

Teacher Education for Assessment in Inclusive School

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55707/ds-po.v39i2.118>

Prejeto 31. 8. 2023 / Sprejeto 12. 4. 2024

Znanstveni članek

UDK 159.922.76:373.3

KLJUČNE BESEDE: izobraževanje, inkluzija, poučevanje, ocenjevanje, osnovna šola, učenci, učitelji

POVZETEK – Izhajajoč iz ideje o kakovostnem izobraževanju se srečujemo z izrazom inkluzija, inkluzivno izobraževanje pa pomeni sposobnost šole, da vsem učencem omogoči kakovostno izobraževanje, ne glede na razlike med njimi. Cilj inkluzivne šole je ustvariti šolsko okolje, v katerem bo vsak učenec dosegel svoj maksimum ne glede na učni potencial. Zato bi moralo biti ocenjevanje namenjeno spodbujanju učencev k aktivnemu sodelovanju v izobraževalnem procesu. Napake, ki jih povzročajo težave, je treba odpraviti, vendar ne smejo vplivati na ocenjevanje učenčevega dela. Namen raziskave je ugotoviti usposobljenost učiteljev za ocenjevanje v inkluzivni šoli. V vzorec je bilo vključenih 459 učiteljev osnovnih šol. Podatki so bili pridobljeni januarja 2021 s pomočjo spletnega vprašalnika. Pridobljeni podatki so bili obdelani s programom SPSS. Rezultati kažejo, da so učitelji pripravljani na poučevanje in ocenjevanje učencev s posebnimi potrebami, da razumejo njihove potrebe in poznajo pristope, metode in strategije, potrebne za delo s takšnimi učenci s posebnimi potrebami v osnovni šoli. Dobljeni rezultati lahko učiteljem predstavljajo motivacijo za spodbujanje pozitivnega odnosa drugih učencev, kar pa bi koristilo vsem učencem.

Received 31. 8. 2023 / Accepted 12. 4. 2024

Scientific article

UDC 159.922.76:373.3

KEYWORDS: education, inclusion, teaching, assessment, primary school, pupils, teachers

ABSTRACT – Starting from the idea of quality education, we encounter the term inclusion, and inclusive education is understood as the school's ability to provide all pupils with quality education, regardless of their differences. The goal of an inclusive school is to create a school environment in which each pupil will achieve his or her maximum regardless of learning potential. Thus, assessment should be aimed at encouraging pupils to actively participate in the educational process. Errors caused by difficulties need to be corrected, but they must not affect the assessment of student work. The purpose of the research is to determine the education of teachers for assessment in an inclusive school. The sample included 459 primary school teachers. The data were obtained in January 2021 with the help of an online questionnaire. The obtained data were processed using SPSS. The results show that research participants are ready to work with and assess pupils with special needs, and that they understand their needs and know the educational methods needed to work with such pupils. The results obtained can be a motivation for teachers to encourage positive attitudes in other students, all with the aim of benefiting the children with whom they work.

1 Introduction

During its existence, the school as an educational institution has needed to adapt to the needs and requirements of society. Its basic task was and is to educate and, as such, it is important for every society. In this sense, schooling is considered the best social investment (Kadum et al., 2019).

We are increasingly encountering the term inclusion and the term inclusive education means the ability of the school to provide quality education to all children, regardless of their differences. Drobnič (2018) states that before the introduction of inclusion and integration into education, a comprehensive system of special schools and institu-

tions was established for the education of children with special needs. It was to be a kind of parallel education system, regulated by special legislation. School inclusiveness finds sufficient legitimacy in the regulations and official documents of the most important international organizations, from the United Nations (UN, 2006, Art. 24,) through UNESCO (IBE-UNESCO, 2016, UNESCO, 1994, 2016) to the European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (EADSNE, 2009, 2012).

From the above, it can be concluded that inclusive education would be attended by all children and it would be experientially, socially, spiritually and emotionally enriched by children with special needs. Therefore, it is important for the teacher, when thinking about teaching and when planning classes, to keep in mind what Demo (2019) has stated, namely that differences in teaching are normal and that it is necessary to consider the differences of each student.

To what extent is the school up to the task? To a large extent, this can be judged on the basis of the assessment of student achievements!

Assessment is a constantly present social function and is almost as old as society itself. All social formations tested and assessed the knowledge, abilities and skills of their members, depending on what was given priority. Grades today have an almost irreplaceable status in the process of education. Due to their economy and the appearance of “clarity”, they are the simplest way of communication between teachers and parents when it comes to the progress of student achievement (Rajić, 2017).

Therefore, the system of monitoring, checking and grading students must consider the child’s abilities and peculiarities of his or her psychophysical development, and consider the objective circumstances in which the student lives. Losing and repeating a school year should be kept to a minimum, as these measures often have the opposite effect than what is expected and desired to be achieved by applying these measures (Kadum-Bošnjak and Brajković, 2007). But the teacher is in direct interaction with the students. He or she chooses the ways, forms and methods of work, striving to make the teaching process better, more diverse, more meaningful, more interesting and appropriate to the age of the students he or she works with (Kadum-Bošnjak, 2012).

According to the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports (MZOS, 2014, 2019), in the case of students with disabilities it is necessary to evaluate their attitude towards work, the set tasks and educational values. Programmes and special curricula need to be tailored to such students. Evaluation and assessment should be aimed at encouraging students to actively participate in the educational process and extracurricular activities. Errors caused by difficulties need to be corrected, but they must not affect the assessment of student work. The methods, ways and procedures of evaluation and assessment should be adapted to the degree and type of difficulty in accordance with the recommendations of the expert team for a particular area. Therefore, according to Štemberger (2013, pp. 32–33), “education that is focused on the achievements of all students enables individual work according to the individual abilities of each child and the promotion of learning as an interdependent peer action.”

In addition to the above, the question arises: Are teachers sufficiently educated to assess the students who are involved in inclusive education?

2 Method

The aim of the research was to examine teachers' education for assessment in inclusive education, and their competencies and abilities to work with students involved in inclusive education on a sample of primary school teachers. After defining the goal of the research, the following null hypothesis was set: All connections between variables will be considered random until appropriate levels of statistical significance are shown under the conditions of statistical quantitative and qualitative analysis (Tot and Klapan, 2008). In the research, we used a descriptive and causal non-experimental method of pedagogical research.

The measuring instrument was compiled for the purposes of this research and consisted of fifteen (15) items: three independent variables (gender; I teach in ...; years of work experience in primary school) and twelve dependent variables based on a Likert-type assessment scale. The research was conducted in 2021 in the Republic of Croatia using an online survey questionnaire as it was impossible to conduct research in direct contact with research participants due to the COVID-19 pandemic. After the administrator's permission was obtained, the survey questionnaire was posted to the Facebook group.

The data obtained in this research were processed using the statistical package IBM SPSS 24.0 Standard Campus Edition (SPSS ID: 729357 5/20/2016).

The research sample consisted of 459 primary school teachers in the Republic of Croatia. There were 439 female respondents (95.6%) in the sample and 20 male respondents (4.4%). Out of the 459 participants in the research, 260 or 56.6% teach in the younger grades of primary school, while 199 or 43.4% teach in the upper grades.

Analysing the specificity of the sample with regard to years of work experience in primary school, it is evident that the largest number of research participants have 5 or more but less than 11 years, and 11 or more but less than 17 years of work experience – i.e., 82 or 17.9% in each interval. The smallest number of participants are those with 30 or more years of work experience: 53 or 11.5%.

To determine whether there are statistically significant differences in the distribution of research participants with respect to the independent variable of *years of work experience in primary school*, we applied the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

Normality is statistically insignificant, i.e., a random deviation from normality, if the magnitude of the significance (Sig.) is greater than .05. As the obtained significance values are .000, it means that there are statistically significant differences in the normality/regularity of the distribution.

Characteristics of the sample with regard to work experience in primary school: Most respondents have 5 years of service, namely 21.2% (98). In the range from 6 to 11 and from 12 to 17 years of service, the number of respondents is the same: 17.9% (82). The smallest number of them are found in the interval of more than 30 years of work experience: 10.9% (50).

3 Research results

Of the twelve dependent variables, the first three are related to the adaptation of teachers to the needs of students involved in inclusive education. They read:

- ☐ I adapt my teaching to the student's abilities.
- ☐ I use simpler books and materials for students with special needs.
- ☐ I give students with special needs more time for written assignments.

Statistical indicators of these three variables are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Statistical Indicators of Variable "Adaptation of Teachers to the Needs of Students Involved in Inclusive Education"

	<i>N</i>	<i>Min.</i>	<i>Max.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>	<i>Variance</i>
Var 4	459	1	5	4.58	.674	.454
Var 5	459	1	5	4.35	.937	.878
Var 6	459	1	5	4.71	.736	.542

Note. Valid N (listwise) = 459. Var 4: I adapt my learning to the student's abilities. Var 5: I use simpler books and materials for students with special needs. Var 6: I give students with special needs more time for written assignments.

From Table 1 it can be seen that for all three variables the arithmetic means are high: the highest is for the variable "*I give students with special needs more time for written assignments*", namely 4.71, with a standard deviation of .736, while the lowest is for the variable "*I use simpler books and materials for students with special needs*", which is 4.35 with a standard deviation of .937.

The relationship between the variables "*adaptation of teachers to the needs of students involved in inclusive education*" was investigated using Pearson's linear correlation coefficients. Preliminary analyses were performed to prove that the assumptions about normality, linearity and homogeneity of variance were met. A positive correlation between these three variables was calculated: $r_{4,5} = .331$, $r_{4,6} = .314$, and $r_{5,6} = .272$, all for $N = 459$ and $p < .001$.

The next set of dependent variables, grouped under the name "assessment of students in inclusive education", consists of the following nine items:

- ☐ I adapt written tests, i.e., assignments, to the students involved in inclusive education.
- ☐ I more often test the knowledge of students involved in inclusive education orally.
- ☐ I test the knowledge of students with reduced concentration more often.
- ☐ When compiling exams for students involved in inclusive education, I consult with professional associates.
- ☐ When evaluating, I set clear boundaries and expectations.
- ☐ I approach the assessment of students involved in inclusive education with special objectivity.

- ☐ I always apply the same criteria when evaluating.
- ☐ I always explain the grade I give to a student.
- ☐ I encounter difficulties in assessing students involved in inclusive education.

From Table 2 it can be seen that for all nine items, the arithmetic means are high: the highest is for the variable “*I adapt written tests, i.e., assignments, to the students involved in inclusive education*”, namely 4.83, with a standard deviation of .549, while the lowest is for the variable “*When compiling exams for students involved in inclusive education, I consult with professional associates*”, which is 3.21, with a standard deviation of 1.454.

Table 2

Statistical Indicators of Variable “Assessment of Students in Inclusive Education”

	<i>N</i>	<i>Min.</i>	<i>Max.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>	<i>Variance</i>
Var 7	459	1	5	4.83	.549	.301
Var 8	459	1	5	3.90	1.112	1.236
Var 9	459	1	5	3.70	1.100	1.211
Var 10	459	1	5	3.21	1.454	2.113
Var 11	459	1	5	4.46	.807	.651
Var 12	459	1	5	4.09	1.069	1.142
Var 13	459	1	5	3.74	1.161	1.347
Var 14	459	1	5	4.75	.580	.337
Var 15	459	1	5	3.46	1.296	1.681

Note. Valid N (listwise) = 459. Var 7: “*I adapt written tests, i.e., assignments, to the students involved in inclusive education.*” Var 8: “*I more often test the knowledge of students involved in inclusive education orally.*” Var 9: “*I test students with reduced concentration more often.*” Var 10: “*When compiling exams for students involved in inclusive education, I consult with professional associates.*” Var 11: “*When evaluating, I set clear boundaries and expectations.*” Var 12: “*I approach the assessment of students involved in inclusive education with special objectivity.*” Var 13: “*I always apply the same criteria when evaluating.*” Var 14: “*I always explain the grade I give to a student.*” Var 15: “*I encounter difficulties in assessing students involved in inclusive education.*”

To determine whether there are statistically significant differences between the arithmetic means of the independent variable “*years of work experience in primary school*” and the dependent variables under the name “*assessment of students in inclusive education*”, we applied a one-factor analysis of variance. The obtained results are shown in Tables 5, 6 and 7.

Table 3*Levene Test of Homogeneity of Variance*

	<i>Levene Statistic</i>	<i>df₁</i>	<i>df₂</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Var 7	1.333	5	450	.249
Var 8	1.650	5	450	.145
Var 9	.942	5	450	.454
Var 10	.649	5	450	.662
Var 11	3.012	5	450	.011
Var 12	.213	5	450	.957
Var 13	3.560	5	450	.004
Var 14	5.829	5	450	.000
Var 15	2.098	5	450	.065

Table 3 shows the Levene test of homogeneity of variance, which we used to examine the equality of variance in the results in each of the groups. It can be noticed that only in two items – Var 13: “*I always apply the same criteria when evaluating*” (Sig. = .004) and Var 14: “*I always explain the grade I give to a student*” (Sig. = .000) – the magnitude is less than .05, which means that in these two items the assumption of homogeneity of variance is violated. Significance values (Sig.) for other items are greater than .05, which means that the assumption of homogeneity of variance is not violated.

Table 4*Robust Tests of Equality of Arithmetic Means*

		<i>Statistic^(a)</i>	<i>df₁</i>	<i>df₂</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Var 13	Welch	1.611	5	196.517	.159
	Brown-Forsythe	1.444	5	395.510	.207
Var 14	Welch	3.069	5	193.191	.011
	Brown-Forsythe	1.436	5	336.590	.211

Note. (a) Asymptotically F-distributed.

For the items “*I always apply the same criteria when evaluating*” and “*I always explain the grade I give to a student*”, for which the significance magnitude is less than .05, we will look at the results in Table 4, where two tests (Welch and Brown-Forsythe) that are resistant to the violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance are shown.

Table 4 shows the sums of the squares of deviations of the results from their arithmetic mean, the number of degrees of freedom, as well as other relevant values that will be used for the analysis of different groups and the analysis of the same respondents.

Of particular interest is the significance magnitude column (Sig.). For values of significance magnitude that are less than or equal to .05 ($p \leq .05$), there is a statistically significant difference between the arithmetic means of the dependent variable. However, this still does not mean that it is known which group differs from which.

Table 5*ANOVA*

		<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Var 7	Between Groups	.531	5	.106	.349	.883
	Within Groups	136.783	450	.304		
	Total	137.314	455			
Var 8	Between Groups	19.934	5	3.987	3.311	.006
	Within Groups	541.820	450	1.204		
	Total	561.754	455			
Var 9	Between Groups	11.714	5	2.,343	1.959	.083
	Within Groups	538.126	450	1.,196		
	Total	549.840	455			
Var 10	Between Groups	12.405	5	2.481	1.173	.321
	Within Groups	951.628	450	2.115		
	Total	964.,033	455			
Var 11	Between Groups	4.843	5	.969	1.530	.179
	Within Groups	284.786	450	.633		
	Total	289.629	455			
Var 12	Between Groups	6.811	5	1.362	1.201	.308
	Within Groups	510.549	450	1.135		
	Total	517.360	455			
Var 13	Between Groups	9.816	5	1.963	1.467	.199
	Within Groups	602.129	450	1.338		
	Total	611.945	455			
Var 14	Between Groups	2.462	5	.492	1.497	.189
	Within Groups	148.029	450	.329		
	Total	150.491	455			
Var 15	Between Groups	5.728	5	1.146	.677	.641
	Within Groups	761.394	450	1.692		
	Total	767.123	455			

Table 5 shows that only one item – Var 8: “*I more often test the knowledge of students involved in inclusive education orally*” – has the value of $p = .006 \leq .05$.

Therefore, the impact of “*years of work experience in primary school*” on the level of “*assessment of students in inclusive education*” was examined by a one-factor analysis of variance. Subjects were divided into six groups according to years of work experience. A statistically significant difference was found at the level of $p \leq .05$ for the dependent variable “*I more often test the knowledge of students involved in inclusive education orally*” $F(5, 450) = 3.311, p = .006$.

The relationship between the nine dependent variables we titled “*assessment of students in inclusive education*” was analysed using Pearson’s linear correlation coefficients. Preliminary analysis proved the satisfaction of assumptions about normality, linearity and homogeneity of variance. The following correlations were calculated:

- Eighteen (18) positive and two (2) negative, all for $N = 459$ and $p < .01$;
- Five (5) positive and one (1) negative, all for $N = 459$ and $p < .05$;
- Ten (10) correlation coefficients are not statistically significant.

4 Conclusion

The school as an educational institution is obliged to respect the uniqueness of each of its students and respond to all their requirements and needs. The philosophy of an inclusive school is based on the view that everyone has the right to learn regardless of different needs and abilities. Inclusive education means changing the school institution, changing the curricula (Kadum et al., 2020) so that all children have equal opportunities to develop all their potentials, skills and abilities. Moreover, including all children in the same group provides an opportunity to learn and live together, developing as individuals who will be able to understand and respect others. The goal of an inclusive school is to create a school environment in which the learning and development of all students, regardless of their learning potential, regardless of whether they master the language of instruction or have difficulties, can be promoted as effectively as possible (Keller et al., 2018; Luder et al., 2019). Based on the above, inclusion can be recognized as a culture of life in a learning community in which each individual is important because he or she co-shapes the school community by introducing his or her own personality elements (Drobnič, 2018).

An important role is also played by the teacher, who has pedagogical and didactic knowledge for teaching and encouraging the acquisition of knowledge by children with special needs and who is aware that working with students with special needs requires a patient teacher (Strniša and Jurišević, 2018).

According to Biasiol Babić (2009), students with disabilities often cannot show their knowledge and skills as others can. Therefore, an individualized curriculum that clearly defines the learning objectives, strategies and outcomes is essential. It is important to be sensitive, attentive and prepared when monitoring, testing and assessing students with special needs. In addition to a good higher education, which is the basis for their career development (Blažič, 2021), teachers also need opportunities for lifelong learning in order to realize their mission as an inclusive teacher in everyday pedagogical practice. Lifelong learning enables them to connect theoretical knowledge

with practical experience, strengthening intergenerational learning (Partalo et al., 2022) and thereby strengthening inclusive competences (Kiswarday and Stemberger, 2017).

In this study, it was found that 92.5% of respondents agree with this statement and that they adapt their teaching to student needs. For children with disabilities, it will sometimes be necessary to adapt the written material and extend the time allocated for writing. In the written task the student can answer by just underlining the answer or circling the letter in front of the correct answer.

The research *Teaching Strategy of Teachers in Teaching Students with Specific Learning Difficulties* (Martan et al., 2016) found that the arithmetic mean is $M = 3.41$, which means that most teachers adapt books and didactic material to the needs of students involved in inclusive education. The authors further state that teachers provide *students with specific learning difficulties with more time for written assignments*. Namely, a large number of teachers are ready to provide help and support to students involved in inclusive education (Martan et al., 2016).

In our study, we found that 92.0% of research participants provide more time for written assignments to students with special needs, which shows that teachers are aware that students with special needs need more time for written assignments. In the case of students with reduced concentration, knowledge needs to be tested more often, in shorter time units, and with a small number of tasks or questions in one examination (MZOS, 2014). The task was to examine how many respondents adhere to these instructions. We found that 57.9% of respondents adhere to the above, while almost one third of survey participants (30.0%) could not decide on the above, i.e., were undecided. Therefore, it can be concluded that a large number of respondents do not follow these instructions or are not even familiar with them.

In the paper *Monitoring and Grading of Students with Disabilities* Užarević (2012) states that the research obtained an arithmetic mean $M = 4.29$ with a standard deviation $SD = 0.547$ with regard to the Guidelines for monitoring and assessment of students with disabilities in primary and secondary school (MZOS, 2014), which state that the assessment of students with special needs involved in inclusive education should be objective. In the mentioned research, 74.8% of respondents agreed with this statement (Užarević, 2012).

Students with special needs pose a major challenge to teachers. They require special methods of work; the competencies of teachers to work with children with special needs and the needs of students should be divided according to various factors. Moreover, each group requires different adjustments. Therefore, it is important that teachers have enough knowledge and skills to work with children with special needs who are involved in inclusive education so that they can work with them in the best and most efficient way.

The research showed that the participants in the research are ready and competent to work with students with special needs and that they understand their needs and know the educational methods needed to work with such students.

It is important that teachers are informed in order to be able to help students with special needs to complete their education as well as possible.

The obtained results can be a motivation for teachers to look for ways and paths that will contribute to more positive attitudes of parents towards the inclusion of children with disabilities and encourage positive attitudes in other students, all for the benefit of

the children with whom they work. There should be more research on this topic so that teachers could get a true picture of the situation of children with disabilities in schools with the aim of providing more successful assessment and achieving better educational outcomes, all in order to improve the quality of life of all children.

As has already been pointed out, the process of inclusion requires constant work aimed at raising the level of teaching quality. According to Mura and Zurrú (2019), the inclusion process should enable students to more easily adopt learning contents. It is necessary to innovate teaching practice through work that includes all students. And finally, we should strive for educational institutions to appreciate everyone, with all their virtues and flaws. In conclusion, this paper could be a starting point for further research with the inclusion of a larger sample of respondents in order to expand the research.

Dr. Sandra Kadum, Anna-Maria Ukić, dr. Jurka Lepičnik Vodopivec

Izobraževanje učiteljev za ocenjevanje v inkluzivni šoli

Vključevanje otrok s posebnimi potrebami v redne osnovne šole je v zadnjem desetletju doživelo vzpon. Vse pogosteje se srečujemo s terminom inkluzija in inkluzivno izobraževanje, kar predpostavlja možnost šole, da vsem otrokom, ne glede na njihove razlike, zagotovi kakovostno vzgojo in izobraževanje. Inkluzivno izobraževanje predstavlja enega najpomembnejših izzivov in pobud v izobraževanju. Inkluzivno izobraževanje se namreč nanaša na prakso vključevanja vseh učencev v redne šole, ne glede na njihove posebnosti. Inkluzivna paradigma si prizadeva doseči enakopravnost vsakega otroka in zagotoviti pogoje, ki bodo omogočali optimalen razvoj vsakega otroka v skladu z njegovimi zmožnostmi (Kadum idr., 2020). Tako naravnava šola prevzema filozofijo inkluzije, ki temelji na izhodišču, da imajo vsi pravico do učenja, ne glede na različne potrebe in sposobnosti, ter uvaja v šole novo dimenzijo – kulturo inkluzije. Spremembe, ki se dogajajo, posledično postavljajo nove izzive za vse učitelje in strokovne delavce v šolah (Robinson in Buly, 2007), saj je velik del teh sprememb zaznati še zlasti na izvedbeni ravni, pri čemer je vloga učitelja izjemno pomembna. Z vključevanjem primernih metod, strategij in ustrezne podpore učencem je zagotovljen osnovni cilj inkluzivnega izobraževanja, to je pravica vsakega otroka do izobraževanja. Strniša in Jurišević (2018) pa dodajata, da je poleg pedagoške in didaktične usposobljenosti pomembno zavedanje učitelja, da je za delo z učenci s posebnimi potrebami potrebno veliko strpnosti in razumevanja.

Ocenjevanje je nenehno prisotna družbena funkcija, ki je stara skoraj toliko kot družba sama. Vse družbene formacije so preverjale in ocenjevale znanje, sposobnosti in veščine svojih članov, odvisno od tega, kaj je bilo prednostno. Sodobne paradigme inkluzije danes ne rešujejo problema ocenjevanja učencev s posebnimi potrebami, temveč opozarjajo na njegovo kompleksnost. Zato mora sistem spremljanja, preverjanja in ocenjevanja učencev upoštevati učenčeve sposobnosti in posebnosti njegovega psihofizičnega razvoja z upoštevanjem objektivnih okoliščin, v katerih učenec živi.

V prispevku so prikazani rezultati raziskave, s katero smo želeli na vzorcu osnovnošolskih učiteljev preveriti njihovo usposobljenost za ocenjevanje v inkluzivnem pouče-

vanju, njihove kompetence in usposobljenost za delo z učenci, vključenimi v inkluzivni pouk.

Vzorec predstavlja 459 osnovnošolskih učiteljev v Republiki Hrvaški, od tega 439 (95,6%) učiteljic in 20 oz. 4,4% učiteljev. Od vseh sodelujočih jih 260 (56,6%) poučuje od 1. do 4. razreda, 199 oz. 43,4% pa od 5. do 8. razreda.

Za zbiranje podatkov smo uporabili anketni vprašalnik, sestavljen za potrebe te raziskave, ki je vseboval tri neodvisne in dvanajst odvisnih spremenljivk. Uporabili smo Likertovo lestvico stališč. Podatke smo zbrali v letu 2021. Zaradi pandemije covid-19 smo uporabili on-line anketni vprašalnik, ki je bil predstavljen v Facebook skupini. Pridobljeni podatki so se obdelovali z uporabo IBM SPSS Statistics 24.

Pridobljeni so bili naslednji rezultati:

- Tri odvisne spremenljivke:
 - učenje prilagajam zmožnostim učenca,
 - za učence s posebnimi potrebami uporabljam bolj preproste knjige in materiale in
 - učencem s posebnimi potrebami ponujam več časa za pisne naloge so se nanašale na prilagajanje učiteljev potrebam učencev, vključenih v inkluzivni pouk.

Pri vseh treh spremenljivkah so aritmetične sredine visoke: najvišja je za spremenljivko (3) in znaša 4,71, ob standardni deviaciji 0,736, medtem ko je najnižja tista za spremenljivko (2), ki znaša 4,35 ob standardni deviaciji 0,937. Med vsemi tremi spremenljivkami so bile izračunane pozitivne korelacije: $r_{1,2} = 0,331$, $r_{1,3} = 0,314$, ter $r_{2,3} = 0,272$, vse za $N = 459$ in $p < 0,001$.

- Del raziskave, ki se je nanašal na ocenjevanje učenca v inkluzivnem pouku, je predstavljalo preostalih devet odvisnih spremenljivk. Za vse spremenljivke so aritmetične sredine visoke: najvišja je za spremenljivko učencem, vključenim v inkluzivni pouk, prilagajam pisna preverjanja in znaša 4,83, ob standardni deviaciji 0,549, medtem ko je najnižja aritmetična sredina (3,21) tista za spremenljivko pri sestavljanju izpita za učence, vključene v inkluzivni pouk, se posvetujem s strokovnimi sodelavci, ob standardni deviaciji 1,454.
- Zveza odvisnih spremenljivki ocenjevanje učenca v inkluzivnem pouku je podana s Pearsonovim linearnim koeficientom. Pridobljene so naslednje korelacije:
 - osemnajst (18) pozitivnih in dve (2) negativni, vse za $N = 459$ in $p < 0,01$;
 - pet pozitivnih (5) in ena (1) negativna, vse za $N = 459$ in $p < 0,05$;
 - deset (10) koeficientov korelacije statistično ni pomembnih.
- Z enofaktorsko analizo variance je bil raziskan vpliv delovnih izkušenj v osnovni šoli na del raziskave ocenjevanja učenca v inkluzivnem pouku. Ugotovljena je bila statistično pomembna razlika na ravni $p \leq 0,05$ za odvisno spremenljivko Znanje učencev, vključenih v inkluzivni pouk, pogosteje preverjam ustno $F(5, 450) = 3,311$, $p = 0,006$.

Poleg tega je treba poudariti, da se 92,5% anketirancev strinja s to trditvijo in da učenje prilagajajo potrebam učenca. Skladno z Navodilom za spremljanje in ocenjevanje učencev z motnjami v razvoju v osnovni in srednji šoli (MZOS, 2014) bo otrokom s posebnimi potrebami včasih potrebno prilagoditi pisna gradiva. V raziskavi Učne

strategije učiteljev pri poučevanju učencev s specifičnimi motnjami učenja (Martan idr., 2016) je iz rezultatov razvidno, da večina učiteljev prilagaja knjige in didaktični material potrebam učencev, vključenih v inkluzivni pouk. Avtorji še navajajo, da učitelji učencem s posebnimi potrebami omogočajo več časa za pisne naloge. Prav tako je veliko število učiteljev pripravljenih nuditi pomoč in podporo učencem, vključenim v inkluzivni pouk (prav tam).

Dobljeni rezultati kažejo, da 92 % anketiranih učiteljev zagotavlja več časa za pisne naloge učencem s posebnimi potrebami, kar kaže, da se učitelji zavedajo, da učenca s posebnimi potrebami potrebujejo več časa za pisne naloge. "Če gre za učence z zmanjšano koncentracijo, je treba znanje preverjati pogostejše, v krajših časovnih enotah in z majhnim številom nalog ali vprašanj v enem preverjanju znanja" (MZOS, 2014, str. 4). Zanimalo nas je, koliko anketirancev upošteva ta navodila. Ugotovili smo, da jih to navodilo upošteva 57,9 %, medtem ko se skoraj ena tretjina udeležencev do navedenega ni opredelila oziroma so bili neodločeni. Na podlagi tega lahko sklepamo, da večina učiteljev ne upošteva navedenih navodil ali – celo zelo verjetno – z njimi niso niti seznanjeni.

Dobljeni rezultati vsekakor predstavljajo motivacijo za učitelje, da še naprej iščejo načine in poti, ki bodo pripomogle k bolj pozitivnim stališčem staršev do inkluzije otrok z motnjami v razvoju, kot tudi k spodbujanju pozitivnih stališč ostalih učencev, vse pa s ciljem dobrobiti otrok, s katerimi delajo.

Kot smo že poudarili je proces inkluzije proces, ki je usmerjen v dvigovanje ravni kakovosti pouka. Kot navajata Mura in Zurru (2019) bi moral proces inkluzije učenca usposobiti za čim preprostejše obvladovanje gradiva. Učno prakso je treba posodobiti skozi delo, ki vključuje vse učence. Takšnih raziskav bi moralo biti več, da učitelji pridobijo pravo sliko položaja otrok z motnjami v razvoju v šolah, s ciljem njihovega uspešnejšega ocenjevanja in doseganja boljših vzgojno-izobraževalnih rezultatov, vse to pa zaradi izboljšanja kakovosti življenja vseh otrok. Prizadevati si je treba za to, da izobraževalne ustanove cenijo in spoštujejo vsakega posameznika z vsemi odlikami in pomanjkljivostmi.

V sklepu izpostavljamo, da bi lahko bilo to delo izhodišče za nadaljnje razširjene raziskave, v katere bi vključili večji vzorec anketirancev.

Dobljeni rezultati kažejo, da so anketirani pripravljeni in kompetentni za delo z učenca s posebnimi potrebami, da razumejo njihove potrebe in poznajo metode in strategije, ki so potrebne za delo s takšnimi učenca. Učitelji se zavedajo, da lahko učenca s posebnimi potrebami pomagajo čim bolj kakovostno zaključiti šolanje. Zaradi tega je treba osmisliti individualizirani program, ki jasno določa cilje, strategije in rezultate učenja, prilagojene zmožnostim posameznega učenca. Pri tem je pomembno, da so učitelji pri spremljanju, preverjanju in ocenjevanju učenca s posebnimi potrebami občutljivi, strpni in prilagodljivi.

Rezultati raziskave predstavljajo spodbudo ne le učiteljem, temveč tudi vodstvom šol in odločevalcem šolskih politik, da ne pozabijo na ta segment našega življenja, ki terja odgovorno in profesionalno držo vseh deležnikov z namenom spodbujanja uveljavljanja inkluzivne kulture na šoli in širše v družbi.

REFERENCES

1. Blažič, M. (2021). Prispevek visokošolskega učnega okolja h kariernemu razvoju študentov. *Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja*, 36(1), 93–113.
2. Biasiol Babić, R. (2009). Vrednovanje i ocjenjivanje s posebnim osvrtnom na učenike s teškoćama u razvoju integrirane u redovini sustav odgoja i obrazovanja. *Metodički obzori*, 4(1–2), 207–2019. Available at: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/45774> (retrieved 14. 1. 2021).
3. Demo H. (2019). Le competenze inclusive del docente. *L'integrazione scolastica e sociale*, 18(4), 346–349.
4. Drobnič, J. (2018). Inkluzija/integracija oseb s posebnimi potrebami v slovenski bibliografiji. *Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja*, 33(3–4), 20–35.
5. EADSNE – European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (2009). Key Principles for Promoting Quality in Inclusive Education. Recommendations for Policy Makers. Odense (Denmark): European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.
6. EADSNE – European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (2012). Teacher Education for Inclusion. Profile of Inclusive Teachers. Odense (Denmark): European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.
7. IBE-UNESCO – International Bureau of Education-UNESCO. (2016). Training Tools for Curriculum Development – Reaching Out to All Learners. Geneva (Switzerland): Resource Pack for Supporting Inclusive Education.
8. Kadum, S., Šušar, V. and Tomić, R. (2020). Školska pedagogija. Pula: Sveučilište Jurja Dobrile, Fakultet za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti.
9. Kadum, S., Štemberger, T. and Beneš, M. (2019). Socijalizacija darovite djece i odgojno-obrazovna podrška u prevenciji rizičnih ponašanja. V: Radetić-Paić, M. (ur.). Programi prevencije problema u ponašanju u lokalnoj zajednici (pp. 155–171). Pula: Sveučilište Jurja Dobrile, Fakultet za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti.
10. Kadum-Bošnjak, S. (2012). Suradničko učenje. *Metodički ogledi*, 19(1), 181–199.
11. Kadum-Bošnjak, S. and Brajković, D. (2007). Praćenje, provjeravanje i ocjenjivanje učenika u nastavi. *Metodički obzori*, 2(2), 35–51.
12. Keller, R., Kunz, A., Luder, R. et al. (2018). Schulentwicklung für eine inklusive gesunde Schule am Beispiel der Projekte „SIS“ und „Challenge“. In: Zala-Mezö, E., Strauss, N.-C. and Häbig, J. (Eds.). Dimensionen von Schulentwicklung. Münster: Waxmann.
13. Kiswarday, V. R. and Štemberger, T. (2017). Pomen inkluzivnih kompetenc z vidika bodočih vzgojiteljev predšolskih otrok. *Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja*, 32 (2), 3–17.
14. Kyriacou, Ch. (1995). Temeljna nastavna umijeća. Zagreb: Educa.
15. Luder, R., Kunz, A. and Müller Bösch, C. (2019). Das Besondere der Pädagogik einer inklusiven Schule. In: Luder, R., Kunz, A. and Müller Bösch, C. (Eds.). *Inklusive Pädagogik und Didaktik*. Bern: hep-Verlag.
16. Martan, V., Skočić Mihić, S. and Puljar, A. (2016). Nastavane strategije učitelja u podučavanju učenika sa specifičnim teškoćama učenja. *Život i škola: časopis za teoriju i praksu odgoja i obrazovanja*, 62(3), 139–150. Available at: https://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=260823 (retrieved 28. 8. 2021).
17. MZOS – Ministarstvu znanosti, obrazovanja i športa. (2019). Pravilnik o načinima, postupcima i elementima vrednovanja u osnovnoj i srednjoj školi. Zagreb. Available at: https://www.sss-makarska.hr/spisi/skola/pravilnik_vrednovanje_os_ss_2019_8_30.pdf (retrieved 14. 8. 2021).
18. MZOS – Ministarstvu znanosti, obrazovanja i športa. (2014). Naputak o praćenju i ocjenjivanju učenika s teškoćama u razvoju u osnovnoj i srednjoj školi. Available at: <http://hud.hr/wp-content/uploads/sites/168/2014/11/naputak-prac-ocj1.pdf> (retrieved 14. 1. 2021).
19. Mura, A. and Zurru, A. L. (2019). Professionalità docente e processi di inclusione: dall'indagine sulle pratiche didattiche alla rilevazione dei bisogni formativi. *L'integrazione scolastica e sociale*, 18(1), 43–57.
20. Partalo, D., Šindić, A. and Ličen, N. (2022). Competencies and Intergenerational Learning of the Preschool Teachers. *Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja*, 37(1), 37–49.

21. Rajić, V. (2017). Pristupi vrednovanju u obrazovanju. V: Matijević, M. (ur). Nastava i škola za net- generacije (pp. 256–270). Zagreb: Učiteljski fakultet Sveučilište u Zagrebu.
22. Robinson, L. and Buly, M. R. (2007). Breaking the Language Barrier: Promoting Collaboration between General and Special Educators. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(3), 83–94.
23. Strniša, T. and Jurišević, M. (2018). Razvoj strokovne samopodobe specialnih in rehabilitacijskih pedagogov. *Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja*, 33(1), 116–130.
24. Štemberger, T. (2013). Učiteljeva pripravljenost na inkluzijo. *Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja*, 28(3–4), 3–17.
25. Tot, D. and Klapan, A. (2008). Ciljevi stalnoga stručnog usavršavanja: mišljenje učitelja. *Pedagogijska istraživanja*, 5(1), 60–71.
26. UN. (2006). Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities and Optional Protocol, United Nations. Available at: <https://social.desa.un.org/issues/disability/crpd/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities-crpd> (retrieved 28. 4. 2021).
27. UNESCO. (1994). Salamanca Statement on Principles, Policy and Practice in Special Needs Education and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. Available at: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000098427> (retrieved 28. 4. 2021).
28. UNESCO. (2016). Education 2030. Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action for the Implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4. Available at: http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/education-2030-incheon-framework-for-action-implementation-of-sdg4-2016-en_2.pdf (retrieved 8. 2. 2021).
29. Užarević, A. (2012). Praćenje i ocjenjivanje učenika s teškoćama u razvoju. [Master's thesis]. Osijek. Josip Juraj Strossmayer University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Available at: <https://repozitorij.ffos.hr/islandora/object/ffos%3A1652/datastream/PDF/view> (retrieved 29. 5. 2021).

Delo je podprla Javna agencija za raziskovalno dejavnost Republike Slovenije [P5-0444].

This work was supported by the Slovenian Research Agency [P5-0444].



Besedilo / Text © 2024 **Avtor(ji) / The Author(s)**

To delo je objavljeno pod licenco CC BY Priznanje avtorstva 4.0 Mednarodna.

This work is published under a licence CC BY Attribution 4.0 International.

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Sandra Kadum, PhD, associate professor at the Faculty of Education in Pula, Croatia.

E-mail: skadum@unipu.hr

Anna-Maria Ukić, student of the 5th year of Teacher Studies at the Faculty of Educational Sciences in Pula, Croatia.

E-mail: annamariaukic76@gmail.com

Jurka Lepičnik Vodopivec, PhD, full professor for preschool pedagogy and scientific adviser at the Faculty of Education of the University of Primorska, Koper, Slovenia.

E-mail: jurka.lepicnik@pef.upr.si