



Copyright © 2021 by Academic Publishing House Researcher s.r.o.

All rights reserved.

Published in the Slovak Republic

European Journal of Contemporary Education


E-ISSN 2305-6746

2021. 10(3): 711-725

DOI: 10.13187/ejced.2021.3.711

www.ejournal1.com

IMPORTANT NOTICE! Any copying, reproduction, distribution, republication (in whole or in part), or otherwise commercial use of this work in violation of the author(s) rights will be prosecuted in accordance with international law. The use of hyperlinks to the work will not be considered copyright infringement.



Organizational and Pedagogical Conditions for the Educational Process Implementation within the Inclusive Education in the Republic of Kazakhstan

Dinara Kh. Shalbayeva ^{a,*}, Bakhytgul A. Zhetpisbayeva ^a, Gulden N. Akbayeva ^a, Dariya N. Assanova ^a

^a E.A. Buketov Karaganda University, Karaganda, Republic of Kazakhstan

Abstract

The present article aims to identify the major problems English teachers face in the process of working with special educational needs learners in the context of inclusive education in general education schools of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Despite the studies on special methods and pedagogy of inclusive education carried out by the educators, there are still no inclusive education achievement indicators enshrined in law.

The study uses the following general scientific methods: analysis of the current and prior normative legal acts regulating teachers' activities in the field of inclusive education, analysis of scientific and methodological literature on special, general, and inclusive education, synthesis of definitions of inclusive education concepts as well as a survey of English teachers.

The conducted survey demonstrates a range of material, technical, pedagogical, and specific subject-related problems the teachers face in the context of inclusive education. Such problems are determined by the specifics and distinctive characteristics of teaching the English language in inclusive education conditions, as well as the preceding absence of courses on the methods of teaching the English language in inclusive education in the programs of higher educational establishments.

One of the main problems identified by the study was insufficient level of teacher training courses to prepare for teaching within the inclusive education, as well as the lack of appropriate methods on teaching English in an inclusive classroom. Thereunder, current article describes some practical ways of addressing problems defined.

Keywords: individual differences, individual learning, inclusive education, language teaching, learning environment, special methods, special educational needs, talented and gifted learners.

* Corresponding author

E-mail addresses: zhetpisbayeva@mail.ru (B.A. Zhetpisbayeva), dinara.shalbaeva@mail.ru (D.Kh. Shalbayeva), rgul.ksu@mail.ru (G.N. Akbayeva), assanova-dariya@mail.ru (D.N. Assanova)

1. Introduction

The country's leadership has repeatedly urged the necessity to provide students in the Republic of Kazakhstan with access to quality education. In particular, the President of Kazakhstan Kassym-Jomart Tokayev in his Address to the Nation of September 1, 2020, states that children should receive quality education, regardless of their residential place and language of instruction ([Address to the Nation by the President of Kazakhstan, 2020](#)). The inclusive education, which has been one of the most important directions in the development of education and educational reforms of the Republic of Kazakhstan since 2008, is aimed to solve the problem of an access to quality education for all students.

In international practice, the term "inclusion" was first introduced at the UNESCO conference in 1994, which was held in the city of Salamanca. The conference resulted in the adoption of "The Salamanca Statement", which stated that "people with special educational needs should have access to learning in regular schools, which, in turn, must provide the conditions necessary for them based on pedagogical methods primarily oriented on children with the goal of meeting their needs" ([UNESCO, Ministry of Education..., 1994](#)).

It was only in 2018 that inclusive education was enshrined in the Law "On education" of the Republic of Kazakhstan ([Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2018](#)). In particular, this law states that "the core task of inclusive education is to provide all learners with an equal access to education, irrespective of their special educational needs and individual capabilities" ([Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2007](#)).

The State Program for the Development of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2016–2019, approved by the Government Decree ([Decree of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2018](#)), defined the categories of students for whom the inclusive education needed to be implemented. This Program is the organizational basis for implementing the Public Policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the field of education. Programs for the Development of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan are a package of policies in the education system.

Thus, the current State Program for the Development of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2020–2025 avoiding duplicating previously defined categories of learners in need of inclusive education, notes only percentage of educational institutions having created conditions for inclusive education, as well as the activities aimed at developing inclusive education practice ([Decree of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2019](#)).

Despite the clear tasks set towards the inclusive education development in Kazakhstan, there is still a number of problems impeding its successful implementation. When implementing the principles of participation, development of abilities and preservation of identity in practice, there arise difficulties due to a lack of a common understanding what the inclusive education is.

In addition, the main obstacle in ensuring access to quality education for students with special educational needs may be, first of all, in identifying persons having special educational needs and how to meet these needs. Hence, it is also important to identify locally the main factors that can influence an access to quality education for all students, regardless of their educational needs.

To define students' qualitative characteristic being needed of implementing inclusive education principles, it is primarily necessary to determine what inclusive education is in essence and what way it differs from traditional segregated education on the one hand, and from special education on the other.

Several scientists, e.g. D.Z. Akhmetova ([Akhmetova, 2013](#)), define inclusive education as joint learning (upbringing) including the organization of joint educational lessons, leisure activities, and different types of additional education for learners with and without disabilities, with which R.N. Zhavoronkov disagrees ([Zhavoronkov, 2011](#)). Still, the need to meet special educational needs remains out of focus, which, according to the Salamanca Statement, is an important component of inclusive education.

F. Bryer and W. Beamish ([Bryer, Beamish, 2019](#)) define inclusive education as a multifaceted practice which encourages diversity and differences caused by family conditions, social class, sex, language, social and economic past, cultural origin, or capabilities in its system of values and beliefs and is founded based on human rights and social justice.

The concept "special educational needs" has no universal definition yet. In the legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan the concepts "disabled students" and "students with special educational needs" are synonymous. However, the concepts "disabilities" and "special educational needs" must

be distinguished, since the meanings of words in each concept demonstrate that the concept “special educational needs” is broader. In particular, I.V. Vozniak (Vozniak, 2017) believes that inclusive education should be implemented for all students needed in support.

E. Dimitrellou, J. Hurry, and D. Male (Dimitrellou et al., 2018) in their research use the concept “pupils with special educational needs and disabilities” (SEND). This definition is much broader since it expands the concept of special educational needs to an indefinite range of persons, not exclusively limited to students with disabilities.

In addition, we disapprove (Zhetpisbayeva, Shalbayeva, 2019) the fact that talented and gifted learners are excluded from the list of people with special educational needs at the legislative level. We are more inclined towards the position of individual researchers. For instance, A.I. Savenkov (Savenkov, 2018) and M.M. Chris (Smith, 2006) who argue that both children with mental retardation and gifted and talented children, children with musculoskeletal system disorders and children fond of sports and having higher sports performance than most students, repatriated children and children living in settlements with no schools have special educational needs.

Exclusion of gifted children from the category of learners with special educational needs can be explained by the fact that while the problem of teaching children with disabilities has been sufficiently studied, the issues of identifying and teaching gifted children remain underresearched. V.N. Bogoiavlenskaia (Baiborodova et al., 2018) indicates that a universal scientifically grounded concept of giftedness is still lacking.

D. Mitchell (Mitchell, 2011) identifies various factors as the reasons for special educational needs in children, namely sensory, physical, intellectual, and emotional factors. L.T. Hilt (Hilt, 2017) also believes that children with language difficulties (in the conditions of Kazakhstan – immigrants and repatriates) have special educational needs as well and can be excluded from the educational process due to their distinctive characteristics which later causes difficulties in achieving progress following school curriculum. Therefore, special educational needs are not limited to the needs of disabled children. In addition, it becomes necessary to adapt the existing school curriculum to the special educational needs of students for achieving the necessary minimum educational content.

We believe that all the above-mentioned categories of children require inclusive education that would provide them with equal access to education regardless of their specific characteristics, allow them to preserve their individuality and develop their capabilities. The inclusion of only children with disabilities in inclusive education cannot be limited. Not only scientists from Kazakhstan, as well as the CIS countries have difficulties in defining which students should get inclusive education but, for example, scientists from Sweden as well (Magnússon, 2020: 28).

Inclusion currently presents more than eliminating of the barrier in access to education and improving the participation of learners with special educational needs in the educational process (Traxler, 2016) and, according to E.A. Ekzhanova and E.V. Reznik (Ekzhanova, Reznikova, 2008), calls for changes in the general education environment and providing support services accounting for the psychophysical capabilities of a child with special educational needs.

Several researchers substitute the concept of inclusive education with integrated education, which is fundamentally wrong (Sigal, 2016). For instance, Akhmetova (Akhmetova, 2013) defines inclusive education and integrated education as synonymous concepts without demarcating them. Unlike inclusive education, integrated education involves the inclusion of a child with special educational needs in a general education environment with no significant alterations being made to it: long-term and middle-term planning is not changed or slightly adjusted, the classroom (or the school) is not always equipped in accordance with the individual needs of children. Although both types of education present the optimal ways of teaching children with special educational needs in general education schools (Zhetpisbayeva, Asylbek, 2016), using these concepts as synonymous is prevented by the differences in approaches to each of them.

M. Ainscow, R. Slee, and M. Best (Ainscow et al., 2019) argue that inclusive education as a philosophical movement calls for changes in values and way of thinking in leaders of various levels and specialists who present an integral part of inclusive education to create an understanding that will form the conditions necessary for inclusion by changing the educational environment of schools and classrooms. In addition, the empirical research studied by M. Pozas, V. Letzel, and Ch. Schneider (Pozas et al., 2020: 224) shows high efficiency of a differentiated approach, which also does not align with the Salamanca Statement Principles.

The study of literature references has allowed to determine that when defining the concept “inclusive class” we are talking about creating the learning environment in the classroom, thereby meeting special educational needs of all students (Opitz et al., 2020; Lundqvist, Larsdotter Bodin, 2018). V.A. Yasvin interprets the “learning environment” as the child’s interaction with everyone and everything surrounding him. This also includes the assistance of an educational psychologist or special-needs expert, which are needed by a part of students with special educational needs. Moreover, according to a number of scientists, the creation of a barrier-free learning environment by special needs student himself is important as well (Hewett et al., 2020: 759; Bloom et al., 2020b: 171). This kind of all students’ inclusion contributes to a high efficiency of inclusive education implementation (De Leeuw et al., 2020: 1194).

L. Palla (Palla, 2019), A. Bloom, S. Critten, H. Johnson, C. Wood (Bloom et al., 2020a), L.M. Olssona, S. Bengtssona, M. Granlunda, K. Huusb, E. Elgmark Andersson and I. Kåreholt (Olssona et al., 2020) in addition to teachers, experts and children themselves, consider it necessary to include parents in the inclusive education process. The researchers may be included as well (Korsgaard et al., 2020: 509). While Billington T. (Billington, 2017) thinks neuroscientists may also be included in the inclusive learning, but he notes that in this case, there is a risk of overestimating what is normal and what is not. In other words, the learning environment includes school community, involving unlimited number of specialists.

Therefore, we can define inclusive education as providing special needs students with an access to general education schools by creating material, technical and pedagogical conditions for them, based on special teaching methods which targeted at meeting the educational needs of such students, as well as ensuring training based on adapted to special educational needs programs by using an individual approach and a sometime segregated learning when co-teaching fails meeting individual special educational needs.

Based on what we stated above, we can conclude that scientists have not yet reached a universal understanding of the essence of inclusive education. In turn, the lack of a clearly formulated conceptual apparatus in this subject area entails difficulties in implementing inclusive education (Alzahrani, 2020: 71). There is also a risk of inclusive education being implemented in a fashion not following the requirements posed by legislators to quality accessible education. The indicated difficulties were identified in the process of surveying teachers from general education schools the results of which are presented below.

As we have noted earlier, providing all students with quality education, regardless of their educational needs is one of the strategic concerns identified by the country’s government. Taking into account the fact that the inclusive education was legislatively enacted in the education system of the Republic of Kazakhstan fairly recently, there is a number of difficulties school community faces in its implementation process.

In particular, these problems are characterized by the insufficient qualification of teachers working in the conditions of inclusion which leads to the rejection and misunderstanding of inclusive education; the connection between an educational institution and parents being broken leaving parents as the participants of the educational process outside of inclusive education; the lack of consideration for age-related and physiological characteristics of individual students which call for a special approach; teachers lacking the knowledge of special methods of teaching the subject to children with special educational needs; shortage or even lack of scientific and methodological literature meeting the requirements of modern trends of inclusive education and examining various aspects of teaching children in inclusive classrooms (Abildina et al., 2018).

The State Program for the Development of Education and Science for 2020–2025 of the Republic of Kazakhstan states that only 60 % of all domestic schools have created conditions for the implementation of inclusive education. However, the document does not specify what is meant by “conditions for inclusive education”. We can assume that they are understood as material and technical conditions, but not psychological and pedagogical. Most likely, the definition “conditions for inclusive education” was given in previous State Program for the Development of Education and Science for 2016–2019.

According to the above-mentioned State Program for the Development of Education and Science for 2020–2025, in December 2020, it was planned to develop competence requirements for teachers working within the inclusive education (special education teachers, subject teachers,

assistant teachers, etc.) ([Decree of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2019](#)). Thus, it is currently difficult to talk about any indicators that define an inclusive class teacher.

2. Materials and methods

Research design

Since the development of inclusive education in Kazakhstan, there are currently no pedagogical university graduates being proficient in teaching subjects on methodology and psychology within the inclusive education. Therefore, refresher courses are the only available way to provide schools with skilled personnel who know teaching methods in an inclusive classroom.

The goal of our study was to identify teacher satisfaction with refresher courses on teaching within the inclusive education. It should be noted that, as indicated by M. Nind and S. Lewthwaite ([Nind, Lewthwaite, 2018](#)), the methods for studying inclusive pedagogics are developed poorly at present.

We have not found any questionnaires designed to assess the understanding of the essence and principles of inclusive education, i.e. the questionnaire was developed taking into account the definitions used in laws and regulations as well as studies, a review of which was presented earlier in this article. Moreover, the analysis of survey results accounted for the experience of M. Grosche and T. Lüke ([Lüke, Grosche, 2017](#)) indicating that survey data may contain socially desirable answers distorting the overall results.

Aside from general scientific methods of analysis of scientific and methodological literature, scientific articles devoted to the studies on the problem of inclusive education in the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, and other specific countries and the analysis of the published normative legal legislative acts and by-laws aimed at regulating the implementation of inclusive education, we deployed the method of synthesis to identify the best conditions allowing to meet students' special educational needs using various methods of traditional and special pedagogics.

Research participants

However, along with the analysis of existing scientific and methodological literature, the study calls for a survey of teachers working in inclusive or special correctional classrooms to identify the problems arising in the process of implementing inclusive education, as well as for a survey of teachers not working in such classrooms but have or have not completed refresher courses on inclusive education to identify the level of their understanding of the problems of working in the conditions of inclusive education.

The survey was conducted during the 2019–2020 academic year. The study sampling principle was as follows: the survey required the teachers' participation from urban and rural schools. The survey should have been attended by teachers working in inclusive classrooms and those working in non-inclusive general education classrooms and special correctional classrooms. Overall, the study involved 70 teachers from the city of Karaganda and the village of Ushtobe, 68 of whom were female and 2 were male.

We have chosen English teachers in general education schools for our survey primarily due to the fact that the school is one of the largest and deeply advanced educational organizations in the implementation of inclusive education. Teachers were selected in one subject, as it is the field study that allows clearly seeing the process of implementing inclusive education, as well as the joint work of all participants in the educational process, who directly create the learning environment of an inclusive class.

Research progress

Thus, we developed and conducted a survey for English teachers from ten general education schools of the city of Karaganda, including the Ushtobe village school. One of Karaganda schools was experimental, since it has implemented the inclusive education on a trial basis the year before a similar process began in other schools in the country. We included the above-mentioned school in the survey due to its special status as an experimental school.

The survey composed questions on the effectiveness of courses on inclusive education and the implementation of the knowledge acquired in such courses, the knowledge of the foundations and provisions of inclusive education, and identification of methodological problems and problems

with material and technical equipment of English language classrooms for the implementation of inclusive education for an individual English teacher and the school as a whole.

Statistical analysis

The descriptive statistics methods were used for empiric evidence, including frequency distribution and the Chi-square test to establish statistical relationship between categorical data. This method allows to assess the significance of differences between the number of observations actually identified as a result of the study falling into each category, as well as the theoretical number that can be expected in groups under study when confirming the research hypothesis.

The null hypothesis states that two variables are considered mutually independent if the observed frequencies in the cells coincide with the expected frequencies. If the observed and expected frequencies are statistically different, then the null hypothesis is rejected and an alternative hypothesis is accepted, which holds that the two variables are interdependent.

It means that this method provides an opportunity to assess the statistical significance of differences between two or more relative indices, thereby proving or falsifying the original hypothesis. The Chi-square value test and p-levels are shown in Tables 1 and 2. Values calculated via IBM SPSS 27.0.0.0 statistical software.

The results obtained were analysed and interpreted from teachers' satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the knowledge gained during refresher courses, as well as knowledge and understanding of the inclusive education theoretical framework and teaching methods within the inclusive education.

3. Results

Table 1 shows the Chi-square test results, which indicate teachers' knowledge of working within the inclusive education, i.e. working in a general education non-inclusive classroom at a level Chi-square = 6,144 and p = 0,013; a general education inclusive classroom at a level Chi-square = 12,854 and p < 0,001; and a general education special classroom at a level Chi-square = 0,584 and p = 0,445 accordingly.

Table 1. Chi-square value test for distributing the surveyed teachers working in general education non-inclusive, inclusive and special classrooms, who either passed or did not take any courses on inclusive education

| Contingency table | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----------|--|--------|---------|
| | | | Working in a general education non-inclusive classroom | | |
| | | | yes | no | total |
| Taking cross-curriculum courses on inclusive education | yes | Frequency | 9 | 2 | 11 |
| | | % | 81,8 % | 18,2 % | 100,0 % |
| | no | Frequency | 58 | 1 | 59 |
| | | % | 98,3 % | 1,7 % | 100,0 % |
| Total | | Frequency | 67 | 3 | 70 |
| | | % | 95,7 % | 4,3 % | 100,0 % |

Chi-square = 6,144; p = 0,013

| Contingency table | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----------|--|--------|---------|
| | | | Working in a general education inclusive classroom | | |
| | | | yes | no | total |
| Taking cross-curriculum courses on inclusive education | yes | Frequency | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| | | % | 54,5 % | 45,5 % | 100,0 % |
| | no | Frequency | 6 | 53 | 59 |
| | | % | 10,2 % | 89,8 % | 100,0 % |
| Total | | Frequency | 12 | 58 | 70 |
| | | % | 17,1 % | 82,9 % | 100,0 % |

Chi-square = 12,854; p < 0,001

| Contingency table | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----------|--|---------|---------|
| | | | Working in a general education special classroom | | |
| | | | yes | no | total |
| Taking cross-curriculum courses on inclusive education | yes | Frequency | 0 | 11 | 11 |
| | | % | 0,0 % | 100,0 % | 100,0 % |
| | no | Frequency | 3 | 56 | 59 |
| | | % | 5,1 % | 94,9 % | 100,0 % |
| Total | | Frequency | 3 | 67 | 70 |
| | | % | 4,3 % | 95,7 % | 100,0 % |

Chi-square = 0,584; p = 0,445

As can be seen from the given [Table 1](#), 67 teachers (95,7 %) worked in a general education non-inclusive classroom, where 9 of them (81,8 %) completed cross-curriculum courses on inclusive education, compared to 58 (98,3 %), who did not. 12 teachers (17,1 %) worked in a general education inclusive classroom, where 6 teachers (54,5 %) completed cross-curriculum courses on inclusive education, whereas 6 of them (10,2 %) did not. As for the teachers working in a general education special classroom, then their number comes up to 3 (4,3 %), where none of teachers (0,0 %) passed any cross-curriculum courses on inclusive education.

The above-mentioned demonstrates that there is a theoretical possibility to provide all students with high-quality education regardless of their educational needs. However, as our study has demonstrated, a range of difficulties arise in the practical implementation of inclusive education principles at the English language lessons due to incorrect understanding of said principles.




Fig. 1. The number of teachers who answered the question on what inclusive education is correctly or incorrectly

The results of the conducted study demonstrate that less than half of teachers currently working in inclusive and special correctional classrooms (6 out of 15) have completed courses on inclusive education but do not have a general idea of how to work on an inclusive education program and what special needs children in inclusive classrooms may have. In the meantime, the nine teachers who have completed such courses do not work in inclusive or special correctional classrooms. It is hard to determine what the process of selecting teachers to refer to inclusive education courses is determined by considering that 45,5 % of such teachers do not receive teaching load in inclusive classrooms.

Out of all teachers surveyed, 14 respondents found it difficult to answer the question of what inclusive education is. A complete definition of inclusive education was provided by 32 teachers out of 70. Six of these teachers were working in inclusive classrooms. A partially correct definition was provided by 18 teachers, two of whom were teaching English in inclusive classrooms. Six respondents provided inaccurate definitions of inclusive education. None of them were working in inclusive classrooms, yet two of them claimed they were familiar with the experience of organizing inclusive education.

It must be noted that 31 of all correct answers were quite apparently copied from internet sources, for instance, inclusive education was defined as education accessible for all, which involves children being included in a universal educational environment regardless of their special needs. However, such an understanding of inclusive education is one-sided and corresponds to integrated education more.

Partially correct answers were provided by teachers themselves, which demonstrates that they attempt to form their own understanding of inclusive education and does not contradict the Salamanca Statement, which, according to Magnússon G. (Magnússon, 2019: 680), allows various interpretations of the concept “inclusive education”. In particular, as previously noted, it can be defined as including all children in the general education system or meeting the special educational needs of such students.

The following answers were interpreted by us as incorrect: “Inclusive education is separate work with children in inclusive classrooms”, “Inclusive education is learning that takes place in the conditions of deviant behavior of a child if a healthy child has certain special characteristics”, “Inclusive education is the education of children with disabilities”, “Inclusive education is teaching children who have problems with health or deviant behavior in a separate classroom”. Since all teachers including those who have completed special courses do not have a complete understanding of the principles of inclusive education and inclusive education itself, such a small number of respondents who were satisfied with the quality of knowledge provided in special courses is not surprising.

The next question concerned the categories of children covered by inclusive education. Teachers were asked to choose such multiple answer options as “children with health problems, deviant behavior, low social-economic and social-psychological status, children from families of migrants and refugees, repatriated children, and children living in settlements with no schools”.

The correct answer to the indicated question included marking all answer options since all of them indicated the categories of children covered by inclusive education. However, none of the teachers answered the question correctly. Two teachers only excluded the category of children living in settlements with no schools from their answers. One more teacher also excluded children with low social and economic status from their answer in addition to the category mentioned earlier. Another teacher marked all answer options except for the categories of children living in settlements with no schools and children with deviant behavior.

The following categories of children were noted by teachers as the ones that present difficulty in joint learning: “children with specific intellectual characteristics”, “inclusive”, “socially neglected”, “underdeveloped”, “children with speech disorders”, “children with deviant behavior”, “children with intellectual disorders”. Along with these categories, teachers also listed “children older than 14 years old”, “students of 8th and 9th grades”, “first-grade students”, and “emotional children”. The problem discovered in the course of the survey demonstrates not only that a part of teachers is not ready to work with children taking into account their age-related, psychophysical, and social characteristics but also that teachers are not aware of what categories of students actually present students with special educational needs. While teaching children with special

educational needs indeed requires special training, age-related characteristics of children are included in the courses of general psychology and pedagogics.

Table 2. Chi-square value test for being satisfied with knowledge obtained at refresher courses on inclusive education

| Contingency table | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----------|--|--------|------------------------------|---------|
| | | | Satisfaction with knowledge obtained at refresher courses on inclusive education | | | |
| | | | yes | no | found it difficult to answer | total |
| Taking cross-curriculum courses on inclusive education | yes | Frequency | 2 | 7 | 2 | 11 |
| | | % | 18,2 % | 63,6 % | 18,2 % | 100,0 % |
| | no | Frequency | 9 | 13 | 37 | 59 |
| | | % | 15,3 % | 22,0 % | 62,7 % | 100,0 % |
| Total | | Frequency | 11 | 20 | 39 | 70 |
| | | % | 15,7 % | 28,6 % | 55,7 % | 100,0 % |

Chi-square = 8,967; p = 0,011

However, the category of emotional children may refer to children with behavioral disorders. While work with physical disabilities children typically does not cause teachers any difficulties, according to E. Bešić, L. Paleczek, P. Rossmann, M. Krammer, B. Gasteiger-Klicpera (Bešić et al., 2020), the inclusion of children with behavioral disorders causes concern among teachers. The inclusion of emotional or behavioral disorders' children can also affect general physical and mental state as well as success of such learners (Metzner et al., 2020: 231).

Eight of the surveyed teachers were satisfied with the knowledge provided in refresher courses on inclusive education. All of them worked in non-inclusive general education classrooms. Only two of them have completed interdisciplinary refresher courses. Out of the 37 teachers unsatisfied with the quality of provided knowledge, seven have completed refresher courses on inclusive education and 9 were working in inclusive classrooms. Only two out of 25 teachers who found this question difficult to answer have completed refresher courses.




Fig. 2. Distribution of answers to the question “What knowledge necessary for teaching in an inclusive class do you lack?”

Therefore, only two out of 11 teachers who have completed refresher courses on inclusive education were satisfied with the quality of knowledge obtained in them. However, they were all unable to put the acquired knowledge into practice since none of them worked in inclusive or special correctional classrooms.

Nine of the survey respondents reported lacking methodological knowledge necessary for teaching in an inclusive classroom. Three of them were working in such classrooms. Four teachers did not possess enough methodological knowledge and knowledge of specific psychological characteristics of children in inclusive classrooms. Nine teachers reported not having enough knowledge of specific psychological characteristics of children in inclusive classrooms, one of them being an inclusive classroom teacher.

Eighteen respondents lacked the knowledge of the psychology of teaching English in inclusive classrooms with one of them working in such a classroom. Eight teachers out of the survey sample noted not having sufficient knowledge in all spheres mentioned in the question. One of them was working in an inclusive classroom. The knowledge of distinctive psychological characteristics of children and the psychology of teaching English in inclusive classrooms was reported to be insufficient by 14 teachers half of whom worked in inclusive and special correctional classrooms.

One respondent reported not having sufficient knowledge in the methodology of inclusive education and planning. Such an answer indicates that it is methodological knowledge the teacher lacks.

One more teacher working in an inclusive classroom noted not having sufficient methodological knowledge and collections of assignments for children in inclusive classrooms. Therefore, the provided answer concerns the lack of methodological knowledge on organizing English lessons in a way that would involve children with special educational needs in the educational process to the same degree as other students and allow them to complete the same assigned tasks at their own level or with the help of assisting tables and other materials.

Thus, the continuing education courses that are currently being conducted do not meet teachers' need in knowledge necessary for the organization of educational process in the conditions of inclusive education. Meanwhile, the regulatory documents of the Republic do not specify the requirements for teachers of inclusive schools.

Approximate requirements can be found in various scientific works on this topic. In particular, L.A. Shkutina, A.R. Rymhanova, N.V. Mirza, G.S. Ashimhanova, G.K. Alshynbekova, (Shkutina et al., 2017) indicate friendliness to children with special educational needs, knowledge of changes in inclusive education trends, knowledge of the individual characteristics of a child's psychophysical development; knowledge of special methods of teaching a subject in an inclusive learning environment, adaptation of a typical curriculum to special educational needs.

I.S. Horn, B. Garner, B.D. Kane, J. Brasel (Horn et al., 2016) and U.A. Satybaldiyeva (Satybaldiyeva, 2017) believe that such a teacher also has to be able to work in collaboration with other specialists (special education teachers, psychologists, speech therapists, etc.) providing psychological and pedagogical assistance to children with special educational needs and their parents. It should be noted that the list of specialists whose collaborative work has a positive impact on teachers' mutual professional training is individual for every child with special educational needs.

Nevertheless, such requirements are impossible to meet in the present conditions identified in our study without fundamental changes in the approach to the organization and implementation of inclusive education.

The surveyed teachers indicate the lack of methodological knowledge and the knowledge of specific characteristics of learners of inclusive classrooms. This presents a serious flaw that needs to be addressed since, as E.L. Indenbaum (Indenbaum, 2013) indicates, the organization of inclusive education requires supplementing standard teaching methods with the elements of special correctional education methods. Even though some authors like A.Iu. Shemanov and E.V. Samsonova (Shemanov, Samsonova, 2019), Jonathan Rix (Rix, 2020) and Roger Slee (Slee, 2019) argue that it contradicts the major politics of UNESCO (UNESCO, 2013) since it only generates more sophisticated forms of separate education in the framework of a general education institution.

It is difficult to determine whether an educational environment adapted to the individual needs of learners exists in schools. Forty-six respondents out of the whole sample believe that their

classroom is not equipped for inclusive education of children, three of them found it difficult to answer what specific equipment they need for the organization of inclusive education. Ten survey respondents reported their classroom being ready for teaching in the conditions of inclusive education yet only three of them left the question on what their classroom lacks unanswered. None of these respondents worked in inclusive or special correctional classrooms.

A significant range of problems in creating an inclusive educational environment is found at the school level as well. Twenty-five of all survey respondents indicated that schools lack modern material and technical equipment for the organization of inclusive education while 28 teachers noted the lack of modern program and methodological equipment. The lack of special education teachers and psychologists was indicated by 33 surveyed teachers. The insufficient improvement of the system of advanced training for teachers to work in inclusive education conditions was indicated by 30 respondents. Twenty-six more teachers reported that schools lack the development of programs for learners of general education schools and their parents to overcome negative attitudes towards inclusive education. Three respondents found it difficult to answer this question.

Of all surveyed teachers, only four noted being ready to work in inclusive classrooms since they had adequate training in psychology and possessed the necessary amount of pedagogical knowledge. All four of them worked in inclusive classrooms but none completed refresher courses in inclusive education. However, it should be noted that all of these respondents previously reported lacking methodological knowledge on teaching English in the conditions of inclusion. Therefore, the complete readiness reported by teachers should not be accepted as corresponding to reality.

However, according to Susanne Schwab, Ghaleb H. Alnahdi (Schwab, Alnahdi, 2020: 321), C. Breyer, K. Wilfling, C. Leitenbauer and B. Gasteiger-Klicpera (Breyer et al., 2020), M. Krischler, J.J.W. Powell and I.M. Pit-Ten Cate (Krischler et al., 2019) opinion, teachers' positive attitude towards inclusive education and belief in high self-efficiency lead to a wider use of inclusive teaching methods. This indicates that education teacher performance in a classroom with special needs students will be high if they are trained properly from methodological viewpoint.

Five of all survey respondents noted having adequate professional skills but not being psychologically ready for such work. Twenty-six teachers noted the opposite, i.e. being psychologically ready but lacking certain necessary professional skills. Four of those teachers have completed inclusive education courses and two were working in inclusive classrooms.

No teachers reported their school having methodological literature covering the principles of working with special needs children.

4. Conclusion

We reached the goal of our study and found that using statistical analysis tool, such as the Chi-square test, showed a range of problems currently existing in teaching the English language within the inclusive education. In particular, these problems include English teachers' insufficient knowledge of the general principles of teaching in an inclusive classroom; low coverage of teachers with cross-curriculum and subject-specific refresher courses on inclusive education, the knowledge obtained in such courses being insufficient; the lack of teachers' knowledge of the methods and psychology of teaching the English language in inclusive classrooms determined by a low coverage at refresher courses and the lack of special methodological literature; poor material and technical equipment of classrooms for children with special educational needs.

Based on the obtained survey results and the conducted analysis of scientific and methodological literature and publications, we can conclude that the access to quality education within the inclusive education calls for:

- developing the program of courses on teaching the English language in the conditions of inclusive education explaining the principles of designing and adjusting long-term, middle-term, and short-term plans accounting for the educational needs of all categories of students with special educational needs learning in each specific class;
- making adjustments to teacher's books for English language textbooks in accordance with the renewed education conditions providing recommendations on organizing the process of teaching students with special educational needs, indicating the characteristics of each category of such students, and citing various special and universal methods and techniques;
- tracking the results of teachers' learning in said refresher courses with mandatory methodological support from the authors of the course by visiting and analyzing the conducted

lessons, testing the obtained knowledge, and analyzing the achievements of both the students with special educational needs and normally developing students;

- developing methodic recommendations (a special method of teaching) on teaching the English language in the conditions of inclusive education accounting for the special educational needs of each child.

References

Abildina et al., 2018 – Abildina, S.K., Zhakipbekova, S.S., Aitzhanova, R.M., Beisembayeva, A.A., Aydarbekova, K.A. (2018). Comparative analysis of the conceptual apparatus of inclusive education. *Bulletin of the Karaganda State University. "Pedagogy" series.* 3(91): 78-86. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://pedagogy-vestnik.ksu.kz/apart/srch/2018_pedagogics_3_91_2018.pdf [in Russian].

Address to the Nation by the President of Kazakhstan, 2020 – Address to the Nation by the President of Kazakhstan Kassym-Jomart Tokayev of September 1, 2020. Information and Legal System of Regulatory Legal Acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan: Adilet. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://www.akorda.kz/ru/addresses/addresses_of_president/poslanie-glavy-gosudarstva-kasy-m-zhomarta-tokaeva-narodu-kazahstana-1-sentyabrya-2020-g [in Russian]

Ainscow et al., 2019 – Ainscow, M., Slee, R., Best, M. (2019). Editorial: the Salamanca Statement: 25 years on. *International Journal of Inclusive Education.* 23(7-8): 671-676. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1622800>

Alzahrani, 2020 – Alzahrani, N. (2020). The Development of Inclusive Education Practice: A Review of Literature. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education.* 12(1): 68-83. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20489/intjces.722380>

Akhmetova, 2013 – Akhmetova, D.Z. (2013). Pedagogics and psychology of inclusive education: study guide. Kazan: Poznanie, 204 p. [in Russian]

Baiborodova et al., 2018 – Baiborodova, L.V., Kirichenko, E.B., Krivun, M.P., Tarkhanova, T.Yu., Kharisova, I.G. (2018). Pedagogy of supplementary education. Working with special educational needs children: textbook. Manual for undergraduate and graduate programs. 2nd edn., rev. and add. Moscow: Yurayt Publishing House, 241 p. [in Russian]

Bešić et al., 2020 – Bešić, E., Paleczek, L., Rossmann, P., Krammer, M., Gasteiger-Klicpera, B. (2020). Attitudes towards inclusion of refugee girls with and without disabilities in Austrian primary schools. *International Journal of Inclusive Education.* 24(5): 463-478. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1467976>

Billington, 2017 – Billington, T. (2017). Educational inclusion and critical neuroscience: friends or foes? *International Journal of Inclusive Education.* 21(8): 866-880. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1283717>

Bloom et al., 2020a – Bloom, A., Critten, S., Johnson, H., Wood, C. (2020). A critical review of methods for eliciting voice from children with speech, language and communication needs. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs.* 20(4): 308-320. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12491>

Bloom et al., 2020b – Bloom, A., Critten, S., Johnson, H., Wood, C. (2020). Evaluating a method for eliciting children's voice about educational support with children with speech, language and communication needs. *British Journal of Special Education.* 47(2): 170-207. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8578.12308>

Breyer et al., 2020 – Breyer, C., Wilfling, K., Leitenbauer, C., Gasteiger-Klicpera, B. (2020). The self-efficacy of learning and support assistants in the Austrian inclusive education context. *European Journal of Special Needs Education.* 35(4): 451-465. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2019.1706255>

Bryer, Beamish, 2019 – Bryer, F., Beamish, W. (2019). Behavioural Support for Students with Special Educational Needs: Trends Across the Asia-Pacific Region. Springer Singapore. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-7177-6>

De Leeuw et al., 2020 – De Leeuw, R.R., De Boer, A., Minnaert, A. (2020). What do Dutch general education teachers do to facilitate the social participation of students with SEBD? *International journal of inclusive education.* 24(11): 1194-1217. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1514081>

[Decree of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2018](#) – Decree of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan of July 24, 2018 No. 460 “On Approval of the State Program for the Development of Education and Science in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2016-2019”. Information and Legal System of Regulatory Legal Acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan: Adilet. [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/P1800000460> [in Russian].

[Decree of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2019](#) – Decree of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan of December 27, 2019 No. 988 “On Approval of the State Program for the Development of Education and Science in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2020–2025”. Information and Legal System of Regulatory Legal Acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan: Adilet. [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/P1900000988> [in Russian]

[Dimitrellou et al., 2018](#) – Dimitrellou, E., Hurry, J., Male, D. (2018). Assessing the inclusivity of three mainstream secondary schools in England: challenges and dilemmas. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 24(10): 1097-1113. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1511757>

[Ekzhanova, Reznikova, 2008](#) – Ekzhanova, E.A., Reznikova, E.V. (2008). Basics of integrated learning. Manual for universities. Moscow: Drofa, 210 p. [in Russian]

[Hewett et al., 2020](#) – Hewett, R., Douglas, G., McLinden, M., Keil, S. (2020). Balancing inclusive design, adjustments and personal agency: progressive mutual accommodations and the experiences of university students with vision impairment in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 24(7): 754-770. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1492637>

[Hilt, 2017](#) – Hilt, L.T. (2017). Education without a shared language: dynamics of inclusion and exclusion in Norwegian introductory classes for newly arrived minority language students. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 21(6): 585-601. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2016.1223179>

[Horn et al., 2016](#) – Horn, I.S., Garner, B., Kane, B.D., Brasel, J. (2016). A Taxonomy of Instructional Learning Opportunities in Teachers' Workgroup Conversations. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 68(1): 41-54. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487116676315>

[Indenbaum, 2013](#) – Indenbaum, E.L. (2013). What does inclusive education of children with mental retardation lead to? *Education and teaching children with developmental disorders*. 4: 33-38. [in Russian]

[Korsgaard et al., 2020](#) - Korsgaard, M.T., Larsen, V., Wiberg, M. (2020). Thinking and researching inclusive education without a banister – visiting, listening and tact as a foundation for collective research on inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 24(5): 496-512. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1469680>

[Krischler et al., 2019](#) – Krischler, M., Powell, J.J.W., Pit-Ten Cate, I.M. (2019). What is meant by inclusion? On the effects of different definitions on attitudes toward inclusive education. *European journal of special needs education*. 34(5): 632-648. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2019.1580837>

[Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2007](#) – Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan of July 27, 2007 No. 319-III “On Education”. Information and Legal System of Regulatory Legal Acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Adilet. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://online.zakon.kz/document/?doc_id=30118747 [in Russian].

[Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2018](#) – Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan of July 4, 2018 No. 171-VI “On amendments and additions to certain legislative acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan concerning the expansion of academic and managerial independence of higher education institutions”. Information and Legal System of Regulatory Legal Acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Adilet. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://online.zakon.kz/Document/?doc_id=39633866 [in Russian].

[Lundqvist, Larsdotter Bodin, 2018](#) – Lundqvist, J., Larsdotter Bodin, U. (2018). Inclusive Classroom Profile (ICP): a cultural validation and investigation of its perceived usefulness in the context of the Swedish preschool. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. AHEAD-OF-PRINT: 1-17. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1555867>

[Lüke, Grosche, 2017](#) – Lüke, T., Grosche, M. (2017). What do I think about inclusive education? It depends on who is asking. Experimental evidence for a social desirability bias in attitudes towards inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 22(1): 38-53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1348548>

Magnússon, 2019 – Magnússon, G. (2019). An amalgam of ideals – images of inclusion in the Salamanca Statement. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 23(7-8): 677-690. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1622805>

Magnússon, 2020 – Magnússon, G. (2020). Inclusive education and school choice lessons from Sweden. *European journal of special needs education*. 35(1): 25-39. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2019.1603601>

Metzner et al., 2020 – Metzner, F., Wichmann, M.L.-Y., Mays, D. (2020). Educational transition outcomes of children and adolescents with clinically relevant emotional or behavioural disorders: results of a systematic review. *British Journal of Special Education*. 47(2): 230-257. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8578.12310>

Mitchell, 2011 – Mitchell, D. (2011). Effective pedagogical technologies of special and inclusive education: book chapters. Trans. from English by Anikeyev, I.S., Borisova, N.V. Moscow: Perspektiva. [Electronic resource]. URL: http://center-prof38.ru/sites/default/files/one_click/mitchel_tehnologii.pdf [in Russian].

Nind, Lewthwaite, 2018 – Nind, M., Lewthwaite, S. (2018). Hard to teach: inclusive pedagogy in social science research methods education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 22(1): 74-88. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1355413>

Olssona et al., 2020 – Olssona, L.M., Bengtssona, S., Granlunda, M., Huusb, K., Andersson, E., Kåreholt, I. (2020). Social service utilisation in relation to class setting – a longitudinal study among children with mild intellectual disability in Sweden. *European journal of special needs education*. 35(4): 544-558. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2020.1726091>

Opitz et al., 2020 – Opitz, E.M., Schnepel, S., Krähenmann, H., Jandl, S., Felder, F., Dessemontet, R.S. (2020). The impact of special education resources and the general and the special education teacher's competence on pupil mathematical achievement gain in inclusive classrooms. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. AHEAD-OF-PRINT: 1-17. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1821451>

Palla, 2019 – Palla, L. (2019). Characteristics of Nordic research on special education in preschool: a review with special focus on Swedish conditions. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 23(4): 436-453. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1441337>

Pozas et al., 2020 – Pozas, M., Letzel, V., Schneider, Ch. (2020). Teachers and differentiated instruction: exploring differentiation practices to address student diversity. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*. 20(3): 217-230. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12481>

Rix, 2020 – Rix, J. (2020). Our need for certainty in an uncertain world: the difference between special education and inclusion? *British Journal of Special Education*. 47(3): 1-25. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8578.12326>

Satybaldiyeva, 2017 – Satybaldiyeva, U.A. (2017). Psychological and pedagogical assistance, facilitating successful learning, development, correction of a child's special educational needs. In: *Features of the inclusive education development: international experience and domestic practice. Materials of the international scientific and practical conference*. Astana: National Academy of Education named after I. Altynsarin, 367 p. [in Russian]

Savenkov, 2018 – Savenkov, A.I. (2018). Psychology of childhood giftedness: a textbook for bachelor's and master's degrees. 2nd edn., corrected and complemented. Moscow: Urait, 335 p. [in Russian]

Schwab, Alnahdi, 2020 – Schwab, S., Alnahdi, G.H. (2020). Do they practise what they preach? Factors associated with teachers' use of inclusive teaching practices among in-service teachers. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*. 20(4): 321-330. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12492>

Shemanov, Samsonova, 2019 – Shemanov, A.Yu., Samsonova, E.V. (2019). Special education as a resource for the inclusive education process. *Psychological Science and Education*. 24(6): 38-46. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2019240604> [in Russian]

Shkutina et al., 2017 – Shkutina, L.A., Rymhanova, A.R., Mirza, N.V., Ashimhanova, G.S., Alshynbekova, G.K. (2017). Kadrovyyi potentsial kak osnovnoi faktor uspekhnoi realizatsii inkluzivnoi sistemy obrazovaniia [Human resource is a key factor in the successful implementation of inclusive education system]. *Vestnik Novosibirskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta* 7(1): 21-33. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15293/2226-3365.1701.02>

Sigal, 2016 – *Sigal, N.G.* (2016). Modern state and development trends of integrated learning in foreign countries: Summary of a Ph.D. dissertation in pedagogics. Specialization: 13.00.01: General pedagogics, history of pedagogics and education. Kazan Federal University, Kazan, 23 p. [in Russian]

Slee, 2019 – *Slee, R.* (2019). Belonging in an age of exclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 23(9): 909-922. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1602366>

Smith, 2006 – *Smith, Ch.* (2006). Including the Gifted and Talented: Making Inclusion Work for More Gifted and Able Learners. Routledge, 224 p.

Traxler, 2016 – *Traxler, J.* (2016). Inclusion in an age of mobility. *Research in Learning Technology*. 24: 1-18. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3402/rlt.v24.31372>

UNESCO, 2013 – UNESCO (2013). International conference on education. 48th session. International Conference Center, Geneva, November 25-28, 2008. “Inclusive Education: Way of the Future”. Background paper. [Electronic resource]. URL: http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Policy_Dialogue/48th_ICE/CONFINTED_48-3_English.pdf

UNESCO, Ministry of Education..., 1994 – UNESCO, Ministry of Education and Science of Spain. (1994). The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality Salamanca, Spain, 7-10 June 1994. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000098427>

Vozniak, 2017 – *Vozniak, I.V.* (2017). Formation of teachers' readiness for inclusive education of children in the system of continuing education: Ph.D. dissertation in pedagogics: 13.00.08. Belgorod National Research University, Belgorod. [in Russian]

Zhavoronkov, 2011 – *Zhavoronkov, R.N.* (2011). Legal regulation of inclusive education in the project of a new Law “On education”. Moscow: Institute of Problems of Inclusive Education of the Moscow State Psychological and Pedagogical University. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://psyjournals.ru/files/43987/Inclusive_edu_Zhavoronkov.pdf [in Russian]

Zhetpisbayeva, Asylbek, 2016 – *Zhetpisbayeva, B.A., Asylbek, T.D.* (2016). Specific features of inclusive education: experience of Finland. *Bulletin of the Karaganda university. “Pedagogy” series*. 4(84): 29-34. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://pedagogy-vestnik.ksu.kz/apart/srch/2016_pedagogics_4_84_2016.pdf [in Russian].

Zhetpisbayeva, Shalbayeva, 2019 – *Zhetpisbayeva, B.A., Shalbayeva, D.Kh.* (2019). Problems of foreign language teaching method to children with special educational needs within the inclusive education in Kazakhstan. *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Pedagogy series*. 1: 45-50. [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://rep.ksu.kz//handle/data/7601>