Croatian Journal of Education
Vol.16; No.4/2014, pages: 1055-1091
Preliminary communication
Paper submitted: 20th August 2012
Paper accepted: 27th May 2013
doi: 10.15516/cje.v16i4.487

Support for Secondary School Students with Special Needs

Majda Schmidt and Branka Čagran
Faculty of Education, University of Maribor

Abstract

The article was part of the target research project Planning the Education Process – the Concepts of Curriculum Design, which examines the following two partial problems: support for, and organization of adaptations, and the implementation of individualized programmes (IP) for students with special needs (SN). The research sample comprised 131 Slovenian secondary school teachers who had students with SN in their classes and were provided additional professional support. We controlled the role of the type of school, type of impairment and teachers' training. Students with SN require most support in the areas of learning and motivation. This is particularly so for the students with learning difficulties and those with health impairments. Most teachers prepare special learning aids; when they need support for a student with SN, they cooperate with the school counselling service. The results show that the majority of students with SN do not participate in team meetings, and they also rarely make decisions about the IP learning objectives.

Key words: *adaptations; individualized programme; secondary schools; students with SN; support.*

Introduction

International legislation in many European countries promotes inclusive education for students with special needs (SN) by educating them together with their peers in regular schools instead of in special schools or special classes. Studies about the effects of inclusive education on the achievement among students with SN have most often revealed positive or neutral effects (Peetsma et al., 2001; Ruis, Peetsma, & van der Veen, 2010). It has been found that secondary school students with SN who receive additional support in inclusive classes were more likely to obtain formal qualifications than those who receive education in special classes (Myklebust, 2007).

The development of quality inclusive practice requires that schools recognize and respect the students' learning needs, i.e. their basic work, and that they allow curricular and educational adaptations to be introduced (Hunt & Goetz, 1997). However, changing the techniques and methods for working with students with SN is not alone enough to make schools more inclusive; instead, teachers and special educators must also change their attitudes towards inclusion (Loreman, 1999; Pijl, 2010). Crucial changes in introducing effective inclusive practice in schools feature the development of a vision and strategy of inclusion; cooperation and effective teamwork among all participants; acquisition of skills and training of teachers for appropriate support to students with SN; continuous professional development; administrative support and availability of help resources (e.g. extra staff, materials, time, etc.) (Florian & Rouse, 2009; McLeskey et al., 2004; Rose, 2002). Teachers are the ones who work on the front lines and whose practical experience concerns education in general. Because of this, they play the central role in the development of efficient inclusion.

One of the most frequent issues in ensuring equality of education in an inclusive school is carefully planned professional training and preparation of teachers for confronting the challenges of inclusion in an increasingly diverse society (Florian & Rouse, 2009). The experience of inclusive schools and some studies show that teachers are unprepared for working with SN students, that they know too little about teaching and that schools lack appropriate capacities and other resources that would allow teachers to do their work efficiently (Cole, Waldron, & Majd, 2004; Marchesi et al., 2005; Myklebust, 2007; Pijl, 2010). This can have a negative effect on the quality of education for students with SN.

Current international trends in the area of legislation, that makes inclusion possible, show that an increasing number of students with SN are being taught in regular classes. The data about officially recognized children with SN who are included in vocational and technical education as well as grammar school programmes in Slovenia indicate continuous growth in the number of these students. The number of students with SN is considerably larger in vocational and professional education programmes compared to grammar school programmes. The number of students with learning difficulties has grown the most, and the number of those with sensory impairments the least (Opara et al., 2010).

In Slovenia, inclusion of children with SN in the school system became possible with the Placement of Children with Special Needs Act, which was passed in 2000 and amended in 2007. Upon the inclusion of students with SN in regular classes, adaptations and Additional Professional Support (APS) can be requested if inclusion in regular classes has been officially proposed by the Committee for Directing Children with Special Needs (Opara, 2005). According to the relevant legislation (Vocational and Technical Education Act, 1996; Grammar School Act, 1996; Placement of Children with Special Needs Act, 2000 and 2007), the following programmes have been implemented for secondary school students with SN:

1. Education programme with adapted implementation and APS (this refers to minor adaptations including the following: the forms, types and methods of teaching that a school adopts).
2. Adapted programme with an equal vocational standard (duration of education can be extended; individual subjects or content can be replaced with equivalent ones that allow achievement of an equal vocational qualification standard or vocational competencies).

Adaptations of the education process are implemented for students who have the status of the student with SN. These can include the following: temporal, spatial or methodological-didactic adaptations, adaptations to the examination and assessment of knowledge and progress to a higher grade. Examples of adaptations include larger print, oral exams, audio books, calculators, computer support technology, etc. All of these allow access to information and the demonstration of knowledge and skills. Appropriate adaptations remove barriers caused by a disability so the individual has equal access to an educational activity (Byrnes, 2008).

Students' individual needs are considered when planning their education. The concept of individualized programmes (IP) for students with SN is incorporated into Slovene legislation and represents an appropriate tool for assisting students with SN in education. IP helps the teacher assess and monitor students' progress in school. Preparation of an IP requires team work, active participation and coordination of all the following: teachers, special educators, school counsellors, as well as parents and students with SN. Active participation of students with SN in the process of designing IP, which, however, schools do not often practice, permits the enhancement of responsibility, independence, self-control, decision-making and setting goals for one's own learning (Barnard-Brak & Lechtenberger, 2010; Wehmeyer, 2002).

Education of students with SN in secondary schools and implementation of adaptations into the education process is demanding and complex because teachers must not only adhere to the legislation that promotes inclusion but also confront the rising academic standards and achievements for all students. Teachers in grammar schools are in a particularly difficult situation because they place results at the forefront. Slee and Wiener (2001) point out that, in their effort for greater efficiency and better academic results, secondary schools often forget about topics connected with prejudice, diversity and fairness. Moreover, traditional school culture in secondary schools often is not in favour of inclusive practice (Friend & Bursuck, 2002).

There exist very few studies that examine support and adaptations for students with SN in inclusive education in Slovenia, and even these relate only to primary schools. Studies about education of students with SN and the implementation of support and adaptations in secondary schools, on the other hand, are virtually non-existent.

Aim of Empirical Study

The current study examines the implementation of support and adaptations for students with SN in the education process; this was part of the target research project

Planning the Education Process – the Concepts of Curriculum Design, in which the following two partial problems have been examined:

– support and organization of adaptations for students with SN,
– the implementation of IP for students with SN.

In both partial problems, the descriptive level of examination is complemented by a statistical control of the type of school (grammar school, vocational and technical school) and category of impairment (visual impairment, hearing impairment, physical impairment, health impairment, learning difficulty). In the analysis of the teacher's role in IP, special focus was given to the training of teachers for working with students with SN.

Methodology

Research Method

Our study is based on the descriptive and causal non-experimental methods of empirical research.

Research Sample

The survey comprised grammar school, vocational and technical school teachers (2008/09 school year) who had an SN student in their class and were offered APS (n=131). The majority of teachers had a university degree.

Our sample included more teachers from vocational and technical (74%) than from grammar schools (26%), which matches the number of officially recognized students with the status of a student with SN. The majority of teachers (67.2%) had received no training for working with SN students; those who did (32.8%) had most often attended training that was organized by the National Education Institute and institutions for children and adolescents with SN.

In Table 1, detailed frequency distributions of the type of impairment in a student with SN are presented.

Table 1

The number (f) and structural percentage (f%) of teachers with respect to the type of impairment in the student with SN

Groups	f	f %
Students with visual impairments (VI)	6	4.6
Students with hearing impairments (HI)	8	6.1
Students with physical impairments (PI)	14	10.7
Students with health impairments (HeI)	30	22.9
Students with learning difficulties (LD)	73	55.8
Total	131	100.0

The majority were students with learning difficulties (LD) (55.8%), followed by students with health impairments (HeI) (22.9%) and students with physical impairments (PI) (10.7%). All other groups were represented in low numbers. All

students with SN have the status of a child with SN. They attend educational programme with adapted implementation and APS in secondary schools. Slovene educational programmes prescribe at least minimal standards of knowledge for the successful advancement of students with SN and do not allow the adaptation of standards.

To sum up, this is a non-random, purposive sample of teachers from grammar, vocational and technical schools. From the point of view of inferential statistics, our sample of teachers is categorized as a simple random sample in a hypothetical population.

Data Collection Procedure

Data was gathered with the help of a questionnaire that was answered by grammar, vocational and technical school teachers who taught and offered APS to students with SN in the 2008/09 school year. The survey was conducted with the help of school counsellors, who delivered the questionnaires to the teachers. Some questionnaires were filled out even after the deadline had passed; teachers had to be asked several times for assistance, which required more effort in gathering the data. For the purpose of our survey, we developed a questionnaire with questions related to the support and adaptations for students with SN and a set of questions related to IP. The questionnaire comprised closed (dichotomous, with verbal and scaled answers) and open-ended questions.

Measurement characteristics of the questionnaire:

– validity is based on the probing use and an examination by experts from the Department of Special and Rehabilitation Education at the Faculty of Education in Ljubljana (M. Čuk and M. Lipec Stopar);
– reliability is ensured with detailed instructions and specific, unambiguous questions;
– objectivity was ensured during the data collection stage by unguided surveying, while in the data processing stage, there was objective reading of answers: i.e., without changing the information obtained.

Data Processing Procedures

We processed the data using the following procedures:

– presentation of frequency distributions (f, f%) with graphs and tables,
– χ^2- test of hypothesis independence for assessing implicitly expressed hypotheses; where there were no conditions for the ordinary Pearson's χ^2-test, we used the χ^2-test with Continuity Correction in the case of 2 x 2 tables, while with larger tables (c x r), the Likelihood Ratio χ^2-test was employed.

Results and Interpretation

Support and Adaptations for Students with SN

This chapter comprises an analysis of the following:

– the required support for students with SN;
– support provided to students with SN;
– adaptations for students with SN.

Analysis of the Required Support for Students with SN

On a four-point scale ("much", "some", "little", "none"), teachers assessed the level of support that a student with SN requires in four areas (social-emotional, learning, motor and motivational).

The frequencies rise almost on a linear basis from "much" (16.8%) towards "none" (32.8%) in the social-emotional area, while in the area of learning the trend is the opposite, from "none" (6.9%) towards "much" (45%). In the motor area, the option "none" prevails (74%); in the motivational area, differences are not that marked; the prevalent option is "much" (32.1%), followed by "some" (24.2%).

To sum up, teachers think that students with SN require most support in the area of learning, followed by motivation. Teachers believe less support is needed in the social-emotional area and the least in the motor area.

The following is a presentation of the extent of differences in terms of the type of secondary school and type of impairment in an SN student.

Table 2

Results of the χ^2-test of differences in the level of required support with respect to the type of secondary school

		GRAMMAR SCHOOL		VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL		χ^2 - test result	
Area	Degree	f	f %	f	f %	χ^2	a(P)
Social-emotional	Much	4	11.8	18	18.6	2.844	0.416
	Some	7	20.6	23	23.7		
	Little	8	23.5	28	28.9		
	None	15	44.1	28	28.9		
Learning	Much	12	35.3	47	48.5	3.480	0.323
	Some	12	35.3	35	36.1		
	Little	6	17.6	10	10.3		
	None	4	11.8	5	5.2		
Motor	Much	2	5.9	13	13.4	1.634	0.693
	Some	2	5.9	5	5.2		
	Little	3	8.8	9	9.3		
	None	27	79.4	70	72.2		
Motivational	Much	8	23.5	34	35.1	3.097	0.377
	Some	7	20.6	25	25.8		
	Little	9	26.5	20	20.6		
	None	10	29.4	18	18.6		

With respect to the type of school, in none of the areas examined in the study the differences proved to be statistically significant. According to the teachers, students in grammar, vocational and technical schools alike need most support in the learning and motivational areas.

Table 3

Results of the χ^2-test of differences in the level of required support with respect to the type of impairment

		VI&HI		PI		HeI		LD		χ^2-testresult	
Area	Degree	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	χ^2	a(P)
Social-emotional	Much	0	0.0	1	7.1	7	23.3	14	19.2	10.538	0.506
	Some	2	14.3	5	35.7	5	16.7	18	24.7		
	Little	6	42.9	3	21.4	8	26.7	19	26.0		
	None	6	42.9	5	35.7	10	33.3	22	30.1		
Learning	Much	7	50.0	4	28.6	8	26.7	40	54.8	16.027	0.066
	Some	5	35.7	4	28.6	17	56.7	21	28.8		
	Little	1	7.1	3	21.4	4	13.3	8	11.0		
	None	1	7.1	3	21.4	1	3.3	4	5.5		
Motor	Much	1	7.1	8	57.1	2	6.7	4	5.5	49.984	0.000***
	Some	1	7.1	3	21.4	2	6.7	1	1.4		
	Little	1	7.1	1	7.1	0	0	10	13.7		
	None	11	78.6	2	14.3	26	86.7	58	79.6		
Motivational	Much	1	7.1	2	14.3	8	26.7	31	42.5	31.773	0.000***
	Some	1	7.1	4	28.6	10	33.3	17	23.3		
	Little	9	64.3	5	35.7	1	3.3	14	19.2		
	None	3	21.4	3	21.4	11	36.7	11	15.1		

The obtained χ^2-test results confirm the existence of statistically significant differences with respect to the type of impairment in the motor (χ^2=49.984, P=0.000) and motivational (χ^2=31.773, P=0.000) areas as well as a tendency (P=0.066) towards a difference in the learning area.

The frequencies show that it is students with LD who need the most support in learning area; in this group, the following problems appear: dyslexia, writing disorders, math problems, language problems, cognitive deficits, problems with meta-cognition and self-regulation. These are followed by students with VI and HI, then HeI, while students with PI are the least represented. In motor area, students with PI understandably require the most support. In the motivational area, it is again students with LD and those with HeI who receive the most support, followed by students with PI and students with VI & HI. It is interesting that teachers rarely list social-emotional support for students with SN. This raises the question whether social impediments and emotional responses such as anxiety, introversion, depression or helplessness are rare or whether teachers consider them unimportant.

Analysis of Support Provided to Students with SN

We examined what proportion of students with SN receive special learning aids (1), with whom the teachers cooperate when support is needed by an SN student (2) and how efficient that support is, according to the teachers (3).

Preparation of Learning Aids

The teachers first answered a dichotomous question (yes, no) and then explained why a particular answer was given.

Most teachers (63.4%) prepare learning aids for students with SN; however, it is worth mentioning that relatively large number of teachers do not do this (36.6%). The main aid are summaries of course topics, special lessons for reviewing acquired knowledge and reading literacy lessons. A lack of learning aids and materials makes it difficult for students with SN to learn and can have a detrimental effect on learning achievements.

Table 4

χ^2-test of differences in the preparation of learning aids with respect to the type of school and impairment

	GRAMMAR SCHOOL		VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL SCHOOL		VI & HI		PI		HeI		LD	
Answer	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %
Yes	16	47.1	67	69.1	11	78.6	9	64.3	16	53.3	47	64.4
No	18	52.9	30	30.9	3	21.4	5	35.7	14	46.7	26	35.6
Total	34	100.0	97	100.0	14	100.0	14	100.0	30	100.0	73	100.0
χ^2 - test result	χ^2 = 5.255		P = 0.022*				χ^2 = 2.733		P = 0.435			

A statistically significant difference exists with respect to the type of school (χ^2=5.255, P=0.022); however, this is not so with respect to the impairment (P=0.435). Teachers of vocational and technical schools prepare learning aids more frequently than grammar school teachers. In the open-ended questions, teachers of vocational and technical schools listed more aids (pictures, special cards, tables and concrete aids in individual subjects) than their colleagues in grammar schools, which indicates that they recognize more their students' learning problems and meet their needs.

Cooperation of Teachers with Others when a Student with SN Requires Support

The teachers answered the following question: "To whom do you turn when you need support for a student with SN?"

Teachers most frequently (59.5%) cooperate with the school counselling service (SCS) when support is required for a student with SN. Other, less frequent options, include simultaneous contact with the SCS and parents (13.7%), contact with special educators and experts from external institutions (5.3%), with assistants (4.6%) or others, e.g. only with the parents (3.1%). As can be seen, SCS is clearly the first option; on the other hand, there are parents whom teachers rarely contact without support from SCS. This is most likely the result of common practice regarding the division of professional duties at Slovenian schools; at the same time, the economic, social and cultural background of these families also represents a factor owing to which the teachers alone, without the SCS and other responsible experts, cannot achieve the goals related to learning support for a student with SN.

Table 5

χ^2-test of differences concerning teacher's cooperation with others with respect to the type of school and impairment

	GRAMMAR SCHOOL		VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL SCHOOL		VI & HI		PI		Hel		LD	
Answer	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%
SCS	18	54.5	60	64.5	5	38.5	5	35.7	21	72.4	47	67.1
Specialeducator	2	6.1	5	5.4	1	7.7	1	7.1	0	0.0	5	7.1
Assistant	1	3.0	5	5.4	0	0.0	6	42.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
Parents	1	3.0	3	3.2	1	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	4.3
Externalexperts	3	9.1	4	4.3	1	7.7	0	0.0	3	10.3	3	4.3
SCSandparents	8	24.2	10	10.8	4	30.8	2	14.3	5	17.2	7	10.0
Other	0	0	6	6.5	1	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	7.1
Total	33	100.0	93	100.0	13	100.0	14	100.0	29	100.0	70	100.0
χ^2-testresult	χ^2=2.733		P=0.233				χ^2=65.055		P=0.000			

No statistically significant differences (P=0.233) appear with respect to the type of school; however, they do exist with respect to the type of impairment. One unique feature of students with PI is that teachers are in contact not only with the SCS but also with the assistants; in other groups of students with SN, SCS dominates together with parents. Another particular feature appears in the group of students with LD, where special educators also become involved. The established differences are professionally confirmed. Because of the problem of restricted mobility and reduced functional and fine motor movements of students, support from assistants is of key importance in avoiding physical barriers as well as in the preparation of the learning environment; in contrast, the required support of special educators in working with students with more intensive learning impairments is present, but rare.

Assessment of the Effectiveness of Teacher's Direct Support to an SN Student

Teachers assessed the effect of the support they offer to students with SN on a four-point scale ("it helps","it helps somewhat","it helps very little","it does not help at all").

Majority (77.1%) of teachers believe that their support helps the student with SN. Others (22.9%) think it has at least a partial or very limited effect; nobody thought it had no effect at all. This assessment on the part of the teachers is encouraging and indicates that teachers can perceive the effects of offering learning support to students with SN; however, it would be necessary to analyze in more detail whether this assessment comes as a result of the energy and effort invested in supporting students with SN rather than from systematic evaluation and monitoring of the effectiveness of the support and strategies they provide in working with these students.

Table 6

χ^2-test of differences in the assessment of the effectiveness of support with respect to the type of school and impairment

	GRAMMAR SCHOOL		VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL SCHOOL		VI & HI		PI		HeI		LD	
Answer	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%
Ithelps	21	61.8	80	82.5	13	92.9	12	85.7	18	60.0	58	79.5
Ithelpssomewhat	8	23.5	14	14.4	1	7.1	2	14.3	8	26.7	11	15.1
Ithelpsverylittle	5	14.7	3	3.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	13.3	4	5.5
Total	34	100.0	97	100.0	14	100.0	14	100.0	30	100.0	73	100.0
χ^2-testresult	χ^2=8.201		P=0.017				χ^2=9.874		P=0.130			

There exist statistically significant differences in the assessment of the effectiveness of support with respect to the type of school (χ^2=8.201, P=0.017). The frequencies indicate that teachers from vocational and technical schools consider the support they offer to students more efficient than grammar school teachers do. It is worth noting that fewer students with SN enrol in grammar schools than in other secondary schools; on the other hand, the grammar school programme is physically and mentally very demanding for students with SN. Differences are not statistically significant with respect to the type of impairment (P=0.130); however, the frequencies clearly indicate that support has a lesser effect on students with HeI compared to others, in particular students with VI, HI and PI. The result does not come as a surprise because students with HeI represent a heterogeneous group comprising students with more complex impairments (e.g. students with autism, psychiatric, neurological and other disorders), which no doubt represents a major challenge for teachers. The category of children with HeI was defined in the legislation only recently.

Analysis of the Adaptations for Students with SN

The answers to open-ended questions provided information about other activities for reducing or eliminating the impairments of students with SN (1), about adaptations in class (2) and unique features in the knowledge assessment stage (3).

If we sum up teachers' answers, the following types of adaptations surface:

- students with SN are provided with additional tasks when they are absent from class,
- students with SN are provided with extra time and additional explanation; the majority of such students sit in the front row;
- students with SN are given more time in exams; written exams are more common than oral ones, and their format is adapted accordingly; minimum standards of knowledge are assessed; exams are announced in advance, and no more than one takes place on a given day.

It is also necessary to point out the 42.4% of teachers who indicated that they did not offer any activities for reducing learning deficits because they deemed these unnecessary; additionally, 25.5% teachers say that they assess the knowledge of students with SN in the same way as that of other students.

This raises several questions about proper identification of and response to the needs and capabilities of students on the part of teachers and questions that are connected with accessibility, equality and fairness in providing inclusion in the education system.

The Implementation of IP for Students with SN

In an analysis of the IP, we examined the following:
– the realisation of IP;
– the role of the teacher in designing an IP; and
– the role of the student and his/her parents in designing an IP.

Analysis of the Realization of IP for Officially Recognized Students with SN

By analyzing answers to the question, "Does a student officially recognized as having SN have an IP?" we tried to examine the actualization of IP in secondary schools.

The majority (94.7%) of students with SN have an IP, which is encouraging but not optimal. The problem is that 5.3% of students do not have an IP even though they are formally entitled to it according to Slovene legislation.

Table 7

χ^2 test of differences in IP implementation with respect to type of school and impairment

	GRAMMAR SCHOOL		VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL SCHOOL		VI & HI		PI		Hel		LD	
Answer	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%
Yes	32	94.1	92	94.8	14	100.0	14	100.0	30	100.0	66	90.4
No	2	5.9	5	5.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	9.6
Total	34	100.0	97	100.0	14	100.0	14	100.0	30	100.0	73	100.0
χ^2 - test result	χ^2 = 0.000.		P = 1.000				χ^2 = 8.499		P = 0.037*			

Statistically and practically, no differences exist in terms of the type of school; however, differences do exist in terms of impairment (χ^2=8.499, P=0.037). All students without an IP are students with LD.

Analysis of the Teacher's Role in the IP

We examined the extent to which teachers participate in IP design (1) and amount of the time teachers need to implement IPs (2).

Participation of Teachers in IP Design

The teachers were asked the following question: "Do you participate in the design of IPs for students with SN?"

The majority of teachers (82.4%) participate in IP design. This data suggests a relatively good situation; however, the real situation in various secondary schools and the role of additional teacher training in the complex task of working with students needs to be examined more closely. When they are not involved in IP design,

teachers listed the following most common reasons in open-ended questions: it was not necessary; they did not receive any invitation; this was not a common practice at school; this was the task of the school counselling service.

Table 8

χ^2-test of differences in teacher involvement in IP design with respect to the type of school and training

	GRAMMAR SCHOOL		VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL SCHOOL		TRAINING YES		TRAINING NO	
Answer	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%
Yes	25	73.5	83	85.6	39	90.7	69	78.4
No	9	26.5	14	14.4	4	9.3	19	21.6
Total	34	100.0	97	100.0	43	100.0	88	100.0
χ^2-test result	χ^2=2.520, P=0.112				χ^2=3.014, P=0.083			

Differences with respect to the type of school and teacher training are not statistically significant; however, it is necessary to point out that in both cases, particularly in the examination of the role of training (P=0.083), the frequencies show that teachers at vocational and technical schools are more frequently involved in IP design than their colleagues from grammar schools. The same applies to the teachers who have received additional training for working with SN students (the National Education Institute, institutions for children and adolescents with SN).

This explains the positive effects of various forms of training, on the one hand, and the reserved response of grammar school teachers, on the other. It has already been pointed out that, on average, fewer students with SN attend grammar school programmes. As a result, teachers in grammar schools have less experience in working with them and a less expressed need for additional training.

The Amount of Time Needed for Implementing IP in Comparison with General Educational Programme

We asked the teachers to compare the amount of time needed for the implementation of IP in comparison with the time they needed for the implementation of the general educational programme.

The difference in the number of teachers who need the same amount (45%) or more time (39.7%) for the implementation of IP than for their regular work is small. However, significantly fewer teachers spend less time (15.3%) on IP than on the general educational programme.

Because of the extent of additional work, planning of objectives and implementation of adjustments, on top of a need for team work, process work and cooperation with other experts, the implementation of IP is complex for teachers (and burdensome for many); therefore, it is understandable that time consumption is greater than with general educational programme. For this reason, it is surprising to see a relatively high proportion of teachers (45%), the highest in our case, who answered that they needed the same amount of time. This raises the question of whether teachers were prepared

for the new tasks and responsibilities involved in IP design and to what extent they believed it is beneficial and effective for students with SN.

Table 9

χ^2-test of differences in the time needed for the implementation of IP with respect to the type of school and impairment

	GRAMMAR SCHOOL		VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL SCHOOL		VI & HI		PI		HeI		LD	
Answer	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %
More time	10	29.4	42	43.3	6	42.9	4	28.6	10	33.3	32	43.8
Same time	13	38.2	46	47.4	3	21.4	7	50.0	14	46.7	35	47.9
Less time	11	32.4	9	9.3	5	35.7	3	21.4	6	20.0	6	8.2
Total	34	100.0	97	100.0	14	100.0	14	100.0	30	100.0	73	100.0
χ^2 - test result	$\chi^2 = 10.475$		P = 0.005				$\chi^2 = 9.868$		P = 0.130			

The χ^2-test result confirms the existence of a statistically significant difference with respect to the type of school (χ^2=10.475, P=0.005). Among those who need the same amount of time or less, grammar school teachers prevail; teachers at vocational and technical schools prevail among those who need more time. We could hypothetically ascribe this difference to the more significant deficits in the field of learning for students from vocational and technical schools compared to students with SN in grammar schools; however, this could also be due to the greater preparedness and responsiveness of teachers in adapting the education process to students with SN.

The existence of differences, albeit not statistically significant (P=0.130), is also evident in the case of various types of impairments. In the case of students with HeI and those with LD, the same amount of time or longer is needed by most teachers; it is the same for the students with PI; and greater (42.9%) and smaller (35.7%) for the students with VI & HI. It seems that there do exist considerable differences between students with SN in the time needed for implementing the IP between different groups as well as within the same group (particularly among the students with VI & HI). This is most likely due to the intensity of deficits as well as to the greater need to make more extensive adaptations to the learning environment.

Analysis of the Role of a Student with SN and His/Her Parents in IP

This chapter tries to establish whether students with SN are familiar with the IP (1), whether they participate in team meetings with experts (2), to what extent they participate in setting the learning outcomes of the IP (3), and, finally, the level of parental involvement in the implementation and evaluation of the IP (4).

Familiarity of the SN Student with IP

By analyzing answers to the dichotomous question, "Is the SN student familiar with IP and his/her role in it?" we collected the following data. With the exception of six students with SN (4.6%), the rest (95.4%) were said to be familiar with the IP. Such a ratio is encouraging; however, that the majority are familiar with it does not imply optimal involvement in IP.

Table 10

χ^2-test of differences in the familiarity of SN students with IP by type of school and impairment

	GRAMMAR SCHOOL		VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL SCHOOL		VI & HI		PI		HeI		LD	
Answer	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %
Yes	32	94.1	93	95.9	14	100.0	14	100.0	30	100.0	67	91.8
No	2	5.9	4	4.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	8.2
Total	34	100.0	97	100.0	14	100.0	14	100.0	30	100.0	73	100.0
χ^2 - test result	χ^2 = 0.000		P = 1.000				χ^2 = 7.245		P = 0.064			

There are neither practical nor statistically significant differences with respect to the type of school. However, there is an expressed tendency of difference (P=0.064) with respect to the type of impairment. Table 10 clearly shows that all those students with SN who are unfamiliar with IP are students with LD. In open-ended answers, teachers warn that these students have no motivation for learning; they dodge the learning tasks and also skip APS classes. A few teachers also pointed out that the programme was too demanding for these students.

Student Participation in Team Meetings with Experts Involved in the Implementation of IP

The teachers were asked the following question: "Is the student with SN invited to attend team meetings with the experts who are involved in the implementation of the IP?"

According to the teachers, the majority (38.2%) of students attend team meetings rarely, followed by those attending them regularly (35.1%), and a still relatively high proportion (26.7%) of students who do not attend them at all.

Our data indicates that regular participation of students with SN in team meetings is not part of common school practice, and too many students remain excluded from meetings. This calls for an additional analysis of teachers' attitudes and beliefs when students regularly attend meetings about IP, to find out to what extent and how frequently the students express their beliefs with respect to their academic achievements, objectives, needs and wishes, and to establish whether students are actually prepared for the involvement in IP design.

We established no statistically significant differences with respect to the type of impairment; however, differences were established with respect to the type of school (χ^2=6.740, P=0.034). Regular participation of students with SN in team meetings is better established at vocational and technical schools than at grammar schools.

The practice of excluding students with SN from team meetings thus seems to be more common in grammar schools than in vocational and technical schools. On the one hand, exclusion perhaps shows insufficient consideration of the students' special needs in the area of learning as well as in the social relationship area. On the other hand, it may reflect the teamwork culture at schools that favour teachers and

other team members when expressing attitudes and beliefs, identifying problems and seeking solutions in the implementation of IP without the students.

Table 11

χ^2-test of differences in the participation of students with SN in team meetings with respect to the type of school and impairment

	GRAMMAR SCHOOL		VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL SCHOOL		VI & HI		PI		HeI		LD	
Answer	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%
Yes, regularly	6	17.6	40	41.2	4	28.6	5	35.7	12	40.0	25	34.2
Rarely	10	29.4	25	25.8	3	21.4	1	7.1	9	30.0	22	30.1
No	18	52.9	32	33.0	7	50.0	8	57.1	9	30.0	26	35.6
Total	34	100.0	97	100,0	14	100.0	14	100.0	30	100.0	73	100.0
χ^2 - test result	χ^2 = 6.740,		P = 0.034*				χ^2 = 6.123,		P = 0.410			

Involvement of Students with SN in Decision-Making When Setting Learning Objectives for the IP

The teachers were asked: "To what extent is the student included in decision-making when establishing learning objectives for the IP?"

The majority of students with SN (43.5%) are rarely involved in the process of setting objectives for the IP, followed by those who are completely involved (30.5%). Only 19.1% of students are frequently involved; the lowest figure applies to students who are not involved at all.

The results reveal that students with SN are usually not involved in the process of setting learning objectives, with more than half participating only rarely or never.

Table 12

χ^2-test of differences in the involvement of students with SN in the decision-making process regarding the learning objectives in terms of type of school and impairment

	GRAMMAR SCHOOL		VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL SCHOOL		VI & HI		PI		HeI		LD	
Answer	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %
Not at all	3	8.8	6	6.2	1	7.1	0	0.0	3	10.0	5	6.8
Rarely	13	38.2	44	45.4	3	21.4	5	35.7	8	26.7	41	56.2
Frequently	4	11.8	21	21.6	7	50.0	3	21.4	4	13.3	11	15.1
Completely	14	41.2	26	26.8	3	21.4	6	42.9	15	50.0	16	21.9
Total	34	100.0	97	100.0	14	100.0	14	100.0	30	100.0	73	100.0
χ^2 - test result	χ^2 = 3.541		P = 0.315				χ^2 = 21.415,		P = 0.007**			

Differences with respect to the type of school are not statistically significant; however, they are significant with respect to the type of impairment (χ^2=21.415, P=0.007). The frequencies show students with HeI, PI, VI & HI to be more frequently involved in the decision-making process than students with LD. In students with LD, who are characterized by greater cognitive problems and problems with metacognition and self-regulation, it is assumed that teachers doubt their ability and potential to help determine and set the learning objectives.

Involvement of the Parents of Students with SN in the Implementation and Evaluation of IP

The teachers also used a four-point scale ("not at all", "rarely", "frequently", "completely") to provide answers in response to the question "To what extent are the student's parents involved in the implementation and evaluation of IP?"

The result seems encouraging with the number of parents who, according to the teachers, are frequently involved (29%) or involved completely (27.5%) being higher than those who are only rarely (32.8%) or not at all involved (10.7%). However, it is necessary to point out that the data came from the teachers, not the parents.

Table 13

χ^2-test of differences in the involvement of student's parents in the IP with respect to the type of school and impairment

	GRAMMAR SCHOOL		VOCATIONAL & TECHNICAL SCHOOL		VI & HI		PI		HeI		LD	
Answer	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %	f	f %
Not at all	5	14.7	9	10.7	1	7.1	0	0.0	5	16.7	8	11.0
Rarely	9	26.5	34	32.8	3	21.4	3	21.4	7	23.3	30	41.1
Frequently	9	26.5	29	29.0	6	42.9	3	21.4	10	33.3	19	26.0
Completely	11	32.4	25	27.5	4	28.6	8	57.1	8	26.7	16	21.9
Total	34	100.0	97	100.0	14	100.0	14	100.0	30	100.0	73	100.0
χ^2 - test result	χ^2 = 1.757		P = 0.624				χ^2 = 13.461		P = 0.143			

Differences with respect to the type of school (P=0.624) and the type of impairment (P=0.143) are not statistically significant; however, in the latter, frequencies show the existence of differences of practical significance. In the case of students with PI, VI & HI the involvement of parents is more common than in students with HeI, in particular those with LD.

It is likely that the parents of students with LD have lower ambition with respect to education, that they are less motivated and less responsive to cooperation in the implementation and evaluation of the IP; other possible reasons for the lack of cooperation include non-existent contact with teachers and schools in previous years.

Discussion and Conclusion

The aim of our empirical study was to examine the support and adaptations for students with SN and IP in secondary education.

The processing of data from grammar, vocational and technical schools from the 2008/09 school year yielded the following basic empirical results:

- Students with SN need the most support in the areas of learning and motivation. This is particularly so for students with LD and those with HeI.
- Most teachers prepare learning aids; when they need support for a student with SN, they cooperate with the SCS. Teachers consider the support they offer SN students to be effective.

– The majority of students with SN have an IP; those with no IP are, without exception, students with LD.
– The teachers, most of whom teach at vocational and technical but also at grammar schools, are involved in IP. They estimate that they need the same amount of time when implementing the IP compared to the general educational programme; this is particularly true of vocational and technical schools and of students with LD.
– Most students with SN are familiar with IP; however, the majority do not participate in team meetings with experts; they also rarely make decisions about the learning objectives of IP (in particular students with LD). According to the teachers, parents are involved in the implementation and evaluation of IP; however, in comparison with other groups of students with SN, this applies less to the parents of students with LD.

Results of the study reveal that students with LD stand out most among the groups of students with respect to the complexity of their impairments. Teachers perceive their lack of motivation for learning, avoidance of obligations and APS; they also consider the programme to be too demanding.

When resolving problems, the teachers most often seek help from school counsellors, who, however, are usually overburdened with administrative work, and, to a lesser extent, from special educators, who are best qualified for supporting students with LD. Since in practice they are overburdened because of commitments at several different schools, the latter are often unavailable. It is a fact that teachers would need greater, more easily accessible and quality professional support from special educators, in particular when it comes to the use of effective teaching strategies, assessment of the needs and abilities of these students and support for their inclusion in the education process (Pijl & Hamstra, 2005; Wong, Pearson, & Lo, 2004).

Among secondary school teachers, no statistically significant differences occurred in their assessment of the support necessary to students in the learning, motor, motivational and social-emotional areas. The empirical results confirm that teachers in secondary schools mostly focus their attention on academic achievement and motivation for learning (in particular for students with LD and those with HeI), while no special attention is given to the social-emotional dimension of support. This has also been confirmed by other studies (Kobolt et al., 2010; Slee & Wiener, 2001). The push for the best achievements and results (in particular in grammar schools) and drive towards academic standards of knowledge or minimal standards of knowledge for students with SN, together with professional pressure to follow the general educational programme, place enormous pressure on teachers. The teachers strive for their students to achieve the goals (Hilton, 2006; Schmidt & Čagran, 2006); however, in doing so they most likely miss the problems and concerns of students in the social-emotional area.

The findings show that most teachers prepare learning aids and materials, seek support for students with SN, adapt their teaching, work more intensively with

students and participate in IP. However, the answers to open-ended questions warn that there are also teachers who do not prepare materials and aids, do not try to reduce the deficits and do not adapt their teaching, which results in fewer opportunities for learning, unequal treatment and creation of hindrances in the development of an accessible and responsive learning environment for students (Forlin, Tait, Carroll, & Jobling, 1999). Obviously, some teachers do not know or understand the needs of students with SN and do not recognize their responsibility for the creation of a cooperative relationship with the students and the provision of adapted learning (Jordan, Schwartz, & McGhie-Richmond, 2009; White, 2000). Of particular concern is the response of teachers in grammar schools because their learning support is less efficient; also weak are their preparation for cooperation and their investment of time in the implementation of IP. Such an attitude certainly does not benefit students with special needs, who are more vulnerable from the point of view of learning and social exclusion. Probable reasons for the inappropriate response of grammar school teachers include fewer contacts with SN students and less experience in working with them compared to teachers from vocational and technical schools, who have had prior experience with these groups of students.

Let us also pause at the inclusion and participation of students with SN and their parents in the design of IP. The results show that secondary schools, in particular grammar schools, pay no attention to the culture of inclusion nor to student participation in the design of IP. Particularly exempt from establishing learning objectives are students with LD, who are often not cognitively and/or motivationally engaged in learning tasks and who generally struggle in learning, as was pointed out in studies by Torgesen (1980) and Bender (2008). By not participating in team meetings for IP, students get fewer opportunities for empowerment, cooperation and control over their own learning and, which is most worrying, their role remains restricted only to passive reception of assistance. It is assumed that by using appropriate teaching methods and systematically developing decision-making skills, teachers could encourage students with LD to recognize their strengths and weaknesses, to which they could respond with more efficient skills for achieving academic and social objectives (Bender, 2008).

According to the existing legislation, the implementation of IP allows inclusion of the parents of children with SN, and the teachers' answers confirm this in practice. However, it is not possible to conclude on the basis of this survey whether the parents do take an active part in designing, implementing and evaluating IP. In our everyday practice, it often happens that parents only attest to the content of IP by formally signing the relevant document (Pulec Lah, 2005). For this reason, future surveys will have to examine more carefully the true nature of parents' active participation in and their decision-making about IP. Special attention will have to be paid to the parents of students with LD, because they are typically less involved in cooperation

with IP than parents of other students with SN. Certainly, schools would also have to recognize their responsibility in working with parents and to think about ways of improving cooperation with parents and encouraging them to take a more active role. It is crucial that the parents be offered professional support by the school, so that they are no longer on their own (Dabkowski, 2004).

Besides empirical insights from the study, it is also necessary to dedicate attention to the training of teachers for working with SN students because this is one of the most important factors in the implementation of inclusion. Among teachers in our sample, the majority (67.2%) had received no training for working with SN children; the rest had undergone training through the Slovenian Education Institute and institutions for children with SN. For this reason, it can be claimed with great certainty that an insufficient level of training and preparedness among teachers for teaching students with SN also had an impact on the results pertaining to the implementation of support and adaptations for students with SN and IP in secondary education; the consequences include fewer opportunities, reduced accessibility and adaptations of teaching for students with SN, in particular among grammar school teachers. We must also point out that the implementation of the processes of inclusion and more flexible ways of teaching children with SN in Slovenia also revealed deficiencies such as training of teachers for working with SN children. In addition, implementation of inclusion in schools was followed by a considerable shortage of special educators and other sources of support, which no doubt caused teachers certain problems in the implementation of new tasks and responsibilities in classrooms with SN students (Opara et al., 2010). In order for teachers to be able to effectively teach students with SN in secondary schools in the future, faculties and the Ministry of Education and Sport together will have to implement study programmes in such a way as to offer systematic training with respect to the following content: inclusion, students with special needs, tolerance of diversity, cooperation with parents and experts, student-centred instruction, evaluation of development and learning objectives and individualized programmes. Equally important, secondary schools, in particular the incentive-oriented grammar schools, as well as the entire local communities will have to respond faster, in a more flexible way and with more understanding of the diversity of students' needs. Formation of good inclusive schools demands positive leadership with a vision and the ability to reach a compromise with respect to planning and harmonization of approaches to teaching through the professional development of teachers and preparedness of schools for inclusion (Florian & Rouse, 2009; Rose, 2002).

This study offers a general insight into the realization of the implementation of support and adaptations for students with SN in secondary schools. The next step will be to emphasize the monitoring and evaluation of adaptations, and provide a more detailed analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the support and adaptations for individual groups of students with SN. In addition, students with SN need to be invited to take part in the study, in order to examine their perspective.

Acknowledgement

This study was carried out as a part of the project *Planning the Education Process – the Concepts of Curriculum Design*, conducted by the Ministry of Education and Sport of the Republic of Slovenia.

References

Barnard-Brak, L., & Lechtenberger, D. (2010). Student IEP Participation and Academic Achievement Across Time. *Remedial and Special Education*, 31(5), 343–349. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0741932509338382

Bender, W. N. (2008). *Learning disabilities: characteristics, identification, and teaching strategies*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Byrnes, M. A. (2008). Educators' Interpretations of Ambiguous Accommodations. *Remedial and Special Education,* 29(5), 306-315. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0741932507313017

Cole, C. M., Waldron, N., & Majd, M. (2004). Academic progress of students across inclusive and traditional settings. *Mental Retardation,* 42(2), 136–144. http://dx.doi.org/10.1352/0047-6765(2004)42<136:APOSAI>2.0.CO;2

Dabkowski, D. M. (2004). Encouraging Active Parent Participation in IEP Team Meetings. *Teaching Exceptional Children,* 36(3), 34–39.

Friend, M., & Bursuck, W. D. (2002). *Including students with special needs.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Florian, L., & Rouse, M. (2009). The inclusive practice project in Scotland: Teacher education for inclusive education. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 25, 594–601. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.02.003

Forlin, C., Tait, K., Carroll, A., & Jobling, A. (1999). Teacher education for diversity. *Queensland Journal of Educational Research,* 15(2), 207–226.

Hilton, Z. (2006). Disaffection and school exclusion: Why are inclusion policies still not working in Scotland? *Research papers in Education,* 21(3), 295–314. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02671520600793765

Hunt, P., & Goetz, L. (1997). Research on inclusive education programs: practices and outcomes for students with severe disabilities. *Journal of Special Education,* 32, 3–29. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002246699703100102

Jordan, A., Schwartz, E., & McGhie-Richmond, D. (2009). Preparing teachers for inclusive classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 25, 535–542. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.02.010

Kobolt, A., Caf, B., Brenčič, I., Lesar, I., Rapuš-Pavel, J., Pelc Zupančič, K., Peček, M. et al. (2010). *Izstopajoče vedenje in pedagoški odzivi*.[Disruptive behavior and pedagogical responses]. Ljubljana: Pedagoška fakulteta.

Loreman, T. (1999). Integration: Coming from the outside. *Interaction,* 13(1), 21–23.

Maarchesi, A., Martín, E., Echeita, G., & Pérez, E. M. (2005). Assessment of special educational needs integration by the educational community in Spain. *European Journal of Special Needs Education,* 20(4), 357–374. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08856250500270615

Myklebust, J. O. (2007). Diverging paths in upper secondary education: Competence attainment among students with special educational needs. *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 11(2), 215–231. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603110500375432

McLeskey, J., Hoppey, D., Williamson, P., & Rentz, T. (2004). Is inclusion an illusion? An Examination of National and State Trends Towards the Education of Students with Learning Disabilities in General Education Classroom. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice,* 19(2), 109–115. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5826.2004.00094.x

Opara, B. (2005). *Otroci s posebnimi potrebami v vrtcih in šolah: vloga in naloga vrtcev in šol pri vzgoji in izobraževanju otrok s posebnimi potrebami.* [Children with special needs in kindergartens and schools: role and task of kindergartens and schools in education of children with special needs]. Ljubljana: Centerkontura.

Opara, B., Barle, A., Globačnik, B., Kobal Grum, D., Košir, S., Macedoni-Lukšič, M., Zorc-Maver, D., et al. (2010). *Analiza vzgoja in izobraževanja otrok s posebnimi potrebami v Sloveniji.* [Analysis of education of children with special needs in Slovenia]. Ljubljana: JRZ Pedagoški inštitut.

Peetsma, T., Vergeer, M., Roeleveld, J., & Karsten, S. (2001). Inclusion in education: Comparing pupils' development in special and regular education. *Educational Review*, 53(2), 125-135. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131910125044

Pijl, S.J., & Hamstra, D. (2005). Assessing pupil development and education in an inclusive setting. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 9(2), 181–192. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1360311042000331192

Pijl, S. J. (2010). Preparing teachers for inclusive education: some reflections from the Netherlands. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 10, 197–201. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2010.01165.x

Pulec Lah, S. (2005). Individualizirani program - vodnik za starše. [Individualized program-guide book for parents]. *Bilten Bravo,* 1(2), 20–23.

Rose, R. (2002). Including Pupils with Special Educational Needs: beyond rhetoric and towards an understanding of effective classroom practice. *Westminster Studies in Education,* 25(1), 67–76. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0140672020250107

Ruis, N., Peetsma, T., & van der Veen, I. (2010). The presence of several students with special educational needs in inclusive education and the functioning of students with special educational needs. *Educational Review,* 62(1), 1-37. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131910903469551

Schmidt, M., & Čagran, B. (2006). Classroom climate in regular primary school settings with children with special needs. *Educational Studies,* 32(4), 361–372. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03055690600850123

Slee, R., & Weiner, G. (2001). Education reform and reconstructions as a challenge to research genres: reconsidering school effectiveness research and inclusive schooling. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* 12(1), 83–98. http://dx.doi.org/10.1076/sesi.12.1.83.3463

Torgesen, J. K. (1980). The use of efficient task strategies by learning disabled children: Conceptual and educational implications. *Journal of Learning Disabilities,* 13, 364–71. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002221948001300704

Wehmeyer, M. L. (2002). *Teaching students with mental retardation.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

White, R. (2000). Pre-service teachers` epistemology viewed through perspectives on problematic classroom situations. *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 26(3), 279–305. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/713676891

Wong, D. K. P., Pearson, V., & Lo, E. M. K. (2004). Competing philosophies in the classroom: a challenge to Hong Kong teachers. *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 8(3), 261–279. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1360311032000160599

Zakon o usmerjanju otrok s posebnimi potrebami [Placement of Children with Special Needs Act]. 2000. Ljubljana: *Uradni list Republike Slovenije* 54.

Zakon o usmerjanju otrok s posebnimi potrebami [Placement of Children with Special Needs Act]. 2007. Ljubljana: *Uradni list Republike Slovenije* 23.

Zakon o poklicnem in strokovnem izobraževanju [Vocational and Technical Education Act]. 1996. Ljubljana: *Uradni list Republike Slovenije* 12.

Zakon o gimnazijah [Grammar School Act]. 1996. Ljubljana: *Uradni list Republike Slovenije* 12.

Majda Schmidt
Faculty of Education, University of Maribor,
Koroška cesta 160, 2000 Maribor, Slovenia
majda.schmidt@uni-mb.si

Branka Čagran
Faculty of Education, University of Maribor,
Koroška cesta 160, 2000 Maribor, Slovenia
branka.cagran@uni-mb.si

Podrška srednjoškolcima s posebnim potrebama

Sažetak

Članak je dio istraživačkog projekta Planiranje obrazovnoga procesa – koncepti kreiranja kurikula, u okviru kojeg se istražuju dva parcijalna problema: potpora i organizacija adaptacije i provedba individualiziranih programa (IP) za učenike s posebnim potrebama (PP). Uzorak istraživanja obuhvaća 131 profesora slovenskih srednjih škola koji su imali učenike s PP u svojim razredima i koji su dobili dodatnu stručnu podršku. Kontrolirali smo ulogu vrste škole, vrste oštećenja i usavršavanje nastavnika. Učenici s PP zahtijevaju najveću podršku u području učenja i motivacije. To je osobito važno za učenike s teškoćama u učenju i one sa zdravstvenim poteškoćama. Većina nastavnika priprema posebna pomagala za učenje; kada im je potrebna podrška za učenika s PP, oni surađuju sa školskom savjetodavnom službom. Rezultati pokazuju da većina učenika s PP ne sudjeluje u grupnim sastancima, kao i da rijetko donose odluke o ciljevima učenja u IP.

Ključne riječi: *adaptacije; individualizirani programi; podrška; srednje škole; učenici s PP.*

Uvod

Međunarodni propisi u mnogim europskim zemljama promiču inkluzivni odgoj i obrazovanje za učenike s posebnim potrebama (PP) obrazujući ih zajedno s njihovim vršnjacima u redovnim školama, umjesto u posebnim školama ili posebnim razredima. Istraživanja o utjecaju inkluzivnog odgoja i obrazovanja na postignuća među učenicima s PP najčešće su pokazala pozitivan ili neutralan učinak (Peetsma i sur., 2001; Ruis, Peetsma, i van der Veen, 2010). Utvrđeno je da je veća vjerojatnost da će srednjoškolci s PP koji dobivaju dodatnu potporu u inkluzivnim razredima steći formalne kvalifikacije nego srednjoškolci koji se obrazuju u posebnim razredima (Myklebust, 2007).

Preduvjet za razvoj kvalitetne inkluzivne prakse jest da škole prepoznaju i poštuju potrebe učenika vezane uz učenje, odnosno njihov osnovni rad, i da omoguće uvođenje prilagodbi nastavnog programa i odgojno-obrazovnoga rada (Hunt i Goetz, 1997). Međutim, samo promjena tehnika i metoda rada s učenicima s PP nije dovoljna da bi škole bile inkluzivne u većoj mjeri. Umjesto toga, nastavnici i defektolozi također

moraju promijeniti svoj stav prema inkluziji (Loreman, 1999; Pijl 2010). Bitne promjene u uvođenju učinkovite inkluzivne prakse u školama predstavljaju razvoj vizije i strategije inkluzije; suradnja i učinkovit timski rad svih sudionika; stjecanje vještina i osposobljavanje nastavnika za odgovarajuću podršku učenicima s PP; kontinuirani profesionalni razvoj; administrativna podrška i dostupnost pomoćnih resursa (npr. dodatno osoblje, materijali, vrijeme itd.) (Florian i Rouse, 2009; McLeskey i sur., 2004; Rose, 2002). Nastavnici su oni koji rade na prvim linijama i čije se praktično iskustvo odnosi na odgoj i obrazovanje u cjelini. Zbog toga oni imaju ključnu ulogu u provedbi učinkovite inkluzije.

Jedan je od najčešćih problema u osiguravanju jednakosti u odgoju i obrazovanju u inkluzivnoj školi pažljivo osmišljena stručna izobrazba i osposobljavanje nastavnika za suočavanje s izazovima inkluzije u sve raznolikijem društvu (Florian i Rouse, 2009). Iskustvo inkluzivnih škola i rezultati nekih istraživanja pokazuju da nastavnici nisu u dovoljnoj mjeri pripremljeni za rad s učenicima s PP, da ne znaju dovoljno o poučavanju i da škole nemaju odgovarajuće kapacitete i druge resurse koji bi omogućili nastavnicima da učinkovito rade svoj posao (Cole, Waldron, i Majd 2004; Marchesi i sur., 2005; Myklebust, 2007; Pijl, 2010). Navedeno može imati negativan utjecaj na kvalitetu odgoja i obrazovanja učenika s PP.

Trenutni međunarodni trendovi na području zakonodavstva koji omogućuju inkluziju pokazuju da se sve veći broj učenika s PP uključuje u redovnu nastavu. Podatci o službeno prepoznatim učenicima s PP koji su upisani u strukovna i obrtnička usmjerenja, kao i gimnazijske programe u Sloveniji, ukazuju na kontinuirani rast broja tih učenika. Broj učenika s PP znatno je veći u strukovnim i tehničkim obrazovnim programima u odnosu na gimnazijske programe. Najveći je porast broja učenika s teškoćama u učenju, a najmanji je broj učenika s osjetilnim oštećenjima (Opara i sur., 2010).

U Sloveniji je inkluzija djece s PP u školski sustav postala moguća stupanjem na snagu Zakona o usmjeravanju djece s posebnim potrebama, koji je donesen 2000. i izmijenjen 2007. godine. Nakon uključivanja učenika s PP u redovnu nastavu, mogu se tražiti prilagodbe i Dodatna stručna potpora (DSP) ako je uključivanje u redovnu nastavu službeno predložio Odbor za usmjeravanje djece s posebnim potrebama (Opara, 2005). Prema relevantnim propisima (Zakon o strukovnom i obrtničkom obrazovanju, 1996; Zakon o gimnazijama, 1996; Zakon o usmjeravanju djece s posebnim potrebama, 2000. i 2007.) uvedeni su sljedeći programi za srednjoškolce s PP:

1. Obrazovni program s prilagođenom provedbom i DSP (odnosi se na manje prilagodbe koje podrazumijevaju: oblike, vrste i metode poučavanja koje škola prihvaća).
2. Prilagođeni program s jednakim strukovnim standardom (trajanje obrazovanja može se produžiti, pojedini predmeti ili sadržaji mogu biti zamijenjeni ekvivalentnima koji omogućuju postizanje jednakih strukovnih kvalifikacija, standarda ili stručnih kompetencija).

Prilagodbe obrazovnoga procesa provode se za učenike koji imaju status učenika s PP. One mogu podrazumijevati: vremenske, prostorne ili metodološko-didaktičke prilagodbe, prilagodbe ispita i vrednovanja znanja i prijelaz u viši razred. Primjeri prilagodbe uključuju veća slova, usmene ispite, audio knjige, kalkulatore, računalno podržanu tehnologiju itd. Sve navedeno omogućuje pristup informacijama i demonstraciju znanja i vještina. Odgovarajuće prilagodbe uklanjaju barijere uzrokovane invaliditetom, tako da pojedinac ima jednak pristup obrazovnoj aktivnosti (Byrnes, 2008).

Učeničke individualne potrebe uzimaju se u obzir pri planiranju njihova odgoja i obrazovanja. Koncept individualiziranih programa (IP) za učenike s PP ugrađen je u slovenske zakone i predstavlja prikladno sredstvo za pomoć učenicima s PP u odgoju i obrazovanju. IP pomaže nastavniku u procjeni i praćenju napretka učenika u školi. Priprema IP zahtijeva timski rad, aktivno sudjelovanje i koordinaciju sljedećih sudionika: nastavnika, defektologa, školskih savjetnika, roditelja i učenika s PP. Aktivno sudjelovanje učenika s PP u procesu izrade IP, što, međutim, škole ne prakticiraju često, omogućuje povećanje odgovornosti, samostalnosti, samokontrole, donošenje odluka i postavljanje ciljeva vlastitoga učenja (Barnard-Brak i Lechtenberger, 2010; Wehmeyer, 2002).

Odgoj i obrazovanje učenika s PP u srednjim školama i provedba prilagodbi procesu obrazovanja zahtjevni su i složeni, jer se nastavnici ne moraju samo pridržavati propisa koji promiču inkluziju već i suočiti s podizanjem akademskih standarda i postignuća za sve učenike. Nastavnici u gimnazijama su u osobito teškoj situaciji jer u prvi plan stavljaju rezultate. Slee i Wiener (2001) ističu da, u svom nastojanju za većom učinkovitošću i boljim akademskim rezultatima, srednje škole često zaboravljaju teme vezane uz predrasude, raznolikosti i pravednost. Štoviše, tradicionalna školska kultura u srednjim školama često nije sklona inkluzivnoj praksi (Friend i Bursuck, 2002).

Postoji vrlo malo istraživanja u kojima se istražuju podrška i prilagodbe za učenike s PP u inkluzivnom obrazovanju u Sloveniji i odnose se samo na osnovne škole. Istraživanja o obrazovanju učenika s PP i provedbi podrške i prilagodbe u srednjim školama, s druge strane, gotovo da i nema.

Cilj empirijskoga istraživanja

Ovim se istraživanjem provjerava provedba podrške i prilagodbe za učenike s PP u odgojno-obrazovnom procesu; to je bio dio istraživačkog projekta *Planiranje obrazovnog procesa-koncepti kreiranja kurikula*, u kojemu se ispituju sljedeća dva parcijalna problema:

– podrška i organizacija prilagodbi za učenike s PP,
– provedba IP za učenike s PP.

U oba parcijalna problema opisna razina ispita dopunjena je statističkom kontrolom vrste škole (gimnazija, strukovna i tehnička škola) i kategorijom oštećenja (oštećenja vida, oštećenja sluha, tjelesna oštećenja, oštećenja zdravlja, poteškoće u učenju). U

analizi uloge nastavnika u individualnom programu posebna pažnja posvećena je obuci nastavnika za rad s učenicima s PP.

Metodologija

Metoda istraživanja

Naše se istraživanje temelji na deskriptivnim i uzročnim neeksperimentalnim metodama empirijskoga istraživanja.

Uzorak istraživanja

Anketom su obuhvaćeni nastavnici gimnazija, strukovnih i tehničkih škola (2008./09. školske godine) koji su imali učenike s PP u svom razredu i imali su na raspolaganju DSP (n=131). Većina nastavnika imala je visoku stručnu spremu.

Naš je uzorak imao više nastavnika iz strukovnih i tehničkih škola (74%) nego iz gimnazija (26%), što odgovara broju službeno priznatih učenika sa statusom učenika s PP. Većina nastavnika (67,2%) nije prošla nikakvu obuku za rad sa učenicima s PP; oni koji jesu (32,8%), najčešće su pohađali obuku koju je organizirao Nacionalni institut za školstvo i ustanove za djecu i mlade s PP. U tablici 1 daje se detaljan prikaz distribucije frekvencija vrste oštećenja učenika s PP.

Tablica 1.

Većina su učenici s poteškoćama u učenju (PU) (55,8%), slijede ih učenici s oštećenim zdravljem (OZ) (22,9%) i učenici s tjelesnim oštećenjima (TO)(10,7%). Sve su ostale skupine zastupljene u malom broju. Svi učenici s PP imaju službeni status djeteta s PP. Oni pohađaju obrazovni program s prilagođenom provedbom i DSP u srednjim školama. Slovenski obrazovni programi propisuju barem minimalne standarde znanja za uspješno napredovanje učenika s PP i ne dopuštaju prilagodbu standarda.

Ukratko, uzorak ispitanika nije izabran nasumično. To je namjerni uzorak nastavnika koji predaju u gimnazijama, stručnim i tehničkim školama. S točke gledišta inferencijalne statistike, naš uzorak nastavnika kategoriziran je kao jednostavni slučajni uzorak odabran iz hipotetske populacije.

Postupak prikupljanja podataka

Podatci su prikupljeni uz pomoć upitnika na koji su odgovarali nastavnici gimnazija, strukovnih i tehničkih škola koji su poučavali i pružali DSP učenicima s PP u školskoj godini 2008./09. Istraživanje je provedeno uz pomoć školskih savjetnika, koji su podijelili upitnike nastavnicima. Neki su upitnici popunjeni čak i nakon što je prošao rok; nastavnike se nekoliko puta moralo tražiti za pomoć, što je zahtijevalo više napora u prikupljanju podataka. Za potrebe našega istraživanja razvili smo upitnik s pitanjima vezanima uz podršku i prilagodbe za učenike s PP, kao i skup pitanja koja se odnose na IP. Upitnik se sastoji od pitanja zatvorenoga (dihotomna pitanja, pitanja s verbalnim i skaliranim odgovorima) i otvorenoga tipa.

Mjerne karakteristike upitnika:
– valjanost se temelji na probnoj primjeni i provjeri od stručnjaka s Odsjeka za specijalno i rehabilitacijsko obrazovanje Fakulteta za obrazovanje u Ljubljani (M. Čuk i M. Lipec Stopar);
– pouzdanost je osigurana detaljnim uputama i specifičnim, nedvosmislenim pitanjima;
– objektivnost je u fazi prikupljanja podataka osigurana nevođenim istraživanjem, a u fazi obrade podataka primijenjeno je objektivno čitanje odgovora: dakle, bez izmjena prikupljenih podataka.

Postupci obrade podataka

Podatke smo obradili primjenom sljedećih postupaka:
– prikaz frekvencija distribucije (f, f%) uz pomoć grafikona i tablica,
– hi-kvadrat test (X^2- test) neovisnosti hipoteze za procjenu implicitno izraženih hipoteza; gdje nije bilo uvjeta za obični Pearsonov hi-kvadrat test, koristili smo se hi-kvadrat testom s korekcijom kontinuiteta u slučaju 2 x 2 tablica, a za veće je tablice (c x r) primijenjen hi-kvadrat test za omjer vjerojatnosti.

Rezultati i interpretacija

Podrška i prilagodbe za učenike s PP

Ovo poglavlje obuhvaća analizu:
– potrebne podrške za učenike s PP;
– pružene podrške učenicima s PP;
– prilagodbi za učenike s PP.

Analiza potrebne podrške za učenike s PP

Na skali od četiri stupnja („puno", „srednje", „malo", „ništa") nastavnici su procjenjivali razinu podrške koja je potrebna učenicima s PP u četiri područja (socijalno-emocionalno, učenje, motoričko i motivacijsko).

Frekvencije rastu gotovo linearno od „puno" (16,8%) prema „ništa" (32,8%) u socijalno-emocionalnom području, a u području učenja trend je suprotan, od „ništa" (6,9%) prema „puno" (45%). Na području motorike „ništa" prevladava (74%); u motivacijskom području razlike nisu toliko značajne; prevladava „puno" (32,1%), a zatim „srednje" (24,2%).

Da zaključimo, nastavnici misle da učenici s PP zahtijevaju najveću podršku u području učenja, a zatim motivacije. Nastavnici vjeruju da je manje podrške potrebno u socijalno-emocionalnom području, a najmanje u području motorike.

Slijedi prikaz razlika s obzirom na vrstu srednje škole i vrstu oštećenja učenika s PP.

Tablica 2.

S obzirom na vrstu škole ni u jednom od ispitivanih područja razlika se nije pokazala statistički značajnom. Prema mišljenju nastavnika, učenicima u gimnazijama,

strukovnim i tehničkim školama podjednako je najpotrebnija pomoć u učenju i motivacijskom području.

Tablica 3.

Dobiveni rezultati hi-kvadrat testa potvrđuju postojanje statistički značajne razlike s obzirom na vrstu oštećenja u motoričkom (χ^2=49,984, P=0,000) i motivacijskom području (χ^2=31,773, P=0,000), kao i tendenciju (P=0,066) prema razlici u području učenja.

Frekvencije pokazuju da su učenici s PU oni kojima je najpotrebnija pomoć u području učenja; u toj skupini pojavljuju se sljedeći problemi: disleksija, poremećaji vezani uz pisanje, matematički problemi, jezični problemi, kognitivni deficiti, problemi u području metakognicije i samoregulacije. Slijede učenici s oštećenjem vida (OV) i učenici s oštećenjem sluha (OS), zatim učenici s oštećenim zdravljem (OZ), a učenici s tjelesnim oštećenjima (TO) najmanje su zastupljeni. U motoričkom području, razumljivo, pomoć je najpotrebnija učenicima s TO. U motivacijskom području, ponovno učenici s PU i oni s OZ primaju najviše pomoći, slijede učenici s TO i učenici s OV i oni s OS. Zanimljivo je da nastavnici rijetko navode socijalno-emocionalnu podršku učenicima s PP. Postavlja se pitanje jesu li društvene prepreke i emocionalne reakcije, kao što su tjeskoba, introvertiranost, depresija ili nemoć rijetke ili ih nastavnici smatraju nevažnima.

Analiza pružanja potpore učenicima s PP

Ispitali smo koji udio učenika s PP dobiva posebnu pomoć prilikom učenja (1), s kim nastavnici surađuju kada je podrška potrebna učeniku s PP (2) i koliko je ta podrška učinkovita, prema mišljenju nastavnika (3).

Priprema pomoćnih materijala za učenje

Nastavnici su najprije odgovorili na dihotomno pitanje (da, ne), a zatim su objasnili svoj odgovor.

Većina nastavnika (63,4%) priprema pomoćne materijale za učenje za učenike s PP. Međutim, važno je spomenuti da relativno velik broj nastavnika to ne čini (36,6%). Glavna su pomoć sažetci nastavnih tema, posebni sati za provjeru stečenoga znanja i sati namijenjeni razvoju čitačke pismenosti. Nedostatak pomoćnih materijala za učenje čini učenje teškim za učenike s PP i može imati štetan učinak na postignuća u učenju.

Tablica 4.

Utvrđena je statistički značajna razlika s obzirom na vrstu škole (χ^2=5,255, P=0,022). Međutim, razlika nije utvrđena s obzirom na poteškoću (P=0435). Nastavnici strukovnih i tehničkih škola pripremaju pomoćne materijale za učenje češće nego gimnazijski nastavnici. Kod pitanja otvorenoga tipa, nastavnici strukovnih i tehničkih škola naveli su veći broj pomoćnih materijala (slike, posebne kartice, tablice i konkretna pomagala za pojedine nastavne predmete) od svojih kolega u gimnazijama, što ukazuje

na to da oni u većoj mjeri prepoznaju probleme u učenju kod svojih učenika i nastoje zadovoljiti njihove potrebe.

Suradnja nastavnika kada učenik s PP treba podršku

Nastavnici su odgovarali na sljedeće pitanje: „Kome ćete se obratiti kada vam je potrebna pomoć za učenika s PP?"

Nastavnici najčešće (59,5%) surađuju sa školskom savjetodavnom službom (ŠSS) kada im je potrebna pomoć u radu s učenikom s PP. Druge, rjeđe opcije, uključuju istodobni kontakt sa ŠSS i roditeljima (13,7%), kontakt s defektologom i stručnjacima iz vanjskih institucija (5,3%), asistentima (4,6%) ili ostalima, npr. samo s roditeljima (3,1%). Kao što se može vidjeti, ŠSS je očito prvi izbor; s druge strane roditelji koje nastavnici rijetko kontaktiraju bez potpore ŠSS. To je najvjerojatnije rezultat uobičajene prakse u vezi s podjelom profesionalnih dužnosti u slovenskim školama. U isto vrijeme, ekonomska, socijalna i kulturna pozadina tih obitelji također predstavljaju čimbenik zbog kojega nastavnici sami, bez ŠSS i drugih nadležnih stručnjaka, ne mogu ostvariti ciljeve vezane uz podršku u učenju učenicima s PP.

Tablica 5.

Nisu utvrđene statistički značajne razlike (P=0,233) s obzirom na vrstu škole. Međutim, one su utvrđene s obzirom na vrstu oštećenja. Jedna jedinstvena značajka učenika s TO je da su nastavnici u kontaktu ne samo sa ŠSS već i s asistentima. U ostalim skupinama učenika s PP, ŠSS dominiraju zajedno s roditeljima. Druga posebna značajka pojavljuje se u skupini učenika s PU, gdje su također uključeni i defektolozi. Utvrđene su razlike profesionalno potvrđene. Zbog problema ograničene pokretljivosti i smanjenih funkcionalnih i finih motoričkih pokreta učenika, podrška asistenata je od ključne važnosti za izbjegavanje fizičkih prepreka, kao i za pripremu okruženja za učenje. Nasuprot tome, potrebna podrška defektologa u radu s učenicima s intenzivnijim teškoćama u učenju je prisutna, ali rijetka.

Procjena učinkovitosti potpore nastavnika učeniku s PP

Nastavnici su procjenjivali učinak potpore koju pružaju učenicima s PP prema skali od četiri stupnja („pomaže", „pomaže donekle", „pomaže vrlo malo", „ne pomaže uopće").

Većina (77,1%) nastavnika vjeruje da njihova podrška pomaže učenicima s PP. Drugi (22,9%) smatraju da njihova podrška ima barem djelomičan ili vrlo ograničen učinak, a nitko ne misli da njihova podrška uopće nije imala utjecaja. Ta je procjena nastavnika ohrabrujuća i pokazuje da nastavnici mogu uočiti učinke pružanja podrške u učenju učenicima s PP. Međutim, bit će potrebno detaljnije analizirati je li navedena procjena posljedica energije i truda uloženoga u potporu učenicima s PP, a ne sustavnoga vrednovanja i praćenja učinkovitosti potpore i strategija koje primjenjuju u radu s tom skupinom učenika.

Tablica 6.

Postoje statistički značajne razlike u procjeni učinkovitosti potpore s obzirom na vrstu škole (χ^2=8,201, P=0,017). Frekvencije pokazuju da nastavnici strukovnih i tehničkih škola smatraju potporu koju nude učenicima učinkovitijom od gimnazijskih nastavnika. Važno je napomenuti da se manji broj učenika s PP upisuje u gimnazije nego u ostale srednje škole. S druge strane, gimnazijski je program fizički i psihički vrlo zahtjevan za učenike s PP. Razlike nisu statistički značajne s obzirom na vrstu oštećenja (P=0,130). Međutim, frekvencije jasno pokazuju da podrška ima manji utjecaj na učenike s OZ u usporedbi s drugima, posebno s učenicima s OV, OS i TO. Rezultat ne iznenađuje, jer učenici s OZ predstavljaju heterogenu skupinu koja obuhvaća učenike sa složenijim oštećenjima (primjerice učenike s autizmom, psihijatrijskim, neurološkim i drugim poremećajima), što bez sumnje predstavlja velik izazov za nastavnike. Kategorija djece s OZ tek je nedavno zakonski definirana.

Analiza prilagodbi učenicima s PP

Odgovori na pitanja otvorenoga tipa daju podatke o ostalim aktivnostima kojima je cilj smanjenje ili otklanjanje poremećaja kod učenika s PP (1), o prilagodbama u razredu (2) i jedinstvenim značajkama u fazi provjere znanja (3).

Ako promotrimo odgovore nastavnika, pojavljuju se sljedeće vrste adaptacija:
- učenicima s PP određeni su dodatni zadatci u slučajevima kada su odsutni s nastave,
- učenicima s PP omogućeni su dodatno vrijeme i dodatna objašnjenja; većina tih učenika sjedi u prvome redu;
- učenicima s PP daje se više vremena na ispitima; pismeni su ispiti češći nego usmeni, i njihov je format prilagođen učenicima; vrednuju se minimalni standardi znanja; ispiti se najavljuju unaprijed, i učenici nikada nemaju više od jednoga ispita u istome danu.

Također je potrebno istaknuti da je 42,4% nastavnika naznačilo da nisu ponudili nikakve aktivnosti za smanjenje deficita u učenju jer to smatraju nepotrebnim; osim toga, 25,5% nastavnika izjavljuje da ocjenjuju znanje učenika s PP na isti način kao i znanje drugih učenika.

Navedeno otvara nekoliko pitanja o pravilnoj identifikaciji i reakciji na potrebe i sposobnosti učenika od nastavnika i pitanja koja su povezana s dostupnosti, jednakosti i pravednosti u omogućavanju inkluzije u sustav obrazovanja.

Provedba IP za učenike s PP

U analizi IP ispitali smo sljedeće:
- realizaciju IP,
- ulogu nastavnika u kreiranju IP,
- ulogu učenika i njihovih roditelja u kreiranju IP.

Analiza realizacije IP za službeno prepoznate učenike s PP

Analizirajući odgovore na pitanje: „Ima li učenik koji je službeno prepoznat kao učenik s PP IP?", pokušali smo ispitati provedbu IP u srednjim školama.

Većina (94,7%) učenika s PP ima IP, što je ohrabrujuće, ali nije optimalno. Problem je u tome što 5,3% učenika nemaju IP iako formalno imaju pravo na njega u skladu sa slovenskim zakonima.

Tablica 7.

Statistički i praktično, nema razlike u odnosu na vrstu škole. Međutim, razlike postoje s obzirom na oblik poremećaja (χ^2=8,499, P=0,037). Svi učenici bez IP su učenici s PU.

Analiza uloge nastavnika u IP

Ispitali smo u kojoj mjeri nastavnici sudjeluju u kreiranju IP (1) i koliko je vremena nastavnicima potrebno za provedbu IP (2).

Sudjelovanje nastavnika u kreiranju IP

Nastavnicima je postavljeno sljedeće pitanje: „Sudjelujete li u izradi IP za učenike s PP?"

Većina nastavnika (82,4%) sudjeluje u kreiranju IP. Taj podatak ukazuje na relativno dobro stanje. Međutim, stvarna situacija u različitim srednjim školama i uloga dodatnoga usavršavanja nastavnika za kompleksni zadatak rada s učenicima trebaju biti pobliže ispitani. Kada nisu uključeni u kreiranje IP, nastavnici navode sljedeće najčešće razloge u odgovorima na pitanja otvorenoga tipa: nije bilo potrebno; nisu dobili nikakav poziv; to nije uobičajena praksa u školi; to je zadatak školskih savjetodavnih službi.

Tablica 8.

Razlike s obzirom na vrstu škole i obuku nastavnika nisu statistički značajne. Međutim, potrebno je istaknuti da u oba slučaja, posebno u ispitivanju uloge obuke (P=0,083), frekvencije pokazuju da su nastavnici u strukovnim i tehničkim školama češće uključeni u kreiranje IP nego njihove kolege iz gimnazija. Isto vrijedi i za nastavnike koji su prošli dodatnu obuku za rad s učenicima s PP (Nacionalni institut za odgoj i obrazovanje, ustanove za djecu i mlade s PP).

Time se mogu objasniti pozitivni učinci raznih oblika edukacije, s jedne strane, i suzdržana reakcija gimnazijskih nastavnika, s druge strane. Već je istaknuto da je, u prosjeku, manje učenika s PP koji pohađaju gimnazijske programe. Kao rezultat toga, nastavnici u gimnazijama imaju manje iskustva u radu s tim učenicima i manje izraženu potrebu za dodatnom obukom.

Iznos vremena potrebnog za provedbu IP u usporedbi s općim odgojno-obrazovnim programom

Od nastavnika smo tražili da usporede količinu vremena potrebnog za provedbu IP u odnosu na vrijeme koje je potrebno za provedbu općeg odgojno-obrazovnog programa.

Razlika u broju nastavnika kojima je potreban isti (45%) ili duži vremenski period (39,7%) za provedbu IP nego za njihov redovni rad je mala. Međutim, znatno manji broj nastavnika troši manje vremena (15,3%) na IP nego na opći odgojno-obrazovni program.

Zbog opsega dodatnoga rada, planiranja ciljeva i provedbe prilagodbi, uz potrebu za timskim radom, procesno orijentiranim radom i suradnjom s drugim stručnjacima, provedba IP je složena za nastavnike (i teret za mnoge). Dakle, razumljivo je da je potrošnja vremena veća nego kod općih odgojno-obrazovnih programa. Zbog toga začuđuje relativno visok postotak nastavnika (45%), najviše u našem slučaju, koji su odgovorili da im je potrebna ista količina vremena. Postavlja se pitanje jesu li nastavnici bili spremni za nove zadatke i odgovornosti koje podrazumijeva kreiranje IP i u kojoj su mjeri vjerovali da je koristan i učinkovit za učenike s PP.

Tablica 9.

Rezultat hi-kvadrat testa potvrđuje postojanje statistički značajne razlike s obzirom na vrstu škole (χ^2=10,475, P=0,005). Među onima kojima je potrebna jednaka količina vremena ili manje prevladavaju gimnazijski nastavnici. Nastavnici u strukovnim i tehničkim školama prevladavaju među onima koji trebaju više vremena. Mogli smo hipotetski pripisati tu razliku značajnijim nedostatcima u području učenja za učenike iz strukovnih i tehničkih škola u odnosu na učenike s PP u gimnazijama. Međutim, to također može biti posljedica bolje pripremljenosti i odaziva nastavnika u prilagodbi procesa obrazovanja za učenike s PP.

Postojanje razlika, iako ne statistički značajnih (P=0,130), vidljivo je i kod raznih vrsta oštećenja. U slučaju učenika s OZ i onih s PU isti ili duži period potreban je većini nastavnika; isti je slučaj s učenicima s TO; i duži (42,9%) odnosno kraći (35,7%) za učenike s OV i one s OS. Čini se da postoje značajne razlike između učenika s PP s obzirom na vrijeme potrebno za provedbu IP između različitih skupina, kao i unutar iste skupine (osobito među učenicima s OV i onih s OS). To je najvjerojatnije zbog intenziteta deficita, kao i veće potrebe za opsežnijim prilagodbama okruženju za učenje.

Analiza uloge učenika s PP i njegovih/njezinih roditelja u IP

U ovom se poglavlju pokušava utvrditi jesu li učenici s PP upoznati s IP (1), sudjeluju li u timskim sastancima sa stručnjacima (2), u kojoj mjeri sudjeluju u definiranju ishoda učenja IP (3) te, na kraju, do koje su razine roditelji uključeni u provedbu i evaluaciju IP (4).

Upoznatost učenika s PP s IP

Analizirajući odgovore na dihotomna pitanja: „Je li učenik s PP upoznat s IP i njegovom/ njezinom ulogom u njemu?" prikupili smo sljedeće podatke. S izuzetkom šest učenika s PP (4,6%), za ostale (95,4%) smo dobili podatak da su upoznati s IP. Takav omjer ohrabruje. Međutim, iako je većina upoznata s IP, to ne podrazumijeva optimalno sudjelovanje u IP.

Tablica 10.

Nije utvrđena ni praktična ni statistički značajna razlika s obzirom na vrstu škole. Međutim, postoji izražena tendencija razlike (P=0,064) s obzirom na vrstu oštećenja. Tablica 10 jasno pokazuje da su svi učenici s PP koji nisu upoznati s IP učenici s PU. U odgovorima otvorenoga tipa nastavnici upozoravaju na to da ti učenici nemaju motivaciju za učenje. Oni izbjegavaju zadatke i preskaču DSP. Nekoliko je nastavnika također istaknulo da je program bio pretjerano zahtjevan za te učenike.

Sudjelovanje učenika na timskim sastancima sa stručnjacima koji su uključeni u provedbu IP

Nastavnicima je postavljeno sljedeće pitanje: „Je li učenik s PP pozvan da prisustvuje timskim sastancima sa stručnjacima koji su uključeni u provedbu IP?"

Prema odgovorima nastavnika, većina (38,2%) učenika rijetko prisustvuje timskim sastancima, zatim slijede oni koji ih pohađaju redovito (35,1%), i još uvijek relativno visok udio (26,7%) učenika koji ih uopće ne pohađaju.

Naši podatci pokazuju da redovito sudjelovanje učenika s PP na timskim sastancima nije dio uobičajene školske prakse i prevelik broj učenika im ne prisustvuje. To zahtijeva dodatnu analizu stavova i uvjerenja nastavnika u situacijama kada učenici redovito sudjeluju na sastancima o IP, kako bi saznali u kojoj mjeri i koliko često učenici izražavaju svoja uvjerenja s obzirom na svoja akademska postignuća, ciljeve, potrebe i želje te kako bi se utvrdilo jesu li učenici zapravo pripremljeni za uključivanje u kreiranje IP.

Tablica 11.

Utvrdili smo da nema statistički značajnih razlika s obzirom na vrstu oštećenja. Međutim, razlike su ustanovljene s obzirom na vrstu škole (χ^2=6,740, P=0,034). Redovito sudjelovanje učenika s PP na timskim sastancima bolje se provodi u strukovnim i tehničkim školama nego u gimnazijama.

Praksa isključivanja učenika s PP s timskih sastanaka čini se uobičajenija u gimnazijama nego u strukovnim i tehničkim školama. S jedne strane, isključenje možda pokazuje nedovoljno uzimanje u obzir učeničkih posebnih potreba u području obrazovanja, kao i u području društvenih odnosa. S druge strane, to može odražavati kulturu timskoga rada u školama koje favoriziraju nastavnike i ostale članove tima kod izražavanja stavova i uvjerenja, identificiranja problema i traženja rješenja za provedbu IP bez učenika.

Uključivanje učenika s PP u odlučivanje kod postavljanja ciljeva učenja za IP

Nastavnici su upitani: „U kojoj je mjeri učenik uključen u donošenje odluka pri definiranju ciljeva učenja za IP?"

Većina učenika s PP (43,5%) vrlo je rijetko uključena u definiranje ciljeva za IP, a prate ih učenici koji su u potpunosti uključeni (30,5%). Tek 19,1% učenika je često uključeno; najniži je postotak učenika koji uopće nisu uključeni.

Rezultati su pokazali da učenici s PP obično nisu uključeni u proces postavljanja ciljeva učenja, a više od pola sudjeluje samo rijetko ili nikada.

Tablica 12.

Razlike s obzirom na vrstu škole nisu statistički značajne. Međutim, razlike su utvrđene s obzirom na vrstu oštećenja (χ^2=21,415, P=0,007). Frekvencije pokazuju da su učenici s OZ, TO, OV i OS češće uključeni u proces donošenja odluka nego učenici s PU. Kod učenika s PU, koje karakteriziraju veći kognitivni problemi i problemi s metakognicijom i samoregulacijom, pretpostavlja se da nastavnici sumnjaju u njihovu sposobnost i potencijal utvrđivanja i postavljanja ciljeva učenja.

Uključenost roditelja učenika s PP u provedbu i vrednovanje IP

Nastavnici su se također služili skalom od četiri stupnja („uopće nisu", „rijetko", „često", „u potpunosti") da bi odgovorili na sljedeće pitanje: „U kojoj su mjeri učenikovi roditelji uključeni u provedbu i vrednovanje IP? "

Rezultat ohrabruje s obzirom na broj roditelja koji su, prema nastavnicima, često uključeni (29%) ili su uključeni u potpunosti (27,5%), što je više od onih koji su samo rijetko (32,8%) ili uopće nisu uključeni (10,7%). Međutim, potrebno je istaknuti da su podatke dali nastavnici, a ne roditelji.

Tablica 13.

Razlike s obzirom na vrstu škole (P=0,624) i vrstu oštećenja (P=0,143) nisu statistički značajne. Međutim frekvencije pokazuju postojanje razlika od praktične važnosti. Kod učenika s TO, OV i OS uključenost roditelja je češća nego kod učenika s OZ, posebno onih s PU.

Vrlo je vjerojatno da roditelji učenika s PU imaju manje ambicija u pogledu obrazovanja, da su manje motivirani i manje spremni na suradnju u provedbi i evaluaciji IP. Ostali mogući razlozi za nedostatak suradnje uključuju nepostojanje kontakta s nastavnicima i školama u prethodnim godinama.

Rasprava i zaključak

Cilj našega empirijskog istraživanja bio je istražiti podršku i prilagodbe za učenike s PP i IP u srednjem školstvu.

Obrada podataka iz gimnazija, strukovnih i tehničkih škola iz 2008./09. školske godine dala je sljedeće osnovne empirijske rezultate:

– Učenicima s PP najpotrebnija je pomoć u području učenja i motivacije. To se posebno odnosi na učenike s PU i one s OZ.
– Većina nastavnika priprema pomoćne materijale za učenje; kada im je potrebna podrška za učenika s PP, surađuju sa ŠSS. Nastavnici smatraju da je potpora koju pružaju učenicima s PP učinkovita.
– Većina učenika s PP ima IP; oni bez IP su, bez iznimke, učenici s PU.
– Nastavnici, od kojih većina predaje u stručnim i tehničkim školama, ali i u gimnazijama, uključeni su u IP. Oni procjenjuju da im je potrebna ista količina vremena za provedbu IP u odnosu na opći odgojno-obrazovni program; to se posebno odnosi na strukovne i tehničke škole i učenike s PU.
– Većina je učenika s PP upoznata s IP. Međutim, većina ne sudjeluje u timskim sastancima sa stručnjacima; također rijetko donose odluke o ciljevima učenja IP (posebno učenici s PU). Prema izjavama nastavnika, roditelji su uključeni u provedbu i vrednovanje IP. Međutim, u usporedbi s ostalim grupama učenika s PP, to se u manjoj mjeri odnosi na roditelje učenika s PU.

Rezultati istraživanja pokazuju da se učenici s PU ističu najviše među skupinama učenika s obzirom na složenost svog oštećenja. Nastavnici opažaju njihov nedostatak motivacije za učenje, izbjegavanje obveza i DSP; oni također smatraju da je program prezahtjevan.

Nastavnici najčešće traže pomoć u rješavanju problema od školskih savjetnika, koji su, međutim, obično pretrpani administrativnim poslovima i, u manjoj mjeri, od defektologa, koji su najkompetentniji za pružanje potpore učenicima s PU. Budući da su u praksi preopterećeni zbog obveza u nekoliko različitih škola, defektolozi su često nedostupni. Činjenica je da će nastavnicima biti potrebna veća, dostupnija i kvalitetna stručna potpora defektologa, posebno kada je u pitanju služenje učinkovitim strategijama poučavanja, procjena potreba i sposobnosti tih učenika i podrška za njihovo uključivanje u odgojno-obrazovni proces (Pijl i Hamstra 2005; Wong, Pearson, i Lo, 2004).

Među srednjim školama se nisu pojavile statistički značajne razlike u njihovoj procjeni potpore potrebne učenicima u učenju, motorici, motivacijskom i socijalno-emocionalnom području. Empirijski rezultati potvrđuju da nastavnici u srednjim školama uglavnom usmjeravaju svoju pozornost na akademski uspjeh i motivaciju za učenje (posebno za učenike s PU i one s OZ), a društveno-emocionalnoj dimenziji podrške ne posvećuje se posebna pažnja. To su potvrdila i druga istraživanja (Kobolt i sur., 2010; Slee i Wiener, 2001). Nastojanje da se postignu najbolji rezultati i postignuća (osobito u gimnazijama), usmjerenost prema akademskim standardima znanja ili minimalnim standardima znanja za učenike s PP, zajedno s profesionalnim pritiskom da slijede opći odgojno-obrazovni program, stvara golem pritisak na nastavnike. Nastavnici se zalažu za to da njihovi učenici postignu zacrtane ciljeve (Hilton, 2006; Schmidt i Čagran, 2006). Međutim, u procesu su im najvjerojatnije promakli problemi i poteškoće učenika u socijalno-emocionalnom području.

Rezultati istraživanja pokazuju da većina nastavnika priprema pomoćne materijale za učenje, traži potporu za učenike s PP, prilagođava nastavu, intenzivnije radi s učenicima i sudjeluje u IP. Međutim, odgovori na pitanja otvorenoga tipa upozoravaju na to da postoje i nastavnici koji ne pripremaju materijale i pomagala, ne pokušavaju smanjiti deficite i ne prilagođavaju nastavu, što rezultira smanjenim mogućnostima za učenje, neravnopravnim položajem i stvaranjem prepreka u razvoju pristupačnoga okruženja punoga razumijevanja i mogućnosti za učenje (Forlin, Tait, Carroll, i Jobling, 1999). Očito, neki nastavnici ne znaju ili ne razumiju potrebe učenika s PP i ne prepoznaju svoju odgovornost za stvaranje suradničkoga odnosa s učenicima i omogućavanje prilagođenoga učenja (Jordan, Schwartz, i McGhie-Richmond, 2009; White, 2000). Od posebne su važnosti reakcije nastavnika u gimnazijama, jer je njihova podrška učenju manje učinkovita; također je slaba njihova priprema za suradnju i njihovo ulaganje vremena u provedbu IP. Takav stav zasigurno ne koristi učenicima s posebnim potrebama, koji su osjetljiviji sa stajališta učenja i socijalne isključenosti. Vjerojatni razlozi za neprimjerene reakcije gimnazijskih nastavnika su manje kontakata s učenicima s PP i manje iskustva u radu s njima u usporedbi s nastavnicima iz strukovnih i tehničkih škola, koji su imali iskustva s tim skupinama učenika.

Zadržimo se također na uključenosti i sudjelovanju učenika s PP i njihovih roditelja u izradi IP. Rezultati pokazuju da srednje škole, posebno gimnazije, ne posvećuju pozornost kulturi inkluzije ni sudjelovanju učenika u izradi IP. Posebno su od uspostavljanja ciljeva učenja izuzeti učenici s PU, koji često nisu kognitivno i/ili motivirajuće sudjelovali u zadatcima i koji se općenito muče u učenju, kako je istaknuto u istraživanjima Torgesena (1980) i Bendera (2008). Ne sudjelujući u sastancima tima za IP, učenici dobivaju manje prilika za osnaživanje, suradnju i kontrolu nad vlastitim učenjem i, što najviše zabrinjava, njihova uloga ostaje ograničena samo na pasivno primanje pomoći. Pretpostavlja se da primjenom odgovarajućih metoda učenja i sustavnim razvijanjem sposobnosti za donošenje odluka, nastavnici mogu potaknuti učenike s PU da prepoznaju svoje prednosti i nedostatke i reagiraju primjenom učinkovitijih vještina za postizanje akademskih i socijalnih ciljeva (Bender, 2008).

Prema postojećim zakonima, provedba IP omogućuje uključivanje roditelja djece s PP, a odgovori nastavnika to potvrđuju u praksi. Međutim, nije moguće donositi zaključke na temelju ovoga istraživanja o tome sudjeluju li roditelji aktivno u kreiranju, provedbi i vrednovanju IP. U našoj svakodnevnoj praksi često se događa da roditelji samo potvrđuju sadržaj IP formalno potpisujući odgovarajući dokument (Pulec Lah, 2005). Zbog toga će buduća istraživanja morati pažljivije ispitati pravu prirodu aktivnog sudjelovanja roditelja i njihovo donošenje odluka o IP. Posebnu će pozornost trebati posvetiti roditeljima učenika s PU, jer su obično manje uključeni u suradnju vezanu uz IP od roditelja drugih učenika s PP. Dakako, škole će također morati priznati svoju odgovornost u radu s roditeljima, razmišljati o načinima poboljšanja suradnje s roditeljima i poticati ih da preuzmu aktivniju ulogu. Pružanje roditeljima stručne

pomoći od škole iznimno je važno, jer u tom slučaju više neće biti prepušteni sami sebi (Dabkowski, 2004).

Osim empirijskih spoznaja proizašlih iz istraživanja, također je potrebno posvetiti pozornost osposobljavanju nastavnika za rad s učenicima s PP, jer je to jedan od najvažnijih čimbenika u provedbi inkluzije. Među nastavnicima u našem uzorku većina (67,2%) nije prošla nikakvu obuku za rad s djecom s PP Ostali su prošli obuku preko Slovenskog instituta za školstvo i institucije za djecu s PP. Zato se s velikom sigurnošću može reći da je nedovoljna razina obuke i spremnosti među nastavnicima za poučavanje učenika s PP također imala utjecaj na rezultate koji se odnose na provedbu podrške i prilagodbe za učenike s PP i IP u srednjem školstvu. Posljedice su manje mogućnosti, smanjena dostupnost i prilagodba nastave učenicima s PP, posebno među gimnazijskim nastavnicima. Također moramo istaknuti da je provedba procesa inkluzije i fleksibilnijih načina poučavanja djece s PP u Sloveniji također otkrila nedostatke, kao što su osposobljavanje nastavnika za rad s djecom s PP. Osim toga, provedbu inkluzije u školama popratio je znatan nedostatak defektologa i drugih oblika podrške, što je bez sumnje nastavnicima donijelo određene probleme u provedbi novih zadataka i odgovornosti u razredima s učenicima s PP (Opara i sur., 2010). Da bi nastavnici mogli učinkovito poučavati učenike s PP u srednjim školama u budućnosti, fakulteti i Ministarstvo obrazovanja, znanosti i športa zajedno će morati provoditi studijske programe na način koji će omogućavati sustavno osposobljavanje s obzirom na sljedeće sadržaje: inkluzija, učenici s posebnim potrebama, tolerancije različitosti, suradnja s roditeljima i stručnjacima, nastava usmjerena na učenike, vrednovanje razvoja i ciljeva učenja kao i individualiziranih programa. Jednako je važno i da će srednje škole, osobito poticajno usmjerene gimnazije, kao i lokalne zajednice u cjelini morati reagirati brže, na fleksibilniji način i s više razumijevanja prema raznolikosti učeničkih potreba. Stvaranje dobrih inkluzivnih škola zahtijeva pozitivno vodstvo s vizijom i sposobnošću postizanja kompromisa s obzirom na planiranje i usklađivanje pristupa poučavanju preko stručnog usavršavanja nastavnika i spremnosti škola za inkluziju (Florian i Rouse, 2009; Rose, 2002).

Ovo istraživanje pruža opći uvid u realizaciju provedbe podrške i prilagodbi za učenike s PP u srednjim školama. Sljedeći će korak biti naglašavanje praćenja i vrednovanja prilagodbi, i pružanje detaljnije analize prikladnosti i učinkovitosti potpora i prilagodbi za pojedine skupine učenika s PP. Osim toga, učenici s PP trebali bi biti pozvani na sudjelovanje u istraživanju kako bi se ispitala njihova perspektiva.

Napomena

Ovo je istraživanje provedeno u sklopu projekta *Planiranje odgojno-obrazovnog procesa – koncepti kreiranja kurikula*, koji provodi Ministarstvo obrazovanja, znanosti i športa Republike Slovenije.