

**IFTE 2019**  
**5th International Forum on Teacher Education**  
**AXIOLOGICAL PRIORITIES OF TEACHER-SPEECH**  
**PATHOLOGISTS' PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL**  
**ORIENTATION**

Anna D. Lozhechkina (a)\*, Galina Y. Kozlovskaya (b), Olga V. Soloveva (c),  
Natalya M. Borozinets (d)

\*Corresponding author

(a) North-Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, RUSSIA, e-mail: gogastik77@mail.ru

(b) North-Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, RUSSIA, e-mail: kozlovskay\_galya@mail.ru

(c) North-Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, RUSSIA, e-mail: olga.vl.soloveva@gmail.com

(d) North-Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, RUSSIA, e-mail: nataboroz@yandex.ru

***Abstract***

In the modern world, there is a modernization of all spheres of life, including education. There is also a change in attitudes towards Others/atypical: people recognize their rights to uniqueness and respect, regardless of the criterion of their "otherness". The idea of inclusion was born within the framework of large-scale changes in the understanding of human rights, its dignity, identity, as well as the mechanisms of social and cultural processes that determine its status and affect its rights. The change in attitudes towards people with disabilities was only one of the manifestations of these changes. The article deals with the formation of the inclusive education teacher professional-personal orientation, the value in inclusive education in domestic and foreign pedagogy. The purpose of the article is to identify the most significant value priorities in the structure of the teacher working personality with children with physical condition. The result of the study is a substantive description of the axiological priorities of the teacher-speech pathologist in the context of a changing socio-educational paradigm.

2357-1330 © 2020 Published by European Publisher.

**Keywords:** Inclusive education, personal and professional orientation, humanistic values of professional activity.



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 Unported License, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## **1. Introduction**

In modern science, the problem of the influence of the teacher personality-professional orientation on the successful socialization of children with physical condition acquires a special status within the humanistic paradigm of personality socialization. Here the teacher serves as a key figure. Despite the fact that various aspects of the teacher personal and professional development are rather fully investigated in modern studies, the axiological aspects of professional orientation are not adequately reflected. Not disclosed the content side and the mechanisms of formation of professional and personal orientation of teacher working with disabled children.

## **2. Problem Statement**

The foregoing suggests that the modern psychological and pedagogical practice of teaching disabled children has the following contradiction: between the requirements of the modern educational paradigm and the lack of knowledge of the teacher of inclusive education professional and personal orientation.

## **3. Research Questions**

Based on the identified contradictions and prerequisites, the research problem was identified: what are the substantive characteristics of the axiological priorities of teacher-speech pathologists' professional and personal orientation.

## **4. Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study: to determine the axiological aspects of the personality-professional orientation of teachers-defectologists, design, on their basis, the technology of the formation of professionally important value orientations of future teachers.

## **5. Research Methods**

In the process of research, the following methods were used: theoretical (analysis; synthesis; specification; generalization; analogy method; modeling);

Training teachers for the implementation of inclusive education is mainly aimed at generating knowledge about the characteristics of children and adolescents with developmental disabilities and taking them into account in the pedagogical process, the design technology of an inclusive educational environment (Nazarova, 2011), and methodological support for educational programs (Kozlovskaya, 2014; Gaidukevich, 2006). At the same time, much less attention is paid to the teacher's professional and personal readiness to work with children with disabilities, and therefore the problem of our research: what are the theoretical foundations of the formation of the teacher- speech pathologists professional and personal orientation in the light of modern value priorities.

The purpose of the study: the definition of axiological aspects of the personality-professional orientation of teacher-speech pathologists, the design on their basis of the technology of the formation of professionally significant value orientations within future teachers.

Research methods: analysis and systematization of both domestic and foreign philosophical, psychological and pedagogical literature.

## 6. Findings

The widespread introduction of ideas of inclusion in educational institutions in Russia largely depends on the qualifications of personnel, the high level of their professional competence, their proficiency in profession, and their readiness for continuous professional growth.

Despite the fact that the formation of professional competence and key competencies of specialists in pedagogical research is highly studied, the process of building inclusive competence at different levels of the educational vertical has not yet received a systematic reflection (Sheveleva, n.d.; Kozlovskaya, 2014).

Training teachers for the implementation of inclusive education is mainly aimed at building knowledge about the characteristics of children and adolescents with developmental disabilities and taking them into account in the pedagogical process, the technological aspects of designing an inclusive educational environment (Nazarova, 2011), methodological issues of ensuring an inclusive educational process (Kozlovskaya, 2014; Purgina, 2014). At the same time, much less attention is paid to the teacher's professional and personal readiness to work with disabled children.

It is noted in the works of Nazarova (2011) and Yakovleva (2009) that a teacher professional and personal readiness to work with disabled children includes the professional and humanistic orientation of the personality, including its professional value orientations, professional and personal qualities and skills.

The professional and humanistic orientation of the personality is manifested in the teacher's awareness of the humanistic values of professional activity, satisfaction with it, dedication in mastering professional skills, the effectiveness and activity of the individual in achieving humanistic goals and objectives of the upbringing and education of children.

Attitude to the values that determine the phenomenology of inclusive education is one of the priorities of the teacher's professional and personal readiness for a "special" child, since the values themselves act as a link between the individual and society. Axiological vector determines human behavior, acting as a prism of world perception and regulator of the system of relationships in all spheres of human activity.

In this regard, the formation of values of inclusive education is one of the top priorities for the teachers' professional training.

At the same time, the analysis of the existing works shows that the interpretation of the professional value orientations system of inclusive education teacher has a different content, which is connected with the interpretation of the very concept of inclusive education.

In the works that consider "inclusive education" in relation to children (persons) with disabilities (Yakovleva, 2009), the approach to modeling the axiological field of the teacher prevails from the standpoint of understanding "limited health" as a disadvantage and violations. This corresponds to the classical concept of dysontogenesis, but to a certain extent contributes to the formation of mental attitudes, which are more characteristic of the culture of integration than of the culture of inclusion. According to Yakovleva (2009), a teacher who is preparing to work with disabled children, should adopt the following

system of vocational value orientations: recognition of the value of a person's personality, regardless of the severity of his or her violation; the focus on the development of the personality of a person with a developmental disorder as a whole, and not only on obtaining an educational result; awareness of their responsibility as a carrier of culture and its translator for people with impaired development; understanding of the creative essence of pedagogical activity with disabled children, requiring great spiritual and energy costs, etc. (Yakovleva, 2009).

According to Yakovleva (2009), an important component of the professional and personal readiness of a teacher working with disabled people is a willingness to assist, regarded as an integral personal quality, including charity, empathy, tolerance, pedagogical optimism, a high level of self-control and self-regulation, friendliness, ability to observe, the ability to summarize observations and use the increased amount of information about child (adult) to optimize educational work; perceptual skills; creativity, creative approach to solving problems, tasks of pedagogical work, etc. (Yakovleva, 2009).

The deontological mentality as a manifestation of tactfulness of the teacher, including the ability to respect the confidentiality of proprietary information and personal secrets of the pupil; responsibility for the chosen goals, objectives, content, methods of teaching and raising a child with disabilities, since initially such a child is more dependent on pedagogical assistance than normally developing peers – are also significant personal qualities (Sheveleva, n.d.).

Thus, within the framework of this approach, the professional and personal readiness of the teacher to work with disabled children suggests the formation of a whole range of qualities that are based on a humanistic paradigm based on traditional differentiated education. According to Vargas-Baron (2009), with many positive properties, this educational model, based on the priority of the concept of correction, led to stigmatization and discrimination of people with disabilities in social terms. Accordingly, not every teacher working in a general education institution with normally developing children is capable of working with a child who has limited health capabilities due to, among other things, the value-motivational attitudes (Vargas-Baron, 2009).

Domestic and western researchers (Vargas-Baron, 2009; Itterstad, 2011), who consider inclusive education as part of the idea of an inclusive society, rely on a social model based on the idea of a society that builds relations, trying to understand and promote the social practice of Others (atypical), unlike. This position by Other (atypical) implies people belonging to cultural, religious, ethnic, linguistic minorities, gifted, having psychophysical, social, behavioral deviations from generally accepted norms either in a positive or in a negative direction, etc. (Vargas-Baron, 2009; Gaidukevich, 2006).

The basis of this concept is the large-scale problems of our time, which have not yet been solved, and are considered from the standpoint of multiculturalism and blurring the boundaries of the notion “norm-deviation” in different areas of being. In modern society, a huge number of people have problems with their psychophysical condition, some deviations from the norm, a disability group (often “disabled child”), etc. In this connection, theories related to the introduction and spreads of inclusion are recently discussed in philosophical discourse: It is considered one of the most important tasks of state policy in the field of education. Inclusion, thanks to its flexible organization of the educational process, is able to provide an adequate form of education for people who have fallen into difficult life circumstances and have various kinds of problems.

Appeal to inclusion in modern times is not accidental. According to Shemanov (2012), the traditional education system of Others (atypical) in special, often closed, educational institutions does not give rise to a “social situation of development” (according to Vygotsky). In such conditions, the Others (atypical) do not form communicative, cognitive and professional skills, they are isolated from extensive social contacts, making dependent demands on society. This does not contribute to the manifestation of the Other (atypical) as an independent person, which ultimately affects their lack of demand and alienation in society, further isolation and a sense of hopelessness of their being.

Inclusive education judges from the fact that each student is a unmatched and unique person with his or her own interests, abilities and needs, requiring an individual approach to the learning process and flexibility in developing curricula that take into account these features, therefore an individual approach requires a teacher of high professionalism, including such qualities as ethics, flexibility, delicacy, ability to hear and understand the Other. Moreover, inclusive education forms its own scale of values (axiology), where the following principles are key: everyone, regardless of abilities and achievements, has the right to education and maintain an acceptable level of knowledge, self-expression and personal progress, communication, friendship and support. Proponents of this approach (for example, Itterstad, 2011) emphasize that the inclusive type of education should be introduced not into specialized institutions, but into ordinary, mass secondary schools, secondary specialized educational institutes and universities, which contributes to the formation of a favorable atmosphere of humanism, tolerance, goodness and charity, the ability to understand and accept the Other/atypical, increases the efficiency of the educational process, promotes successful socialization and self-realization, is an effective means of communication with society and combating discrimination (Shemanov, 2012).

The basis of this approach is a social model of understanding the Other/atypical and protection of his rights, including against discrimination. The motto of this approach can be called the idea of creating an inclusive society in which there is always a place for the Other/atypical, despite the difference of cultural-semantic worlds and their values. Here, the problem of the Other/atypical is approached from the point of view of the methodology of social constructivism, which allows criticizing society, changing it in a direction, and actively influencing social state policy.

The valuable meaning of inclusion in this model is associated with a change in the status of the student and his or her inclusion in the subjective relations through the isolation and alienation of the student, the activation of his or her personal position and the dysactualization of his or her “feature” (Gaidukevich, 2006). The introduction of inclusive education contributes to the restructuring of the culture of the institution, capturing in its process all: the teaching staff, students and their parents, who also become an active actors in the inclusive educational process. The diversity itself, the dissimilarity of the students to each other, acts as a powerful potential resource contributing to the development and manifestation of creativity. In general, inclusive education is a unique process of accessible education for everyone, within the framework of which the barriers associated with the dissimilarity of students are eliminated, and conditions are created for self-disclosure of the potentials inherent in a person.

It must be emphasized that in some cases the social model of inclusion can act as an object of criticism. First, it is not always acceptable to help others related to their inclusion in the educational process (for example, people with severe visual impairment, hearing impairment, intellectual disability). Secondly,

the very ideology of inclusion implies the division of people into “normal” and “Other” /“atypical” (disabled, incapable), which distorts the idea of community, group solidarity and equality of people.

In general, within this approach, cultural difference is perceived as a condition for further development and interaction. As a result of the introduction of the methodology of social constructivism, the society itself and its institutions favourably meet the Other/atypical, adequately including it in social functioning, thereby contributing to its growth, development and self-expression on equal rights.

In the second approach to inclusion, the process of making, formation and development of a person within the framework of a certain cultural landscape, its socialization and development inherent in society, ideas, norms and values is studied. As a result of the introduction of this approach, the defectology, which was mentioned above, is functioning (Vargas-Baron, 2009; Gaidukevich, 2006; Shemanov, 2012)

Currently, both of these approaches are being implemented in Russia as part of the implementation of inclusive education as a universal, effective process that contributes to the formation of social subjectivity, adaptation, socialization, self-realization, expansion of the social and cognitive potential of the Other/atypical.

Taking into account the existence and practical functioning of these approaches to inclusion in Russia, it is necessary to form the axiological priorities of the inclusive education teacher. When introducing the ideology of inclusion, the teacher should be guided by high moral principles. It is humanity, tolerance, mercy, kindness, decency, patience, along with respect for the Other/atypical, without losing a sense of proportion and self-control. The teacher of an inclusive group should not forget that he or she is responsible for the physical, intellectual, emotional and spiritual health of the students, so he or she contributes to a favorable microclimate for obtaining various knowledge. Any of his or her information should be positive, not detracting from the personality of the trainees. A teacher should be impartial, equally benevolent and supportive of all students, strengthening their self-esteem and faith in their strength, showing them opportunities for improvement. Moreover, the teacher encourages the development of self-reliance, the desire to cooperate and help the Other/atypical in their pupils. Evaluating the achievements of the trainees, the teacher seeks objectivity and fairness, without overestimating or artificially lowering the assessment. Moreover, the teacher must have a culture of speech and communication, without provoking scandals and insulting anyone, even if the opponent is not always right. His or her main task is to listen and understand the opinion of the Other/atypical, building a compromise model of behavior. In general, within the framework of inclusive education, the ethical image of a teacher as a mentor, a senior comrade is very important. He or she must combine the nobility in thoughts, words and deeds, be devoted to his work and sincere with the students.

Within the framework of the process of inclusive education, as the leading methodological principles for maximum adoption of the Other/atypical, it is recommended to a teacher to introduce and combine various approaches, including systemic, team, environmental, conductive, individual. The systematic approach implies a successive, interconnected chain of “inclusive school - vocational educational institution - inclusive livelihoods”. The team approach focuses on the interaction of specialists with the family environment of atypical trainees. The environmental approach produces an analysis of the environment and its influence on what the Other/atypical achieves in the learning process. The conductive approach involves the family and its both positive and negative effects on the degree of inclusion of the Other/atypical in the

learning environment. One of the main approaches in the framework of inclusion can be called an individual approach to the Other/atypical, depending on the personality of the teacher who builds the methodology and strategy of progressive learning. The individual approach to the students is based on the consideration of their personal characteristics and knowledge of psychology and is closely related to the creative approach. Due to such a creative approach, each person will realize self-development and will be able to realize all his or her potential, becoming a true and full member of society. It is creativity that is one of the basic criteria for the normative development and adaptation of an individual to the environment. Creativity, interpreted as the process of creating something new and valuable, can be considered extremely broadly applied to inclusive education. Such clarification, according to Shemanov (2012), leads to the idea that creativity is 1) learning environment, 2) the process of combining the ability of thinking and activity, 3) the process of creating man, thanks to which he/she is transformed, changed, creatively rebuilt, becomes different, finding new opportunities for self-development; 4) the process of creating your own spiritual world of values and world views, 5) the process of discovering new meanings of being as a result of education (Shemanov, 2012).

The teacher, possessing creative thinking, should not be afraid to deviate from the standard in solving methodological problems, carrying out the inclusion. Moreover, taking into account the atypical nature of the trainees, enactivism occurs, that is, “the engagement of the knowing subject” (in our case, both the teacher and the learner) “into the environment they know, their mutual influence (cyclic determination), mutual creation and occurrence”, “in as a result, the environment is transformed and the mind itself (and the creator’s personality itself) is reorganized, acquiring new opportunities for its development” (Yakovleva, 2009, p. 56).

In general, inclusive education is a specific form of the educational process organization in which any student is accepted and understood, regardless of individual characteristics. This is the process of co-education of typical and Other/atypical students, within the framework of which the method of individual approach is implemented. Inclusion as a kind of philosophy satisfies educational needs, opens and develops individual abilities, supports and gives confidence, promotes good adaptation, socialization, self-realization, and gaining experience (communicative, social, psychological). Within the framework of inclusion, individual features and intellectual and personal potential are taken into account, which are developed, translated into a creative direction and evaluated in a positive way. All this creates conditions for the further manifestation and activity of the Other/atypical in society. The result of the introduction of such an education is a harmoniously developed person who does not distance himself or herself from society and does not feel alienation, capable of independent and full life in society.

## 7. Conclusion

Within the framework of the axiological approach, the professional and personal readiness of the teacher to work with disabled children implies the formation of a number of qualities based on a set of approaches within the humanistic paradigm. Professional competence in the field of inclusive education is a complex product of environmental influence and individual-personal characteristics of a teacher of an inclusive class. As a key factor in the successful functioning of inclusive educational strategies, competence in inclusive education has a variety of reflections, but generally the totality of interpretations of competence

characteristics clearly reveals the functional role of the teacher of an inclusive class – “the fullest inclusion of an atypical child in the peer team, the educational process and further wide society” (Akhmetova, 2013, p. 78).

The most effective way to a tolerant world is through the education of a mature, active, tolerant person, which includes an orientation toward universal human values, creativity, independence of judgment, and respect for someone else's point of view. Personal development underlies the development of a student as a professional, the basis of the development of his professionally significant personal qualities.

## References

- Akhmetova, D. Z. (2013). *Pedagogika i psikhologiya inklyuzivnogo obrazovaniya: uchebnoe posobie* [Pedagogy and Psychology of Inclusive Education: study guide]. Kazan: «Poznanie» Instituta ekonomiki, upravleniya i prava.
- Gaidukevich, S. E. (2006). *Organizatsiya obrazovatel'noi sredy dlya detei s osobennostyami psikhofizicheskogo razvitiya v usloviyakh integrirrovannogo obucheniya* [The organization of the educational environment for children with peculiar psychophysical development in the context of integrated education]. Minsk: BGPU.
- Itterstad, G. (2011). Inclusion – what does this concept mean and what challenges does the Norwegian school face putting it into practice? *Psychological Science and Education*, 3, 41–49.
- Kozlovskaya, G. Yu. (2014). Aksiologicheskie priority v strukture professional'no-lichnostnoi napravlenosti pedagogov inklyuzivnogo obrazovaniya [Axiological priorities in the structure of professional and personal orientation of inclusive education teachers]. In I. V. Belasheva & I. V. Bakunova (Eds.), *Psychological health of a person: theory and practice: Proceedings of the I Russian Scientific Practical Conference* (pp. 278-283). Stavropol'.
- Nazarova, N. M. (2011). Teoreticheskie i metodologicheskie osnovy obrazovatel'noi integratsii [Theoretical and methodological foundations of educational integration]. *PsyJournals.ru*. Retrieved May 20, 2019, from [http://psyjournals.ru/inclusive\\_edu/issue/43976\\_full.shtml](http://psyjournals.ru/inclusive_edu/issue/43976_full.shtml)
- Purgina, E. I. (2014). Filosofskie osnovy inklyuzivnogo obrazovaniya v kontekste spetsial'nogo federal'nogo gosudarstvennogo obrazovatel'nogo standarta dlya detei s ogranichennymi vozmozhnostyami zdorov'ya [Philosophical foundations of inclusive education in the context of a special federal state educational standard for children with disabilities]. *Pedagogical education in Russia*, 2, 152-156.
- Shemanov, A. Yu. (2012). Drugoi kak «nesposobnyi»: sotsial'nyi konstruktivizm vs. medikalizatsiya [Other as "incapable": social constructivism vs. medicalization]. *Kul'turologicheskii zhurnal*, 1(7). Retrieved from [http://www.cr-journal.ru/rus/journals/112.html&j\\_id=9](http://www.cr-journal.ru/rus/journals/112.html&j_id=9)
- Sheveleva D. E. (n.d.). Aksiologicheskoe izmerenie inklyuzivnogo obrazovaniya v postindustrial'nom obshchestve [Axiological dimension of inclusive education in the post-industrial society]. In E. N. Seliverstova (Ed.), *Education in a post-industrial society: philosophical-pedagogical, historical-pedagogical, theoretical and applied aspects: Proceedings of the 7th Russian correspondence Pedagogical readings in memory of I. Ya. Lerner* (pp. 1-8). Vladimir: VGGU.
- Vargas-Baron, E. (2009). *Rannee vmeshatel'stvo, spetsial'noe obrazovanie i integratsiya: fokus na respublike Belarus'* [Early intervention, special education and integration: focus on the Republic of Belarus]. Minsk.
- Yakovleva, I. M. (2009). Professional'no-lichnostnaya gotovnost' pedagoga k rabote s det'mi s ogranichennymi vozmozhnostyami zdorov'ya [Professional and personal readiness of the teacher to work with children with disabilities]. *Vestnik MGOPU. Seriya «Pedagogika»*, 6, 140-144.