Modelling Teachers' Readiness for Inclusive Education: A Predictive Approach

Lyudmila B. Baryaeva[1], Marina L. Skuratovskaya[2]*, Marina Z. Gazieva[1], Nigar E. Zeynalova[3]

[1] Chechen State Pedagogical University, Grozny, Russian Federation
[2] Don State Technical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation
[3] Azerbaijan University of Languages, Baku, Azerbaijan

*Corresponding author: marinasku@yandex.ru

Abstract

Introduction. The article addresses the formation of teachers' inclusive culture as an integrative personal trait that determines their readiness to work in inclusive education. It presents a contemporary understanding of the construct of inclusive culture and its relationship with general culture, identifies its key components, values and social norms, and describes its external dimension (accessibility and safety of the educational environment) and internal dimension (values, norms and rules). The role of inclusive culture as a foundational condition for the development of inclusive education is emphasized. **Methods.** The study employed four standardized diagnostic instruments measuring inclusive readiness, readiness for teaching, pedagogical communication styles and emotional intelligence in a sample of 549 pre-service teachers (372 students from Chechen State Pedagogical University and 177 students from Azerbaijan University of Languages). Statistical analysis was carried out using multiple regression (backward stepwise method, 12 models). **Results.** Regression analysis demonstrated a significant contribution of the studied variables to the prediction of inclusive readiness (F = 38.790; p < 0.001). Nine key predictors were identified: emotional awareness, absence of a hyporeflexive communication style, absence of a hyperreflexive communication style, ability to recognize others' emotions, differentiated attention pattern, sociability, dictatorial communication style, self-confidence and self-motivation. **Discussion.** A predictive

GENERAL PEDAGOGY

model of teachers' readiness for inclusive education is proposed. The strongest predictor is emotional awareness ($\beta = 0.278$), reflecting teachers' capacity for reflection on their own emotions; the second most important predictor is the absence of a hyporeflexive behavioral pattern ($\beta = -0.177$), and the third is the absence of a hyperreflexive style ($\beta = -0.135$). Together, these components shape teachers' readiness to work effectively in an inclusive educational environment.

Keywords

Funding

For citation

Introduction

The development of inclusive practices in society and education places new demands on the preparation of future teachers. One of the key requirements is the formation of an inclusive culture as an integrative personal characteristic that underpins future teachers' readiness to work in inclusive educational settings and to provide continuous psychological and pedagogical support to students with disabilities. Despite the long-standing experience of implementing inclusive education in Russia, teachers' attitudes towards inclusion remain ambivalent, shaped by a complex interplay of contextual and individual factors, which makes the task of fostering an inclusive culture among students in teacher education programmes particularly salient.

Contemporary research conceptualizes inclusive culture as an integral part of general culture that encompasses core cultural components such as values, social norms and mechanisms for transmitting cultural heritage (Andreeva, 2021). At the heart of an inclusive

GENERAL PEDAGOGY

culture lies the value of the individual, recognised in all their unique characteristics and capabilities. The social norms underpinning an inclusive culture are linked to the acceptance of others, mutual support and cooperation (Dyachkova, Tomyuk, Shutaleva, & Dudchik, 2019; Booth & Ainscow, 2002). The transmission of inclusive cultural heritage is closely tied to teachers' communicative competences, in particular their willingness and ability to interact with all participants in the educational process within an inclusive environment (Booth, 2007; Polyansky & Martirosyan, 2018).

In this perspective, inclusive education is viewed as one of the key mechanisms for building a society of equal opportunities (Kudryavtsev, Kashtanova, Olkhina, Medvedeva, & Karpushkina, 2018; Mirzayeva, 2019), and the acceptance of inclusive values in society—reflected in people's communication, language, behaviour and activity—is regarded as an important indicator of an inclusive social culture (Shemanov & Yekushevskaya, 2018). In the scientific literature, inclusive culture is described as the foundation of inclusive education, largely determining the success of inclusion, and is understood both as a specific philosophy and as a component of the overall culture of an educational organization (Segal, 2014; Ainscow & Sandill, 2010).

Recent studies distinguish between the external and internal dimensions of inclusive culture. The external dimension is associated with the accessibility and safety of the educational process (the educational component) and of the educational organization itself (the architectural component), whereas the internal dimension encompasses the values, norms and rules shared by all participants in the educational process (Alyokhina, 2014; Alyokhina & Shemanov, 2018; Makarova, 2020; Starovoit, 2022; Ainscow, 2005).

In the context of higher education, inclusive culture is defined as the basic, initial stage in the development of future teachers' readiness for professional activity in inclusive educational settings (Kashtanova, Kudryavtsev, & Krasnopevtseva, 2023; Yemelyanova, 2015; Skuratovskaya, 2020; Ilaltdinova, Filchenkova, Kudryavtsev, & Krasnopevtseva, 2022). Its formation depends on specific pedagogical conditions created at the university, including the use of a competence-based approach to organizing the educational process, the development of didactic models for cultivating inclusive culture, and the implementation of targeted programmes for enhancing students' inclusive culture through specially designed educational activities (Bogdanova, 2020; Krivodonova, 2020; Salavatulina & Reznikova, 2023; Khitryuk, 2012).

Methods

The level of inclusive culture and readiness to work in inclusive education among students of teacher education programmes at Chechen State Pedagogical University and Azerbaijan University of Languages was assessed using the following instruments: Method for Diagnosing the Level of Inclusive Readiness of Future Teachers (V. V. Khitruk), Scale for Assessing Readiness and Adaptability of the Individual to Teaching Activity (Yu.

GENERAL PEDAGOGY

Dementieva), Method for Diagnosing Pedagogical Communication Styles (N. P. Fetiskin), and Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (N. Hall). Multiple regression analysis using the backward stepwise method (12 models) was conducted to determine the contribution of psychological and socio-psychological characteristics to the manifestation of future teachers' inclusive readiness.

The study was carried out online using an electronic survey form that incorporated the stimuli of all four instruments. The sample comprised 549 students aged 17–21 years, including 372 students from Chechen State Pedagogical University and 177 students from Azerbaijan University of Languages.

Results

To develop a predictive model, all studied variables were initially included as candidate predictors, namely: overall level of emotional intelligence, rigidity of response, productivity, hyporeflexive style, hyperreflexive style, dictatorial style, differentiated attention style, efficiency, contactless style, level of self-regulation, authoritarian style, creative capacity, adaptability, sociability, self-confidence, emotion regulation, emotional awareness, active interaction style, self-motivation and the ability to recognize other people's emotions. The indicators listed in Table 1 were selected from this set for further analysis and interpretation as the most informative predictors of teachers' inclusive readiness.

Table 1

Variables Removed During Backward Stepwise Regression Analysis of Predictors of Teachers' Inclusive Readiness

Model	Removed Variable	Method
1	—	Backward (Criterion: Probability of F for removal $\geq$ .100)
2	Overall emotional intelligence level	Backward (Criterion: Probability of F for removal $\geq$ .100)
3	Level of self-regulation	Backward (Criterion: Probability of F for removal $\geq$ .100)
4	Creative capacity	Backward (Criterion: Probability of F for removal $\geq$ .100)
5	Task efficiency	Backward (Criterion: Probability of F for removal $\geq$ .100)
6	Authoritarian style	Backward (Criterion: Probability of F for removal $\geq$ .100)

Model	Removed Variable	Method
7	Adaptability	Backward (Criterion: Probability of F for removal ≥ .100)
8	Emotion regulation	Backward (Criterion: Probability of F for removal ≥ .100)
9	Work capacity	Backward (Criterion: Probability of F for removal ≥ .100)
10	Contactless (avoidant) style	Backward (Criterion: Probability of F for removal ≥ .100)
11	Active interaction style	Backward (Criterion: Probability of F for removal ≥ .100)

As shown in Table 1, nine variables were retained for subsequent analysis: sociability, self-confidence, emotional awareness, self-motivation, the ability to recognize others' emotions, and four pedagogical communication patterns—namely, dictatorial, differentiated attention, hyporeflexive and hyperreflexive styles.

Table 2 presents the statistical parameters of the final regression model, including standardized and unstandardized coefficients, standard errors and significance levels.

Table 2

Results for the Regression Model Predicting Teachers' Inclusive Readiness

Model	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Significance (p)
Regression	173.052	19.228	38.790	< .001
Residual	212.159	0.496	—	—
Total	385.211	—	—	—

Note. Dependent variable: Teachers' Inclusive Readiness

As indicated in Table 2, the F-statistic ($F = 38.790$, $p < .001$) demonstrates a significant contribution of the studied variables to predicting teachers' inclusive readiness.

To assess the assumptions of multiple regression analysis, the Durbin–Watson test was conducted and variance inflation factors (VIF) were examined. The results are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

GENERAL PEDAGOGY

Table 3

Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) and Condition Indices

Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	(Constant)	Sociability	Self-Confidence	Dictatorial	Differentiated Attention	Hyporeflexive	Hyperreflexive	Emotional Awareness	Self-Motivation	Emotion Recognition	Dimension
1	7.198	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	1
2	2.000	1.897	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.04	.04	.03	2
3	0.209	5.867	.00	.01	.01	.00	.00	.00	.00	.75	.28	.11	3
4	0.184	6.263	.00	.05	.05	.06	.00	.06	.00	.16	.03	.00	4
5	0.169	6.520	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.01	.61	.81	5
6	0.137	7.241	.00	.03	.04	.00	.12	.07	.05	.01	.00	.02	6
7	0.044	12.823	.00	.02	.00	.27	.08	.37	.22	.02	.02	.01	7
8	0.029	15.738	.00	.44	.47	.11	.17	.19	.13	.00	.00	.00	8
9	0.024	17.258	.00	.35	.40	.12	.44	.22	.23	.00	.01	.00	9
10	0.006	35.474	1.00	.10	.02	.43	.19	.10	.37	.00	.00	.01	10

Table 4

Summary Statistics of Residuals

Statistic	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted value	0.522	3.753	2.262	0.629	438
Residual	−1.852	2.346	0.000	0.697	438
Standardized predicted value	−2.765	2.369	0.000	1.000	438
Standardized residual	−2.630	3.332	0.000	0.990	438

Note. Dependent variable: Teachers' Inclusive Readiness

The diagnostic tests presented in Tables 3 and 4 confirm that the assumptions of multiple regression were satisfied: no multicollinearity was detected (all VIF values were acceptable), and the Durbin–Watson statistic indicated no significant autocorrelation in the residuals. These findings justify proceeding with the interpretation of the regression results.

Table 5 presents the regression coefficients and model fit statistics for the final regression model predicting teachers' inclusive readiness based on the studied psychological and social-psychological characteristics.

Table 5

Unstandardized and Standardized Regression Coefficients for the Final Model Predicting Teachers' Inclusive Readiness

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p
(Constant)	1.643	0.404	—	4.067	< .001
Sociability	0.040	0.018	0.123	2.191	.029
Self-Confidence	0.036	0.018	0.110	2.006	.046
Dictatorial Style	0.898	0.383	0.116	2.344	.020
Differentiated Attention Style	0.892	0.307	0.127	2.903	.004
Hyporeflexive Style	−1.179	0.301	−0.177	−3.918	< .001
Hyperreflexive Style	−1.056	0.351	−0.135	−3.009	.003
Emotional Awareness	0.032	0.007	0.278	4.445	< .001
Self-Motivation	0.014	0.007	0.123	1.866	.063
Emotion Recognition	0.015	0.008	0.130	1.978	.049

Note. B = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE = standard error; β = standardized regression coefficient (beta); t = t-statistic; p = significance level. Dependent variable: Teachers' Inclusive Readiness.

GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY, PERSONALITY PSYCHOLOGY, HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY

The regression analysis results illuminate the differential contributions of the studied variables to teachers' inclusive readiness. Emotional awareness emerged as the primary predictor ($\beta = 0.278$, $p < .001$), reflecting the capacity for reflection on one's own emotional states—a core component of emotional intelligence according to Hall's model. This finding underscores emotional awareness as the leading predictor of future teachers' readiness to implement inclusive practices.

The second-strongest predictor was the absence of a hyporeflexive communication style ($\beta = -0.177$, $p < .001$), characterized by teacher-centeredness, reliance on monologic discourse, and emotional insensitivity to others. The significant negative coefficient indicates that the absence of this maladaptive pattern is crucial for inclusive readiness and achieved statistical significance comparable to emotional awareness.

The absence of a hyperreflexive style ($\beta = -0.135$, $p = .003$) constituted the third-strongest predictor. This dysfunctional pattern manifests as excessive socio-psychological reactivity, preoccupation with impression management and defensive responsiveness to student feedback. Its absence similarly predicted stronger inclusive readiness.

Ranked in descending order of predictive strength, the remaining significant predictors were: emotion recognition ability ($\beta = 0.130$, $p = .049$), reflecting the capacity to identify others' emotional states; differentiated attention style ($\beta = 0.127$, $p = .004$), denoting teachers' strategic focus on students requiring additional support; sociability ($\beta = 0.123$, $p = .029$), understood as interpersonal openness and adaptability to teaching roles; dictatorial style ($\beta = 0.116$, $p = .020$), suggestive of directive classroom management; and self-confidence ($\beta = 0.110$, $p = .046$).

Self-motivation ($\beta = 0.123$, $p = .063$) was retained in the final model as a marginal predictor, indicating a pronounced but sub-threshold trend. While not meeting conventional significance criteria, this indicator's inclusion suggests the potential importance of intrinsic motivation for sustained inclusive practice, warranting further investigation.

Discussion

The findings underscore the fundamental role of inclusive culture as an integrative personal attribute that shapes teachers' readiness to work in inclusive educational environments. The identification of emotional awareness as the strongest predictor of inclusive readiness aligns with contemporary understanding of the significance of emotional intelligence and metacognitive reflection on one's own emotional states for effective teacher practice within inclusive settings (Hall, 2006; Dunaevskaya, 2018). This suggests that emotional awareness functions as a key resource enabling teachers to embrace student diversity and adopt a humanistic pedagogical orientation (Andreeva, 2021; Alyokhina, 2014).

A noteworthy finding is that inclusive readiness is predicted not only by the presence of positive psychological characteristics, but also—and significantly—by the absence of

Lyudmila B. Baryaeva, Marina L. Skuratovskaya, Marina Z. Gazieva, Nigar E. Zeynalova
Modelling Teachers' Readiness for Inclusive Education: A Predictive Approach
Russian Psychological Journal, 22(4), 2025

GENERAL PEDAGOGY

certain dysfunctional communication styles, particularly hyporeflexive and hyperreflexive patterns. Teachers who are predominantly self-focused, emotionally unresponsive to their students, or conversely, overly concerned with impression management contradict the foundational values of inclusive culture, which centre on acceptance, dialogue and genuine cooperation (Booth & Ainscow, 2002; Shemanov & Yekushevskaya, 2018). This finding empirically supports the theoretical proposition that cultivating an inclusive culture requires a fundamental transformation of pedagogical communication styles (Ainscow & Sandill, 2010; Polyansky & Martirosyan, 2018).

The contributions of emotional recognition, sociability and differentiated attention patterns further illuminate the relational foundations of inclusive readiness. These predictors demonstrate that inclusive culture rests on well-developed interpersonal and social-perceptual competences. This aligns with contemporary approaches that conceptualize inclusive culture not merely as an articulated system of values, but as a coherent set of sustainable interactive practices with students requiring specialized support (Kolokoltseva, 2022; Kashtanova et al., 2023). The emphasis on targeted, individualized support correlates with the notion of an inclusive educational environment as a space characterized by flexible differentiation and personalized pedagogical assistance (Morina, 2017; Stubbs, 2008).

The positive contribution of the dictatorial communication style merits particular attention. On the surface, this result appears inconsistent with inclusive principles; however, it may be interpreted as reflecting culturally situated features of university-level educational organization, where more directive group management can coexist with teachers' emotional awareness and communicative sensitivity. Contemporary literature describes such transitional or hybrid professional orientations as characteristic of educational systems undergoing institutional transformation (Kudryavtsev et al., 2018; Starovoit, 2022).

The marginal statistical significance of self-motivation suggests a potentially important but emerging role for teachers' intrinsic motivation in sustaining inclusive practice over time. Scholarship emphasizes that resilience to occupational stress and sustained commitment to supporting students with special educational needs correlate with deep personal investment and intrinsic motivation (Yemelyanova & Sinyavskaya, 2015; Skuratovskaya, 2020). These findings indicate self-motivation as a fruitful direction for future investigation within the broader predictive model.

Collectively, the predictive model presented aligns with theoretical frameworks positing that inclusive culture in higher education emerges at the intersection of ethical values, emotional-personal dispositions and pedagogical interaction patterns (Alyokhina & Shemanov, 2018; Ilaltdinova et al., 2022). The results underline the imperative to incorporate into teacher preparation programmes targeted content addressing the development of emotional intelligence, reflective practice and communicative competence within inclusive educational contexts.

GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY, PERSONALITY PSYCHOLOGY, HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY

The developed predictive model yields a coherent profile of teachers' inclusive readiness. Concretely, teachers will demonstrate readiness to implement inclusive practices when they possess the capacity for reflective engagement with their own emotional experiences, the ability to differentiate pedagogical attention and direct it towards students requiring additional classroom support, and an orientation towards the substantive content of their teaching rather than its superficial presentation. Additionally, such teachers will display emotional attunement to their students, accurately recognize student emotions, and demonstrate genuine sociability—capacities that enable authentic connection with learners in inclusive settings, flexible structuring of instructional materials aligned with students' cognitive abilities, and professional confidence in their pedagogical conduct.

References

Ainscow, M. (2005). *From special education to effective schools for all. Keynote presentation at the Inclusive and Supportive Education Congress,* University of Strathclyde.

Ainscow, M., & Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organisational cultures and leadership. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14*(4), 401–416. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110802504903

Alyokhina, S. V. (2014). Principles of inclusion in the context of changes in educational practice. *Psychological Science and Education, 19*(1), 5–16. (In Russ.).

Alyokhina, S. V., & Shemanov, A. Yu. (2018). Inclusive culture as a value basis for changes in higher education. In V. Rubtsov (Ed.), *Developing inclusion in higher education: A network approach* (pp. 5–13). Moscow State Psychological and Pedagogical University. (In Russ.).

Andreeva, E. E. (2021). On the essence of the concept of inclusive culture. *Herald of Social and Humanitarian Education and Science, 1*, 4–9. (In Russ.).

Armstrong, D., Armstrong, A. C., & Spandagou, I. (2011). Inclusion: By choice or by chance? *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 15*(1), 29–39.

Bogdanova, E. V. (2020). *Inclusive competence of students in the information and educational environment of higher education*. KNITA. (In Russ.).

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools*. Bristol, United Kingdom: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education. http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/Index%20English.pdf

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2007). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools* (Russian ed.). Perspektiva. (In Russ.).

Dyachkova, M. A., Tomyuk, O. N., Shutaleva, A. V., & Dudchik, A. Yu. (2019). Inclusive organizational culture as a culture of acceptance of diversity and mutual understanding. *Perspectives of Science and Education, 5*(41), 373–385. (In Russ.).

Lyudmila B. Baryaeva, Marina L. Skuratovskaya, Marina Z. Gazieva, Nigar E. Zeynalova
Modelling Teachers' Readiness for Inclusive Education: A Predictive Approach
Russian Psychological Journal, 22(4), 2025

GENERAL PEDAGOGY

Ilaltdinova, E. Yu., Filchenkova, I. F., Kudryavtsev, V. A., & Krasnopevtseva, T. F. (2022). Development of an inclusive culture of pre-service teacher. *ARPHA Proceedings, 5*, 635–646. https://doi.org/10.3897/ap.5.e0635

Kashtanova, S. N., Kudryavtsev, V. A., & Krasnopevtseva, T. F. (2023). Culture of inclusion in the educational ecosystem of a modern university. *Psychological Science and Education, 28*(6), 33–44. https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2023280603 (In Russ.).

Khitryuk, V. V. (2012). Inclusive readiness as a stage in the formation of teachers' inclusive culture: Structural and level analysis. *Bulletin of Bryansk State University*. (In Russ.)

Kolokoltseva, M. A. (2022). Inclusive culture of a teacher: The essence, structure, and ways of solving professional tasks. *Concept*, 2022(4), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.24412/2304-120X-2022-11020 (In Russ.).

Koroleva, Y. A. (2016). Teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education in general education organizations. *Concept, 20*, 77–80. (In Russ.)

Krivodonova, Y. E. (2020). Features of the formation of inclusive competencies among teachers within a general education organization. In *Innovative directions of social and humanitarian research: Collection of scientific papers from the International Scientific and Practical Conference* (February 12, 2020). Belgorod. (In Russ.)

Kudryavtsev, V. A., Kashtanova, S. N., Olkhina, E. A., Medvedeva, E. Y., & Karpushkina, N. V. (2018). Inclusive culture as a strategic orientation in building a society of equal opportunities. In V. Rubtsov (Ed.), *Developing inclusion in higher education: A network approach* (pp. 30–39). Moscow State Psychological and Pedagogical University. (In Russ.)

Levin, H. M. (1997). Doing what comes naturally: Full inclusion in Accelerated Schools. In *Inclusion and school reform: Transforming America's schools*. Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Makarova, N. V. (2020). Inclusive culture as an indicator of successful university development. *Bulletin of Taganrog Institute Named After A. P. Chekhov, 81*–85. (In Russ.)

Mirzayeva, E. R. (2019). Culture of inclusion as a strategic orientation of the education system. *Human. Society. Inclusion, 3*(39), 30–37. (In Russ.)

Morina, A. (2017). Inclusive education in higher education: Challenges and opportunities. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 32*(1), 3–17.

Polyansky, A. I., & Martirosyan, V. D. (2018). Inclusive culture in an educational organization. *Scientific Works of Moscow University for the Humanities, 1*, Article 7. https://doi.org/10.17805/trudy.2018.1.7 (In Russ.)

Rubtsov, V. V., Alyokhina, S. V., & Khoustov, A. V. (2019). Continuity of inclusive education and psychological and pedagogical support for persons with special educational needs. *Psychological and Pedagogical Research, 11*(3), 1–14. (In Russ.)

GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY, PERSONALITY PSYCHOLOGY, HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY

Salavatulina, L. R., & Reznikova, E. V. (2023). Diagnosing future teachers' readiness for inclusive volunteering. *Kazan Pedagogical Journal, 2*. (In Russ.)

Segal, N. G. (2014). Inclusion as a vector of humanization of education and society: International experience. In V. I. Pisarenko (Ed.), *Questions of pedagogy and psychology: Theory and practice. Collection of materials from the International Scientific Conference* (pp. 73–79). Kirov: MCNIP. (In Russ.)

Shemanov, A. Yu., & Yekushevskaya, A. S. (2018). Formation of inclusive culture in the implementation of inclusive education: Challenges and achievements. *Contemporary Foreign Psychology, 7*(1), 29–37. https://doi.org/10.17759/jmfp.2018070103 (In Russ.)

Skuratovskaya, M. (2020). Psychological and pedagogical aspects of personnel training in higher inclusive education. In *State and prospects for the development of agribusiness – INTERAGROMASH*. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202017515030

Starovoit, N. V. (2022). Inclusive culture of teachers: Substantive characteristics of the concept in the context of the pedagogy of individuality. *Bulletin of the Baltic State Academy of Fisheries Fleet, 2*(44), 133–137. (In Russ.)

Stubbs, S. (2008). *Inclusive education: Where there are few resources*. The Atlas Alliance.

Yemelyanova, T. V., & Sinyavskaya, A. A. (2015). Inclusive culture of future teachers of "included" education. In *Modern trends in the development of science and technology* (No. 7, Pt. X, pp. 38–41). IP Tkacheva E. P. (In Russ.).

Yusupov, R. G., & Zainulin, R. I. (2019). On the formation of inclusive culture as an element of legal culture in society and educational institutions. *Bulletin of the Institute of Law of Bashkir State University, 2*(4), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.33184/vest-law-bsu-2019.4.1 (In Russ.)

Author Contributions

Lyudmila B. Baryaeva — literature review and source analysis.

Marina L. Skuratovskaya — literature analysis, manuscript preparation and editing, final approval of the version for publication.

Lyudmila B. Baryaeva, Marina L. Skuratovskaya, Marina Z. Gazieva, Nigar E. Zeynalova
Modelling Teachers' Readiness for Inclusive Education: A Predictive Approach
Russian Psychological Journal, 22(4), 2025

GENERAL PEDAGOGY

Marina Z. Gazieva — conceptualization and methodology, research organization and coordination, empirical data analysis.

Nigar E. Zeynalova — research organization and coordination, literature review and source analysis.

Author Details

Lyudmila B. Baryaeva — Dr. Sci. (Pedagogy), Professor of the Department of Special Psychology and Preschool Defectology, Chechen State Pedagogical University, e-mail: alesej@yandex.ru

Marina L. Skuratovskaya — Dr. Sci. (Pedagogy), Professor and Head of the Department of Defectology and Inclusive Education, Don State Technical University, e-mail: marinasku@yandex.ru

Marina Z. Gazieva — Cand. Sci. (Psychology), Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Special Psychology and Preschool Defectology, Chechen State Pedagogical University, e-mail: marina-gazieva@yandex.ru

Nigar E. Zeynalova —Ph. D. in Pedagogy, Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Pedagogy, Azerbaijan University of Languages, e-mail: nigarzeynalova777@gmail.com

Conflict of Interest Information

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.