

NECHITAİLO IRYNA,

Doctor of Sociological Sciences,
Professor of the Department of
Sociology and Psychology, Kharkiv
National University of Internal Affairs,
Kharkiv, Ukraine

ALEKSANDROV YURII,

Candidate of Psychological Sciences,
Associate Professor of the Department
Sociology and Psychology, Kharkiv
National University of Internal Affairs,
Kharkiv, Ukraine

KALAMKOVIĆ MARTIN,

PhD-student of Faculty of Education in
Sombor, University of Novi Sad,
Specialist in Special Pedagogy of
Primary and Secondary School
«Milan Petrovic», Novi Sad, Serbia

**SOME BARRIERS TO INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN
UKRAINE: INTERDISCIPLINARY ANALYSIS
(BASED ON RESULTS OF IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS)**

The article is dedicated to educational inclusion. It is emphasized that educational inclusion is an integral part of European educational systems, since it provides everyone with equal opportunities to study in regular (non-specialized) schools, as well as universities, regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, linguistic and other features. The article carries out an interdisciplinary (at the intersection of sociology, psychology and pedagogy) analysis of the barriers to inclusive education that exist in modern Ukrainian society. Such barriers as institutional, architectural, technological and behavioral are described. The results of an empirical research conducted by the authors using the in-depth interview method are presented. It is concluded that the most pronounced and difficult to overcome are the behavioral barriers of educational inclusion.

Key words: social inclusion, barriers of educational inclusion, disabled people, inclusive education, school, university.

Статтю присвячено освітній інклюзії. Підкреслюється, що освітня інклюзія є невід'ємною частиною європейських освітніх систем, оскільки забезпечує всім людям, незалежно від їх фізичних, інтелектуальних, соціальних, мовних та інших особливостей, рівні можливості для навчання у звичайних (неспеціалізованих) школах, а також університетах. У статті здійснюється міждисциплінарний (на перетині соціології, психології та педагогіки) аналіз бар'єрів інклюзивної освіти, які існують у сучасному українському суспільстві. Описуються інституційні, архітектурні, технологічні та поведінкові бар'єри. Представлені результати емпіричного дослідження, проведеного авторами з використанням методу глибинного інтерв'ю. Робиться висновок про те, що найбільш вираженими та важкими для подолання є поведінкові бар'єри освітньої інклюзії. **Ключові слова:** соціальна інклюзія, бар'єри освітньої інклюзії, люди з інвалідністю, інклюзивна освіта, школа, університет.

Статья посвящена образовательной инклюзии. Подчеркивается, что образовательная инклюзия является неотъемлемой частью европейских образовательных систем, поскольку обеспечивает всем людям, независимо от их физических, интеллектуальных, социальных, языковых и других особенностей, равные возможности для обучения в обычных (неспециализированных) школах, а также университетах. В статье осуществляется междисциплинарный (на стыке социологии, психологии и педагогики) анализ барьеров инклюзивного образования, которые существуют в современном украинском обществе. Описываются институциональные, архитектурные, технологические и поведенческие барьеры. Представлены результаты эмпирического исследования, проведенного авторами с использованием метода глубинного интервью. Делается вывод о том, что наиболее выраженными и тяжелыми для преодоления являются поведенческие барьеры образовательной инклюзии.

Ключевые слова: социальная инклюзия, барьеры образовательной инклюзии, люди с инвалидностью, инклюзивное образование, школа, университет.

Introduction. Equality of rights and freedom are the most important fundamental values, which create the core of the EU values. We believe in the important role of education in the full realization of these values. In European democratic countries education is an important “social elevator” providing equal opportunities for success for all citizens. That is why educational inclusion is an integral part of European educational systems. It provides everyone equal opportunities to study in regular (non-specialized schools), as well as universities regardless of physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic and other features. Inclusion rate in Western European countries, as well as those that are members of the European Union, significantly exceeds that in Ukraine. For example, in Italy it is 99%, in Norway and Lithuania – 90%, in Poland – 42%, in France – 25%. For comparison, in Ukraine the inclusion rate is only 7%.

In our opinion, an increase in the inclusion rate, as well as the approximation of domestic education to European quality standards, largely depends on the implementation of inclusive education practices and the elimination of barriers to educational inclusion, which manifest themselves very clearly in Ukraine.

In the modern scientific discourse, the social inclusion of people with disabilities is especially actively discussed. It is necessary to emphasize that the very concept of inclusion is far from being limited to this category of citizens. However, it's the most difficult for people with disabilities to realize their social activity, to engage in social processes (even such familiar ones as getting an education), since their inclusion depends not only on their desire, but also on certain social “barriers”, which may impede the full realization of this desire.

The interdisciplinary analysis of these barriers (in the case of this article at the crossroads of sociology, psychology and pedagogy) seems relevant, since inclusive issues nowadays acquire a universal humanitarian character.

Any state that has embarked on a democratic path of development, first of all, should take care to remove the barriers to educational inclusion. Indeed, education is a resource of social growth and development, the most important channel of social mobility and the “social elevator”, as well as that social institution, which ensures both the process of building up human capital in society and its (capital's) high quality (Nechitailo, 2011; Nechitailo, 2017).

The object of this research is barriers to inclusive education.

The research aim is to typologize, theoretically interpret and empirically identify the main objectively existing barriers to inclusive education (in particular, those that take place in Ukraine).

Participation of the research. An empirical research, the results of which formed the basis of this article, was carried out from March to May 2019/ This research was part of the “MILETUS” international project (“Enhancing Student Mobility Potential in Higher Education in Ukraine and Serbia” (GA No. 2016 –

2562/001 – 001)), implemented under the Erasmus + KA2 Higher Education Capacity Building Program, funded by European Union. The essence of the MILETUS project was to organize cooperative scientific work of international and interdisciplinary research teams consisting of PhD-students from Ukraine and Serbia, and professors from Germany, Denmark, Italy, Ukraine and Serbia. Each team had to conduct an empirical research, the results of which would be of great importance for the preparation of doctoral theses by PhD-students included in the project. Thus, research highlighted in this article was conducted by PhD-student from Serbia under the guidance of a professor (both are the co-authors of this article).

Research method. We used in-depth interviews as a method of data collection. Traditional quantitative methods (questionnaires, formal interviews, etc.) are not suitable in this case. Such methods do not provide an opportunity for a deeper understanding of the nature of those barriers to inclusive education that still exist in modern Ukrainian society.

All interviews were recorded. After that, the recorded data were transferred to a paper document in the form of a transcript. Transcripts were analyzed using the content analysis method. We applied semantic (sociological) content analysis and used a qualitative approach to its application, which involves the identification of more or less intense semantic units. In our case, such units were the judgments of the respondents, reflecting their attitude to the existing problems of educational inclusion, allowing us to identify these barriers and characterize them as more or less relevant, more or less surmountable.

Research methodology. We interviewed seven respondents with various diseases and disorders existing either from the moment of birth or from early childhood, which led them to disability. We do not disclose the names of our respondents, as our research was anonymous. In this regard, to identify our respondents in the text of this article, instead of their names, randomly selected alphabetical letters will be used: 1) respondent “A” is the man, 26 years old, cerebral palsy, the disease is not visually identified; 2) respondent “B” is the woman, 21 years old, complete blindness, the disease is visually identified; 3) respondent “C” is the woman, 29 years old, disorders of the musculoskeletal system, the disease is visually identified; 4) respondent “D” is the man, 17 years old, complete deafness, the disease is not visually identified; 5) respondent “E” is the woman, 20 years old, very small stature, the disease is visually identified; 6) respondent “F” is the man, 34 years old, spinal injury, lower body paralysis, the disease is visually identified; 7) respondent “G” is the woman, 25 years old, cerebral palsy with impaired vision and musculoskeletal system, the disease is visually identified.

Since the aim of our research was to identify the objectively existing (institutional, architectural and emotional) barriers to educational inclusion, the subjective

factors related to the medical, anthropological and other characteristics of the respondents were omitted.

The selection of respondents was random. For the selection, the “snowball method” was used. According to the selection procedure, each interviewed respondent recommended one of his acquaintances for the next interview. Data collection was stopped when the newly received responses began to repeat the content of the responses received before.

The interview guide included twenty questions. Fifteen of them were focused on identifying institutional, technological, architectural and behavioral barriers, and five related to some socio-demographic characteristics of respondents (age, marital status, etc.). Interviews were informal. That is, respondents had the opportunity to answer questions in the way they prefer. The interviewer acted as a moderator of the discussion, gently bringing the respondents to those questions that need to be answered in order to achieve the goal of the research.

Review of previous research. Nowadays, issues of social inclusion and, in particular, educational inclusion are highly relevant. These issues are studied by many scientists who are representatives of various sciences about society and social behavior. To strengthen the theoretical and methodological foundations of our research of the barriers to inclusive education, we studied and analyzed a number of scientific articles on similar topics.

Awareness of the high importance of education in the formation of human capital has led to the development of the theory and practice of inclusive education. In the special scientific literature, “inclusive education” is considered from the point of view of ensuring full inclusion in the educational processes of people with different levels of mental and physical development, as well as people with disabilities. Foreign scientists such as L. Borell, A. Darrow, C. Dugan, L. Coriale, H. Hemmingson, S. Fillips, G. Larson, J. Mazurkievich, E. Markovich, L. Marshak, J. Pivik, J. Robertson and others have made significant contributions to this issue (Darrow, 2009; Hemmingson & Borell, 2002; Fillips, 2018; Coriale, Larson & Robertson, 2012; Marshak, Van Wieren, Raeke Ferrell, Swiss & Dugan, 2010; Pivik, McComas & Laflamme, 2002).

Our attention was paid to the works of such post-Soviet scientist as: A. Bazilenko, V. Boyko, E. Budnikova, O. Dikova-Favorska, M. Malofeev, Y. Selivanova, E. Reznikova, D. Zaitsev, S. Zdragat and other (Bazilenko & Utkina, 2019; Bojko, 2012; Budnikova & Reznikova, 2017; Dikova-Favorska, 2019; Malofeev, Nikol'skaya, & Kukushkina, 2010; Zajcev & Selivanova, 2018; Zdragat, 2018). All these scientists have made a significant contribution to the development of various areas of the study of social inclusion. The cumulative effect of their research has resulted in various models and technologies of inclusive education, many of which are already being implemented in modern educational practice.

Our special attention was paid to the work of the modern American scientist S. Phillips. Her book "Disability and Mobile Citizenship in Post-Soviet Ukraine" is based on research at the crossroads of anthropological and sociological scientific traditions (Phillips, 2018). To conduct her research, she used the included observation method, which involved direct participation in the lives of respondents. S. Phillips lived with them, communicated with them closely enough to try to understand their daily life, their point of view. Based on the study, she described in detail the living conditions of people with disabilities, their social circle, the problems they face in everyday life, analyzed the legal aspects of social inclusion, etc. She paid special attention to the subjective and psychological barriers of the full inclusion of people with disabilities in society. Despite the fact that S. Phillips pays a lot of attention to objective factors that impede social inclusion (in particular, legal and institutional), the barriers of educational inclusion itself were not the subject of her study.

At the same time, it should be noted that in Ukraine, as in most other countries with the same level of democratic and social development, there is the lack of a common vision of those barriers that impede the processes of inclusion in educational processes. Such a gap in scientific knowledge was the reason for our research.

Therefore, in the next part of the article, we will offer a theoretical interpretation of the barriers to educational inclusion and the main results of our empirical research aimed at identifying these barriers as they are in social practice.

Results and discussions. According to UNESCO (Salamanca Conference, 1994), inclusive education includes (Ontario Human Rights Commission. The Opportunity to Succeed: Achieving Barrier-Free Education for Students with Disabilities. Consultation Report, 2003):

- movement towards improving the education system as a whole;
- a study of the various educational needs of all students to ensure their full participation in learning, culture and the community. Inclusive education does not imply a special change in the content of education, the structure of curriculum, methods for assessing students' knowledge, etc. The process of educational inclusion should take place on the basis of ordinary standard educational institutions;
- an inclusive society is one in which a respectful attitude to individual differences and features of its members is cultivated, actively fights discrimination and prejudice in theory and practice.

As emphasized by L. Coriale, G. Larson and J. Robertson, people with disabilities, like those on whom, primarily, educational inclusions are oriented, have the following features: mental disorders (poor learning ability, etc.); blindness; dysfunction of motor skills; autism (Coriale, Larson, Robertson, 2012).

A key principle in the implementation of inclusive education practices (as well as inclusion in general) is accessibility. This term is used to describe the difficulty/ease of obtaining certain products, services, conditions. Serbian scholars such as E. Markovic, M. Kalamkovich and J. Mazurkiewicz identify and describe in their articles four types of barriers that impede the accessibility of education for people with disabilities: institutional (or systemic); architectural (or physical); technological and behavioral (or communicational) (Markovic, Kalamkovich & Mazurkiewicz, 2010).

Institutional barriers are obstacles associated with the imperfection of certain established institutional norms, leading to the isolation or exclusion of some individuals or social groups from social life (due to their disability, social status, ethnic or gender affiliation, etc.). L. Marshak, T. Van Vyeren, S. Duran and others note that these barriers arise when an institution (or the state as a whole) ignores the individual diversity of society members. Thus, at the level of various social institutions (politics, economics, education), as well as in the legal system, favorable conditions are created for the reproduction of (unfair) social inequality and social polarization. Institutional barriers are the most difficult to overcome. In addition, they never exist autonomously. As a rule, they contribute to the emergence and/or support the existence of other types of barriers, mainly architectural and behavioral (Marshak, Van Wieren, Raeke Ferrell, Swiss & Dugan, 2010).

Architectural barriers are associated with restrictions on movement on public transport, in residential and public buildings, related to educational infrastructure. Architectural or physical barriers are those barriers that exist in the means of public transport, in apartments and houses, on the streets and on roads, in the workspace, etc. Barriers prevent or interfere with access to buildings and public institutions. They cause a feeling of lower value, confusion, but they can also cause physical injuries. The inability to use public transport means, the inadequate housing conditions, the lack of sound traffic lights and tactile paths on our streets, the lack of affordable public toilets, parking spaces, insufficiently wide pavements with high banks, lack of ramps and slopes for unhindered movement of wheelchairs, unadjusted rooms for work, inappropriate marks for people with visual impairment and hearing are only part of the physical barriers that need to be removed. After the adoption of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (Article 9, Accessibility), the struggle for equal opportunities, the rise of political awareness that the accessibility of public buildings, public transport is a basic human right, is increasingly widespread (Hemmingson & Borell, 2002).

Technological barriers are obstacles caused by the underdevelopment of special educational and pedagogical technologies of inclusive education as a combination of techniques and methods (including technical ones), allowing to take into account the needs of students with disabilities. There are two main

aspects of the technological development of inclusive education. The first of them involves equipping educational institutions and the educational process with the necessary technical devices and software. For example, equipping computers with special speech synthesizers for blind users, voice data input, a braille display (which literally makes the information tangible), etc. Already developed and ready to use speech management software interface for computer systems specially designed for people with cerebral palsy and other problems of the musculoskeletal system. The second aspect of the application of inclusive education technologies concerns its content and involves the organization of an environment in which all students (both with and without disabilities) study together and participate on an equal footing in the life of educational community. This refers to the technologies of individually oriented teaching and pedagogy of partnership, involvement of all students without exception in creative and scientific projects, etc. Inadequate state financing of education, as well as poor-quality training of teaching staff becomes the cause of technological barriers to inclusive education (Darrow, 2009; Newcomer & Barenbaum, 1991).

Behavioral barriers are obstacles associated with the social interaction of participants in the educational process, limiting its capabilities due to certain emotional, psychological and similar problems, as well as existing prejudices and negative stereotypes. Foreign scientists J. Pivik, J. McComas, M. Laflame emphasize that the identified causes of behavioral barriers are associated with a lack of information about people with disabilities. This manifests itself at all levels: family, school and university, community peers (classmates, etc.), professional groups, and even often at the level of people with disabilities themselves (Pivik, McComas & Laflamme, 2002). The formation of new (positive) social stereotypes is a long process. An important role in this process is played by the dissemination of information about positive life stories, success stories of people with disabilities, etc.

Presence of the barriers described above indicates serious obstacles to the implementation of inclusive education policies. An attempt to identify and identify them was carried out by us as part of our empirical research.

Getting to the description of its results, we consider it necessary to give some general information regarding the educational experience of our respondents. Firstly, the vast majority (five people) studied in regular schools, and not in specialized educational institutions for people with disabilities. Respondent “B” spent most of the school period studying at a specialized school in Singapore. And respondent “F” studied at home schooling. None of the respondents has their own family, have no children and have never been married. They all live with their parents. Probably such family status of our respondents is associated with their relatively young age, ranging from 17 to 34 years.

The first set of questions dealt with *institutional barriers*. It should be noted that the vast majority of our respondents (five people) agreed that it is rather difficult for a child with a disability to enroll in a regular school, despite the absence of any contraindications. This was especially emphasized by those respondents who have visible signs of disability. Those two of them, whose appearance is no different from the appearance of the average person, noted that entering the school did not cause any difficulties. All the rest needed some additional resources to enter a regular school: help from influential relatives, contacting the educational authorities to obtain special permits, etc.

We emphasize that our respondents do not have mental disorders. All of them are / was relatively successful students. In this case, the school's refusal from responsibility for such people as they called themselves "exclusive" in an interview, as well as the unjustified fear of the school administration of such people, is very negative. This attitude and behavior should be attributed, rather, to the emotional barriers, which will be discussed below.

Respondent "B", who has complete blindness, told us that she applied to special state institutions with a request to buy a white cane (the cane for the blind people). But she has not received a response from these institutions to this day. She managed to get the white cane in Singapore when she arrived there for treatment to restore vision lost at the age of seven and to attend parallel training at a specialized school for fully or partially blind people. This school was well adapted to the needs of such people. In addition, a psychologist specializing in working with children with disabilities worked at this school.

Respondent "B" raised the question of such forms of state participation in ensuring the social inclusion of blind people as training guide dogs. She noted that in Singapore there are special institutions that are engaged in breeding and raising these dogs. Such a dog is expensive. But there is still the possibility of acquiring it. Unfortunately, this practice is absent in Ukraine. Respondent "B" noted that the state provides the opportunity to receive an escort, which is a social worker who helps to get to the required place (for example, at a university). However, the path itself involves traveling exclusively by public transport. Public transport in itself is one huge barrier for people with disabilities.

It should be noted that those respondents who can independently move around the city without special means are not inclined to turn to public services for any help. They believe that they do not have any special needs, and therefore there is no need to demand from the government special attention to their problems. They note that they are able to independently cope with all their problems associated with their disability.

As for admission to university, all respondents agreed that there were no problems with this. All of them were on an equal footing with those applicants who did not have a disability.

Regarding the *architecture and organization of the physical space* of educational institutions, all of our respondents emphasized the almost complete lack of adaptability to the needs of people with disabilities, especially those who are forced to move with a wheelchair or other assistive devices. Only individual devices, such as ramps, are available. Moreover, even specialized (for people with disabilities) education institutions are provided only with ramps. Those respondents who had experience in such institutions said something like this: "Despite the education institution's specialty, there were no technical conditions except for the ramp. Those who needed more were simply not taken there" (respondent "A"); "... In a specialized school, certain conditions were created for teaching children with disabilities, but not enough to facilitate their mobility" (respondent "F"). In other words, the interior spaces of educational and other institutions are not adapted at an elementary level. According to respondent "C", "...a person in a wheelchair could never have independently reached for the door handle to open it, and the doorways are too narrow for the wheelchair".

Speaking of architectural barriers, it should also be noted that all respondents focused on the inadequacy of urban space to the needs of people with disabilities. Public institutions, such as banks, cinemas, theaters and others do not have ramps and/or special handrails. In addition, the city is oversaturated with borders, which become an insurmountable architectural barrier that makes mobility of people with disabilities (blind or wheelchairs) impossible. According to respondent "A", "...if any work is carried out, then it is formal. The ramps have such a large angle of inclination that it is impossible to move on them in a wheelchair. The sidewalks are surrounded by borders, the height of which is 25 cm, and they do not have any ramps. Traffic lights operate at intervals of twenty seconds. A person with leg problems is not able to cross the road in such a short time. The road surface, even in the city center, is very uneven and too lumpy. ... In reality, it looks like a mockery of people with disabilities..."

Respondent "B", who has vision problems, says about the same thing: "... Our city is not adapted to the needs of people like me. There are too many borders on the streets. Borders are terrible! For example, In Singapore there are no borders at all. It makes life easier for people with disabilities ...".

But the worst architectural barrier is public transport, in particular the subway. According to respondent "B", "...in Singapore there are special "tactile glass paths" for people with visual problems. There are elevators at every subway station. Our people are not educated. Even if elevators had been made, they would have been used by those who can easily go down and climb stairs...". Respondent "F" says: "... Public transport in our city is not adapted at all for the movement of citizens in a wheelchair. There is a budget public transport, both externally and internally involves the possibility of a wheelchair entering it. However, at every stop

there is a curb, which becomes an obstacle. In addition, drivers are not at all trained in how to stop at a bus stop so that a person with a disability can enter or enter vehicles. They stop where they feel comfortable. The presence of a large entrance to transport, unfortunately, does not facilitate our mobility...”.

Of the positive aspects, the presence of traffic lights with sound effects is noted. They are not everywhere, but have already been installed in many city places.

As for the *technological* barriers, all our respondents note that regular schools are completely unprepared for teaching children with disabilities. There are no special textbooks (for example, audio books for the blind), nor special pedagogical techniques and technologies for working with such students. The results of our interviews show that university programs and teachers are much more adapted to the special needs of people with disabilities than school ones. According to respondent “A”, “...school teachers are generally not prepared to work with students with disabilities. During the years of my schooling, they simply ignored me, did not ask for homework, and did not call to the blackboard. I could skip classes without consequences. They were simply afraid of me... Partly because of this, I had low school performance...”.

Other respondents say approximately the same: “Teachers in Ukrainian schools are not prepared at all... As a contrast, in the Singapore specialized school, on the initiative of the Association of People with Visual Problems, specialized lessons were held that taught how to use the white cane, computer, iron, and other equipment, such as make sandwiches, etc.” (respondent “B”); “... Teachers at school were not ready to accept such an “exclusive” person like me... They simply did not know how to behave. Somewhere too sorry, somewhere undeservedly wronged... Sometimes they didn’t let me do some simple tasks, that were quite within my power...” (respondent “C”).

According to respondent “A”, “...university professors are trained in how to work with people with disabilities and require each of them according to their ability...”. All other respondents also noted that most of the university professors they are good at distance learning tools, they have their own accomplishments in the field of distance teaching, as well as remote control of knowledge. All this makes it possible to get higher education to people with disabilities that, due to insurmountable architectural barriers, are not mobile (such as respondent “F”, who can only move with the help of a wheelchair). Although the problem with audio-books remains very relevant and, unfortunately, far from being resolved in the nearest future. No less relevant is the problem of the complete absence of special libraries for people with vision problems.

And the most difficult obstacles to educational inclusion have got emotional and psychological nature. It is about *behavioral (or communicational)* barriers.

Before proceeding with their description, we consider it necessary to note that, without exception, all respondents characterized themselves positively – as open, sociable, and friendly people. That is, all of our respondents have a positive attitude towards the world and people around them. The vast majority have a hobby. Four respondents (“A”, “C”, “D” and “F”) go in for sports (arm wrestling, basketball, regular weight training in the gym). Moreover, each of them took part in various competitions of the all-Ukrainian and international level. Respondent “A” is fond of and professionally engaged in photography. He organizes paid photo sessions. This is the situation when a hobby is also the main source of income. Respondent “E” is actively involved in science. Respondent “B” is fond of reading and sometimes draws pictures. In principle, all respondents are comprehensively developed people with a fairly wide circle of friends and social contacts. For each of them, the basis of support for their activity is still the parent family. At the same time, it should be noted that there are some problems in the personal lives of our respondents. None of them at the time of the interview had their “significant other”. And only three respondents (“A”, “C” and “F”) had experience of a love relationship. However, their significant others also had a disability.

In general, all respondents assess the attitude of other people to themselves as positive. All respondents have enough friends. At the same time, such an assessment is in contradiction with individual statements based on specific life experience. For example, respondent “B” says: “I have a positive attitude towards all people, but people are different. In our society, people do not perceive people like me as equals. This is not fair... This is the problem... People don’t consider us completely ordinary people...”. Respondent “A” says the following: “At school, the teachers told me that I am stupid... And I considered myself stupid and behaved the same way. At the university, the situation was exactly the opposite. Thanks to university professors, I have reached a “winner” position and accepted the position of the winner as the basis of my life ... “.

It is important to note that at school, relations with classmates were very complex and negative among those respondents who have visual manifestations of disability. In particular, respondent “C” says: “Relations with classmates were difficult. The impression was they did not understand me at all. Someone felt sorry, someone offended. But clearly there was not such an attitude as to equal oneself. In general, at school I was very often offended. Students could put the bandwagon, they could call names, ask some offensive question about the disease, etc.”. Respondent “D”, who has problems with growth, told us about the same: “... Sometimes there were situations when at school I was bullied because of growth and eye-catching appearance. I had no friends among classmates. But I had friends from other classes... But they were also not quite ordinary people...”.

Respondent "A", whose disability is almost invisible, also notes: "In the lower grades schoolmates regularly laughed at me and beat me. As a rule, children from dysfunctional families behaved this way... I could not stand up for myself... Because of my health problems I was very weak physically. At a young age, who is stronger is right ...". Respondent "G", who has very noticeable external manifestations of disability, says: "In school, I was always the target of bullying. It was unbearable... I showed success in learning. I had a reason to be proud of myself... I begged my parents to allow me to study at home. But they could not, because there was no medical evidence for this... At the university, everything turned out quite differently. I felt the support of professors and groupmates. They treated me as equal to them...". As for respondent "D", whose disability is not reflected at all in appearance, he notes that his communication with classmates was quite normal. He says: "...I had many friends among classmates. With many of them I still maintain relations ...".

Interestingly, bullying can also occur in specialized educational institutions for children with disabilities, as evidenced by respondent's "B" experience from learning in Singapore school: "In a specialized school, children were divided into visually impaired and completely blind. Visually impaired girls offended those who are completely blind. I stood up for them and then all these girls became my friends. As a result, two constantly conflicting groups were formed ...".

In general, it is obvious that all the types of inclusion barriers described by us most clearly manifest themselves in the school system, while modern Ukrainian universities are much more (especially technologically) prepared to accept on an equal footing those students who have disability.

According to the results of our research, it is behavioral barriers that represent the greatest obstacle to educational inclusion. It should be emphasized that such a conclusion is a finding of our research. More often in the special scientific literature, other barriers are noted as more significant, what will be discussed in more detail in the next section of this article.

Discussions. Russian researchers N. Zaichenko and I. Sapunova conducted a survey of teachers and managers in the field of education. The survey was conducted in 2016-2017. The total sample size was 564 respondents from 65 educational organizations in St. Petersburg and the Vsevolozhsk district of the Leningrad region. The results of the survey showed the following: 1) teachers and heads of educational institutions consider the "lack of escort services for children with disabilities" to be a key barrier in organizing and developing an inclusive environment; 2) the second place is occupied by such a barrier as "insufficient material and technical base"; 3) the third place is shared by barriers, characterized as "a lack of special knowledge about the psychophysiological characteristics disabled students" and "indifference of parents to the problems of children with disabilities"; 4) every second educational

manager (51.2%) and every fourth teacher (25.2%) identify in the list of barriers “absence of special educational programs”; 5) about 37.0% of managers and 17.0% of teachers highlight “lack of funding” among the reasons for difficulties in organizing work with disabled students; 6) every third of the respondents identifies as a barrier to educational inclusion “lack of external support”; 7) the majority (63.5%) of teachers identify parents as “the main opponents” of the development of inclusive education (Zaichenko & Sapunova, 2018).

Similar results show studies conducted by Ukrainian scientists I. Gevko, L. Khodanich, S. Mironova, O. Zavalnyuk, O. Taranchenko and others. According to these results, the most significant obstacle to inclusive education, according to teachers, educational managers and parents, are technological barriers (lack of special knowledge about effective pedagogical technologies that allow teaching children with disabilities; lack of special technical means of teaching children with disabilities, etc.) (Hevko, 2018; Hodanich, 2019; Mironova & Zaval'nyuk, 2011; Taranchenko, 2011).

As we can see, in all of these cases, behavioral barriers are not defined as significant. By contrast, our research revealed the paramount importance of behavioral barriers. We consider such result to be correct, since it is based on the opinion and personal experience of the most important stakeholders of educational inclusion – people with disabilities.

Conclusions. Making general conclusions, we emphasize that the theoretical conceptualization and empirical identification of barriers to inclusive education carried out within the framework of this article made it possible to identify the main problem areas of inclusive practice that significantly slow down inclusive growth.

Despite significant advances in the legislation of Ukraine on inclusive education, despite the real steps taken to reorganize the spaces of educational institutions, there is a very poor performance of all this activity. It must be admitted that at the level of inclusive practice, all the barriers described in the article still exist, and some are very distinct and aggressive.

Our research found that the most difficult problem is the behavioral barriers associated with emotional rejection of students with disabilities by the school community. Modern teachers, like most students (who are at the stage of insufficient social maturity), are not ready for full communication with people with disabilities. The formation of such readiness is a long and complicated process that requires significantly more complex work with public opinion and mass consciousness than the adjustment of laws and the reorganization of social space. An equally difficult problem zone is technological barriers associated with the insufficient implementation of relevant socio-pedagogical technologies, which allow taking into account the educational needs and capabilities of students with disabilities as fully as possible.

The results of our research substantiate the need to concentrate the efforts of the state, educational institutions and key subjects of the educational process (teachers/professors and students) on the following: 1) organization and implementation of a powerful social PR-program for the formation of a positive attitude towards people with disabilities, as citizens who have equal rights and obligations with others; 2) development and implementation of effective social and pedagogical technologies relevant to the tasks of educational inclusion.

Such initiatives, in our opinion, will positively affect inclusive growth and, at the same time, will contribute to the increase of human capital in society.

Transliteration of References:

1. Bazilenko, A. & Utkina, Y. (2019). Porivnyal'na charakteristika stanu social'noi roboti u sferi formuvannya bat'kivs'koï kompetentnosti u sim'yah, de vihovuyut'sya diti z invalidnistyu: Litva ta Ukraina [Comparative characteristics of social work status in the area of parental competence in families with children with disabilities: Lithuania and Ukraine]. An inclusive education environment: challenges, prospects and best practices: Collection of materials of the XIX international scientific and practical conference (207-210). Kyiv: Univ. «Ukraine».
2. Bojko, V. O. (2012). Inklyuzivna osvita: do pitannya viznachennya ponyattya ta osoblivostej ii zaprovadzhennya [Inclusive education: the question of defining the concept and features of its introduction]. Psychological and pedagogical sciences, № 4, 4-8.
3. Budnikova, E.S. & Reznikova, E.V. (2017). Realizaciya inklyuzivnogo obrazovaniya v obrazovatel'noj organizacii [The implementation of inclusive education in an educational organization]. Chelyabinsk: Publishing House "Tsitsero".
4. Coriale, L., Larson, G., Robertson, J. (2012): Exploring the educational experience of a social work student with a disability: A Narrative. Social Work Education, 31(4), 422-434.
5. Darrow, A. A. (2009). Barriers to effective inclusion and strategies to overcome them. General Music Today, 22(3), 29-31.
6. Dikova-Favorska, O. M. (2019). Pedagogika partnerstva yak peredumova uspishnoi realizacii koncepcii inklyuzii [Partnership pedagogy as a precondition for successful implementation of the concept of inclusion]. Collection of materials of scientific-practical conference «Partnership pedagogy as a basis for development of subjects of educational activity in the conditions of the new Ukrainian school» / ed. by OV Kosigina. Zhytomyr: Municipal Institution «Zhytomyr Regional Boarding School of Teacher Education».
7. Fillips, S.D. (2018). Invalidnost' i mobil'noe grazhdanstvo v postsovetsoj Ukraine [Disability and mobile citizenship in post-Soviet Ukraine]. Kharkiv: V.I. Karazin Kharkiv National University.

8. Hemmingson, H., Borell, L. (2002). Environmental barriers in mainstream schools. *Child: Care, Health & Development*, 28(1), 57–63.
9. Hevko, I. V. (2018). Znachennia innovatsiinykh tekhnolohii pry zdiisnenni inkluzyvnoi osvity [The Importance of Innovative Technologies in the Implementation of Inclusive Education]. *Pedagogical Almanac: Collection of Communal Higher Educational Institutions Kherson Academy of Continuing Education, Kherson Regional Council*, 37, 236–240.
10. Hodanich, L. (2019). Inkluzivna osvita u svitli problem gumanizmu [Inclusive education in light of the problems of humanism]. Retrieved from: <http://www.zakinppo.org.ua/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.zakinppo.org.ua%2Fkabineti%2Fkabinet-vihovnoi-roboti%2Finkluzivna-osvita%2F1181-inkluzivna-osvita-u-svitli-problem-gumanizmu43>.
11. Malofeev, N. N., Nikol'skaya, O. S. & Kukushkina, O. I. (2010). Deti s otkloneniyami v razvitii v obshcheobrazovatel'noj shkole: obshchie i special'nye trebovaniya k rezul'tatam obucheniya [Children with developmental disabilities in a comprehensive school: general and special requirements for learning outcomes]. *Defectology*, 5, 14–20.
12. Marković, S., Kalamković, M., Mazurkijević, J. (2010). Asistivne tehnologije u nastavi, specijalnoj edukaciji i rehabilitaciji, ŠOSO „Milan Petrović” [Assistive technologies for mentoring, special education and rehabilitation at the specialized school «Milan Petrovich»] (21–30). Novi Sad: “Milan Petrović”.
13. Marshak, L., Van Wieren, T., Raeke Ferrell, D., Swiss, L., Dugan, C. (2010). Barriers to use of accommodations. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 22(3), 151–165.
14. Mironova, S. & Zaval'nyuk, O. (2011). Stavleniya studentiv i pedagogiv do problem inkluzyvnoi osviti ditej z porushennyami psihofizichnogo rozvitku [Attitudes of Students and Educators to the Problems of Inclusive Education of Children with Disorders of Psychophysical Development]. *Defectology*, 1, 8–17.
15. Nechitailo, I. S. (2011). Rol' universiteta v opredelenii professional'nyh perspektiv studentov [The role of the university in determining the social prospects of its graduates]. In *University graduate in the modern sociocultural space: monograph* / ed. by E. Podolskaya (pp. 160–252). Kharkov : Publishing House of the PUA.
16. Nechitailo, I. S. (2017). Rol' obrazovaniya v ustanovlenii samoorganizacionnogo social'nogo poryadka [The role of education in the establishment of a self-organizing social order]. *Science-Theoretical and Public-Political Almanac «Grani»*, №11 (151), 34–41.
17. Newcomer, P. L., Barenbaum, E. M. (1991). The written composing ability of children with learning disabilities: A review of the literature from 1980 to 1990. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 10, 578–593;

18. Ontario Human Rights Commission. The Opportunity to Succeed: Achieving Barrier-Free Education for Students with Disabilities. Consultation Report (October 2003). Cited in University of Toronto Scarborough, Universal Instructional Design, Creating an Accessible Curriculum, AccessAbility, Teaching and Learning Services.
19. Pivik, J., McComas, J., Laflamme, M. (2002). Barriers and facilitators to inclusive education. *Exceptional Children*, 69 (1), 97-107.
20. Taranchenko, O. (2011). Tendencii suchasnoi osviti: rol' pedagoga u stvorenni effektivnoi inklyuzivnoi shkoli [Trends in Contemporary Education: The Role of the Educator in Creating an Effective Inclusive School]. *Defectology*, 1, 18-24.
21. Zaichenko N.A. & Sapunova I.V. (2018). Geterogennost' i inklyuziya v predstavleniyah pedagogov i rukovoditelej obrazovatel'nyh organizacij [Heterogeneity and inclusion in the views of educators and heads of educational organizations]. *Inclusion in Education*, 2(10). 56-73.
22. Zajcev, D. V. & Selivanova, Y. V. (2018). Inklyuzivnaya paradigma sovremennogo obrazovaniya v Rossii: regional'naya specifika realizacii [The inclusive paradigm of modern education in Russia: regional specificity of implementation]. *Humanities. Scientific and practical journal*, 2 (42), 37-43.
23. Zdragat, S. G. (2018). Evaluaciya inklyuzivnoi osviti: social'na tekhnologiya ii realizacii v ukrains'komu osvitn'omu prostori : avtoref. dis. kand. soc. nauk: 22.00.04 [Evolution of inclusive education: social technology of its implementation in the Ukrainian educational space: autoref. diss. cand. soc. sciences: 22.00.04]. Zaporizhzhya: Klassical Privat University.



NECHITAILO Iryna

Doctor of Psychological Sciences, Professor of the Department of Sociology and Psychology, Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs, Ukraine
E-mail: nechitai@ukr.net

ALEKSANDROV Yurii

Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Associate professor of the Department Sociology and Psychology, Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs, Ukraine
E-mail: aleks251053@gmail.com

KALAMKOVIĆ Martin

PhD-student of Faculty of Education in Sombor, University of Novi Sad,
Specialist in Special Pedagogy of Primary and Secondary School
«Milan Petrovic», Novi Sad, Serbia
E-mail: kalamkovic@gmail.com

SOME BARRIERS TO INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN UKRAINE: INTERDISCIPLINARY ANALYSIS (BASED ON RESULTS OF IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS)