas V., Srinivasan R., Kulkarni V., Teplicky R., Anaby D., Khetani M. A guiding process to culturally adapt assessments for participation-focused pediatric practice: the case of the Participation and Environment Measures (PEM). *Disability and Rehabilitation,* 2021. DOI:10.1080/09638288.2021.1960645
39. UNESCO: A Guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education. 2017 [Elektronnyĭ resurs]. Available at: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000248254 (Accessed 04.08.2022).

Литература

1. *Алехина С.В.* Предисловие // Леонтьев Д.А., Александрова Л.А., Лебедева А.А. Развитие личности и психологическая поддержка учащихся с ОВЗ в условиях инклюзивного профессионального образования. М.: Смысл, 2017. 79 с.
2. *Алехина С.В., Мельник Ю.В., Самсонова Е.В., Шеманов А.Ю.* Оценка инклюзивного процесса как инструмент проектирования инклюзии в образовательной организации [Электронный ресурс] // Психологическая наука и образование. 2021. Том 26. № 5. С. 116—126. DOI:10.17759/pse.2021260509
3. *Близнюк О.А., Сенченков Н.П.* Понятия «инклюзивная образовательная среда», «инклюзивное образовательное пространство»: сходства и различия // Человек и образование. 2020. № 4(65). С. 112—115.
4. *Богинская Ю.В.* Инклюзивная образовательная среда дошкольного образовательного учреждения и начальной школы: комплексный подход [Электронный ресурс] // Гуманитарные науки. 2015. № 4(32). С. 47—53. URL: https://www.elibrary.ru/download/elibrary_25075809_14145638.pdf (дата обращения: 31.08.2022).
5. *Выготский Л.С.* Педагогическая психология. М.: Педагогика, 1991. 480 с.
6. *Дженкинс Г.* Конвергентная культура. Столкновение старых и новых медиа. М.: РИПОЛ Классик, 2019. 384 с.
7. *Жуланова И.В., Медведев А.М.* Системно-деятельностный подход как методологическое основание проектирования образовательной ситуации подготовки учителей и психологов [Электронный ресурс] // Интернет-журнал «Науковедение». 2014. Вып. 5(24). 81PVN514. С. 1—21. URL: http://naukovedenie.ru/PDF/81PVN514.pdf (дата обращения: 31.08.2022).
8. *Зарецкий В.К., Зарецкий Ю.В.* Субъектная позиция ребенка в преодолении учебных трудностей (случай из практики) // Консультативная психология и психотерапия. 2012. Том 20. № 2. С. 110—133.
9. Инклюзивное образование: путь в будущее: справочный документ [Электронный ресурс] // Международная конференция по образованию. 48-я сессия. Организация Объединенных Наций по вопросам образования, науки и культуры. Международный центр конференций. Женева, 25—28 ноября 2008 г. URL: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000162787_rus/PDF/162787rus.pdf.multi (дата обращения: 31.08.2022).
10. *Конокотин А.В.* Включение детей с особыми образовательными потребностями и нормативно развивающихся детей в совместное решение учебных задач (на примере решения задач на понимание мультипликативных отношений) // Культурно-историческая психология. 2019. Том 15. № 4. С. 79—88. DOI:10.17759/chp.2019150408
11. Межведомственный комплексный план мероприятий по повышению доступности среднего профессионального и высшего образования для инвалидов и лиц с ограниченными возможностями здоровья, в том числе профориентации и занятости указанных лиц (утв. Правительством РФ 21.12.2021

№ 14000п-П8) [Электронный ресурс]. URL: https://legalacts.ru/doc/mezhvedomstvennyi-kompleksnyi-plan-meroprijatii-po-povysheniiu-dostupnosti-srednego-professionalnogo/ (дата обращения: 06.09.2022).
12. Межведомственный комплексный план мероприятий по развитию инклюзивного общего и дополнительного образования, детского отдыха, созданию специальных условий для обучающихся с инвалидностью, с ограниченными возможностями здоровья на долгосрочный период (до 2030 года) (утв. Правительством РФ 22.12.2021 № 14068п-П8) [Электронный ресурс]. URL: https://sudact.ru/law/mezhvedomstvennyi-kompleksnyi-plan-meropriiatii-po-razvitiiu-inkliuzivnogo/ (дата обращения: 06.09.2022).
13. Минпросвещения России подвело первые итоги реализации межведомственного комплексного плана [Электронный ресурс] // Министерство просвещения РФ. Новости. URL: https://edu.gov.ru/press/5564/minprosvescheniya-rossii-podvelo-pervye-itogi-realizacii-mezhvedomstvennogo-kompleksnogo-plana (дата обращения: 31.08.2022).
14. Об образовании в Российской Федерации: Федеральный закон Российской Федерации от 29 декабря 2012 г. № 273-ФЗ [Электронный ресурс] // Российская газета. URL: http://www.rg.ru/2012/12/30/obrazovanie-dok.html (дата обращения: 31.08.2022).
15. *Попова Н.Т., Попова Е.А.* Развитие индивидуальной выразительности актера с ограниченными возможностями здоровья в групповом театральном тренинге: синтез эстетических и реабилитационных задач // Актуальные проблемы психологической реабилитации лиц с ограниченными возможностями здоровья: сб. науч. ст. / ред. А.М. Щербакова. М.: МГППУ, 2013. С. 80—96.
16. *Попова Н.Т., Шеманов А.Ю.* Творческие инклюзивные практики становления субъектности: подход к концептуальному обоснованию // Вестник Пермского университета. Серия: Философия. Психология. Социология. 2021. Вып. 3. С. 376—385. DOI:10.17072/2078-7898/2021-3-376-385
17. *Рубцов В.В., Ивошина Т.Г.* Проектирование развивающей образовательной среды школы [Электронный ресурс] // М.: Изд-во МГППУ, 2002. 272 с. URL: http://psychlib.ru/mgppu/RPr/RPr-001.htm#$p1 (дата обращения: 31.08.2022).
18. Руководящие принципы политики в области инклюзивного образования [Электронный ресурс] // Организация Объединенных Наций по вопросам образования, науки и культуры. 2009. 38 с. URL: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000177849_rus (дата обращения: 31.08.2022).
19. *Садовский В.Н.* Система // Новая философская энциклопедия: в 4 т. Т. 3 / науч.-ред. совет: В.С. Степин, А.А. Гусейнов, Г.Ю. Семигин, А.П. Огурцов. М.: Мысль, 2010. С. 552—553.
20. *Советов Б.Я., Яковлев С.А.* Моделирование систем. 7-е изд. М.: Юрайт, 2019. 343 с.
21. Совместная учебная деятельность и развитие детей: коллективная монография / под ред. В.В. Рубцова, И.М. Улановской. М.: ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ, 2021. 352 с.
22. Технологии разработки индивидуального образовательного маршрута для обучающихся с ограниченными возможностями здоровья: методические рекомендации [Электронный ресурс] // авт. колл.; рук. авт. колл. Е.В. Самсонова. М.: МГППУ, 2020. 192 с.. URL: http://psychlib.ru/resource/pdf/documents/tri-2020/tri-2020.pdf (дата обращения: 10.08.2022).
23. *Хитрюк В.В.* Инклюзивная готовность педагога: мотивационно-конативный компонент // Веснік МДПУ імя І.П. Шамякіна. 2015. № 1(45). С. 98—103.
24. *Шуклина Е.А.* Партисипаторные исследования в сфере образования: особенности и перспективы [Электронный ресурс] // Вестник Сургутского государственного педагогического университета. 2015. № 2(35). С. 5—12. URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/partisipatornye-issledovaniya-v-sfere-obrazovaniya-osobennosti-i-perspektivy (дата обращения: 25.08.2022).
25. *Якшина А.Н., Леван Т.Н.* Реализация принципа соучастия в образовательной практике: обзор современных исследований и проектов по развитию профессиональных компетенций педагога [Электронный ресурс] // Современное дошкольное образование. 2021. № 4(106). С. 4—21. DOI:10.24412/1997-9657-2021-4106-4-21
26. *Ясвин В.А.* Школьная среда как предмет измерения: экспертиза, проектирование, управление. М.: Народное образование, 2019. 448 с.
27. *Allen K.A., Kern M.L., Vella-Brodrick D., Hattie J., Waters L.* What schools need to know about fostering school belonging: A meta-analysis // Educational Psychology Review. 2018. Vol. 30. № 1. P. 1—34. DOI:10.1007/s10648-016-9389-8
28. *Chevalier J.M., Buckles D.J.* Participatory Action Research: Theory and Methods for Engaged Inquiry. UK: Routledge, 2013. DOI:10.4324/9781351033268
29. *Chevallier-Rodrigues E., Savournin F., Courtinat-Camps A., Brossais E., de Leonardis M.* Being different or similar? An exploration of inclusive education from the point of view of French adolescents // Disability & Society. 2021. P. 1—23. DOI:10.1080/09687599.2021.1907547
30. *Connor D.J., Cavendish W.* 'Sit in my seat': Perspectives of students with learning disabilities about teacher effectiveness in high school inclusive classrooms // International Journal of Inclusive Education. 2020. Vol. 24. № 3. P. 288—309. DOI:10.1080/13603116.2018.1459888
31. *Goldan J., Schwab S., Hoffmann L.* A matter of resources? — Students' Academic Self-concept,

Social Participation and School-Wellbeing in Inclusive Education // International Perspectives on Inclusive Education. 2021. Vol. 15. P. 89—100. DOI:10.1108/S1479-363620210000015008

32. *Guo Y., Sawyer B.E., Justice L.M., Kaderavek J.N.* Quality of the Literacy Environment in Inclusive Early Childhood Special Education Classrooms // Journal of Early Intervention. 2013. Vol. 35. № 1. P. 40—60. DOI:10.1177/1053815113500343

33. *Jose J.P., Shanuga C.* Inclusive Properties of School Interactional Milieu: Implications for Identity Construction and Social Exclusion // Contemporary Voice of Dalit. 2018. Vol. 10(1). P. 98—113. DOI:10.1177/2455328X17745174

34. *Li L., Ruppar A.* Conceptualizing Teacher Agency for Inclusive Education: A Systematic and International Review // Teacher Education and Special Education. 2021. Vol. 44(1). P. 42—59. DOI:10.1177/0888406420926976

35. *Love H.R., Horn E.* Definition, Context, Quality: Current Issues in Research Examining High-Quality Inclusive Education // Topics in Early Childhood Special Education. 2021. Vol. 40(4). P. 204—216. DOI:10.1177/0271121419846342

36. *Sharma U., Woodcock S., May F. and Subban P.* Examining Parental Perception of Inclusive Education Climate // Frontiers in Education. 2022. Vol. 7: 907742. DOI:10.3389/feduc.2022.907742

37. *Subban P., Woodcock S., Sharma U., May F.* Student experiences of inclusive education in secondary schools: A systematic review of the literature // Teaching and Teacher Education. 2022. Vol. 119. Art. 103853. DOI:10.1016/j.tate.2022.103853

38. *Tomas V., Srinivasan R., Kulkarni V., Teplicky R., Anaby D., Khetani M.* A guiding process to culturally adapt assessments for participation-focused pediatric practice: the case of the Participation and Environment Measures (PEM) // Disability and Rehabilitation. 2021. DOI:10.1080/09638288.2021.1960645

39. UNESCO: A Guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education. 2017 [Электронный ресурс]. URL: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000248254 (дата обращения: 04.08.2022).

Information about the authors

Svetlana V. Alekhina, PhD in Psychology, Head of the Institute of Inclusive Education Problems, Moscow State University of Psychology & Education, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9374-5639, e-mail: ipio.mgppu@gmail.com

Elena V. Samsonova, PhD in Psychology, Head of the Scientific and Methodological Center, Institute of Inclusive Education Problems, Moscow State University of Psychology & Education, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8961-1438, e-mail: samsonovaev@mgppu.ru

Alexey Yu. Shemanov, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Department of Special Psychology and Rehabilitation, Faculty of Clinical and Special Psychology, Leading Researcher, Scientific and Methodological Center, Institute of Inclusive Education Problems, Moscow State University of Psychology & Education, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3925-3534, e-mail: ShemanovAYu@mgppu.ru

Информация об авторах

Алехина Светлана Владимировна, кандидат психологических наук, директор, Институт проблем инклюзивного образования, ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет» (ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9374-5639, e-mail: ipio.mgppu@gmail.com

Самсонова Елена Валентиновна, кандидат психологических наук, руководитель, Научно-методический центр, Институт проблем инклюзивного образования, ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет» (ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8961-1438, e-mail: SamsonovaEV@mgppu.ru

Шеманов Алексей Юрьевич, доктор философских наук, профессор, кафедра специальной психологии и реабилитологии факультета клинической и специальной психологии, ведущий научный сотрудник, Научно-методический центр, Институт проблем инклюзивного образования, ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет» (ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3925-3534, e-mail: ShemanovAYu@mgppu.ru

Получена 26.06.2022
Принята в печать 29.08.2022

Received 26.06.2022
Accepted 29.08.2022