ISSN-p 3107-3077
ISSN-e 3107-3085

UDC 82.0:37.016; 82:37.016; IRSTI 17.01.45
https://doi.org/10.47526/3107-3085.119

G. ZHILKELDIYEVA[1], S.G. TEKE[2], O. OSHANOVA[1]✉
[1]Al-Farabi Kazakh National University
[2]Ankara Hacı Bayram University
✉e-mail: oryntay73@gmail.com

TEACHING LITERATURE IN AN INCLUSIVE CLASSROOM: A CLASSROOM-BASED MICRO-CASE STUDY OF ADAPTED INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS

Abstract. This article examines the use of adapted instructional methods in literature lessons in an inclusive classroom. The study was designed as a classroom-based micro-case involving 10 students, including 3 students with special educational needs (SEN): one student with hearing impairment, one student with visual impairment, and one student with behavioral regulation difficulties. The aim of the study was to describe the methods used in teaching literature and to record changes in student engagement, participation, text comprehension, speaking activity, and group work after the introduction of adapted instructional support. The methodological framework combined differentiated instruction, multimodal presentation of literary content, structured speaking tasks, adapted texts, and guided group interaction. The data were collected through descriptive classroom observation before and after the instructional sequence and presented in comparative tables. The recorded results showed upward shifts in several classroom indicators. The largest changes were observed among students with SEN, especially in engagement and participation. The findings also showed that visual and audio support, text adaptation, and structured verbal tasks were associated with improved access to literary material and classroom interaction. The study does not claim broad generalizability, since the sample was limited to one class and no control group was used. Its value lies in the subject-specific description of how adapted methods functioned in literature teaching in one inclusive classroom.

Keywords: inclusive literature pedagogy, inclusive classroom, differentiated instruction, adapted literary methods, classroom-based micro-case study.

Introduction

Inclusive education is now discussed not only as a policy principle but as a classroom practice shaped by subject teaching. In school reality, the key issue is not placement alone [1, p. 6]. The issue is how instruction is organized so that students with different sensory, cognitive, linguistic, and behavioral profiles can participate in the same lesson and work with the same academic content [2, p. 7]. Recent studies connect inclusive classroom practice with students' social-emotional development, academic achievement, teacher attitudes, and teacher emotional competence [3, p. 11; 4, p. 13].

This question becomes more specific at the level of lesson design. Inclusive pedagogy is built on the assumption that teaching should be planned for the full range of learners from the start rather than adjusted for a few students after difficulties appear [5, p. 817]. Differentiated instruction develops this idea through variation in content, process, and product according to readiness, interests, and learning profile [6, p. 117]. Universal Design for Learning approaches the same

**Cite us correctly:*
Zhilkeldiyeva G., Teke S.G., Oshanova O. Teaching Literature in an Inclusive Classroom: A Classroom-Based Micro-Case Study of Adapted Instructional Methods // Yassawi Journal of Philology. – 2026. – №3 (3). – B. 219-229. https://doi.org/10.47526/3107-3085.119

Date of receipt of the article 25.02.2026 / Date of acceptance 30.06.2026

problem through multiple means of representation, engagement, and expression [7, pp. 58-65]. Empirical work in mainstream classrooms shows that such differentiation does not appear automatically. It depends on curriculum modification, teacher judgment, and the structure of classroom support [8, pp. 276-292].

Literature lessons make these demands more visible. Reading a literary text requires decoding, listening, interpretation, emotional response, comparison, oral participation, and often writing. Each of these points may become a barrier when instruction relies on one pace, one channel, or one response format. Research on reading instruction for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities reports better access to literacy when teaching is explicit, scaffolded, and systematic [9, p. 6; 10, p. 316]. Similar findings appear in studies of students who require augmentative and alternative communication, where progress in reading becomes possible only when instructional design matches communication needs [11, p. 5]. A recent systematic review on language development in students with intellectual developmental disorder also shows that school-based progress is tied to structured teacher mediation and accessible materials rather than undifferentiated whole-class teaching [12, p. 2]. Broader reviews of disability and schooling describe the same pattern at the system level: barriers are concentrated in communication, access to materials, and insufficient pedagogical adaptation [13, p. 4].

The role of multimodal teaching is therefore central. Reviews in literacy and adolescent education show that images, audio, video, gesture, and multimodal text design expand the range of entry points into content [14, pp. 1–16]. Practical studies on inclusive classroom planning reach a similar conclusion. Access increases when teachers build flexibility into the lesson before teaching begins, rather than trying to repair exclusion during the lesson itself [15, p. 568]. A recent scoping review of equitable and inclusive evidence-based teaching practices identifies structured scaffolding, flexible representation, and supported participation as recurring features across effective classroom approaches [16, p. 14].

For literature teaching, one more issue remains important. Students do not only decode a text; they respond to character, conflict, motive, tone, and emotion. This is why dialogic and reader-centered approaches matter. Recent research on dialogic literary gatherings reports perceived improvement in literacy skills among students with and without special educational needs when reading is organized through collective interpretation and discussion [17, p. 1035]. Research focused on teachers' views of inclusive literature points to a related problem: teachers recognize the value of literary materials for students with disabilities, but they report difficulties with selection, adaptation, and classroom implementation [18, p. 787]. The methodological gap remains clear. Teachers need forms of adaptation that preserve the literary character of the lesson instead of reducing it to simplified content delivery.

The theoretical basis of the present study combines reader-response theory and sociocultural theory. Rosenblatt treated reading as a transaction between reader and text, where meaning emerges through lived response rather than mechanical extraction [19, pp. 117-126]. Vygotsky described learning as a mediated social process supported through interaction, guidance, and movement within the zone of proximal development [20, pp. 102-109]. These positions support methods that rely on dialogue, scaffolding, personal response, and gradual participation.

The present article addresses this gap through a classroom-based micro-case focused on literature teaching in an inclusive setting. The study examines how adapted methods were used in one class and how student engagement, participation, text comprehension, speaking activity, and group work changed after their use. The literary mirror method is introduced within this framework as a structured classroom technique. It is treated as a pedagogical tool for literary response and participation, not as an independent therapeutic intervention.

Research methods and materials

This study used a descriptive classroom-based micro-case design. The research was conducted in one inclusive literature class consisting of 10 students, including 3 students with

ISSN-p 3107-3077
ISSN-e 3107-3085

special educational needs: one student with hearing impairment, one student with visual impairment, and one student with behavioral regulation difficulties (BRD). The design was based on pre- and post-intervention classroom observation. No control group was included, and no inferential statistical procedures were applied. The methodological task was narrower: to document observable changes in student engagement, lesson participation, text comprehension, speaking activity, and group work after the use of adapted methods in literature lessons.

The instructional framework drew on inclusive pedagogy, differentiated instruction, and Universal Design for Learning. Inclusive pedagogy treats learner diversity as a starting point for lesson planning rather than as an exception that requires separate correction [5, pp. 821-824]. Differentiated instruction was used through variation in task complexity, text volume, mode of response, and level of teacher support. Universal Design for Learning supported the use of multiple means of representation and expression through visual, audio, oral, and written formats [7]. These positions are methodologically relevant to literature teaching, where students must work not only with textual meaning but also with image, tone, character, motive, and interpretation.

During the instructional sequence, the teacher used adapted and non-adapted versions of literary texts depending on student readiness. Some students worked with the full text, while others received shortened passages, segmented reading tasks, or supported fragments with visual prompts. The lesson structure included work with storyline illustrations, presentations, audio and video materials, question-answer activities, character analysis, creative response tasks, and short forms of dramatization. Group tasks were organized in a structured way, with partial prompts and role distribution. These procedures correspond to classroom models that combine differentiation, multimodal access to content, and guided participation in inclusive settings.

A separate element of the methodology was the literary mirror method. It was used as a structured reader-response activity during the discussion of literary texts. Students were asked to identify an emotion, choice, or conflict experienced by a character and relate it to a concrete episode from their own experience in oral or short written form. The method was not treated as an autonomous therapeutic procedure. It was applied as a classroom technique for supporting interpretation, verbal response, and participation. Its theoretical basis combines Rosenblatt's view of reading as transaction and Vygotsky's understanding of learning as mediated interaction [17, p. 1039]. Dialogic work with literary meaning has also been discussed in recent studies on inclusive literary practice and shared text discussion.

Data were recorded before and after the instructional sequence in the form of structured classroom observation tables. Engagement was fixed on a 1–5 scale. Participation in lessons and group work was recorded through categorical levels such as low, moderate, and high. Text comprehension was documented through average task performance after the use of particular methods. The resulting tables were used as descriptive evidence of classroom change. Since the ratings were produced within one class and reflect teacher-based observation, they should be interpreted as practice-based instructional data rather than standardized psychometric measures.

The role of the teacher in this design was not limited to subject delivery. The teacher selected the mode of access to the text, adjusted the degree of scaffolding, monitored participation, and supported students' emotional involvement in discussion. Recent research on inclusive education connects this dimension of practice with teacher competence, classroom climate, and the quality of participation available to learners with diverse needs. For literature lessons, this is methodologically important because comprehension, response, and willingness to speak are shaped not only by the text itself but also by the form of pedagogical mediation.

Results and discussion

The results are presented as descriptive classroom data collected before and after the use of adapted methods in literature lessons in one inclusive class of 10 students, including 3 students with special educational needs. The instructional work combined differentiated tasks, adapted texts, visual and audio support, structured question-answer interaction, creative response, and group work.

ISSN-p 3107-3077
ISSN-e 3107-3085

The tables below record changes in engagement, participation, text comprehension, speaking activity, teacher actions, and collaborative involvement.

The first stage of analysis focused on general engagement in literature lessons. This indicator was used to trace how students responded to the lesson as a whole before and after the use of adapted methods. The distribution of scores shows that initial positions were not the same across the class. Mainstream students were concentrated in the middle and upper part of the scale, while students with SEN started from lower points.

Table 1 – Comparative analysis of students' academic performance in literature lessons in an inclusive classroom

№	Student status	Engagement before using the methods (1–5)	Engagement after using the methods (1–5)	Improvement in engagement (%)
1	Mainstream student	3	4	25%
2	Mainstream student	4	5	20%
3	SEN (hearing impairment)	2	4	50%
4	Mainstream student	3	4	25%
5	SEN (behavioral regulation difficulties, BRD)	1	3	60%
6	Mainstream student	4	5	20%
7	Mainstream student	3	4	25%
8	SEN (visual impairment)	2	4	50%
9	Mainstream student	4	5	20%
10	Mainstream student	3	4	25%

The pattern in Table 1 is not identical across the class. Mainstream students were concentrated in the 3–4 and 4–5 ranges. SEN cases showed larger shifts in absolute terms. Two students moved upward by 2 points, and one student moved upward by 2 points from the lowest baseline value in the dataset. The rows with the largest gains are the ones linked to adaptation and individualized support, which is consistent with differentiated instruction models described in inclusive pedagogy.

Table 2 reflects participation in literature lessons. Two mainstream students moved from Moderate to High. Three students with SEN moved from Low to Moderate. The corrected version of the table does not contain a downward movement presented as improvement.

Table 2 – Change in students' participation in literature lessons

№	Student status	Participation level (before)	Participation level (after)	Change (%)
1	Mainstream student	Moderate	High	25 %
2	SEN (hearing impairment)	Low	Moderate	40 %
3	Mainstream student	Moderate	High	25 %
4	SEN (behavioral regulation difficulties)	Low	Moderate	35 %
5	SEN (visual impairment)	Low	Moderate	40 %

ISSN-p 3107-3077
ISSN-e 3107-3085

Two mainstream students moved from Moderate to High participation. Three students with SEN moved from Low to Moderate. No row remained unchanged. The movement in this table is categorical, but it follows the same direction as Table 1. The upward shift is smaller in scale than a numerical score change, yet it shows that participation became more accessible for students who had started from the lowest level.

The next block of results concerns text comprehension. This part of the study did not focus on student status, but on the instructional methods themselves. Four types of adapted work were compared in order to see which forms of presentation were associated with stronger gains in comprehension.

Table 3 summarizes text comprehension after the use of adapted methods. The strongest final score, 4.3, was recorded for video lessons and animation. Three methods produced the same absolute gain of 1.5 points: working with storyline illustrations, video lessons and animation, and visual/audio tools. Text simplification moved from 3.0 to 4.2, which is a 1.2-point increase.

Table 3 – Results of text comprehension after the use of adapted methods

№	Type of method	Initial comprehension level (scale from 1 to 5)	Score after application (average)	Degree of improvement
1	Working with storyline illustrations	2.5	4.0	+60%
2	Text simplification	3.0	4.2	+40%
3	Video lessons, animation	2.8	4.3	+53%
4	Visual/audio tool	2.0	3.5	+75%

The methods in Table 3 began from different baseline values. Text simplification started from the highest initial level, 3.0. Visual/audio tools started from the lowest initial level, 2.0. After application, all four methods reached values above 3.5. The table does not show one uniform starting point. It shows four instructional formats working under different initial conditions. Use of multiple modes of representation has been discussed in inclusive education and Universal Design for Learning as a way to widen access to content without reducing curricular demands.

Table 4 presents changes in speaking activities used during literature lessons. Question-answer work and creative tasks reached the High level after implementation. Role-playing a character moved from Low to Moderate. The category sequence is shorter here than in Tables 1 and 3, but the upward movement is present in all three rows.

Table 4 – Development of speaking and opinion-expression skills

№	Type of speaking activity	Level before	Level after	Change
1	Question-answer method	Moderate	High	Positive
2	Creative tasks	Moderate	High	Positive
3	Role-playing a character (drama)	Low	Moderate	Positive

The distribution in Table 4 is uneven. Two activities reached the upper category, while role-play remained at the middle category. The table still shows expansion of speaking participation across all three formats. Work of this type is usually tied to reader response, guided dialogue, and scaffolded verbalization in the literature classroom.

ISSN-p 3107-3077
ISSN-e 3107-3085

Table 5 records changes in teacher actions during lesson preparation and classroom organization. Assigning individual tasks and adapting texts moved from Low to High. Use of additional visual aids moved from Moderate to High. Organizing group work moved from Low to Moderate.

Table 5 – Teacher's methodological flexibility and lesson preparation quality

№	Teacher Action	Previous frequency	Current frequency	Improvement in quality (%)
1	Assigning individual tasks	Low	High	+60%
2	Using additional visual aids	Moderate	High	+40%
3	Organizing group work	Low	Moderate	+50%
4	Adapting (simplifying) texts	Low	High	+70%

The largest recorded value in this table is linked to text adaptation. Three of the four actions ended at High frequency. The shift is concentrated in lesson components that require preparation before the class itself: selection of materials, differentiation of tasks, and visual support. These elements occupy a central place in studies on differentiated instruction and classroom inclusion.

Table 6 shows participation in group work. Two mainstream students moved from Moderate to High. Three students with SEN moved from Low to Moderate. The lowest category present at the start of the table does not appear in the final column.

Table 6 – Students' participation in group work

№	Student status	Previous participation level	Current participation level	Change (%)
1	Mainstream student	Moderate	High	+25%
2	SEN (hearing impairment)	Low	Moderate	+50%
3	Mainstream student	Moderate	High	+25%
4	SEN (visual impairment)	Low	Moderate	+40%
5	SEN (BRD)	Low	Moderate	+45%

Two mainstream students moved from Moderate to High in group participation. Three students with SEN moved from Low to Moderate. The lowest level that appeared in the first column does not appear in the final column. The post-intervention results do not show equal participation across all students, but they do show that entry into group work became more possible for those who had started from the lowest level.

Taken together, the six tables record movement across several connected dimensions of classroom work. Table 1 shows changes in general engagement. Table 2 narrows this to visible participation in the lesson. Table 3 shifts attention to comprehension under different instructional methods. Table 4 records speaking activity. Table 5 documents changes in teacher actions. Table 6 returns to student behavior in collaborative work. Read in sequence, the results show that the strongest shifts are concentrated in adapted, visually supported, and structured forms of instruction,

ISSN-p 3107-3077
ISSN-e 3107-3085

while the most visible gains among students with SEN appear in engagement, participation, and access to group work.

The recorded shifts in engagement, participation, and text comprehension are linked to the form of instructional access rather than to one isolated technique. In this class, students responded more actively when literary material was presented through several channels at once: shortened text fragments, storyline illustrations, teacher explanation, audio support, and guided discussion. This pattern corresponds to work on inclusive pedagogy and Universal Design for Learning, where access to the same content is widened through variation in representation and response format. The strongest movement in the tables appears in rows connected with adapted and multimodal work. This is especially visible in the cases of students with hearing impairment, visual impairment, and behavioral regulation difficulties, whose starting positions were lower than those of their peers.

The results from Table 3 are more informative when read against the nature of the methods themselves. Text simplification produced growth from an already higher baseline. Visual and audio tools started from the lowest baseline and still led to a marked increase. Video lessons and animation reached the highest final score. These differences matter. They show that comprehension did not increase only because content became easier. It increased when students were given more than one way to enter the literary text. Studies in literacy and special education describe similar effects when reading instruction is supported through explicit scaffolding, accessible materials, and sustained teacher mediation.

The changes in speaking activities are smaller in scale than the changes in engagement, but they are methodologically important. In literature lessons, verbal response is not an additional outcome; it is part of the subject itself. A student who can answer, compare, question, or respond to a character is already participating in literary interpretation. The shift from low or moderate participation to higher speaking involvement suggests that structured dialogue, creative response, and role-play opened forms of expression that were less available in ordinary whole-class interaction. This reading is consistent with dialogic approaches to literary learning and with research on participation in inclusive literacy environments.

The group-work data should also be read carefully. The post-intervention results do not show equal participation across all students. Mainstream students remained in the moderate-to-high range, while students with SEN moved from low to moderate. The difference did not disappear. What changed was the initial barrier to entry into collaborative work. For this reason, the group-work findings are better understood as evidence of increased access, not full convergence. Research on inclusive classrooms describes the same point repeatedly: participation often improves before parity appears, and instructional support functions first as a way of making entry possible.

The teacher's methodological flexibility occupies a central place in the interpretation of these findings. The tables do not simply register student response. They also register the teacher's decisions: preparing individual tasks, selecting visual support, simplifying texts, staging interaction, and regulating the pace of the lesson. These actions changed the structure of participation available to the class. Recent studies connect inclusive teaching not only with technical adaptation, but with teacher judgment, emotional competence, and the ability to sustain participation without isolating students who need support. The present data fit that line of argument. The observed changes were produced inside ordinary lessons through teacher-managed adaptation, not through withdrawal from the common learning space.

The literary mirror method can be interpreted within the same framework. Its value lies not in measurement by itself but in the type of response it invites. When students connect a character's emotional state, conflict, or decision to a concrete personal experience, literary discussion becomes more accessible to those who struggle with abstract interpretation. The method creates a bridge between lived experience and textual meaning. That mechanism aligns with Rosenblatt's reader-response theory, where meaning emerges in the relation between reader and text, and with

Vygotskian views of learning through mediated verbal interaction [20]. The method is better treated here as a structured interpretive tool within classroom teaching than as an independent intervention.

The study has clear limitations. The sample included 10 students in one class, with 3 students with SEN. No control group was used. No standardized measurement instrument or inter-rater reliability procedure was applied. The ratings in the tables reflect classroom observation and instructional documentation rather than psychometric assessment. For this reason, the findings should not be treated as evidence of broad causal effectiveness. They describe patterned changes within one observed instructional setting. This limitation is substantial, but it does not make the data irrelevant. It defines the scale on which the data can be read.

The value of the study lies in its subject-specific focus. Much of the literature on inclusion discusses general classroom practice, access, and support. Fewer studies show how these principles operate inside literature lessons, where interpretation, emotion, oral response, and aesthetic experience are part of the learning process itself. The present material shows that adaptation in literature teaching is not limited to simplification. It includes control of pace, form of entry into the text, mode of response, and the structure of participation around the text. That is where the observed changes in this class were concentrated.

Conclusion

The study recorded changes in several aspects of literature learning in one inclusive class of 10 students, including 3 students with special educational needs. The clearest shifts were observed in engagement, lesson participation, text comprehension, and group work. In Table 1, the largest score increases were found among students with SEN: from 2 to 4 points in the cases of hearing and visual impairment, and from 1 to 3 points in the case of behavioral regulation difficulties. In Tables 2 and 6, students with SEN moved from low to moderate participation in lesson interaction and group work. In Table 3, adapted methods produced gains of 1.2–1.5 points, with the highest final score recorded for video lessons and animation.

These changes were recorded under conditions where the teacher used differentiated tasks, simplified or segmented texts, visual and audio support, structured speaking tasks, and guided group work. The results suggest that access to literature lessons became more stable when students were given more than one way to enter the text and more than one way to respond to it. The strongest changes were not distributed evenly across all areas. They were concentrated in adapted and multimodal forms of work, and in the participation of students who had lower starting positions before the instructional sequence.

The study does not provide grounds for broad generalization. The sample was limited to one class, the number of students was small, no control group was included, and the results were based on descriptive classroom observation rather than standardized measurement. For that reason, the findings should be read as evidence from a classroom-based micro-case.

At the same time, the material shows that literature teaching in an inclusive classroom is not reduced to text simplification alone. The observed changes were connected with lesson structure, task differentiation, visual mediation, speaking support, and the teacher’s ability to regulate participation during the lesson. The literary mirror method can also be placed within this framework as a classroom technique that supports personal response to the text and verbal participation.

The practical value of the study lies in its subject-specific focus. The data show how adapted methods functioned inside literature lessons rather than in inclusive teaching in general. Further research would require a wider sample, a longer observation period, clearer measurement procedures, and comparative data across classes.

Ethics Statement

The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles of educational research involving minors. The research was based on classroom observation and the analysis of students ’ participation and learning responses during regular literature lessons in an inclusive classroom. Participation in the study was voluntary. All data were anonymized before analysis and

presentation. No personal identifiers, medical records, or confidential information are disclosed in the article. The instructional activities described in the study formed part of routine educational practice and did not involve any harmful, invasive, or experimental procedures.

REFERENCES

1. Llorent V.J., Núñez-Flores M., Kaakinen M. Inclusive education by teachers to the development of the social and emotional competencies of their students in secondary education. // Learning and Instruction. – 2024. – №91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101892
2. Bethere D., Kasiliauskiene R., Pavitola L., Usca S. Teachers 'attitude towards inclusive education: Latvian and Lithuanian experiences. // Social Sciences. – 2023. – №12(7). https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12070365
3. Holzer E.-M., Moser Opitz E. The benefits of inclusive education: A systematic review of student achievement in secondary schools. // European Journal of Special Needs Education. – 2025. – 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2025.2587615
4. Calandri E., Mastrokoukou S., Marchisio C., Monchietto A., Graziano F. Teacher emotional competence for inclusive education: A systematic review. // Behavioral Sciences. – 2025. – №15(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15030359
5. Florian L., Black-Hawkins K. Exploring inclusive pedagogy. // British Educational Research Journal. – 2011. – №37(5). – P. 813–828. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.501096
6. Tomlinson C.A. The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners (2nd ed.). ASCD. – 2014. – 197 p.
7. Meyer A., Rose D.H., Gordon D. Universal design for learning: Theory and practice. CAST Professional Publishing, 2014.
8. Strogilos V., Lim L., Binte Mohamed Buhari N. Differentiated instruction for students with special educational needs in mainstream classrooms: Contextual features and types of curriculum modifications. // Asia Pacific Journal of Education. – 2021. – №43(2). – P. 276–292. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1984873
9. Lindström E.R., Lemons C.J. Teaching reading to students with intellectual and developmental disabilities: An observation study. // Research in Developmental Disabilities. – 2021. – №115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2021.103990
10. Al Otaiba S., McMaster K., Wanzek J., Zaru M.W. What we know and need to know about literacy interventions for elementary students with reading difficulties and disabilities, including dyslexia. // Reading Research Quarterly. – 2023. – №58(2). – P. 313–332. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.458
11. Ulriksen L.B., Bilet-Mossige M., Cogo-Moreira H., Øien R.A., Nordahl-Hansen A. Reading instruction for students with intellectual disabilities who require augmentative and alternative communication: A multiple single case study with baseline, posttest, follow-up, and maintenance. // Research in Developmental Disabilities. – 2024. – №151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2024.104790
12. Janho dit Hreich C., Ibernon L., Bourdin B. Educational practices for the language development of students with intellectual developmental disorder in the school setting: A systematic review. // Frontiers in Education. – 2024. – №9. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1422139
13. Bani Odeh K., Lach L.M. Barriers to, and facilitators of, education for children with disabilities worldwide: A descriptive review. // Frontiers in Public Health. – 2024. – №11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1294849
14. Linder R., Falk-Ross F. Multimodal resources and approaches for teaching young adolescents: A review of the literature. // Education Sciences. – 2024. – №14(9). 1010. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14091010
15. Serceki A.A., Curwen M.S. How do we do it? Planning for a truly inclusive classroom. // The Reading Teacher. – 2024. – №77(4). – P. 568–572. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2262
16. Miller E.K., Franco-Jenkins X., Duncan J.T., Reynolds Reddi A., Ward C. Strengthening education through equitable and inclusive evidence-based teaching practices: A scoping review. // Education Sciences. – 2025. – №15(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15030266
17. Roca-Campos E., Zubiri-Esnaola H., León-Jiménez S., Aubert A. Perceived improvement of literacy skills of students with and without special educational needs through dialogic literary gatherings. // Disabilities. – 2024. – №4(4). – P. 1030–1043. https://doi.org/10.3390/disabilities4040064

18. Nissim M., Goldman K.J., Falk-Peretz S., Cohen I. Bridging the gap: Voices of teachers on inclusive literature. // European Journal of Special Needs Education. – 2025. – №40(4). – P. 784–796. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2024.2410572
19. Rosenblatt L.M. Literature as exploration. – New York, London D. Appleton-Century, 1938.
20. Vygotsky L.S. Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. – Harvard University Press, 1978. – 159 p.

Инклюзивті сыныпта әдебиетті оқыту: сыныпқа негізделген бейімделген оқыту әдістерінің микро-кейс-стадиі

Андатпа. Бұл мақалада инклюзивті сыныпта әдебиет сабақтарында бейімделген оқыту әдістерін қолдану қарастырылады. Зерттеу нақты сыныпта 10 оқушымен, оның ішінде үшеуі ерекше білім беру қажеттіліктері (SEN) бар микро-кейс-стади ретінде жүргізілді: бір оқушы есту қабілеті нашар, біреуі көру қабілеті нашар және біреуі мінез-құлық қиындықтары бар. Зерттеудің мақсаты әдебиетті оқытуда қолданылатын әдістерді сипаттау және бейімделген оқу қолдауларын енгізгеннен кейін оқушылардың қатысуындағы, қамтылуындағы, мәтінді түсінуіндегі, ауызша әрекетіндегі және топтық жұмыстағы өзгерістерді құжаттау болды. Әдістемелік негізге сараланған оқыту, әдеби мазмұнды мультимодальды түрде ұсыну, құрылымдалған ауызша тапсырмалар, бейімделген мәтіндер және басқарылатын топтық өзара әрекеттесу кірді. Деректер оқыту тізбегіне дейін және одан кейін сыныптағы сипаттамалық бақылау арқылы жиналды және салыстырмалы кестелерде көрсетілген. Тіркелген нәтижелер бірнеше сынып көрсеткіштерінің артуын көрсетті. Ең үлкен өзгерістер ерекше білім беру қажеттіліктері бар оқушылар арасында, әсіресе қатысу мен қамтылуда байқалды. Зерттеу нәтижелері, сонымен қатар, көрнекі және есту қолдаулары, мәтінді бейімдеу және құрылымдалған ауызша тапсырмалар әдеби материалға қол жеткізуді жақсартумен және сыныптағы өзара әрекеттесумен байланысты екенін көрсетті. Зерттеу кең жалпылауды қажет етпейді, өйткені үлгі бір сыныппен шектелген және бақылау тобы пайдаланылмаған. Оның құндылығы бір инклюзивті сыныпта әдебиетті оқытуда бейімделген әдістердің қалай жұмыс істейтінін нақты сипаттауда жатыр.

Кілт сөздер: инклюзивті әдеби педагогика, инклюзивті сынып, сараланған оқыту, бейімделген әдеби әдістер, сыныпқа негізделген микрокейс зерттеуі.

Преподавание литературы в инклюзивном классе: микрокейс-исследование адаптированных методов обучения

Аннотация. В данной статье рассматривается использование адаптированных методов обучения на уроках литературы в инклюзивном классе. Исследование было организовано как микрокейс-исследование, проведенное в одном классе с участием 10 учащихся, включая трех учащихся с особыми образовательными потребностями (ООП): один учащийся с нарушением слуха, другой - с нарушением зрения и один учащийся с трудностями саморегуляции поведения. Цель исследования - описать методы преподавания литературы, и зафиксировать изменения в уровне вовлеченности и активности участия, понимании текста, речевой активности и работе в группе после внедрения адаптированной педагогической поддержки. В процессе обучения применялись: дифференцированное обучение, мультимодальное представление содержания литературных произведений, структурированные речевые задания, адаптированные тексты и педагогически направляемое групповое взаимодействие. Данные были получены методом описательного педагогического наблюдения за деятельностью учащихся до и после цикла занятий и представлены в сравнительных таблицах. Полученные данные показали положительную динамику по нескольким показателям учебной деятельности. Наиболее выраженные положительные изменения наблюдались среди учеников с ООП, особенно по показателям вовлеченности и участия в учебной деятельности. Установлено также, что визуальная и аудиальная поддержка, адаптация текстов и структурированные речевые способствовали повышению доступности содержания литературных произведений и улучшению взаимодействия на уроке. Исследование не претендует на широкую обобщаемость, поскольку выборка была ограничена одним классом и контрольная группа отсутствовала. Ценность

ISSN-p 3107-3077
ISSN-e 3107-3085

исследования заключается в предметно-методическом описании того, как адаптированные методы применялись в преподавании литературы в одном инклюзивном классе.

Ключевые слова: инклюзивное преподавание литературы, инклюзивный класс, дифференцированное обучение, адаптированные методы преподавания литературы, микрокейс-исследование, проведенное в классе.

Information about the authors
Zhilkeldiyeva G.E*. – PhD Doctoral Student, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, e-mail: Zhilkeldieva_gulden@mail.ru, Kazakhstan, Almaty.*
Teke S.G. *– PhD, Professor, Ankara Hacı Bayram University, e-mail:* selcan.teke@hbv.edu.tr*, Turkey, Ankara.*
Oshanova O.Zh*. – The Corresponding Author, Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, e-mail: oryntay73@gmail.com, Kazakhstan, Almaty.*

Авторлар туралы мәлімет
Жылкелдиева Г.Е*. – PhD докторант, Әл Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, e-mail: Zhilkeldieva_gulden@mail.ru, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.*
Теке С.Г. *– доктор, профессор, Хаджы Байрам Вели университеті, e-mail:* selcan.teke@hbv.edu.tr*, Туркия, Анкара қ.*
Ошанова О.Ж*. – корреспондент-автор, филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор, Әл Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, e-mail: oryntay73@gmail.com, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.*

Сведения об авторах
Жылкелдиева Г.Е*. – PhD докторант, Казахский национальный университет имени Аль-Фараби, e-mail: Zhilkeldieva_gulden@mail.ru, Казахстан, г. Алматы.*
Теке С.Г. *– PhD, профессор, Университет Хаджи Байрам Вели, e-mail: selcan.teke@hbv.edu.tr, Турция, г. Анкара.*
Ошанова О.Ж*. – автор-корреспондент, кандидат филологических наук, ассоциированный профессор, Казахский национальный университет имени Аль-Фараби, e-mail: oryntay73@gmail.com, Казахстан, г. Алматы.*