

Assessment of Professional Teacher Training in the Context of Inclusion in Belarus

Vera V. Khitruk

Maxim Tank Belarusian State Pedagogical University, Minsk, Republic of Belarus

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1722-3713>, e-mail: 3577058@gmail.com

The results of an empirical study of a comprehensive assessment of the professional training of future teachers of various specialties (preschool educators, primary school teachers, subject teachers, psychology teachers, social educators, speech pathologists) at higher education institutions in the Republic of Belarus are presented. The complexity of the assessment is ensured by the study of all components of professional teacher training (educational conditions, educational process, educational results) and the representativeness of the multi-subject groups of respondents (vice-rectors for academic affairs of institutions of higher education, teaching staff, graduate students and undergraduates). In order to obtain the research results, there were used author's checklists, 4 types of questionnaires correlated with the marker system (marker 1 — “educational conditions”, marker 2 — “educational process”, marker 3 — “educational results”), criteria, indicators. The study involved 8242 respondents, including the authority (10 vice-rectors for academic affairs), the teaching staff (1131 people), future teacher students of various specialties (7101 people). Mathematical and statistical data processing included the use of Pearson's χ^2 criterion (STATISTICA statistical package version 10.0). The study allowed us to see an important problem — “deficits” in the quality of university teaching staff training (especially its methodological component) that enables to solve problems of forming professional competencies in future teachers. The assessment of professional teacher training made it possible to determine the vectors of improvement of organizational and pedagogical conditions, content and methodological support of higher teacher-training education in the context of the implementation of the principle of inclusion, new methodological approaches to improving the quality of differentiated professional teacher training and to create a basis for making a number of managerial decisions.

Keywords: the principle of inclusion in education; special educational needs; professional teacher training; educational process; educational conditions; educational results; higher education institution.

Funding. The article was prepared based on the results of the implementation of the international technical assistance project “Inclusive Education: a favorable environment for realizing the potential of every child”, approved by Resolution No. 15 of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Belarus dated March 21, 2022.

For citation: Khitruk V.V. Assessment of Professional Teacher Training in the Context of Inclusion in Belarus. *Psikhologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological Science and Education*, 2024. Vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 110—122. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2024290509> (In Russ.).

Оценка профессиональной педагогической подготовки в контексте принципа инклюзии в Беларуси

Хитрюк В.В.

Учреждение образования «Белорусский государственный педагогический университет имени Максима Танка» (УО БГПУ), г. Минск, Республика Беларусь
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1722-3713>, e-mail: 3577058@gmail.com

Представлены результаты эмпирического исследования комплексной оценки профессиональной педагогической подготовки будущих педагогов разных специальностей (воспитателей дошкольного образования, учителей начальных классов, учителей-предметников, педагогов-психологов, социальных педагогов, учителей-дефектологов) в учреждениях высшего образования Республики Беларусь. Комплексность оценки обеспечивается исследованием всех компонентов профессиональной педагогической подготовки (образовательных условий, образовательного процесса, образовательных результатов) и репрезентативностью полисубъектных групп респондентов (проректоры по учебной работе учреждений высшего образования, профессорско-преподавательский состав, студенты выпускного курса и магистранты). С целью решения исследовательских задач использовались авторские чек-листы, 4 вида анкет в соответствии с системой маркеров (маркер 1 — «образовательные условия», маркер 2 — «образовательный процесс», маркер 3 — «образовательные результаты»), критериев, показателей. В исследовании приняли участие 8242 респондента, в том числе администрация (проректоры по учебной работе — 10 человек), профессорско-преподавательский состав (1131 человек), студенты-будущие педагоги разных специальностей (7101 человек). Математико-статистическая обработка данных проводилась с использованием критерия χ^2 Пирсона (статистический пакет STATISTICA версия 10.0). Отмечается, что исследование позволило увидеть важную проблему — «дефициты» качества подготовки профессорско-преподавательского состава университетов (особенно ее методической составляющей) к решению задач формирования профессиональных компетенций у будущих педагогов. В свою очередь, оценка профессиональной педагогической подготовки позволила определить векторы совершенствования организационно-педагогических условий, содержания и методического обеспечения высшего педагогического образования в контексте реализации принципа инклюзии, новые методические подходы в повышении качества дифференцированной профессиональной педагогической подготовки и создать основу для принятия ряда управленческих решений.

Ключевые слова: принцип инклюзии в образовании; особые образовательные потребности; профессиональная педагогическая подготовка; образовательный процесс; образовательные условия; образовательные результаты; учреждение высшего образования.

Финансирование. Статья подготовлена по результатам выполнения проекта международной технической помощи «Инклюзивное образование: благоприятная среда для реализации по-

тенциала каждого ребенка», одобренного постановлением Совета Министров Республики Беларусь от 21 марта 2022 г. № 15.

Для цитаты: Хитрюк В.В. Оценка профессиональной педагогической подготовки в контексте принципа инклюзии в Беларуси // Психологическая наука и образование. 2024. Том 29. № 5. С. 110—122. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2024290509>

Introduction

The Code of the Republic of Belarus on Education emphasizes the principle of inclusion as a fundamental aspect of state policy in the realm of education [11]. Researchers have dedicated significant attention to evaluating the efficacy of inclusive processes within educational settings [1; 2; 3]. High-quality educational inclusion can be reached by professional pedagogical training [4; 5; 6; 7; 14; 16; 17; 18], aligning with the definition of “quality of education” [8; 9; 10; 11]. Quality education is evaluated based on two primary criteria: the capacity of an education to meet state standards, as well as its ability to fulfill societal needs.

The term “quality” is defined as “the characteristics of an object and its ability to meet established and anticipated needs” [12]. Evaluation of professional pedagogical training has been the subject of numerous publications, scientific discussions, and research studies. The effectiveness and efficiency of professional pedagogical training are key considerations.

In a previous publication [15], methodological approaches to creating diagnostic tools for evaluating the training of inclusive education teachers were presented. This toolkit enables the assessment of learning conditions, educational processes, and the development of professional competencies among prospective teachers.

Our research results will serve two main purposes. Firstly, they will help identify the strengths and weaknesses of every aspect of the educational process related to training

future teachers, including the conditions, the actual teaching process, and the educational outcomes. This analysis will enable us to make informed management decisions aimed at enhancing the quality of teacher training. Secondly, our findings will facilitate the development of a monitoring system that will empower each university to formulate a strategic approach to training future teachers within the framework of promoting inclusive education.

Research methodology and sample characteristics

In order to address the research objectives, a set of tools was developed, including a system of markers (Marker 1 — “Educational Conditions”, Marker 2 — “Educational Process”, Marker 3 — “Educational Results”), criteria, and indicators for evaluating the quality of preparation of future teachers to implement inclusive education principles. A variety of elements within the field of professional pedagogical training were evaluated, including educational and programme documentation, scientific and methodological support (such as higher education educational standards, exemplary curricula for pedagogical specialities, and teaching staff professional activities), as well as the content of practical training (which encompasses various types of practices outlined in the curricula). Additionally, the evaluation considered personal and professional educational outcomes, which encompass a range of fundamental and specialised competencies.

The study was conducted during the 2023/2024 academic year in higher educa-

tion institutions (HEIs) across the Republic of Belarus. These institutions collectively specialise in the training of teachers across various disciplines. The study encompassed a total of ten higher education institutions (HEIs), distributed across the country. Seven of the institutions (HEIs-1) concentrated their efforts on training future teachers for preschools, general secondary schools, and special education institutions, representing 70% of the total number of HEIs included in the study. The remaining three HEIs (HEIs-2) focused their training on teachers for establishments spanning different levels of basic education, including vocational and secondary special education, representing 30% of the total number of HEIs included in the study.

The survey respondents were classified into three distinct groups: those occupying administrative roles (including vice-rectors for academic affairs), faculty members, and graduate students. The research tools were comprised of checklists that were tailored to the specific needs of the higher education institution's administration, as well as questionnaires that were designed to elicit information from different segments of the academic community. The questionnaires included options for graduate students pursuing pedagogical qualifications, graduate students focusing on becoming teacher-defectologists/special education teachers, graduate students in general, and the teaching staff of the institution. The response scale ranged from "yes" to "I find it difficult to answer", thereby providing a comprehensive spectrum of responses for the participants.

6852 respondents took part in the study, including:

group of respondents 1 (marker 1) — vice — rectors for academic affairs of the Higher education institution — a total of 10 people;

group of respondents 2 (marker 2) — 1131 teachers of higher education institutions, including teaching staff of higher education institutions-1 — 76.7%, teaching staff of higher education institutions-2 — 23.3% (female respondents — 77.5%, male — 22.5%). Teaching experience in higher education: 14.9% — up to 5 years; 7.9% — 5—10 years; 26.5% — 11—20 years; 32.4% — 21—30 years; 13.4% — 31—40 years; 4.9% — over 41 years. They have an academic degree of Doctor of Sciences — 3.2%; Candidate of Sciences — 44.9%; academic master's degree — 26.2%; academic title of professor — 2.7%; academic title of associate professor — 39.1%; do not have an academic degree / title — 58.2%. The respondent teachers teach various academic disciplines: 19.6% — humanities; 6.7% — general pedagogical disciplines; 12.4% — special pedagogical disciplines; 6.2% — general psychological disciplines; 5.1% — special psychological disciplines; 8.5% — methodological disciplines; 20.2% — language disciplines (including foreign languages); naturally-scientific disciplines — 8.2%; physical education — 8.1%; other — 4.9%. The survey of teaching staff focused on two key aspects of the educational process: firstly, the preparedness and capability of teaching staff to teach academic disciplines in line with the principles of inclusive education, and secondly, the understanding and acceptance of the ideas of educational inclusion, as well as the possession of the requisite knowledge about the theoretical and practical aspects of implementing the principle of inclusion in education. The utilisation of information pertaining to the integration of students with special educational needs into the learning environment and their interactions with their peers, the prevention of stigmatisation and bullying in children's collective settings, and so forth. Secondly, the

deployment of competence-oriented tasks and cases that demonstrate the realisation of the principle of inclusion in education, in lectures, practical classes, laboratory sessions, and the various forms of practice;

the group of respondents 3 (marker 3) — a total of 5,711 people, including:

a) 5,083 future teachers (4143 (81.5%) — future teachers of kindergartens, ordinary schools, special schools and 940 (18.5%) — future teachers of professional colleges (respondents of the HEI-1 female — 80%, male — 20%; HEI respondents-2 female — 69.7%, male — 30.3%);

b) 501 (12.1%) graduate students who receive the qualification of “teacher-defectologist/special teacher” (female respondents — 99%, male — 1%);

c) 127 graduate students in the profile of “Pedagogy” (female respondents — 78.7%, male — 21.3%).

Three groups of student respondents were identified: a — “future teachers of various specialties”, b — “future teachers of speech pathologists”, c — “undergraduates of pedagogical specialties”). The students of group “a” studied:

1) the formation of **basic professional competencies (BPC)** that ensure effective professional activity in an inclusive education environment:

understanding and acceptance of the ideas of inclusive education;

emotional readiness for professional activity in an inclusive education environment;

knowledge of the typology of special educational needs (hereinafter — SEN) of students;

understanding of their professional role in team interaction in solving the tasks of teaching a child with SEN and willingness to perform it;

2) willingness and ability:

to organize the educational process on a diagnostic basis, taking into account individual SEN;

to adapt/modify the content of education and methodological techniques taking into account the SEN of the student;

to analyze the resources of the educational environment in terms of their compliance with the SEN of students;

to create special educational conditions taking into account the individual SEN of students;

to prevent discrimination and/or bullying of individual students.

The students of group “b” studied:

1) the formation of specialised professional competencies (SPC) that ensure effective professional activity in an inclusive education environment is contingent upon a number of factors. Firstly, there must be an understanding and acceptance of the principles of inclusive education. Secondly, professionals must possess knowledge of the typology of students with special educational needs (SEN);

2) The ability to diagnose students with special educational needs (SEN) and assess the suitability of the educational environment for meeting their individual requirements is essential. Furthermore, the development of tailored learning environments, the organisation of the educational process on a diagnostic basis and the creation of special educational conditions must be considered. The special educational needs (SEN) of students must be taken into account when adapting the content of education and the methodological techniques employed. This entails modifying the content and techniques in a way that is sensitive to the specific needs of each student. It is essential to interact with other participants in the educational process and engage in the development of joint solutions. This collaborative approach is crucial for ensuring the ef-

fective delivery of education to students with diverse needs.

The students in Group C studied two key areas: firstly, the formation of deep professional competencies (DPC) that ensure effective professional activity in an inclusive education environment, and secondly, willingness and ability. To design an inclusive educational environment within an educational institution; to undertake methodological activities within an educational institution on issues of inclusive education; to organise and undertake project activities, and to participate in scientific and methodological work within an educational institution in the context of inclusive education. Some of the questionnaire items were identical for all groups of student respondents, enabling the collection of comparative data on their preparedness to work in an inclusive education environment. The sample of respondents is representative of the general population of educational institutions that provide training for future teachers, ensuring the objectivity of the results. To compare the distribution of response frequencies across three different groups of respondents, the Pearson criterion χ^2 was employed (STATISTICA statistical package version 10.0).

Results

Marker 1 "Educational conditions" (respondents are vice-rectors for academic affairs). A total of 80.0% of respondents indicated that the educational programmes are aligned well with current pedagogical science and educational practices in the realm of inclusive education from a theoretical perspective. Competence-based tasks are being created and implemented within the educational framework to foster the skills necessary for constructing the educational process based on diagnostic foundations, taking into account the specific special educational needs (SEN)

of students (60.0%). While some respondents acknowledge only a partial alignment (40.0%), the overall sentiment is positive towards the integration of inclusive practices in education.

It was not identified by any of the respondents that the allocation of tasks was towards enhancing the readiness and capability of future teachers to work in an inclusive education setting. This contradictory situation requires further investigation. The respondents indicated that control and evaluation materials are either absent (20.0%) or inadequate (20.0%), which are essential for assessing the development of various competencies crucial for working in an inclusive education environment. Additionally, the respondents stated that they have sufficient access to textbooks, teaching materials, and other educational resources necessary for effectively preparing future teachers for inclusive education (80.0%).

The respondents indicated that only 40% of the sources specified in the list of essential and additional literature comply with the requirements for relevance. Conversely, the learning environment in two out of ten universities (20%) is fully compliant with accessibility requirements, while eight universities (80%) have partial compliance. The majority of respondents (90%) indicate the presence of structures that support the preparation of teachers for inclusive education. Additionally, they indicate that the necessary technical equipment is available to conduct practical classes in academic subjects that contribute to the development of skills and readiness for work in inclusive education settings.

The vast majority of respondents (100.0%) attest to the teaching staff's profound grasp of the philosophy and values of inclusion, their embrace of the concept of inclusive education, and their comprehensive understanding

of the theoretical foundations of implementing inclusive principles in education. However, the respondents also indicate that there is room for improvement in the teaching staff's preparedness to effectively utilise methods and strategies to prevent discrimination and bullying within a student community. Additionally, there is a dearth of knowledge regarding the current landscape of inclusive educational practices, the characteristics of an inclusive learning environment, the various types of special educational needs (SEN), as well as the expertise and ability to employ methodological techniques when integrating a student with SEN into interactions with peers. It is further recommended that students with SEN receive enhanced training and education.

Marker 2 "Educational process" (respondents — teaching staff).

The majority of respondents (the total response rate is "yes" and "rather yes than no") understand the philosophy of inclusion in education (58.6% and 33.7%) and accept the values of educational inclusion (46.3% and 38.6%). At the same time, less than half of the respondents indicated that they are well aware of the ideas of inclusive education, and 15.1% of the respondents' answers relate to the positions "rather no than yes", "no", "I find it difficult to answer". Respondents unequivocally affirmatively believe that they know the current state of educational practice in the context of inclusive education (31.7%); the necessary knowledge to consider theoretical (32.8%) and practical (27.8%) aspects of the implementation of inclusive education in teaching students; methods and techniques to prevent discrimination and bullying (37.0%); information on methodological methods (34.6%) and the actual methodological methods of work (30.6%) in the training and upbringing of a student with SEN; knowledge of methodological techniques (31.3%) and the

actual methodological techniques (28.1%) of involving a student with SEN in interaction with peers. At the same time, from 32.6% to 37.3% of respondents answered these questions "rather no than yes", "no", "I find it difficult to answer". 30.7% of respondents use information about methodological techniques for including a student with SEN in interaction with peers, while 37.0% of respondents do not do this.

Less than a third of respondents answered in the affirmative that they use competence-oriented tasks/cases on inclusive education in lecture classes (27.3%), in practical and/or laboratory classes (29.0%). Respondents answered "rather no than yes", "no", "I find it difficult to answer" in 23.5%, 12.9% and 6.5% of cases (regarding the use of competence-oriented tasks in lectures) and from 20.4%, 11.9% and 5.3% (in practical and/or laboratory classes) of respondents, respectively.

The survey showed that 24.8% of teaching staff have practical experience working with a child with SEN. University teachers feel the need for knowledge about the special educational needs of students (61.7%); note a lack of knowledge about techniques and ways to adapt the content of educational material (55.2%) and methodological techniques (54.3%), taking into account different SEN of students; lack of knowledge about the formation of an inclusive culture of students in a group/class (51.0%) and about organization of effective interaction with parents of group/class children, including parents raising children with SEN (51.1%); 28.4% of respondents confidently claim that they have an inclusive culture, while 29.4% of respondents note that they have not formed an inclusive culture.

Marker 3 "Educational outcomes" (student respondents (a)). The absolute majority of respondents understand and accept the

ideas of inclusive education, 85.0% intend to improve their professional skills in this direction. Future speech-language pathologists are confident that they have deep and complete knowledge in the field of inclusive education (14.4%); they know how to communicate correctly with parents of “special” children (25.4%). The respondents believe (the answers are “yes” and “rather yes than no”) that they are able to determine the educational needs of each child (28.4% and 41.7% respectively); they are able to establish friendly relationships between normal and “special” children (31.3% and 35.6% respectively); they will be able to organise communication between parents of “normal” and “special” children (37.3% and 36.8% respectively). The respondents of this group believe that they have the knowledge that will allow them to resist discriminatory manifestations against “special” children (63.8%), intend to create a positive image of a “special” child in the classroom (85.7% of respondents). At the same time, 21.3% of the respondents admit that they do not understand the idea of inclusion or find it difficult to answer this question; 12.3% do not accept the idea of inclusive education or find it difficult to answer this question. 16.0% of pre-service teachers think that knowledge of inclusive education is unnecessary and 14.3% of respondents find it difficult to answer this question. The very idea of the possibility of working in an inclusive educational environment causes a varying degree of negative attitude in 19.0% of future teachers.

With varying degrees of confidence, 67.8% say that every child with SEN is ready to learn. At the same time, 44.9% of respondents feel professionally insecure when working with “special” children, 44.2% feel psychologically unprepared to work with “special” children in conditions of inclusion, and 40.2%

feel methodologically unprepared to work with “special” children. In addition, it is difficult to answer the questions: “I feel professionally insecure in working with “special” children” — 17.7%, “I feel psychologically unprepared to work with “special” children in conditions of inclusion” — 15.5%, “methodically unprepared to work with “special” children” — 17.9% of respondents. The reasons for a child’s “failure” in the educational process are associated with the teacher’s work by 47.6%, and with the child’s existing disorder — 23.7%.

Most of the future teachers interviewed are aware of the role of teamwork in solving the problems of inclusive education. Thus, the respondents intend to solve the problems of teaching “special” children (63.6%) in a team of specialists, including a teacher-defectologist, a teacher-psychologist, parents and the administration of an educational institution. In order to adapt teaching materials to the characteristics of each child, 63.6% of respondents plan to consult a teacher-defectologist. At the same time, 78.8% of the respondents intend to offer the adaptation of educational materials taking into account the characteristics of each child to a teacher-defectologist (11.4% find it difficult to answer), 73.4% of the respondents would offer the same to the parents of a child with SEN, and 20.7% of the future teachers will delegate the solution of problems arising in the education of “special” children to the children’s parents (15.3% find it difficult to answer).

The respondents expressed confidence in their ability to adapt methodological techniques to the needs of each child. 27.1% (42.0% “rather yes than no”) indicated knowledge of structuring lessons (courses) to address the educational needs of all children, including those with special needs. 26.0% (35.1% “rather yes, rather than no”) demonstrated proficiency in utilizing didactic mate-

rials in a manner that considers the diverse needs of learners. A significant proportion of respondents indicated that they intend to use various methodological techniques and ways of organising educational activities for children with special educational needs (SEN). In particular, 48.4% of respondents indicated that they intend to use a range of techniques and approaches, while 56.1% stated that they intend to select educational material in accordance with the educational needs of each child, including those with special requirements.

Furthermore, a notable number of respondents (35.4%) indicated that they are able to consider the specific needs of different children with SEN. This suggests that they are able to adapt their teaching methods to meet the diverse learning needs of their students.

The self-assessment by prospective teachers of the formation of specialised professional competencies indicates a relatively high level of preparedness for the implementation of the principle of inclusive education. A total of 18.0% of respondents expressed doubts of varying severity or difficulties in answering the question about their readiness to teach any child with special educational needs (SEN). Similarly, 13.8% of respondents indicated difficulties in their ability to adapt any methodological techniques to the characteristics of each child. Additionally, 11.6% of respondents expressed concerns regarding their willingness to carry out an examination of the resources of the educational environment in terms of its ability to satisfy the individual special educational needs (SEN) of the student. To satisfy the individual special educational needs (SEN) of the student — 11.6% and an expert assessment of the created special educational conditions — 13.2%; willingness to work with undesirable student behaviour — 16.2%; willingness to consult

teachers on the inclusion of a child with SEN in interaction with their peers — 12.0%. A significant proportion of future teachers-defectologists expressed reservations about their ability to foster amicable relationships between typically developing and children with special educational needs (SEN), ascertain the educational requirements of each child, and facilitate communication between parents of typically developing and SEN children.

The data from the survey of Masters postgraduates of pedagogical specialties (respondents — Masters postgraduates (c)) on the formation of the required deep professional competencies indicate that 19.7% of respondents are uncertain or have difficulties in knowing the typology of the SEN of students, while 24.4% have similar difficulties in relation to strategic directions for the development of educational inclusion. The respondents indicate a lack of preparedness to design an inclusive educational environment in an educational institution (25.7%), implement methodological measures on inclusive education (31.5%), organise and implement project activities in the context of inclusive education (30.5%), and organise scientific and methodological. The remaining areas requiring attention are as follows: work on educational inclusion (28.4%); conducting an examination of the resources of the educational environment in terms of its capabilities to meet the individual needs of a student (25.9%); conducting an expert assessment of the created special educational conditions (25.2%).

In order to compare the distribution of response frequencies in three different groups of respondents (students-future teachers of preschool education and general secondary education (P), students who receive the qualification of “teacher-defectologist/SEN teacher”, and students who receive postgraduate education (master’s degree)), Pearson’s cri-

terion χ^2 was employed to assess the statistical significance of differences between two or more relative indicators (frequencies) (STATISTICA statistical package version 10.0).

The results of Pearson's χ^2 calculation (Table 1) allow stating significant differences in the three groups of respondents on the general questions of the questionnaires.

The results of Pearson's χ^2 calculation (see Table 1) allow stating significant differences in the three groups of respondents of future teachers (P) and future teachers-defectologists (TD) on the general questions of the questionnaires.

The analysis of the data presented in Table 1 allows stating that the understanding of philosophy, acceptance of the values of educational inclusion, knowledge of the ideas of its implementation and the need to improve professionally among students-defectologists are more pronounced than in other groups of respondents.

The analysis of the data presented in Table 2 allows stating that the readiness to teach any child with special educational needs, consideration of the failure of a "special" child as a pedagogical problem, the ability to adapt and use any methodological

Table 1

The results of comparing the frequency of responses to the questionnaire of graduate students: future teachers (P), teachers-defectologists (TD) and Masters postgraduates (M)

Question	χ^2	df	p
I understand the philosophy of inclusion in education	63,34	8	< 0,001
I accept the values of educational inclusion	77,77	8	< 0,001
I am well aware of the ideas of implementing the principle of inclusion in education	190,35	8	< 0,001
I accept the terms of inclusion and will improve professionally so that my activities are successful	80,45	8	< 0,001

Table 2

The results of comparing the frequency of responses to the questionnaire of future teachers and future teachers-defectologists

Question	χ^2	df	p
I will solve problems in teaching "special" children together, involving a teacher-defectologist, a teacher-psychologist, parents, and the administration of an educational institution	48,73	4	< 0,001
I am ready to teach any child with special educational needs	50,19	4	< 0,001
The failure of a "special" child is a pedagogical problem related to the work of a teacher	45,36	4	< 0,001
I will be able to adapt any methodological techniques to the characteristics of each child	67,53	4	< 0,001
I accept the terms of inclusion and will improve professionally so that my work is successful	75,08	4	< 0,001
I am able to use didactic materials taking into account the special educational needs of different children	341,77	4	< 0,001
I will be able to organize communication between "ordinary" and "special" children	93,70	4	< 0,001
I can identify the educational needs of each child	108,07	4	< 0,001
I will be able to organize communication between parents of "ordinary" and "special" children	41,88	4	< 0,001

techniques to the characteristics of each child, as well as the ability to form friendly relations between ordinary and “special” children and their parents are more pronounced among students-defectologists compared to future teachers.

Conclusion

The conducted research made it possible for the first time in the Republic of Belarus to comprehensively assess the quality of training future teachers for inclusive education. We consider it reasonable to recommend the developed tools for conducting monitoring procedures in higher education institutions that prepare future teachers of various specialties. Preparing future teachers for inclusive education requires transformations of all components of the educational process: revision of

the content of general pedagogical, general psychological and methodological academic disciplines, targeted training of teaching staff. A meaningful examination of curricula should be carried out from the standpoint of 1) the presence in them of tasks that determine the formation of future teachers' ability and readiness to work in an inclusive education; 2) requirements for knowledge and skills that reveal the essence of pedagogical activity in an inclusive education. Teaching methods should be enriched with relevant competence-oriented tasks developed in inclusive education. Special attention should be paid to methodological training, which involves the formation of the readiness and ability of future teachers to adapt and/or modify the content and methodological techniques, taking into account the individual SEN of students.

References

1. Alekhina S.V., Mel'nik YU.V., Samsonova E.V., SHemanov A.YU. K voprosu ocenki inklyuzivnogo processa v obrazovatel'noj organizacii: pilotazhnoe issledovanie [On the issue of assessing the inclusive process in an educational organization: a pilot study]. *Psihologo-pedagogicheskie issledovaniya = Psychological-Educational Studies*, 2019. Vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 121—132. DOI:10.17759/psyedu.2019110410. (In Russ., abstr. in Engl.)
2. Alekhina S.V., Mel'nik YU.V., Samsonova E.V., SHemanov A.YU. Ocenka inklyuzivnogo processa kak instrument proektirovaniya inklyuzii v obrazovatel'noj organizacii [Assessment of the inclusive process as a tool for designing inclusion in an educational organization]. *Psihologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological Science and Education*, 2021. Vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 116—126. DOI:https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2021260509 (In Russ.).
3. Alekhina S.V., Mel'nik YU.V., Samsonova E.V., SHemanov A.YU. Ekspertnaya ocenka parametrov inklyuzivnogo processa v obrazovanii [Expert assessment of the parameters of the inclusive process in education]. *Klinicheskaya i special'naya psihologiya = Clinical Psychology and Special Education*, 2020. Vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 62—78. DOI:10.17759/cpse.2020090203 (In Russ.).
4. Alekhina S.V., Alekseeva M.N., Agafonova E.L. Gotovnost' pedagogov kak osnovnoj faktor uspešnosti inklyuzivnogo processa v obrazovanii [The readiness of teachers as the main factor of the success of the inclusive process in education]. *Psihologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological Science and Education*, 2011. Vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 83—92.
5. Alekhina S.V., Silant'eva T.A. Podderzhka uchitelya v inklyuzivnom obrazovanii [Teacher support in inclusive education]. *Sovremennaya zarubezhnaya psihologiya = Modern foreign psychology*, 2014. Vol. 3, no 3, pp. 5—15.
6. Gajdukevich S.E. Konceptiya metodicheskoy podgotovki uchitelya-defektologa k rabote v usloviyah diversifikacii obrazovaniya lic s osobennostyami psihofizicheskogo razvitiya [The concept of methodological training of a teacher-defectologist to work in conditions of diversification of education of persons with special psychophysical development]. *Vestnik GGU*, 2023, no. 3, pp. 205—215.
7. Gajdukevich S.E. Strategiya razvitiya soderzhaniya metodicheskoy podgotovki uchitelya-defektologa v usloviyah diversifikacii obrazovaniya lic s osobennostyami psihofizicheskogo razvitiya [Strategy for the development of the content of methodological training of a teacher-defectologist in the context of diversification of education of persons with special psychophysical development]. *Adukacyya i vyhavanne*, 2023, no. 1, pp. 68—75.
8. Korotkov E.M. Upravlenie kachestvom obrazovaniya: ucheb. posobie dlya vuzov [Quality Management in Education]. Moscow: Akadem. Proekt: Mir, 2007. 320 p.

9. Mel'nik YU.V. Professional'naya kompetentnost' pedagoga kak uslovie realizacii inkluzivnoy obrazovatel'noj deyatel'nosti [Professional competence of a teacher as a condition for the implementation of inclusive educational activities]. *Vestnik Kostromskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. Seriya: Pedagogika. Psihologiya. Sociokinetika, no. 2, pp. 18—21.
10. Matros D.SH., Polev D.M., Mel'nikova N.N. Upravlenie kachestvom obrazovaniya na osnove novyh informacionnyh tekhnologij i obrazovatel'nogo monitoring [Quality management of education based on new information technologies and educational monitoring]. Moscow: Ped. obshchestvo Rossii, 1999. 96 p.
11. Ob izmenenii Kodeksa Respubliki Belarus' ob obrazovanii [Elektronnyj resurs]: Zakon Resp. Belarus' ot 14.01.2022 № 154-Z. URL: <https://pravo.by/docum ent/?guid=12551&p0=H12200154&p1=1> (Accessed 01.02.2024).
12. Razvitie sistemy ocenki kachestva obrazovaniya v Respublike Belarus'. Obsheee srednee obrazovanie [Development of the education quality assessment system in the Republic of Belarus. General secondary educatio] / M.B. Gorbunova [i dr.]; pod nauch. red. V.F. Ruseckogo. Minsk: Nacional'nyj institut obrazovaniya, 2022. 392 p.
13. Slastyonin V.A. Kachestvo obrazovaniya kak social'no-pedagogicheskij fenomen [The quality of education as a socio-pedagogical phenomenon]. *Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie i nauka*, 2005, no. 3, pp. 65—69.
14. Sokova E.V. Gotovnost' pedagogov kak neobhodimoe uslovie vnedreniya i razvitiya inkluzivnogo obucheniya [The readiness of teachers as a necessary condition for the introduction and development of inclusive education]. Stanovlenie i razvitie inkluzivnogo obrazovaniya v regione Severnyj Kavkaz: materialy regional'noj nauch.-prakt. konf. (26—27 noyabrya 2010 god). Armavir: RIC AGPA, 2010, pp. 140—141.
15. Khitruk V.V., Feklistova S.N., Lemekh E.A. Instrumentarij dlya monitoringa kachestva podgotovki pedagogicheskikh rabotnikov k realizacii principa inkluzii: metodologiya, markery, kriterii i pokazateli [Tools for monitoring the quality of teacher training for the implementation of the principle of inclusion: methodology, markers, criteria and indicators]. *Adukacyya i vyhavanne*, 2024, no. 3, pp. 36—46.
16. Khitruk V.V. Podgotovka pedagogov k formirovaniyu funkcional'noj gramotnosti obuchayushchihsya v kontekste principa inkluzii v obrazovanii [Preparation of teachers for the formation of functional literacy of students in the context of the principle of inclusion in education]. *Adukacyya i vyhavanne*, 2022, no. 4, pp. 23—30.
17. Khitruk V.V., Feklistova S.N., Poznyak A.V., Volchenkov V.S. Training of teaching staff in the context of the principle of inclusion: vectors of development of the content of education [Training of teaching staff in the context of the principle of inclusion: vectors of development of the content of education]. *Adukatsia i vykhavanne*, 2023, no. 4, pp. 19—28.
18. Vaughn S., Bos C.S. Strategies for teaching students with learning and behavior problems. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc., 8th ed, 2012. 450 p.

Литература

1. Алехина С.В., Мельник Ю.В., Самсонова Е.В., Шеманов А.Ю. К вопросу оценки инклюзивного процесса в образовательной организации: пилотажное исследование // Психолого-педагогические исследования. 2019. Т. 11. № 4. С. 121—132. DOI:10.17759/psyedu.2019110410
2. Алехина С.В., Мельник Ю.В., Самсонова Е.В., Шеманов А.Ю. Оценка инклюзивного процесса как инструмент проектирования инклюзии в образовательной организации // Психологическая наука и образование. 2021. Т. 26. № 5. С. 116—126. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2021260509>
3. Алехина С.В., Мельник Ю.В., Самсонова Е.В., Шеманов А.Ю. Экспертная оценка параметров инклюзивного процесса в образовании // Клиническая и специальная психология. 2020. Т. 9. № 2. С. 62—78. DOI:10.17759/cpse.2020090203
4. Алехина С.В., Алексеева М.Н., Агафонова Е.Л. Готовность педагогов как основной фактор успешности инклюзивного процесса в образовании // Психологическая наука и образование. 2011. Т. 16. № 1. С. 83—92.
5. Алехина С.В., Силантьева Т.А. Поддержка учителя в инклюзивном образовании // Современная зарубежная психология. 2014. Т. 3. № 3. С. 5—15.
6. Гайдукевич С.Е. Концепция методической подготовки учителя-дефектолога к работе в условиях диверсификации образования лиц с особенностями психофизического развития // Вестник ГГУ. 2023. № 3. С. 205—215.
7. Гайдукевич С.Е. Стратегия развития содержания методической подготовки учителя-дефектолога в условиях диверсификации образования лиц с особенностями психофизического развития // Адукацыя і выхаванне. 2023. № 1. С. 68—75.
8. Коротков Э.М. Управление качеством образования: учеб. пособие для вузов. М.: Академ. Проект: Мир, 2007. 320 с.
9. Мельник Ю.В. Профессиональная компетентность педагога как условие реализации инклюзивной образовательной деятельности // Вестник Костромского государственного университета. Серия: Педагогика. Психология. СоциокINETика. № 2. С. 18—21.

10. Матрос Д.Ш., Полев Д.М., Мельникова Н.Н. Управление качеством образования на основе новых информационных технологий и образовательного мониторинга. М.: Пед. общество России, 1999. 96 с.
11. Об изменении Кодекса Республики Беларусь об образовании: Закон Республики Беларусь от 14.01.2022 № 154-З [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://pravo.by/document/?guid=12551&p0=H12200154&p1=1> (дата обращения: 01.02.2024).
12. Развитие системы оценки качества образования в Республике Беларусь. Общее среднее образование / М.Б. Горбунова [и др.]; под науч. ред. В.Ф. Русецкого. Минск: Национальный институт образования, 2022. 392 с.
13. Слостёнин В.А. Качество образования как социально-педагогический феномен // Педагогическое образование и наука. 2005. № 3. С. 65—69.
14. Сокова Е.В. Готовность педагогов как необходимое условие внедрения и развития инклюзивного обучения // Становление и развитие инклюзивного образования в регионе Северный Кавказ: материалы региональной науч.-практ. конф. (26—27 ноября 2010 г.). Армавир: РИЦ АГПА, 2010. С. 140—141.
15. Хитрюк В.В., Феклистова С.Н., Лемех Е.А. Инструментарий для мониторинга качества подготовки педагогических работников к реализации принципа инклюзии: методология, маркеры, критерии и показатели // Адукацыя і выхаванне. 2024. № 3. С. 36—46.
16. Хитрюк В.В. Подготовка педагогов к формированию функциональной грамотности обучающихся в контексте принципа инклюзии в образовании // Адукацыя і выхаванне. 2022. № 4. С. 23—30.
17. Хитрюк В.В. Подготовка педагогических работников в контексте принципа инклюзии: векторы развития содержания образования / В.В. Хитрюк, С.Н. Феклистова, А.В. Позняк, В.С. Волченков // Адукацыя і выхаванне. 2023. № 4. С. 19—28.
18. Vaughn S., Bos C.S. Strategies for teaching students with learning and behavior problems. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc., 8th ed, 2012. 450 p.

Information about the authors

Vera V. Khitruk, Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Director of the Institute of Inclusive Education of the educational institution “Maxim Tank Belarusian State Pedagogical University”, Minsk, Republic of Belarus, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1722-3713>, e-mail: 3577058@gmail.com

Информация об авторах

Хитрюк Вера Валерьевна, доктор педагогических наук, профессор, директор Института инклюзивного образования учреждения образования «Белорусский государственный педагогический университет имени Максима Танка» (УО БГПУ), г. Минск, Республика Беларусь, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1722-3713>, e-mail: 3577058@gmail.com

Получена 08.08.2024

Принята в печать 29.10.2024

Received 08.08.2024

Accepted 29.10.2024