

The Issue of End of First Term Final Grading

Nikola Margetić
IV. Primary School Bjelovar

Abstract

The aim of this research was to examine the attitudes of class and single subject primary school teachers, as well as secondary school teachers, towards the abolition of first term final grades in the Republic of Croatia. The study has shown that this novel practice is not accepted well by teachers. Both class and subject teachers think that end of term final grades serve as useful feedback for pupils and thus positively contribute to pupils' performance. The participants in the survey believe that the abolition of end of term final grades will also lead to poorer final results achieved by pupils at the end of the school year. The study has also shown that female participants respond to grading with a higher level of stress than their male counterparts.

Key words: *grading; lower primary class teachers; pupils; subject teachers; term.*

Introduction

Grades are a constituent part of the education process and should be an indicator of pupils' performance in school subjects, as well as their overall end-term performance (the end of first term and the end of school year). They provide a basis on which students enter higher levels of education (secondary school). Therefore, it is important to aim towards the definition of what a grade implies and to precisely define (reach an agreement on) what the meaning of a particular grade is and what level of performance it represents (Kollar Billege, 2012).

Škalko (1952) writes about grades as having a considerable impact on the life of an individual. He also talks about grades, especially numerical ones, which do not motivate pupils to study, but are often discouraging and not all-encompassing, which has led to a change in the evaluation system (Mužić, 1961). Numerous authors write about the negative effect of numerical grades, as they foster negative competition between pupils (Pongrac, 1980), do not eliminate the negative effects of competitive spirit (Matijević et al., 1983), are not entirely clear and comprehensible (Hadžiselimović,

1986), are generalized and oversimplified (Mijatović, 1999), often unfair to pupils due to a teacher's personal equation (Furlan, 1964; Strahinić, 2012). In addition to this, among professionals in the field of education, but also in a wider social context, the emphasis is more frequently put on grades than on the question whether the pupils have mastered the content covered (Mužić & Vrgoč, 2005) and how this content can be applied in practice (Kolar Billege, 2014).

Brkić-Devčić (2002) sees numerical grades as having an almost detrimental effect in all the stages of children's schooling because they reduce a pupil's entire personality down to a number. Feedback on one's performance is seen as a basis for building high quality knowledge and an instrument for enhancing the effects of learning (Askew & Lodge, 2000; Komljanc, 2001; Emberger, 2002; Wormeli, 2006).

According to Singer (1984, 1985), grades should be abolished, at least in primary schools, because they run counter to the fundamental pedagogic principles. They have a discouraging effect on pupils, cause fear, are not objective and fair, and give very little insight into pupils' abilities and their motivation to learn.

Fear and stress inhibit learning to a certain degree and through examinations pupils deliver poorer performance if they suffer from excessive stress or fear (Hilsman & Garber, 1995; Brdar & Rijavec, 1996; Ross, Niebling, & Heckert, 1999; Nazor, 2001; Nazor & Klaić, 2005; Penca Palčić, 2008; Kadum, 2013). However, grading can also prove to be motivating if it provides relevant feedback on a pupil's performance (Shalaway, 1998; Rudner & Schafer, 2002; Kadum, 2013).

A large number of teachers are dissatisfied with the current grading model because they believe that grades do not faithfully reflect the true level of pupils' knowledge (Brlas, 2004; Kolar Billege 2012). Vilenica and Slovenec (2002) argue that grading is much stricter at the end of the first term than at the end of the school year.

Article 14 of the Act on Amendments to the Primary and Secondary Education Act (Official Gazette, 86/2012) states that pupils shall not be awarded final end of first term grades. The decision received a lot of comments by prominent individuals working in the field of education in Croatia. The decision sparked off numerous debates, which encouraged this research¹.

Matijević (2004) discusses purposes and methods of grading. In the Republic of Croatia pupils are awarded a summative synthetic grade in all of the subjects. The author also discusses synthetic assessment as a docimological model according to

¹ Professor Ante Bežen talks about frustrating learning experiences in our school system and warns about the danger of last-minute studying at the end of the school year. Source: <http://www.nacional.hr/clanak/122828/ukida-se-zakljucivanje-ocjena-na-polugodistu>

Ljilja Vokić, former Croatian Education Minister, warns that the abolition of end of first term final grades will turn children into slackers. Source: <http://www.novolist.hr/Vijesti/Hrvatska/Skolarci-od-slijedece-skolske-godine-bez-zakljucnih-ocjena-na-polugodistima>

Željko Stipić, head of School Employees' Union *Preporod*, responded positively to that decision, his main reason being the disproportion between the duration of terms. He also proposed the solution by extending the first term until February. Source: <http://www.nacional.hr/clanak/122828/ukida-se-zakljucivanje-ocjena-na-polugodistu>

which more educational objectives are assessed by a single synthetic grade. Kolar Billege (2012) points out that a synthetic grade for a pupil's performance in the mother tongue (Croatian) is not a good indicator because due to the diversity of areas the subject comprises it does not clearly show which elements a pupil has mastered and to what degree.

Research Methodology

Research Subject and Aim

The subject of this research is the abolition of end of term final grades. The aim of the research is to identify differences of opinion regarding this issue between class teachers and subject teachers in primary school and teachers in high school.

Problems

1. To determine whether there is a statistically significant difference of opinion on the abolition of end of term final grades between class teachers and subject teachers with respect to their field of work.

2. To determine whether there is a statistically significant difference of opinion on the abolition of end of term grades between class teachers and subject teachers with respect to years of their work experience.

Sample

The study included a total of 197 primary and secondary school teachers from the town of Bjelovar, 44 of whom were male. The statistical data analysis excluded participants who responded to any of the statements with "I don't know, I am not sure", considering that the midpoint on the Likert scale defined in this manner does not mean a neutral attitude.

Instruments

The survey questionnaire was drawn up on the basis of current issues perceived as relevant by class and subject teachers. The introductory section of the questionnaire asks the participants to provide details about their field of work, gender, years of work experience and professional qualifications attained.

The questionnaire includes:

- 4 closed-ended questions about respondents' personal details
- 15 statements aimed at learning the respondents' opinion on the abolition of end of term final grades.

The respondents are expected to specify their level of agreement with each of the statements on a Likert scale. The meaning of numbers is specified at the beginning of the questionnaire, while below each statement there is a scale offered with points 1 through 5 and the scale ends explained (1 – completely disagree, 5 – completely agree). The respondents are supposed to circle only one number.

The calculated reliability of this survey is 0.34. Given the fact that the Cronbach reliability coefficient (0.34) points to a low level of internal consistency of the survey, it was decided to statistically analyse each statement.

Procedure

It took approximately 15 minutes for teachers taking part in the survey to complete the questionnaire. At the beginning of the survey, they were provided with an explanation of the purpose of the survey and were guaranteed that the data collected would be kept anonymous. They were asked to be cooperative and honest in expressing their opinion and providing the data. The survey was conducted in spring 2013.

Results and Interpretation

The analysis of data began with calculating frequencies and basic descriptive results for the main features of the research.

Table 1
Frequencies of independent variables

Field of work	F	%
Primary school – class	66	33.5
Primary school – subject	59	29.9
Secondary school	72	36.5
Total	197	100.00
Years of work experience	F	%
5 years or less	49	24.9
6-15 years	62	31.5
15-30 years	53	26.9
More than 30 years	33	16.8
Total	197	100.00
Professional qualifications attained	F	%
University degree	47	23.9
Advanced specialist training	132	67.1
Total	179	91.0

As can be seen from Table 1, the largest number of participants in the research were secondary school teachers (N=72), and the smallest number of participants were primary school subject teachers (N=59). As for the years of work experience, the highest number of respondents had 6-15 years of work experience, whereas those with more than 30 years were in the minority. As for professional qualifications attained by the respondents, the research included 132 of those with a university degree. Before proceeding to the interpretation of results, it is important to mention the fact that this research is limited to class and subject teachers working in the Bjelovar-Bilogora County and that the sample is relatively small. A small number of respondents and the choice of a purposive sample reduce the possibility of generalization about the wider population of class and subject teachers.

Table 2

Descriptive results relating to the statements used in the survey

	N	Min	Max	Med	R	Skew	Kurt	K-S
End of term final grading is stressful for pupils	169	1	4	2	3	0.26	-0.86**	0.24**
End of term final grading is stressful for class/ subject teachers	174	1	4	2	3	0.05	-1.02**	0.24**
End of term final grading is an objective mode of evaluation	164	1	4	3	3	-0.96**	1.03**	0.28**
End of term final grading imposes an unnecessary burden on class/subject teachers	165	1	4	2	3	0.82**	-0.04	0.31**
The first term is too short a period to decide on the final grade	160	1	4	2	3	0.41*	-0.85*	0.28**
The first term offers enough time to grade a pupil's performance in all elements of a subject	152	1	4	3	3	-0.41*	-0.56	0.24**
End of term final grades serve as useful feedback to pupils	178	1	4	4	3	-1.38**	2.21**	0.44**
End of term final grades contribute to pupils' improved end of term performance	172	1	4	4	3	-1.06**	1.46**	0.37**
Without awarding end of term grades pupils will attain significantly poorer results during the first term	170	1	4	4	3	-0.8**	0.12	0.29**
Abolition of end of term final grading will result in pupils' poorer performance by the end of the school year	161	1	4	3	3	-0.92**	0.54	0.30**
End of term final grades are a very useful and efficient tool teachers can use for the assessment of pupils' progress	178	1	4	3	3	-0.86	0.8*	0.35**
Abolition of end of term grades will give rise to last-minute studying towards the end of the school year	176	1	4	4	3	-1.15**	1.17**	0.43**
Final grades should be awarded only at the end of the school year	175	1	4	1	3	0.27	0.84*	0.43**
Final grades should be awarded twice in the course of the school year	177	1	4	4	3	0.47**	0.65	0.44**
Final grades should be awarded three times in the course of the school year	159	1	4	1	3	1.71**	2.62**	0.34**

*significance level $p < 0.05$ ** significance level $p < 0.01$

As shown in Table 2, both the lowest and the highest points on the scale were achieved for all the statements surveyed. Results on statements do not have a normal distribution, which is indicated by statistically significant K-S coefficients (Table

2). The distribution of results is indicated by the Skewness and Kurtosis variability measures (Skew and Kurt in Table 2). The negative statistically significant values of the Skewness variability measure indicate that the result distribution on particular statements is negatively asymmetrical to the normal one, whereas the positive results indicate a positive asymmetry of result distribution compared to what is considered normal. The negative statistically significant values of the kurtosis variability measure indicate a flat distribution of results on some statements compared to normal, whereas the positive results indicate a result distribution that is more peaked than normal.

Given the sensitivity of some measures of central tendency to the normality of distribution, the selected measure of central tendency is the mean. As can be seen from Table 2, in two statements, “*Final grades should be awarded only at the end of the school year*” and “*Final grades should be awarded three times in the course of the school year*”, the results are largely grouped around the lowest value on the scale. The results related to statements “*End of term grades serve as useful feedback to pupils*”, “*End of term final grades contribute to pupils’ improved end of term performance*” and “*Without awarding end of term grades, pupils will attain significantly poorer results during the first term*” are largely grouped around the highest value on the scale, as are in relation to statements “*Abolition of end of term grades will give rise to last-minute studying towards the end of the school year*” and “*Final grades should be awarded twice in the course of the school year*”.

Given a relatively small sample and regarding the fact that the distribution of results related to particular statements statistically significantly deviates from normal, non-parametric statistical tests will be used, i.e. the chi-square test.

Examining Statistically Significant Differences in the Opinions on the Abolition of End-Term Grades between Class and Subject Teachers with Respect to Their Field of Work

In order to examine whether there are any statistically significant differences in opinions on the particular statements with respect to the field of work of class and subject teachers, the significance of differences in frequencies was tested by means of a chi-square test. Statistically significant differences were observed in teachers’ opinions with respect to their field of work on two surveyed statements, the frequencies and degree of significance which are shown in the tables below.

As Table 3 shows, the chi-square score (19.79; $p < 0.05$) is statistically significant, which means that there is a statistically significant difference in the opinion relating to the statement about stress caused by end of term final grading. Subject teachers find it least stressful to perform end of term final grading, whereas the highest level of stress in the process is felt by class teachers. This result is assumed to be related to the fact that class teachers spend more time with the pupils and are provided with more useful information through (everyday) formative evaluation than from the final grade, which at times does not do them justice because it does not serve as an appropriate indicator of their performance.

Table 3

Frequencies and significance of differences in opinion relating to the statement "End of term final grading is stressful for class/subject teachers" with respect to the respondents' field of work

	<i>"End of term final grading is stressful for class/subject teachers"</i>			
	Completely disagree	Do not agree	Agree	Completely agree
Primary school class teachers	17	10	25	7
Primary school subject teachers	10	17	17	6
Secondary school teachers	8	29	13	15
Total	35	56	55	28

Chi-square = 19.79; $p < 0.05$

Table 4

Frequencies and significance of differences in opinion relating to the statement "Abolition of end of term final grading will result in pupils' poorer performance by the end of the school year" with respect to the respondents' field of work

	<i>"Abolition of end of term final grading will result in pupils' poorer performance by the end of the school year"</i>			
	Completely disagree	Do not agree	Agree	Completely agree
Primary school class	4	8	23	14
Primary school - subject	1	1	23	24
Secondary school	1	8	24	30
Total	6	17	70	68

Chi-square = 12.74; $p < 0.05$

As Table 4 shows, the chi-square attained (12.74; $p < 0.05$) is statistically significant, meaning that there is a statistically significant difference in opinion relating to the issue of pupils' poorer end of the school year school performance. This points to the fact that final grades are not the best indicator of a pupil's school performance and do not motivate them to work hard throughout school year. They are motivated to do so by their teachers' use of adequate methodology, not by grades.

Table 5

Frequencies and significance of differences in opinion relating to the statement "End of term final grading imposes an unnecessary burden on class/subject teachers" with respect to the respondents' field of work

	<i>"End of term final grading imposes an unnecessary burden on class/subject teachers"</i>			
	Completely disagree	Do not agree	Agree	Completely agree
Primary school class teachers	16	11	16	9
Primary school subject teachers	15	20	9	5
Secondary school teachers	20	24	14	1
Total	51	55	39	15

Chi-square = 12.88; $p < 0.05$

Table 5 shows that the chi-square attained (12.88; $p < 0.05$) is statistically significant, which means that there is a statistically significant difference in opinions on the

statement relating to the burden imposed on teachers by end of term final grading. The difference in opinions suggests that class teachers, who agree with this statement to a greater extent, have more opportunity and time (which they spend with their pupils and probably with pupils’ parents, too) to carry out grading, which makes end of term final grading less essential for them than for their single subject and secondary school counterparts.

Examining Statistically Significant Differences in the Opinions on the Abolition of End-Term Grades between Class and Subject Teachers with Respect to Years of Work Experience

In order to examine whether there are any statistically significant differences in opinion on particular surveyed statements with respect to years of class and subject teachers’ work experience, the significance of differences between frequencies was tested by means of a chi-square test. Statistically significant differences have been determined in teachers’ opinions on two surveyed statements with respect to years of their work experience, the frequencies and degree of significance which are shown in the tables below.

Table 6
Frequencies and significance of differences in opinion relating to the statement “End of term final grading imposes an unnecessary burden on pupils” with respect to the respondents’ work experience

	“End of term final grading imposes an unnecessary burden on pupils”			
	Completely disagree	Do not agree	Agree	Completely agree
5 years or less	14	17	8	1
6-15 years	22	23	3	2
15-30 years	12	17	10	6
More than 30 years	17	9	2	2
Total	65	66	23	11
Chi-square = 17.15; p< 0.05				

As shown in Table 6, the chi-square attained (17.15; p<0.05) is statistically significant, meaning that there is a statistically significant difference in opinion on the statement relating to the burden imposed on pupils by end of term final grading. The highest proportion of respondents agreeing with the statement are those with 15-30 years of work experience, which possibly suggests that extensive experience in teaching tells them that the novelty in the grading system is acceptable.

As can be seen from Table 7 (chi-square=21.45; p<0.05), the statistically significant difference suggests that the level of agreement with the statement is the lowest among the oldest respondents, whose experience probably tells them that end of term final grading is a necessity.

Table 7

Frequencies and significance of differences in opinion relating to the statement "End of term final grading imposes an unnecessary burden on class/subject teachers" with respect to the respondents' work experience

	"End of term final grading imposes an unnecessary burden on class/subject teachers"			
	Completely disagree	Do not agree	Agree	Completely agree
5 years or less	16	11	12	1
6-15 years	16	20	11	1
15-30 years	10	14	8	11
More than 30 years	9	10	8	2
Total	51	55	39	15

Chi-square = 21.45; $p < 0.05$

Conclusion

The abolition of final grades at the end of the first term has given rise to many different opinions on the issue, ranging from the support thereof to dissatisfaction with this new practice. As this research shows, both class and subject teachers think that the decision to introduce the change was not the most satisfactory solution. They argue that end of term grades were a solution that was helping pupils receive objective evaluation given the fact that there was enough time to grade their performance in all the elements of a school subject.

Furthermore, the respondents believe that in the absence of end of term final grades pupils are bound to attain significantly poorer results during the course of the first term and that the abolition of end of term final grades will result in poorer performance at the end of the school year. They also reckon that the abolition is sure to bring about an increase in last-minute studying towards the end of the school year.

Despite the fact that the respondents have proved to find end of term grading stressful to a certain degree (more for them than for pupils), they think that it is a very useful and efficient tool for assessing pupils' progress.

This research yielded some interesting results relating to opinions on particular survey statements on the abolition of end of term final grades among class and subject teachers with respect to their field of work. A difference was observed between the opinions of primary school class teachers and subject teachers and high school teachers. Primary school class teachers obviously have a lot more time to carry out adequate grading of pupils. This is facilitated by more flexible hours they spend with their pupils (up to 5 class periods a day).

Furthermore, the present research has shown no major differences in opinion on particular survey statements about the abolition of end of term final grades between class and subject teachers with respect to years of their work experience. The older respondents have mainly proved to be opposed to the abolition of end of term final grading.

Finally, the research results have undoubtedly shown that the abolition of end of term final grades is not well-received by a majority of class and subject teachers

working in Croatian schools. Croatian teachers are used to final, end of term grades, which provide them with a better insight into their work, and serve as guidelines for pupils as to what efforts they need to make in the second term. Despite the fact that grading calls for more administrative work, class and subject teachers are keen on its reintroduction. Given the importance of the issue of mandatory or non-mandatory character of end of term final grading in the communication between teachers, pupils and pupils' parents, this calls for a review of the decision to be undertaken by relevant administrative and supervisory institutions in the Croatian school system. A public hearing for all those interested in the issue of pupils' assessment, particularly teachers who will carry out the assessment should also be conducted.

References

- Askwed, S. (Ed.). (2000). *Feedback for Learning*. New York and London: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Brdar, I., & Rijavec, M. (1996). Suočavanje sa stresom zbog loše ocjene – konstrukcija upitnika. *Društvena istraživanja*, 4-5 (30-31), 599-617.
- Brkić-Devčić, V. (2002). Kažnjavanje ocjenama. In H. Vrgoč (Ed.), *Praćenje i ocjenjivanje školskog uspjeha* (pp. 121-123). Zagreb: Hrvatski pedagoško-književni zbor.
- Brlas, S. (2004). Ocjenjivanje učenika u srednjoj školi. *Život i škola*, 11(1), 145-153.
- Emberger, M. (2002). Focused Feedback. *Maryland Classroom*, 7(3), 1-8.
- Hadžiselimović, Dž. (1986). Strah od škole, njegovo ublažavanje i prevencija. *Obrazovanje i rad*, 9(20), 111-117.
- Hilsman, R., & Garber, J. (1995). A test of the cognitive diathesis-stress model of depression in children: Academic stressors, attributional style, perceived competence, and control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(2), 370- 380. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.2.370>
- Kadum-Bošnjak, S. (2013). *Dokimologija u primarnom obrazovanju*. Pula: Juraj Dobrila University of Pula
- Kolar Billege, M. (2012). Neusklađenost u ocjenjivanju – ista postignuća učenika, a različite ocjene. *Napredak*, 153(3-4), 399-418.
- Kolar Billege, M. (2014). *Metodički pristup određivanju sadržaja poučavanja i kognitivnih ishoda učenja za nastavni predmet Hrvatski jezik u primarnom obrazovanju (Doctoral dissertation)*. Zagreb: Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb.
- Komljanc, N. (2001). Što omogućuje povratna informacija u ocjenjivanju. *Školski vjesnik*, 1, 27-34.
- Matijević, M. (Ed.). (1983). *Praćenje i opisno ocjenjivanje učenika u razrednoj nastavi: priručnik za nastavnike*. Zagreb: Školske novine.

- Mijatović, A. (Ed.). (1999). *Osnove suvremene pedagogije*. Zagreb: HPKZ.
- Mužić, V. (1961). *Testovi znanja*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Mužić, V. (1999). *Uvod u metodologiju istraživanja odgoja i obrazovanja*. Zagreb: Educa.
- Mužić, V., & Vrgoč, H. (2005). *Vrjednovanje u odgoju i obrazovanju*. Zagreb: HPKZ.
- Nazor, M. (2001). Povezanost učeničkog straha, težine i zanimljivosti nekih školskih predmeta i ocjena. *Život i škola*, 47(6), 16-22.
- Nazor, M. (2005). *Uzroci neuspjeha u osnovnoj školi*. Split: Fakultet prirodoslovno matematičkih znanosti i odgojnih područja Sveučilišta u Splitu.
- Vilenica, M., & Slovenec, B. (2002). Ocjenjivanje. *Život i škola*, 48(8), 23-31.
- Penca Palčić, M. (2008). Vpliv preverjanja in ocenjevanja znanja na učenje. *Život i škola*, 19, 125-148.
- Petz, B. (1997). *Osnovne statističke metode za nematematičare*. Jastrebarsko: Naklada Slap.
- Pongrac, S. (1980). *Ispitivanje i ocjenjivanje u obrazovanju*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Ross, S. E., Niebling, B. C., & Heckert, T. M. (1999). Sources of stress among college students. *College Student Journal*, 33(2), 312-317.
- Rudner, L., & Schafer, W. (2002). *What Teachers Need to Know About Assessment*. National Education Association: Washington, DC.
- Schalaway, L. (1998). *Learning to teach: - not just for beginners: the essential guide for all teachers*. New York: Scholastic Professional Books.
- Singer, K. (1984). Bez ocjena se uči s više volje i postižu se bolji rezultati. *Život i škola*, 33(5), 419-433.
- Singer, K. (1985). Da li u svakom odjeljenju mora biti slabih ocjena. *Život i škola*, 34(5), 411-417.
- Strahinić, C. (2012). *Škola bez ocjena*. Osijek: Grafika.
- Škalko, K. (1952). *Ispitivanje i ocjenjivanje u školi*. Zagreb: Pedagoško – književni zbor.
- Vrgoč, H. (Ed.). (2002). *Praćenje i ocjenjivanje školskog uspjeha*. Zagreb: Hrvatski pedagoško – književni zbor.
- Wormeli, R. (2006). Accountability: teaching through assessment and feedback, not grading. *American Secondary Education*, 34(3), 14 -17.

Nikola Margetić

IV. Primary School Bjelovar
Andrije Hebranga b.b.,
43000, Bjelovar, Croatia
nikola.margetic@skole.hr

Problem zaključivanja školskih ocjena na kraju prvog polugodišta

Sažetak

Cilj ovog istraživanja bio je istražiti mišljenja učitelja razredne i predmetne nastave u osnovnoj školi i nastavnika u srednjoj školi, o ukidanju zaključivanja ocjena na polugodištu u Republici Hrvatskoj. Istraživanje je pokazalo kako se ta novost ne prihvaća u zbornicama. Učitelji i nastavnici smatraju kako je zaključna ocjena na polugodištu kvalitetna povratna informacija učeniku koja pridonosi boljim rezultatima učenika. Ispitanici smatraju da će zbog ukidanja zaključivanja ocjena učenici i na kraju godine postizati lošije rezultate. Također se pokazalo da ispitanice stresnije doživljavaju ocjenjivanje od ispitanika.

Ključne riječi: *nastavnici; ocjenjivanje; polugodište; učenici; učitelji.*

Uvod

Ocjena je sastavni dio odgojno-obrazovnog procesa i trebala bi biti pokazatelj učenikova uspjeha u nastavnim predmetima, ali i cjelovitoga uspjeha na kraju obrazovnih razdoblja (polugodište ili kraj godine). Na temelju tih ocjena učenici se uključuju u više stupnjeve obrazovanja (srednju školu). Stoga je važno težiti definiranju sadržaja ocjene, odnosno jasno odrediti (dogovoriti) što ocjena znači i kakav uspjeh stoji iza koje ocjene (Kolar Billege, 2012).

Škalko (1952) govori o ocjeni koja ima znatan utjecaj na život pojedinca. Govori se i o ocjeni, pogotovo onoj brojčanoj, koja ne potiče na rad, već često obeshrabruje i nije svestrana, što je dovelo do mijenjanja sustava ocjenjivanja (Mužić, 1961). Znanstvenici ističu negativan utjecaj brojčane ocjene jer ona razvija negativno natjecanje među učenicima (Pongrac, 1980); ne eliminira negativne efekte natjecateljskog duha (Matijević i sur., 1983); nije toliko jasna i razumljiva (Hadžiselimović, 1986); uopćena je i šablonizirana (Mijatović, 1999): ocjenjivači često učenicima nanose nepravdu ocjenjujući ih na temelju osobne jednadžbe (Furlan, 1964; Strahinić, 2012); među stručnjacima u obrazovanju, ali i u širem društvenom kontekstu, naglasak je češće na ocjenama nego na pitanju je li učenik ovladao predviđenim sadržajima (Mužić i Vrgoč, 2005) i kako te sadržaje može funkcionalno primijeniti (Kolar Billege, 2014).

Brkić-Devčić (2002) procjenjuje brojčane ocjene gotovo štetnima za djecu na svim stupnjevima školovanja jer je cjelokupna osobnost učenika svedena na broj. Povratna informacija o uspjehu temeljna je podloga za stjecanje daljnjeg kvalitetnog znanja i njome se može poboljšati učinak učenja (Askew i Lodge, 2000.; Komljanc, 2001.; Emberger, 2002; Wormeli, 2006).

Prema Singeru (1984, 1985) ocjene bi trebalo ukinuti, bar u osnovnim školama, jer su u suprotnosti s osnovnim pedagoškim načelima. One obeshrabuju, uzrokuju strah, neobjektivne su i nepravedne te malo govore o učenikovim sposobnostima i volji za učenjem.

Strah i stres donekle onemogućuju učenje, a u ispitnim situacijama učenik pokazuje slabije rezultate ako je u stanju prevelikoga stresa ili straha (Hilsman i Garber, 1995; Brdar i Rijavec, 1996; Ross, Niebling i Heckert, 1999; Nazor, 2001; Nazor i Klaić, 2005; Penca Palčić, 2008; Kadum, 2013).

Ocjenjivanje može biti i poticajno ako ocjena donosi valjanu povratnu informaciju o uspjehu učenika (Shalaway, 1998; Rudner i Schafer, 2002; Kadum, 2013).

Mnogi učitelji nisu zadovoljni postojećim modelom ocjenjivanja jer, prema njihovu mišljenju, ocjene nisu u potpunosti odraz stvarnoga znanja učenika (Brlas, 2004; Kolar Billege, 2012). Vilenica i Slovenec (2002) tvrde da je ocjenjivanje na polugodištu mnogo strože nego na kraju školske godine.

Odredbom u članku 14. Zakona o izmjenama i dopunama Zakona o odgoju i obrazovanju u osnovnoj i srednjoj školi (Narodne novine, br. 86/2012) odlučeno je da se učenike neće ocjenjivati na polugodištu. O tom su se pitanju na razini komentara izjasnili čelni ljudi u hrvatskom obrazovnom sustavu. Takva je odluka potaknula mnoge rasprave koje su bile temeljni poticaj za provođenje ovoga istraživanja.²

Matijević (2004) opisuje svrhe i načine ocjenjivanja. U Republici Hrvatskoj se učenike ocjenjuje sumativnom sintetičkom ocjenom za svaki nastavni predmet. Isti autor problematizira sintetičko ocjenjivanje koje je dokimološko rješenje prema kojem se za više ciljeva odgoja i obrazovanja dodjeljuje jedna sintetička ocjena. Kolar Billege (2012) navodi da sintetička ocjena za nastavni predmet Hrvatski jezik nije dobar pokazatelj jer zbog opsežnosti nastavnoga predmeta i sadržaja tih područja ne pokazuje jasno kojim je sadržajem i na kojoj razini učenik ovladao.

² Prof. dr. sc. Ante Bežen govori o frustrirajućem učenju u našem školskom sustavu, no upozorava na opasnost kampanjskog učenja na kraju nastavne godine. Izvor: <http://www.nacional.hr/clanak/122828/ukida-se-zakljucivanje-ocjena-na-polugodistu>

Bivša ministrica Ljilja Vokić, prof., upozorava da će, ako se ukine ocjenjivanje na polugodištu, djeca postati kampanjci. Izvor: <http://www.novolist.hr/Vijesti/Hrvatska/Skolarci-od-slijedece-skolske-godine-bez-zakljucnih-ocjena-na-polugodistima>

Predsjednik sindikata Preporod Željko Stipičić pozitivno je reagirao na tu odluku, a kao ključni razlog navodi nesrazmjer u trajanju polugodišta i nudi vrlo zanimljivo rješenje u produženju prvog polugodišta, i to do veljače. Izvor: <http://www.nacional.hr/clanak/122828/ukida-se-zakljucivanje-ocjena-na-polugodistu>

Metodologija istraživanja

Predmet i cilj istraživanja

Predmet ovog istraživanja je ukidanje zaključivanja ocjena na polugodištu. Cilj istraživanja je utvrđivanje razlika u mišljenjima o ukidanju zaključivanja ocjena između učitelja razredne i predmetne nastave i nastavnika iz srednjih škola.

Problemi

1. Utvrditi postoji li statistički značajna razlika u mišljenjima prema ukidanju zaključivanja ocjena na polugodištu između učitelja i nastavnika s obzirom na njihovo područje rada.

2. Utvrditi postoji li statistički značajna razlika u mišljenjima prema ukidanju zaključivanja ocjena na polugodištu između učitelja i nastavnika s obzirom na radni staž.

Uzorak

U ispitivanju je sudjelovalo 197 učitelja osnovnih škola i nastavnika srednjih škola s područja grada Bjelovara, od toga 44 muška ispitanika. Iz statističke obrade podataka izuzeti su ispitanici koji su na bilo koju tvrdnju odgovorili s „Ne znam, nisam siguran“ jer tako definirana središnja točka Likertove skale nema značenje neutralnog stava.

Instrumenti

Anketni upitnik za ispitivanje sastavljen je na temelju aktualne problematike koja zaokuplja učitelje i nastavnike. Na početku anketnog upitnika od učitelja su zatraženi podaci o području rada, spolu, duljini radnog staža i stručnoj spremi.

Upitnik sadrži:

- 4 pitanja zatvorenog tipa o osobnim podacima ispitanika
- 15 tvrdnji za ispitivanje mišljenja o ukidanju zaključivanja ocjena na polugodištu.

Zadatak ispitanika je izraziti svoje slaganje sa svakom tvrdnjom na Likertovoj skali. Značenje brojeva navedeno je na početku upitnika, a ispod svake tvrdnje ponuđena je skala od 1 do 5 s opisima krajeva skale (1 – uopće se ne slažem, 5 – u potpunosti se slažem). Ispitanici su trebali zaokružiti samo jedan broj.

Izračunata pouzdanost za tu anketu iznosi 0,34. S obzirom na to da dobiveni Alpha koeficijent (0,34) ukazuje na nisku unutarnju pouzdanost ankete, odlučili smo statistički obraditi svaku pojedinu tvrdnju.

Postupak

Učitelji su upitnik popunjavali oko 15 minuta. Na početku ispitivanja učiteljima je objašnjena svrha ispitivanja i zajamčena anonimnost podataka. Bili su zamoljeni za suradnju i iskrenost pri izražavanju mišljenja i davanju podataka. Ispitivanje je provedeno tijekom proljeća 2013. godine.

Rezultati i njihova interpretacija

Obradu podataka započeli smo izračunavanjem frekvencija i osnovnih deskriptivnih rezultata za glavna obilježja istraživanja.

Tablica 1

Kao što vidimo iz Tablice 1 u istraživanju je sudjelovalo najviše nastavnika srednjih škola (N=72), a najmanje učitelja predmetne nastave (N=59). S obzirom na radni staž najviše ispitanika je u skupini između 6 i 15 godina, a najmanje u skupini s više od 30 godina staža. I s obzirom na stupanj obrazovanja u istraživanju je sudjelovalo 132 ispitanika s VSS-om.

Prije interpretacije rezultate smatramo važnim ukazati na ograničenje istraživanja koje se odnosi na prigodan uzorak koji obuhvaća učitelje i nastavnike zaposlene u školama samo Bjelovarsko-bilogorske županije, kao i na relativno malen uzorak. Malen broj ispitanika i namjerni odabir uzorka umanjuje generalizaciju rezultata na širu populaciju učitelja i nastavnika.

Tablica 2

Kao što se vidi iz Tablice 2, za sve ispitivane odredbe postignuta je i najmanja i najveća vrijednost. Rezultati na tvrdnjama se ne distribuiraju po normalnoj distribuciji, što nam ukazuju statistički značajni K-S koeficijenti (Tablica 2). O obliku distribucije rezultata govore nam mjere varijabilnosti Skewness i Kurtosis (Skew i Kurt u Tablici 2). Negativne statističke značajne vrijednosti mjere varijabilnosti Skewness ukazuju na to da je distribucija rezultata na pojedinim tvrdnjama negativno asimetrična s obzirom na normalnu distribuciju, a pozitivni rezultati ukazuju na pozitivnu asimetričnost razdiobe rezultata s obzirom na normalnu distribuciju. Negativne statistički značajne vrijednosti mjere varijabilnosti Kurtosis ukazuju na spljoštenost distribucije rezultata na pojedinim tvrdnjama s obzirom na normalnu distribuciju, a pozitivni rezultati ukazuju na to da je razdioba rezultata izdužena s obzirom na normalnu distribuciju.

S obzirom na osjetljivost pojedinih mjera centralne tendencije na normalnost distribucije, odabrana mjera centralne tendencije je medijan. Kao što vidimo iz Tablice 2 na dvije odredbe „Ocjene treba zaključivati samo na kraju nastavne godine” i „Ocjene treba zaključivati tri puta tijekom nastavne godine” rezultati su u najvećoj mjeri grupirani oko najniže vrijednosti skale. Rezultati na odredbama „Zaključna ocjena na polugodištu je bitna povratna informacija učeniku”, „Zaključna ocjena pridonosi boljim rezultatima učenika na polugodištu” i „Učenici će postizati znatno slabije rezultate tijekom prvog polugodišta kada nema zaključne ocjene” u najvećoj su mjeri grupirani oko najviše vrijednosti skale, kao i na odredbama „Ukidanje zaključne ocjene će povećati kampanjsko učenje na kraju nastavne godine” i „Ocjene treba zaključivati dva puta tijekom nastavne godine”.

S obzirom na relativno malen uzorak i da distribucije rezultata pojedinih odredbi statistički značajno odstupaju od normalne distribucije rezultata, za statističku obradu podataka koristit ćemo neparametrijske statističke testove, točnije Hi-kvadrat test.

Ispitati postoje li statistički značajne razlike u mišljenju prema pojedinim stavkama o ukidanju zaključivanja ocjena na polugodištu između učitelja i nastavnika s obzirom na njihovo područje rada.

Kako bismo ispitali postoje li statistički značajne razlike u mišljenju prema pojedinim tvrdnjama s obzirom na područje rada učitelja i nastavnika, testirali smo značajnost razlika između frekvencija Hi-kvadrat testom. Utvrdili smo statistički značajne razlike u mišljenju učitelja s obzirom na područje rada prema dvije stavke čije su frekvencije i stupanj značajnosti prikazani u sljedećim tablicama.

Tablica 3

Kao što se vidi iz Tablice 3 dobiveni Hi-kvadrat (Hi-kvadrat = 19,79; $p < 0,05$) statistički je značajan, što znači da postoji statistički značajna razlika u mišljenju prema odredbi vezanoj uz eventualni stres prouzročen zaključivanjem ocjena na polugodištu. Najmanje stresno ocjenjivati je učiteljima predmetne nastave, a najviše je stresno ocjenjivati na polugodištu učiteljima RN. Pretpostavljamo da takav rezultat proizlazi iz činjenice da učitelji RN više vremena provode s učenicima pa im formativno praćenje (svakodnevno) daje korisnije informacije nego zaključna ocjena kojom se ponekad zakida učenika jer ocjena nije dobar pokazatelj uspjeha.

Tablica 4

Kao što se vidi iz Tablice 4, dobiveni Hi-kvadrat (Hi kvadrat = 12,74; $p < 0,05$) statistički je značajan, što znači da postoji statistički značajna razlika u mišljenju prema odredbi vezanoj uz postizanje lošijih rezultata na kraju nastavne godine. Taj podatak ukazuje na to da zaključna ocjena nije najbolji pokazatelj uspjeha učenika, ne potiče učenika na rad tijekom školske godine. Na rad ga potiče učitelj motivirajući ga adekvatnim metodičkim postupcima, a ne ocjenom.

Tablica 5

Iz tablice 5. vidi se da je dobiveni Hi-kvadrat (Hi-kvadrat = 12,88; $p < 0,05$) statistički značajan, što znači da postoji statistički značajna razlika u mišljenjima prema odredbi vezanoj uz opterećenje pri zaključivanju ocjena. Razlika u mišljenjima sugerira da učitelji razredne nastave, koji se u većoj mjeri slažu s tom odredbom, imaju puno više mogućnosti i vremena (koje provode sa svojim učenicima, a vjerojatno i s roditeljima) za ocjenjivanje pa im ocjenjivanje na polugodištu nije potrebno kao kolegama u predmetnoj nastavi i srednjoj školi.

Ispitati postoje li statistički značajne razlike u mišljenju prema pojedinim stavkama o ukidanju zaključivanja ocjena na polugodištu između učitelja i nastavnika s obzirom na njihov radni staž

Kako bismo ispitali postoje li statistički značajne razlike u mišljenju prema pojedinim odredbama s obzirom na radni staž učitelja i nastavnika, testirali smo

značajnost razlika između frekvencija testom Hi-kvadrat. Utvrdili smo statistički značajne razlike u mišljenju učitelja s obzirom na radni staž prema dvije stavke čije su frekvencije i stupanj značajnosti prikazani u sljedećim tablicama.

Tablica 6

Kao što se vidi iz Tablice 6., dobiveni Hi-kvadrat (Hi-kvadrat = 17,15; $p < 0,05$) statistički je značajan, što znači da postoji statistički značajna razlika u mišljenju prema odredbi vezanoj uz opterećenje učenika zaključivanjem na polugodištu. Najviše se s odredbom slažu ispitanici između 15 i 30 godina staža, što bi moglo sugerirati da im iskustvo rada u nastavi govori da je novina u zaključivanju ocjena prihvatljiva.

Tablica 7

Kao što se vidi iz Tablice 7 (Hi-kvadrat = 21,45; $p < 0,05$) statistički značajna razlika sugerira da se s odredbom najmanje slažu najstariji ispitanici, kojima vjerojatno iskustvo govori da je zaključivanje na polugodištu potrebno.

Zaključak

O ukidanju zaključivanja ocjena na polugodištu, kritici i prihvaćanju odredbe o ukidanju ocjene na polugodištu, kao što pokazuje ovo istraživanje, učitelji i nastavnici misle da ta odluka nije prihvatljiva. Oni misle da je zaključivanje ocjena na polugodištu učenicima pomoglo da objektivno budu ocijenjeni jer je bilo dovoljno vremena za ocjenjivanje učenika iz svih sastavnica nastavnog predmeta.

Ispitanici također smatraju da će učenici postizati znatno slabije rezultate tijekom prvog polugodišta ako nema zaključne ocjene i da će zbog ukidanja zaključivanja ocjena na polugodištu na kraju nastavne godine postizati lošije rezultate. Također smatraju da će ukidanje zaključne ocjene povećati kampanjsko učenje na kraju nastavne godine.

Iako ispitanici iskazuju da je ocjenjivanje na polugodištu na određeni način stresno (više njima nego učenicima), oni ipak smatraju da je to ocjenjivanje vrlo korisno i učinkovito sredstvo praćenja napredovanja učenika.

U mišljenju prema pojedinim stavkama o ukidanju zaključivanja ocjena na polugodištu između učitelja i nastavnika, s obzirom na njihovo područje rada, postoje zanimljive razlike. Očituje se razlika u mišljenjima učitelja razredne nastave u odnosu na učitelje predmetne nastave i nastavnike srednjih škola. Očigledno je da učitelji razredne nastave imaju puno više vremena za kvalitetno ocjenjivanje, čemu pogoduje fleksibilnije radno vrijeme koje provode s učenicima (do 5 sati svaki dan).

U mišljenjima prema pojedinim stavkama o ukidanju zaključivanja ocjena na polugodištu između učitelja i nastavnika s obzirom na njihov radni staž nema znatnih razlika. Stariji ispitanici uglavnom ne podržavaju ukidanje zaključivanja ocjena.

Ovo je istraživanje nedvojbeno pokazalo kako ukidanje zaključivanja ocjena na polugodištu ne prihvaća veći dio učitelja i nastavnika u hrvatskim školama. Učitelji i

nastavnici su navikli na zaključnu ocjenu, koja im daje potpuniji uvid u njihov rada, a i učeniku sugerira kako treba usmjeriti svoj rad u drugom polugodištu. Iako samo zaključivanje zahtijeva više administrativnog posla, učitelji i nastavnici bi ga ipak vratili. Budući da je obveznost ili neobveznost zaključivanja ocjena na kraju prvoga polugodišta važno pitanje u komunikaciji učitelja, učenika i učenikovih roditelja, a uzimajući u obzir rezultate ovog istraživanja, postoji potreba da upravne i nadzorne ustanove u našem obrazovnom sustavu preispitaju navedenu odluku, dakako uz javnu raspravu u kojoj će sudjelovati svi subjekti koji su zainteresirani za ocjenjivanje učenika, a osobito prosvjetni djelatnici koji će to provoditi.