Croatian Journal of Education
Vol.21; No.2/2019, pages: 599- 638
Original research paper
Paper submitted: 3rd March 2018
Paper accepted: 30th October 2018
https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v21i2.3107

Estimate of Implementation of Educational Inclusion by Primary School Teachers and High School Teachers

Anela Nikčević-Milković[1], Denis Jurković[1] and Josip Durdov[2]
[1]*University of Zadar, Department of Teacher Education Studies in Gospić*
[2]*Primary school Dr Jure Turić in Gospić*

Abstract

The results of the research on the estimate of implementing educational inclusion in the Lika-Senj County showed that the majority of primary school teachers and high school teachers have a positive perception of its implementation. While the majority of primary school teachers have experience in working with students with developmental disabilities, subject teachers report somewhat weaker experience. Both groups of teachers mostly establish cooperation with support staff in the school, but not with professionals out of school. Teachers with less training with these students and with greater support from schools are aware of their teaching methodology, individualize programs, attend professional development and establish cooperation. They, when compared to high school teachers, have a significantly higher estimate of the use of teaching methods and manners of work with these students, apply individualized programs, attend professional development and establish cooperation. The multivariate analysis showed that primary school teachers with less training for working with such students and with greater support from school have more positive estimates of the teaching methodology, implementation of individualized programs, professional development and cooperation and reception of students with disabilities by peers and parents. With fewer numbers of students per class, less experience of working with such students and the humanities and social studies profile of teachers, estimates of inclusion of such students become more positive. Primary school teachers, as

opposed to high school teachers, more positively estimate their competence when cooperation with parents of these students is weak.

Key words: *educational inclusion; evaluation of implementation of inclusion; primary school teachers and high school teachers; students with developmental disabilities.*

Introduction

Implementing educational inclusion of students with developmental disabilities must be the general policy and practice deeply rooted into the educational system and not a specific intervention that solves particular issues of a certain vulnerable group (Liston & Zeichner, 1990). Considering that those working in education at various levels of the system have to be able to analyze approaches, types and methods of work, and change them accordingly, this research was directed towards evaluating educational inclusion by primary school teachers[1] and high school teachers in the Lika-Senj County as a precondition for improved changes. This is a very important issue in education considering that over the past four decades there has been an observed increase of inclusion of students with disabilities into the regular school system. During the mentioned period a change occurred in the concept of educational inclusion from medical to social; however, that is a process change indicating that it is still under way. *Differentiation of variety* in educational practice presents a broad spectrum of inclusion of children and students into the educational system, where, in addition to the inclusion of those with disabilities, there is inclusion of talented children, those with different cultural and ethnical identities, racial and gender differences, educationally neglected children, children not motivated for learning and other. The *school's culture of inclusion* is a process of humanizing relationships between all differences that students bring with them into the school, and its aim is directed towards the overall practice of education at all levels of education. Educational inclusion, according to Pašalić-Kreso (2003, p. 22), presents the "teaching – humanistic reform movement that strives to achieve complete equality for each student and enables the development of each child according to the child's abilities". Differences between students are seen as incentives for learning and participation in the teaching process and not as obstacles. The teaching and learning processes are directed towards respect and acceptance of differences among students. Inclusion of children with disabilities into kindergartens and regular schools is the first step in their inclusion in broader society, and in that way lessens their labeling and recognizes them as "normal" members of society. It is key that attitudes towards educational inclusion are positive as accepted laws can never be realized on their own. According to Igrić et al. (2015, p. 160), "the support system at the school level implies one inclusive design that refers

[1] The concept "teacher" denotes all teachers in primary school and high school except when comparing those in primary and those in high school. For that purpose, we differentiate between primary school teacher and high school teacher.

to the material-technical, staffing-organizational, psychological-pedagogical, teaching and social readiness of school for the education of all students."

Knowledge from national literature suggests that primary school and high school teachers are not sufficiently prepared for working with students with disabilities and they frequently lack assistance from education and rehabilitation specialist, particularly in high schools in Croatia (Karamatić Brčić, 2013; Žic Ralić & Ljubas, 2013). Problems which teachers and support staff deal with are solved through professional development in the area of those competences that they have not acquired through formal education, flexible adaptation of curricula and ensuring extra time for implementing an individualized program. One of the shortcomings is insufficient cohesion of professionals in education at various levels and the educational system which results in inadequate information flow on the child/student (Ljubić & Kiš-Glavaš, 2003). Furthermore, there are traces of insufficient and objective conditions such as lack of support staff, large number of children in groups or classes, inadequate equipment, teacher workload to meet curriculum demands, pressure of external evaluation and generally frequent testing in schools. Furthermore, research on Croatian teachers shows their positive attitudes towards inclusion, but at the same time a concern for the numerous negative effects of including children with disabilities into the regular system of education.

In order for inclusion to be successful, teachers need organizational, material and professional support. However, that support is sometimes absent or incomplete, which is why teachers do not feel competent enough when working with such children. In order to increase their competence, professional development is necessary, but in a manner that will transfer the acquired competence unto their teaching practice and enable further independent development of the competence. Acedo (2008) states that the need for developing competences for inclusive education is only partially satisfied. Teachers have basic knowledge and skills necessary for implementing personalized approaches in their everyday teaching and work. They adapt the curriculum to particular students using various assessments, however, they are aware that they need further development in creating and implementing individualized teaching, which can be achieved through lifelong learning and professional development.

According to Ivančić (2010, p. 7), for "quality implementation of educational inclusion we need a change of attitudes, beliefs, knowledge and skills in order to understand students' diverse needs". Developing awareness of accepting differences among students and changing attitudes towards them is an important requirement for successful implementation of inclusion in a school. According to some authors, teachers' attitudes towards inclusion are considered as the major obstacle to its successful implementation (Sebba & Sachdev, 1997). They change for the better if the teacher had experience with such students, and they are negative if teachers sense that working with such students is imposed and they do not feel competent for such work etc. (Mittler, 2006).

Although inclusion has taken root more in primary schools than in high schools, according to Ljubić and Kiš-Glavaš (2003), primary school teachers report negative attitudes towards the inclusion of students. Primary school teachers with more experience with students with disabilities are more aware of the numerous disadvantages in practical implementation of inclusion, which is why further research and analysis of its objective, subjective and organizational requirements is necessary. Primary school teachers find that schools must prepare for accepting students with special needs. They do not think that students with disabilities negatively affect the achievement of a class and in particular emphasize the need for employing an education-rehabilitation professional in regular schools.

"Some research established that teachers have diverse understandings regarding the type of developmental disability, have lower expectations from such students, have negative stereotypes and show more negative attitudes towards such students as opposed to their peers with a typical developmental pattern" (Leutar & Frantal, 2006). As for assistants in teaching, teachers emphasize that their presence positively affects students, and teachers find them to be a relief and help (Ivančić, 2010; Krampač-Grljušić, Žic Ralić, & Lisak, 2010).

In Croatia and in Northern Ireland, the main reason for resisting inclusion among teachers is their lack of competence (Ivančić & Stančić, 2013), while in Australia that is considered additional individual work with students with disabilities (Forlin, 2012). Teachers in Norway emphasize additional training to be of great help with such students and it helps in their work, planning and teaching (Tangen, 2005). All of the above shows that teachers in Croatia mostly have similar attitudes on educational inclusion as their European colleagues.

Research Aim, Problems and Hypotheses

The main aim of this research was to assess the implementation of inclusion by teachers in primary school and teachers in high school. The research was undertaken so as to establish the current state, to explain reasons for such a situation in comparison with results of similar research in order to establish theoretical foundations for implementing changes for the better.

The following questions ensued from the research aim:

1. Examine how primary school teachers and high school teachers in the Lika-Senj County evaluate the implementation of educational inclusion?
2. Examine differences in the evaluation of implementing inclusion between primary teachers and high school teachers in the Lika-Senj County?
3. Examine the contribution of some socio-demographic characteristics of teachers (as predictors) to the evaluation of implementation of educational inclusion (as criteria)?

According to the existing theoretical knowledge and research to date, the following hypotheses were set:

H1: Teachers give positive estimates of the implementation of educational inclusion.

H2: Teachers express insecurity when it comes to inclusion of students with developmental disabilities into the educational system due to the added work load, commitment, and their competence, which can reduce their overall class achievement.

H3: There is a significant difference in the estimates of implementing educational inclusion between primary and high school teachers in favor of primary school teachers.

H4: There are significant differences in the estimates of educational inclusion with respect to age, years of work experience, professional qualification, additional training in inclusion, school support, teachers with professional support staff in school and professionals out of school and other. Teachers with a college education, with fewer years of work experience, those who have attended courses relating to educational inclusion during their teacher training and those who had additional training on the subject, those who have better cooperation with the professional support staff, and support from school principal, those who had an experience of students with disabilities give positive estimates regarding the implementation of educational inclusion.

Methods

Participants

The research was carried out on a sample of 197 research participants (average age M=40.3; SD=1.73), 155 class teachers and subject teachers in primary school (78.68%) and 42 high school teachers (21.32%) from the Lika-Senj County.

Instruments

Questionnaire on the Evaluation of Inclusion in Education

The questionnaire on the evaluation of inclusion in education by authors Kudek Mirošević and Jurčević Lozančić (2014) consists of 37 statements. Participants give answers on a five-point Likert-type scale with the following values: 1 - never, 2 - rarely, 3 - sometimes, 4 - frequently, 5 - regularly. Questionnaire reliability calculated in the research by Kudek Mirošević and Jurčević Lozančić (2014) was based on the calculation of reliability coefficient of internal consistency – Cronbach alpha which was 0.78, and in this research 0.73, thus confirming the satisfactory reliability of this questionnaire. The questionnaire measures six latent dimensions or factors: 1) Inclusion of students with disabilities into the system of education (item sample: *I find that students with disabilities should attend regular educational programs with their peers without disabilities*); 2) Teaching aspects of work (selection of adequate methods/ manners of work) (item sample: *I select, apply and adapt methods of work to individual*

students' needs); 3) Accepting students with disabilities by peers and their parents (sample item: *Students without disabilities are not tolerant of students with disabilities);* 4) Competence in working with students with disabilities and their parents (item sample: *I find that I need more training for acquiring competences of working with students with disabilities);* 5) Application of individualized educational programs (sample item: *I find that I am sufficiently educated for working with students with disabilities);* 6) Professional development and cooperation within the educational institution (item sample: *My institution organizes various forms of lifelong education).*

Questionnaire

The questionnaire yielded data on teachers: gender, age, professional qualification, number of students in the classroom, training for inclusive work through teacher training and/or work experience in school, school support for inclusion, cooperation with parents and school's support staff.

Research Procedure

The research took place in the 2016/2017 school year in the manner that the *Questionnaire* and the *Survey* were sent to all of the 15 primary schools and 5 high schools in the Lika-Senj County[2]. The completed Questionnaires and Surveys were returned to the researchers by 11 primary schools and 3 high schools. Consent by the *Professional Council of the Department of Teacher Education Studies in Gospić, University of Zadar* was obtained, while school principals were sent an invitation for teachers to participate in the research. After receiving the consent from the schools' Teachers' Councils, the researchers distributed the questionnaires to teachers at the ensuing Teachers' Councils. The questionnaires were completed within 40 minutes and followed the codes of ethics for conducting research.

Results

Data were analyzed using the package *Statistica 13* for statistical data analyses. The analyses included basic descriptive indicators for the participating sample of teachers.

Table 1 shows that the range of values for almost all items is maximal (1-5), which implies that the items have good coverage of the spectrum of answers: from extremely negative to extremely positive perceptions of teachers on the implementation of inclusion as a subject of measurement. Considering the characteristics of the distribution, the majority of variables are slightly negatively asymmetric which implies a *preference of primary teachers and high school teachers towards positive values of perception of educational inclusion*. When referring to kurtosis, the majority of items are slightly platykurtic (kurtosis with negative values), implying greater dispersion of

[2] According to the *Croatian Bureau of Statistics* from 2016, there were 456 teachers in primary schools in the Lika-Senj County in 2015, and 308 teachers in high schools.

results around the arithmetic mean, i.e. kurtosis. The values of measures of central tendency imply that the *majority of primary school and high school teachers have a positive perception towards educational inclusion*, which confirms the first hypothesis.

Table 1

Basic statistical indicators of the Questionnaire on the evaluation of inclusion in education for primary school teachers (N=155) and high school teachers (N=42) from the Lika-Senj County.

Factors	N	M	Mode	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Std. error Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. error Kurtosis
F1	155	3.00	3	0.636	1	5	-0.386	0.195	-0.330	0.387
	42	3.00	3	0.599	2	4	0.032	0.365	-0.617	0.717
F2	155	4.26	4	0.477	3	5	-0.238	0.195	-0.635	0.387
	42	3.98	4	0.639	2	5	-1.376	0.365	2.991	0.717
F3	155	2.66	3	0.517	2	4	0.373	0.195	-0.026	0.387
	42	2.72	3	0.468	2	4	0.397	0.365	-0.381	0.717
F4	155	3.90	4	0.437	3	5	-0.298	0.195	0.584	0.387
	42	3.77	4	0.489	3	5	0.141	0.365	0.324	0.717
F5	155	3.30	3	0.768	1	5	-0.201	0.195	0.296	0.387
	42	2.72	3	0.844	1	4	-0.343	0.365	-0.368	0.717
F6	155	3.55	4	0.730	2	7	0.300	0.195	1.813	0.387
	42	2.93	3	0.721	1	4	-0.294	0.365	-0.582	0.717

Legend: F1: Inclusion of students with difficulties into the educational system, F2: Teaching aspects of work, M3: Accepting students with disabilities by their peers and their parents, M4: Competence in working with students with disabilities and their parents, M5: Application of individualized educational programs, M6: Professional development and cooperation within the educational institution; M – arithmetic mean; Mode (D) – dominant value; SD – standard deviation; Min – minimal results; Max – maximal results; Skewness – asymmetry; Kurtosis

Table 2 shows that the sample of primary school teachers and high school teachers is mostly female, between 35 and 55 years of age, with completed higher education, i.e. completed 4-year professional or university study, with mostly 15-25 students in a classroom, which is in line with the OECD – TALIS 2013 results of the research carried out in Croatia (NSZSSH, 2013). Within the sample of primary school teachers, the majority are class teachers with the humanities profile and the majority did not have courses on teaching students with disabilities during their pre-service teacher training, however, they acquired that knowledge mostly through experience of working in school. The majority of teachers had some experience of working with such students. The sample of high school teachers indicates that the majority are of a natural sciences profile and mostly did not have courses related to teaching students with disabilities during their pre-service training, and they generally did not encounter such situations throughout their experience of working in school. Their present-day experience of working with such students is weak. School support to primary school and high school teachers for working with such students is mostly moderate. Cooperation with parents

and school support services for working with students with disabilities is mostly realized while cooperation with professionals out of school is mostly not realized.

Table 2

Basic descriptive results of socio-demographic characteristics of primary school teachers and high school teachers

Teacher characteristics	PRIMARY SCHOOL					HIGH SCHOOL				
	N	M	SD	Min	Max	N	M	SD	Min	Max
Gender	155	1.73	0.445	1	2	42	1.79	0.410	1	2
Age	155	1.83	0.731	1	3	42	1.52	0.663	1	2
Professional qualification	155	2.11	0.802	1	4	42	2.40	0.758	1	4
Number of students in the classroom	155	1.57	0.547	1	3	42	1.88	0.324	1	2
Teacher profile	155	2.17	1.265	1	5	42	2.76	0.811	1	4
Inclusive education in teacher training	155	1.63	0.484	1	2	42	1.71	0.452	1	2
Inclusive education through experience	155	1.34	0.476	1	2	42	1.60	0.491	1	2
Experience to date of working with students with disabilities	155	1.12	0.321	1	2	42	1.19	0.393	1	2
Current experience of working with students with disabilities	155	1.35	0.478	1	2	42	1.36	0.474	1	2
School support for working with students with disabilities	155	2.25	0.565	1	3	42	1.91	0.569	1	3
Cooperation with parents	155	1.21	0.406	1	2	42	1.26	0.430	1	2
Cooperation with support staff	155	1.03	0.305	1	2	42	1.12	0.324	1	2
Cooperation with support staff out of school	155	1.61	0.490	1	2	42	1.71	0.432	1	2

Legend: gender: M - 1, F - 2; age: from 25 to 35; - 1, from 35 to 55; - 2, from 55 to 65. - 3; professional qualification: secondary – 1, four-year study – 2, five-year study – 3, master or PhD, – 4; number of students in the classroom: < 15 -1, from 15 to 25 -2, from 25 to 35 – 3; teacher profile: class teacher – 1, teacher in the humanities – 2, teacher – social studies – 3, teacher – natural sciences– 4, teacher - arts – 5; inclusive education during pre-service teacher training: yes -1, no - 2; inclusive education through experience: yes -1, no - 2; experience to date in working with students with disabilities: yes -1, no - 2; current experience of working with students with disabilities: yes -1, no - 2; school support: weak -1, modest – 2, strong – 3; cooperation with parents: yes -1, no - 2; cooperation with school's support staff: yes-1, no – 2; cooperation with support staff out of school: yes -1, no – 2.

This was followed by correlation analyses which examined the correlation of indicators of evaluation of inclusion and correlation of indicators of evaluation of inclusion with some socio-demographic data of primary school teachers and high school teachers.

Table 3

Correlation between factors on the Survey on the evaluation of inclusive education teaching practice

FACTORS	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6
F1: Inclusion of students with difficulties into the system of education	1.00	**-0.16***	**0.37***	**-0.20***	**-0.26***	-0.10
F2: Teaching aspects of work		1.00	**-0.19***	**0.40***	**0.53***	**0.40***
F3: Accepting students with difficulties by peers and their parents			1.00	**-0.15***	-0.11	-0.11
F4: Competence in working with students with difficulties and their parents				1.00	**0.31***	**0.26***
F5: Application of individualized educational programs					1.00	**0.54***
F6: Professional development and cooperation within the educational institution						1.00

N=197; p<.05

The results obtained (see Table 3) show statistically significant correlations (Pearson's correlation coefficient) from low to moderate between *factor 1*: Inclusion of students with developmental disabilities into the system of education and *factor 3*: Accepting such students by peers and their parents ($r = 0.37$; $p < 0.05$), which means that with greater inclusion of such students into the system of education they are better accepted by peers and their parents; *factor 2*: Teaching aspects of work and *factor 4*: Competence for working with such students and their parents ($r = 0.40$; $p < 0.05$), and *factor 5*: Application of individualized programs ($r = 0.53$; $p < 0.05$) and *factor 6*: Professional development and cooperation ($r = 0.40$; $p < 0.05$), which means that with better teaching methodology for working with such students, teachers more positively assess their own competence for working with them, the individualized program and professional development and cooperation within their institutions. *Factor 1*: Inclusion of students with developmental disabilities into the educational system has a low negative statistical correlation with *factor 2*: Teaching methodology aspects of work ($r = -0.16$; $p < 0.05$), which means that with greater inclusion of these students into the system of education, estimates of teaching methodology aspects of work are more negative. *Factor 1*: Inclusion of students with disabilities into the system of education has a low negative statistical correlation with *factor 4*: Competence for working with such students and their parents ($r = -0.20$; $p < 0.05$) and *factor 5*: Application of

individualized programs (r = - 0.26; $p < 0.05$), which means that with greater inclusion of these students, teachers' estimates of their competences become more negative and the application of individualized programs is reduced. *Factor 2*: Teaching methodology aspects of work are slightly negatively correlated with *factor 3*: Accepting students with disabilities by peers and their parents (r = - 0.19; $p < 0.05$), which means that with more organization of particular teaching methodology estimates of their acceptance by peers and their parents become more negative. *Factor 3*: Accepting these students by peers and their parents has a low and negative statistically significant correlation with *factor 4*: Competence for working with these students and their parents (r = - 0.15; $p < 0.05$), which indicated that the more such students are accepted by their peers and their parents the estimates of teachers' competence for working with such students ar more negative. *Factor 4*: Competence for working with students with disabilities and their parents has a low statistical correlation with *factor 5*: Application of individualized programs ($r = 0.31$; $p < 0.05$) and *factor 6*: Professional development and cooperation ($r = 0.26$; $p < 0.05$), which means that teachers evaluate themselves as more competent for working with these students with more implementations of individualized programs and the more professional development they have and the more they cooperate. *Factor 5*: Application of individualized programs has a moderate, positive statistically significant correlation with *factor 6:* Professional development and cooperation ($r = 0.54$; $p < 0.05$), which means that teachers who apply more individualized programs have more positive estimates of their own professional development and cooperation.

The results shown in Table 4 indicate statistically significant correlations between aspects of teaching methodology and weaker teacher training in the area of working with students with developmental disabilities through experience in school (r_s = -0.22; $p < 0.05$), along with weaker experience to date with working with such students in school (r_s = -0.22; $p < 0.05$) and greater school support for working with such students ($r_s = 0.27$; $p < 0.05$). Furthermore, statistically significant correlations are present between application of individualized programs and weaker pre-service training relating to work with such students (r_s = -0.29; $p < 0.05$), and weaker training through experience in school (r_s = -0.38; $p < 0.05$) and, on the other hand greater school support ($r_s = 0.35$; $p < 0.05$). Statistically significant correlations are evident between professional development and cooperation and weaker pre-service training regarding work with such students through experience in school (r_s = -0.32; $p < 0.05$) and, on the other hand greater school support ($r_s = 0.52$; $p < 0.05$). The results indicate that the second hypothesis is partially confirmed. Other statistically significant but low correlations are shown in Table 4.

Differences in estimates on the implementation of educational inclusion between primary school teachers and high school teachers are calculated using the *t-test* for large independent samples (Table 5).

Table 5 shows that statistically significant differences in the estimates of implementation of educational inclusion between primary school teachers and high

Table 4

Correlation coefficients (Spearman r$_s$) between factors within the Questionnaire of estimates of inclusion practices and some socio-demographic teacher data

Factors	Gender	Age	Prof. qualification	Number of students in class	Teacher profile	Pre-service teacher training
F1	-0.12	**0.16***	**-0.15***	0.10	-0.11	0.08
F2	**0.18***	0.00	-0.01	0.01	**-0.15***	**-0.15***
F3	0.01	0.11	**-0.14***	0.06	-0.04	0.06
F4	**0.01***	0.07	0.07	0.01	0.01	-0.10
F5	-0.00	-0.10	0.02	0.08	-0.03	**-0.29***
F6	-0.04	-0.01	-0.05	0.03	0.05	**-0.15***

Factors	Education through experience in school	Experience to date	Present-day experience	School support
F1	0.09	0.10	0.04	**-0.12***
F2	**-0.22***	**-0.21***	0.02	**0.27***
F3	0.13	-0.04	0.00	**-0.19***
F4	**-0.16***	**-0.16***	-0.13	**0.18***
F5	**-0.38***	-0.13	-0.05	**0.35***
F6	**-0.32***	0.09	**-0.16***	**0.52***

N = 197; p < 0.05;

Legend: F1: Inclusion of students with disabilities into the educational system. F2: Teaching methodology aspects of work. M3: Accepting students with disabilities by peers and their parents, M4: Competence for working with students with disabilities and their parents, M5: Application of individualized educational programs, M6: Professional development and cooperation within the educational institution; gender: M-1, F-2; age: from 25 to 35 - 1, from 35 to 55 - 2, from 55 to 65 - 3; work experience: up to 5 yrs. – 1, from 5 to 25 - 2; > 25 yrs. – 3; professional qualification: college or three-year professional study – 1, four-year professional or university study – 2, five-year university study – 3, master or PhD – 4; number of students in class: < 15 -1, from 15 to 25 -2, from 25 to 35 – 3; teacher profile: primary school teacher – 1, humanities profile– 2, social sciences profile – 3, natural sciences profile – 4, art profile– 5; pre-service teacher training for working with students with disabilities: yes -1, no - 2; training through experience of working in school: yes -1, no - 2; experience to date with working with such students: yes -1, no – 2; current experience of working with such students: yes -1, no - 2; school support for working with such students: weak -1, moderate – 2, strong – 3.

school teachers in the Lika-Senj County are at *factor 2*: Teaching methodology aspects of work (*t-test* = 3.12; *df* = 195; $p < 0.05$), at *factor 5*: Application of individualized programs (*t-test* = 4.29; *df* = 195; $p < 0.05$) and *factor 6*: Professional development and cooperation (*t-test* = 4.85; *df* = 195; $p < 0.05$). Primary school teachers statistically significantly positively estimate the use of adequate teaching methods with such students, application of individualized programs and professional development and cooperation in comparison to high school teachers. The mentioned results indicate confirmation of the third hypothesis.

In order to examine the contribution of some socio-demographic characteristics of teachers (as predictors) explained through *estimates of implementation of educational inclusion by teachers* (as criteria) hierarchical logistic regression analyses were carried out where the predictor in the first step includes *education of teachers for working with*

students with developmental disabilities, while additional predictors in the second step were *school's work dynamics*, and in the third step *socio-demographic characteristics of teachers* (Table 6).

Table 5

Difference in estimate of implementation of educational inclusion between primary school teachers and high school teachers in the Lika-Senj County

FACTORS	PS			HS			t-test	df
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD		
F1: Inclusion of students with disabilities into the educational system	155	3.00	0.636	42	3.00	0.599	0.00	195
F2: Teaching methodology aspects of work	155	4.26	0.477	42	3.98	0.639	3.12*	195
F3: Accepting students with disabilities by peers and their parents	155	2.66	0.517	42	2.72	0.468	0.66	195
F4: Competence for working with students with disabilities and their parents	155	3.90	0.437	42	3.77	0.489	1.59	195
F5: Application of individualized teaching programs	155	3.30	0.768	42	2.72	0.844	4.29*	195
F6: Professional development and cooperation within an educational institution	155	3.55	0.730	42	2.93	0.721	4.85*	195

Legend: N – number of participants; M – arithmetic mean; SD – standard deviation; t-test – (for large independent samples) – testing significant differences between two arithmetic means; df – number of participants by group; $p<0.05$ - probability

Table 6

Results of hierarchical regression analysis with 6 factors of evaluation of implementation of educational inclusion (as criteria) and some socio-demographic variables of teachers (as predictors)

Criteria	Inclusion of students with disabilities into the educational system	Teaching methodology aspects of work	Accepting students with disabilities by peers and their parents	Competence for working with students with disabilities and their parents	Application of individualized educational programs	Professional development and cooperation within the educational institution
Predictors	β	β	β	β	β	β
Step 1						
Completed education	**-0.15***	-0.02	**-0.15***	-0.06	-0.00	-0.05
Pre-service teacher training	0.03	-0.11	0.00	-0.05	**-0.21****	-0.08
Training through work experience	0.09	**-0.19****	0.13	-0.14	**-0.32****	**-0.30****

R=	0.18	0.24	0.19	0.17	0.43	0.33
R^2=	0.03	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.18	0.11
Adjusted R^2	0.02	0.04	0.23	0.02	0.17	0.10
F ($_{3,193}$)	2..20*	3.86*	2.51*	2.03	14.47**	7.88*
Step 2						
Completed education	**-0.19****	0.04	**-0.15***	-0.01	0.06	-0.01
Pre-service teacher training	0.00	-0.09	0.00	-0.02	**-0.16****	-0.03
Training through work experience	0.07	-0.14	0.11	-0.10	**-0.30****	**-0.25****
Number of students in class	0.12	-0.01	0.08	-0.01	0.06	-0.01
School support	-0.10	**0.23****	**-0.27****	0.16	**0.21****	**0.42****
Cooperation with support staff out of school	0.05	-0.08	-0.07	0.02	-0.04	0.03
R=	0.33	0.40	0.31	0.34	0.58	0.63
R^2=	0.11	0.17	0.10	0.03	0.18	0.39
Adjusted R^2	0.06	0.12	0.05	0.16	0.17	0.36
F ($_{10,186}$)	2.31*	3.73*	1.98*	2.03	9.22**	11.93**
Step 3						
Gender	-0.13	0.12	0.01	-0.02	-0.10	-0.06
Age	0.08	0.05	0.00	0.10	0.01	0.03
Level of education	-0.13	0.04	-0.15	0.04	0.08	0.02
Number of students in class	**-0.16***	-0.02	0.07	-0.05	0.07	-0.03
Teacher profile	**-0.18****	-0.07	-0.03	0.06	0.01	0.05
Pre-service teacher training	-0.01	-0.07	0.01	-0.05	**-0.17****	-0.04
Training through experience	0.05	-0.12	0.12	-0.10	**-0.31****	**-0.25****
Experience to date	0.06	**-0.17***	-0.07	-0.04	-0.00	0.09
Present-day experience	0.03	0.10	0.01	-0.11	-0.01	**-0.16***
School support	-0.09	**0.25****	**-0.26****	**-0.19****	**0.21****	**0.41****
Cooperation with parents	0.05	-0.03	-0.00	0.06	**-0.17****	**-0.13***
Cooperation with support staff	0.05	0.04	-0.00	0.00	0.06	-0.07
R=	0.40	0.46	0.32	0.37	0.58	0.65
R^2=	0.16	0.22	0.10	0.14	0.34	0.42
Adjusted R^2	0.09	0.15	0.03	0.69	0.29	0.37
F ($_{15,181}$)	2.27*	3.31*	1.37*	1.96*	6.24**	8.73*

N= 197; *p<0.05; **p<0.01

In order to examine the contribution of some socio-demographic characteristics of teachers (as predictors) to the estimates of implementation of educational inclusion (as criteria) hierarchical logistic regression analyses were carried out. Table 6 shows three blocks of input variables, the same information for each block of variables. After applying three predictors in step 1 relating to *teacher education* (degree of completed formal education, training for work with these students during pre-service teacher training, and training through work experience) the multiple correlation is $R = 0.18$ and this set of predictors significantly contributes 3% of explanation of all criteria of estimates of implementation of educational inclusion ($R^2 = 0.03$). The significant predictors were: *completed level of education* ($\beta = -0.15$; $p < 0.05$) for the first criterion *Inclusion of students with disabilities into the system of education,* which means that teachers with a lower degree of formal education have more positive estimates of inclusion of students with developmental disabilities into the system of education; *teacher training through work experience* ($\beta = -0.19$; $p < 0.01$) for the second criterion *Teaching methodology aspects of work; training of teachers for work with students with disabilities through pre-service teacher training* ($\beta = -0.21$; $p < 0.01$) and *teacher training for working with students with disabilities through work experience* ($\beta = -0.32$; $p < 0.01$) for the fifth criterion *Application of individualized programs,* which means that teachers who have less pre-service teacher training or work experience for working with such students have more positive estimates of the application of individualized programs; *teacher training through work experience* ($\beta = -0.30$; $p < 0.01$) for the sixth criterion *Professional development and cooperation,* which means that teachers less educated for working with such students through work experience have more positive estimates of professional development and cooperation. The second step, in addition to predictors from the first step, contains a set of predictors related to the *school's work dynamics* (number of students per class, school support, cooperation with parents, cooperation with support staff and cooperation with professionals out of school) with the $R = 0.33$, i.e. by adding these variables it is possible to explain an additional 8% of the criterion variance, i.e. predictors from the 1st and 2nd step explain 11% of the criterion variance. Individual significant predictors from the 1st step whose significance has been confirmed are mentioned in the 2nd step: *completed level of education* ($\beta = -0.19$; $p < 0.01$) for the first criterion *Inclusion of students with disabilities into the system of education*; *completed formal education* ($\beta = -0.15$; $p < 0.05$) for the third criterion *Accepting students with disabilities by peers and their parents*; *pre-service teacher training* ($\beta = -0.16$; $p < 0.01$) and *teacher training through work experience* ($\beta = -0.30$; $p < 0.01$) for the fifth criterion *Application of individualized programs*; and *training through work experience* ($\beta = -0.25$; $p < 0.01$) for the sixth criterion *Professional development and cooperation*. Teachers with a lower level of formal education give more positive estimates of inclusion of such students into the educational system and have more positive estimates of acceptance of students by peers and their parents. Teachers who were trained throughout their pre-service

training or through work experience and who are less educated for working with such students have more positive estimates of the application of individualized programs. Teachers with less training from work experience have more positive estimates of professional development and cooperation. In the second step, the following emerged as significant predictors: *school support for the students* ($\beta = 0.23$; $p < 0.01$) for the second criterion *Teaching methodology aspects of work*, for the third criterion *Accepting students with disabilities by peers and their parents*, for the fifth criterion *Application of individualized programs* and for the sixth criterion *Professional development and cooperation*, which indicates that with greater school support teachers give more positive estimates of teaching methodology, accepting these students by peers and their parents, application of individualized programs and professional development and cooperation. In the third step along with predictors from step 1 and step 2 a set of predictors relating to the *socio-demographic characteristics of teachers* (gender, age, teacher profile and experience) were introduced with the $R = 0.40$, i.e. by adding these variables it is possible to explain an additional 5% of the criterion variance, i.e. predictors in all three steps explain 16% of the criterion variance. Individual significant predictors from the first and second steps whose significance is confirmed in the third step are: *training for working with such students through pre-service teacher training* ($\beta = - 0.17$; $p < 0.01$) and *training through work experience in school* ($\beta = - 0.31$; $p < 0.01$) for the fifth criterion *Application of individualized programs*, which again confirms that teachers who got less training for working with such students during their pre-service teacher training or through experience of working in school have more positive estimates of the implementation of individualized programs; *training through work experience in school* ($\beta = - 0.25$; $p < 0.01$) for the sixth criterion *Professional development and cooperation*, which confirms that teachers with less training through work experience for working with such students have more positive estimates of professional development and cooperation. For the third step, the following significant predictors were identified: *number of students per class* ($\beta = - 0.16$; $p < 0.05$) and *teacher profile* ($\beta = - 0.18$; $p < 0.01$) for the first criterion *Inclusion of students with disabilities into the educational system*, which means that with fewer students in the class and the humanities and social sciences teacher profile, estimates of inclusion of such students into the system become more positive; previous experience ($\beta = - 0.17$; $p < 0.05$) and school support ($\beta = 0.25$; $p < 0.01$) for the second criterion *Teaching methodology aspects of work. School support* ($\beta = - 0.26$; $p < 0.01$) for the third criterion *Accepting students with difficulties by peers and their parents*, which indicates that with lower school support teachers have more positive estimates of acceptance of students with disabilities by peers and their parents. *School support* ($\beta = 0.41$; $p < 0.01$) for the fifth criterion *Application of individualized programs*, indicating that with greater support from school, teachers have more positive estimates of application of individualized programs, and *school support for such students* ($\beta = 0.21$; $p < 0.01$) for the sixth criterion *Professional development and cooperation*, which means that with greater support

from school, teachers have a more positive estimate of professional development and cooperation. Furthermore, *cooperation with parents* ($\beta = -0.19$; $p < 0.01$) for the fourth criterion *Competence for working with students with disabilities and their parents; cooperation with parents* ($\beta = -0.17$; $p < 0.01$) for the fifth criterion *Application of individualized programs,* and *cooperation with parents* ($\beta = -0.13$; $p < 0.01$) for the sixth criterion *Professional development and cooperation,* which indicates that the weaker the cooperation with parents of these students, teachers have a more positive estimate of competence for working with these students, for applying individualized programs and for professional development. These results partially confirm the fourth hypothesis.

Discussion

"Teachers who are well-prepared should have the leading role in the education of students with developmental disabilities in regular school, while support should be permanently ensured through work with professionals in the education-rehabilitation field" (Mustać & Vicić, 1996, p. 52). Because of that, the main aim of this research was to examine how primary school teachers and high school teachers in the Lika-Senj County estimate the implementation of educational inclusion. The research established that the majority generally have a positive estimate of its implementation. However, knowledge from national literature suggests that primary school teachers and high school teachers are inadequately prepared for work with students with disabilities, frequently do not have the necessary support from professionals in the education-rehabilitation field, particularly in high schools (Karamatić Brčić, 2013; Žic Ralić & Ljubas, 2013). Even wealthy countries across the world have not been able to provide conditions for the integration of these children, which leaves plenty of room for further work on this issue (Ljubić & Kiš-Glavaš, 2003). The concept of inclusive education, in agreement with the social model is not possible if professionals in education have not developed necessary attitudes, skills, knowledge and motivation, i.e. competences and support from the educational institution and social environment (Acedo, 2008; Jones, 2004). Vizek Vidović (2005) emphasizes that education and professional development of a teacher are the key issues in any country that strives to enhance the educational system and make it more available, mobile and flexible. Educational inclusion implies adequate teacher training at the level of initial teacher education followed by continuous professional development and lifelong learning. Issues which primary school teachers, high school teachers and support staff face are dealt with through professional development in the area of competences that they have not acquired during their initial teacher training. Particular issues require particular specialization, flexible adaptation of the curriculum and ensuring extra time for implementing individualization. According to Kudek Mirošević and Jurčević Lozančić (2014), teachers find that they lack adequate knowledge for working with students with developmental disabilities in general, and existing professional development that is offered is not sufficiently practical. According to the results of

OECD research TALIS 2013, on average, 63% of Croatian teachers work in schools that lack specialist teachers for developmental disabilities (the TALIS average is 48%), the rate of participation in professional development programs that are most necessary for teachers is moderate (46%), and one such program is teaching students with special needs. On average, 23% of teachers report of small or no positive effect from programs that deal with the topic of teaching students with special needs and classroom management, and 80% of teachers speak of a moderate or great importance when it comes to the topic of teaching students with special needs (the TALIS average is 82%) (NSZSSH, 2013). According to Čepić, Tatalović Vorkapić, Lončarić, Anđić, Skočić Mihić, Kalin, and Šteh (2017), Croatian teachers, like Slovene teachers, assess themselves as qualified for inclusive education using advice from support staff, for the application of individualized procedures, cooperation and creating classroom environment through strengthening students' social skills and positive class discipline.

Primary school teachers and high school teachers in the Lika-Senj County find that the increase of students with special educational needs is a negative factor as their competence decreases along with the possibility of implementing individualized teaching. On the other hand, they estimate that they can increase their competence by improving aspects of teaching methodology. With the increase of competence, they can more easily implement individualized teaching which is necessary for working with such students and they have greater need for professional development and cooperation within the educational institution. They recognize the necessity for assistance and support coming from rehabilitation education specialist and teaching assistants through forming special classes, particularly for students with more complex diagnoses. Teachers recognize that their better preparation of teaching, increased professional development and cooperation improve the application of individualized programs. It is easier for teachers to implement individualized programs when they attend professional development and adapt their teaching to particular needs, and when on the other hand the school and local community establish professional cooperation where the teacher is only one stakeholder. When school support is greater, teachers from primary school adapt their teaching more for these students' needs. However, when such support is lacking, teachers estimate of inclusion of such students becomes more positive and peers and their parents are more accepting as it seems that when school support (as a unit) is lacking, teachers, peers and parents take responsibility for work, growth and development of students with developmental disabilities. Teachers in this county, as teachers across Croatia, show concern for the teaching process if a larger number of students with disabilities are integrated into regular classes, and on the other hand there is no professional assistance nor support from the school or local community (Ljubić & Kiš-Glavaš, 2003). Teachers in this county express clear attitudes on the necessary program, ergonomic and technical adaptations of the school necessary for the integration of these students, the necessary assistance from the local community in realizing an inclusive school

culture, etc. On the other hand, the research results show that the majority of tested teachers have not had adequate training during their pre-service education for working with such students, which is why they have gained experience while working in school. The majority of teachers had experience of working with students with disabilities, primary school teachers more so than high school teachers, while school support is assessed by the majority as moderate. Cooperation of teachers with parents and school's support services is mostly established as opposed to cooperation with professionals out of school that is generally not established. The research results show that teachers who have less training for working with these students and those with less work experience in school, those who have lower school support are more focused to compensate these "deficiencies" through modifying their teaching. Furthermore, teachers with less pre-service training and less work experience for working with these students, but with greater school support are more prone to applying individualized programs. It seems that through individualizing programs they wish to "compensate" their weaker training for working with these students. Lack of training for working with these students is compensated through professional development and better cooperation which is also better with increased school support. The research results show that primary school students are significantly better in selecting adequate work methods with these students in comparison to high school students. Possible reasons for that are: greater experience of primary school teachers for working with these students as some high school classes have not integrated special needs students due to the demands of the program; pre-service teacher training programs of study, particularly primary school teachers have had more courses over the last 15 years relating to the education of special needs students (implying those with disabilities and talented students) and more teaching methodology courses. According to the research results, primary school teachers apply more individualized programs and have more professional development in this area, which was expected due to the larger inclusion of students with special needs into primary schools. Ljubić and Kiš-Glavaš (2003) also state that integration has caught on more in primary schools in Croatia than in high schools. Its objective and organizational postulates are met for the majority part in primary schools as opposed to high schools, however they are not entirely met, which is revealed through this research. Teachers who have not had a lot of experience with students with difficulties have more positive attitudes towards inclusion, i.e. teachers who through personal experience of working with these students become witnesses of the numerous shortcomings in practical implementation of inclusion which is why further research of the analysis of their objective, subjective and organizational preconditions is necessary. Kranjčec Mlinarić, Žic Ralić, and Lisak (2016) state that teachers express basic support for the process of inclusion, but it is evident that they deal with these issues in various ways. They mostly see it as positive and good for students with disabilities, and for their peers with a typical development. It is evident that their opinions are affected by the type of difficulty and classrooms with

larger numbers of students which results in the inability to devote time to students with disabilities. According to Skočić Mihić, Gabrić, and Bošković (2016), there are significant differences in the level of agreement of teachers with the statement that inclusive education contributes to the development of all students with respect to age, years of work experience, type and content of the pre-service study program. Those who have completed the university program of study, have fewer years of work experience, and have attended courses on inclusive education show greater agreement with the statement that inclusive education contributes to the development of students with disabilities, and the development of their typical peers. Teachers who have better cooperation and support from support staff and the principal feel more competent and have more positive attitudes towards inclusion of students with disabilities into the educational system. Those who have had such students during their work experience or who currently teach such students have positive attitudes towards inclusion.

Furthermore, multivariate analyses in the research confirmed that teachers with a lower degree of education have positive estimates of including such students into the educational system and towards individualized teaching. It seems that the lower level of education is "compensated" with positive evaluations of inclusion and greater teacher engagement. Considering that education has an effect on forming attitudes, it is expected that with higher education which is accompanied with more courses on inclusion and students with disabilities particularly at faculties of teacher education, primary school teachers and high school teachers should develop more positive attitudes towards these issues. Since the results obtained are in opposition to the expectations, there is room for additional testing in future research. These teachers have more positive attitudes towards teaching methodology, individualized programs, professional development and cooperation, and have more positive estimates of accepting these students by peers and their parents. Again, it seems that we are dealing with "compensation" which should direct future research towards testing these findings. The greater the school support for these students, teachers have more positive estimates of their teaching methodology, accepting students by peers and their parents, application of individualized educational programs, professional development and cooperation within the educational institution. When cooperation with parents is weak, teachers have more positive estimates of their own competence in working with these students and their parents, which confirms that parents of students with difficulties are at times "obstacles" in the teacher's work, i.e. with their subjective involvement they do not allow for objectiveness and professionalism of the teacher particularly at lower levels of education. The smaller the number of students in the classroom and with the teacher's profile the estimates of including these students into the educational system is more positive. If there is little experience of working with these students to date, and school support is greater, teachers have more positive estimates of their teaching methodology. If school support is weak, teachers have more positive estimates of accepting these students by peers and their parents. It seems

that with lack of school support teachers' awareness becomes increased, but also awareness of students and their parents on the importance of inclusion of students with disabilities. The greater the support from school for these students, teachers have more positive estimates of applying individualized programs and professional development and cooperation. On the other hand, if cooperation with parents is weak, teachers have more positive estimates of their own competence for working with these students and their parents, and for applying individualized programs and professional development. As mentioned earlier, the professional approach of teachers towards these students demands an objective approach, greater engagement and development, and parents frequently do not understand the complexity of these issues or take on a subjective approach towards their child.

The limitation of this research can be found in the small and selected sample, difference in the number of primary school teachers and high school teachers and the questionnaire and survey measure of self-evaluation with its limitations (e.g. retrospective method of providing answers, issue of honesty in answers). Despite the limitations in research it provides answers for the set research questions which can be compared to other research results, particularly in Croatia. What is more, it can serve as a precondition for further development of inclusive practice in Croatia.

Conclusion

The research on the primary school and high school teachers' estimates of implementing educational inclusion in the Lika-Senj County, which is shown in Table 1, indicates that they mostly have positive estimates, which confirms the first hypothesis. However, teachers express insecurity when it comes to the increasing number of students with disabilities who are integrated into regular classes, with parental involvement into the professional work of teachers (particularly at lower levels of education), which partially confirms the second hypothesis (see Table 4). The implementation of educational inclusion is more dominant in primary schools than in high schools in the Lika-Senj County, which can be seen in Table 5 and confirms the third hypothesis. The research established (Table 6) that educational inclusion is more positively evaluated by teachers with fewer years of teaching experience (younger, which was expected), of lower formal education and less training for working with students with disabilities (which was not expected and leaves room for further research) and those who have better cooperation with the school's support service (which was expected) and partially confirms the fourth hypothesis.

References

Acedo, C. (2008). Inclusive education: pushing the boundaries. *Prospects,* 38, 5-13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-008-9064-z

Čepić, R., Tatalović Vorkapić, S., Lončarić, D., Anđić, D., Skočić Mihić, S., Kalin, J., & Šteh, B. (2017). Profesionalni razvoj učitelja: status, ličnost i transverzalne kompetencije. *Sažetci radova znanstveno-stručnog skupa Identitet i različitost u odgoju i obrazovanju, 21.-23.09.2017* (p. 29). Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru.

Forlin, C. (2012). *Future Directions for Inclusive Teacher Education*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203113585

Igrić, Lj. et al. (2015). *Osnove edukacijskog uključivanja – škola po mjeri svakog djeteta je moguća*. Zagreb: Edukacijsko-rehabilitacijski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu i Školska knjiga.

Ivančić, Đ. (2010). *Diferencirana nastava u inkluzivnoj* školi. Zagreb: Alka script.

Ivančić, Đ., & Stančić, Z. (2013). Stvaranje inkluzivne kulture škole. *Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja*, *49*(2), 139-157.

Jones, C. (2004). *Supporting inclusion in the early years (supporting early learning).* Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press.

Karamatić Brčić, M. (2013). Pretpostavke inkluzije u školi. *Život i škola*, *30*(2), 67-78.

Krampač-Grljušić, A., Žic Ralić, A., & Lisak, N. (2010). Što djeca s teškoćama misle o podršci asistenta u nastavi. In V. Đurek (Ed.), *Zbornik radova 8. kongresa s međunarodnim sudjelovanjem „Uključivanje i podrška u zajednici"* (pp. 181-195). Varaždin: Školska knjiga.

Kranjčec Mlinarić, J., Žic Ralić, A., & Lisak, N. (2016). Promišljanje učitelja o izazovima i barijerama inkluzije učenika s poteškoćama u razvoju. *Školski vjesnik*, *65*, 233-247.

Kudek Mirošević, J., & Jurčević Lozančić A. (2014). Stavovi odgojitelja i učitelja o provedbi inkluzije u redovitim predškolskim ustanovama i osnovnim školama. *Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja*, *50*(2), 17-29.

Leutar, Z., & Frantal, M. (2006). Stavovi nastavnika o integraciji djece s posebnim potrebama u redovne škole. *Napredak*, *147*(3), 298-312.

Liston, D. P., & Zeichner, K. M. (1990). Reflective Teaching and Action Research in Preservice Teacher Education. *Jounal of Education for Teaching*, *16*(3), 235-254. https://doi.org/10.1080/0260747900160304

Ljubić, M., & Kiš-Glavaš, L. (2003). Razlike u stavovima nastavnika osnovnih i srednjih škola prema edukacijskoj integraciji. *Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja*, *39*(2), 129-136.

Mittler, P. (2006). *Working Towards Inclusive Education: Social Contexts*. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Mustać, V., & Vicić, M. (1996). *Rad s učenicima s teškoćama u razvoju u osnovnoj školi, Priručnik za prosvjetne djelatnike*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Nezavisni sindikat zaposlenih u srednjim školama Hrvatske (NSZSSH) (2013). Retrieved from http://www.nszssh.hr/pdf/TALIS_2013.pdf

Pašalić-Kreso, A. (2003). *Inkluzija u školstvu Bosne i Hercegovine*. Sarajevo: Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta.

Sebba, J., & Sachdev, D. (1997). *What Works in Inclusive Education?* Barkingside: Barnardo's.

Skočić Mihić S., Gabrić I., & Bošković S. (2016). *Učiteljska uvjerenja o vrijednostima inkluzivnog obrazovanja*. Rijeka: Fakultet zdravstvenih studija Sveučilišta u Rijeci, Učiteljski fakultet Sveučilišta u Rijeci, Osnovna škola Kraljevica. https://doi.org/10.31299/hrri.52.1.3

Tangen, R. (2005). Promoting inclusive education in secondary school in Norway: a national programme for teacher development. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *20*(1), 57-70. https://doi.org/10.1080/0885625042000319089

Vizek Vidović, V. (2005). Obrazovanje učitelja i nastavnika u Europi iz perspektive cjeloživotnog učenja. In V. Vizek Vidović (Ed.), *Cjeloživotno obrazovanje učitelja i nastavnika: Višestruke perspektive* (pp. 15-64). Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja.

Žic Ralić, A., & Ljubas, M. (2013). Prihvaćenost i prijateljstvo djece i mladih s teškoćama u razvoju. *Društvena istraživanja, 22*(3), 435-453. https://doi.org/10.5559/di.22.3.03

Anela Nikčević-Milković
University of Zadar, Department of Teacher Education Studies in Gospić
dr. Ante Starčevića 12, 53000 Gospić, Croatia
amilkovic@unizd.hr

Denis Jurković
University of Zadar, Department of Teacher Education Studies in Gospić
dr. Ante Starčevića 12, 53000 Gospić, Croatia
djurkovic@unizd.hr

Josip Durdov
Primary school Dr Jure Turić in Gospić
Miroslava Kraljevića 15, 53000 Gospić, Croatia
josip.durdov.4@gmail.com

Procjena provedbe odgojno-obrazovne inkluzivne prakse učitelja i nastavnika

Sažetak

Rezultati istraživanja procjene provedbe inkluzivne prakse u Ličko-senjskoj županiji pokazuju da većina učitelja i nastavnika ima pozitivnu percepciju o njezinoj provedbi. Dok većina učitelja ima iskustvo rada s učenicima s teškoćama u razvoju, kod nastavnika je to iskustvo slabije. I jedni i drugi uglavnom ostvaruju suradnju sa stručno-razvojnom službom škole, ali ne i sa stručnjacima izvan škole. Učitelji manje obrazovani za rad s tim učenicima, s većom potporom škole više metodičko-didaktički oblikuju nastavu, individualiziraju programe te se stručno usavršavaju i surađuju. Oni u odnosu na nastavnike značajno pozitivnije procjenjuju primjenu adekvatnih metoda i načina rada s tim učenicima, primjenu individualiziranih programa, stručno usavršavanje i suradnju. Multivarijantnom analizom pokazalo se da učitelji s nižim stupnjem obrazovanja za rad s tim učenicima te većom potporom škole imaju pozitivnije procjene metodičko-didaktičkih aspekata rada, primjene individualiziranih programa, stručnog usavršavanja i suradnje, kao i prihvaćanja učenika s teškoćama od vršnjaka i roditelja. S manjim brojem učenika u razredu, manjim iskustvom rada s tim učenicima, humanističkim i društvenim profilom nastavnika, procjene uključivanja tih učenika postaju pozitivnije. Učitelji, za razliku od nastavnika, pozitivnije procjenjuju vlastitu kompetentnost što je suradnja s roditeljima tih učenika manja.

Ključne riječi: *odgojno-obrazovna inkluzija; procjena provedbe inkluzivne prakse; učenici s teškoćama u razvoju; učitelji i nastavnici osnovnih i srednjih škola.*

Uvod

Provedba obrazovne inkluzije učenika s teškoćama u razvoju mora biti opća politika i praksa, duboko ukorijenjena u odgojno-obrazovni sustav, a ne specifična intervencija kojom se rješavaju pojedinačni problemi određene osjetljive skupine (Liston i Zeichner, 1990). Upravo zbog toga što odgojno-obrazovni djelatnici na svim razinama sustava odgoja i obrazovanja moraju biti sposobni analizirati dosadašnje pristupe, oblike i načine rada te ih po potrebi mijenjati, ovo je istraživanje usmjereno

na procjenu provedbe obrazovne inkluzije učitelja[1] osnovnih i nastavnika srednjih škola Ličko-senjske županije kao preduvjeta promjena nabolje. To je vrlo važno odgojno-obrazovno pitanje jer je u proteklih četiri desetljeća došlo do porasta uključivanja učenika s teškoćama u razvoju u redovni odgojno-obrazovni sustav. U navedenom razdoblju došlo je i do promjene koncepta odgojno-obrazovne inkluzije s medicinskog na socijalni, no ta je promjena procesne prirode, što znači da još uvijek traje. *Diferencijacija različitosti* u odgojno-obrazovnoj praksi predstavlja širi spektar uključivanja djece i učenika u odgojno-obrazovni sustav, gdje se osim onih djece s teškoćama uključuju i ona koja su darovita, različitih kulturnih i etničkih identiteta, rasnih i spolnih razlika, odgojno zapuštena, nemotivirana za školski rad i dr. *Inkluzivna kultura škole* proces je humanizacije odnosa između svih različitosti koje učenici donose sa sobom u školu, a njezin je cilj usmjeren na cjelokupnu praksu odgoja i obrazovanja na svim obrazovnim razinama. Odgojno-obrazovna inkluzija, prema Pašalić-Kreso (2003, str. 22), predstavlja „pedagoško-humanistički reformski pokret koji teži postizanju pune ravnopravnosti svakog učenika te omogućava razvoj svakog djeteta u skladu s njegovim sposobnostima. Različitosti među učenicima smatraju se kao poticaj u učenju i sudjelovanju u nastavnom procesu, a ne kao prepreka. Proces nastave i učenja usmjeren je na uvažavanje i prihvaćanje različitosti kod učenika. Inkluzija djece s teškoćama u vrtiće i redovne škole prvi je korak u njihovu uključivanju u šire društvo te se na taj način smanjuje njihovo etiketiranje i prihvaća ih se kao „normalne" članove društva. Ključno je da stavovi okoline prema odgojno-obrazovnoj inkluziji budu pozitivni jer se prihvaćeni zakoni nikada ne mogu ostvarivati sami po sebi. Prema Igrić i sur. (2015, str. 160) „sustav oblika potpore na razini škole podrazumijeva jedan *inkluzivni dizajn* koji se odnosi na materijalno-tehničku, kadrovsko-organizacijsku, psihološko-pedagošku, didaktičko-metodičku i socijalnu pripremljenost škole za školovanje svih učenika."

Spoznaje iz domaće literature sugeriraju da za rad s učenicima s teškoćama učitelji i nastavnici nisu dobro pripremljeni, a često nemaju ključno potrebnu suradničku pomoć edukacijsko-rehabilitacijskog stručnjaka, posebno u srednjim školama u RH (Karamatić Brčić, 2013; Žic Ralić i Ljubas, 2013). Problemi s kojima se suočavaju učitelji i stručni suradnici rješavaju se profesionalnim usavršavanjem u području onih kompetencija koje nisu stekli tijekom formalnog obrazovanja, fleksibilnim prilagođavanjem nastavnih planova i programa te osiguravanjem dodatnog vremena za provedbu individualizacije. Jedan od nedostataka je nedovoljna povezanost odgojno-obrazovnih djelatnika s različitih razina odgojno-obrazovnog sustava, što uzrokuje neadekvatan protok informacija o djetetu/učeniku (Ljubić i Kiš-Glavaš, 2003). Također, još su uvijek prisutni nedostatni organizacijski i objektivni uvjeti poput

[1] Termin „učitelji" označava sve odgojno-obrazovne djelatnike u osnovnim i srednjim školama, osim kada se uspoređuje odgojno-obrazovne djelatnike osnovnih i srednjih škola. U tom slučaju termin „učitelji" koristi se za djelatnike osnovnih, a „nastavnici" za djelatnike srednjih škola.

nedostatka odgovarajućih stručnih suradnika, velikog broja djece u skupinama ili odjelima, loša materijalna opremljenost, opterećenja nastavnim planom i programom, pritisak zbog vanjskog vrednovanja i općenito učestala testiranja učenika u školi. Nadalje, istraživanja na hrvatskim učiteljima pokazuju njihove pozitivne stavove prema inkluziji, ali i zabrinutost zbog brojnih negativnih efekata uključivanja učenika s teškoćama u redovni odgojno-obrazovni sustav.

Da bi se provedba inkluzije što uspješnije ostvarila, potrebna je organizacijska, materijalna i stručna potpora učiteljima. Međutim, ta potpora nekad izostaje ili nije cjelovita, zbog čega se učitelji ne smatraju dovoljno kompetentnima u radu s tim učenicima. Kako bi se njihova kompetentnost povećala, potrebno je njihovo stručno usavršavanje, ali na način njihova osposobljavanja za prijenos stečenih kompetencija u odgojno-obrazovnu praksu i njihov daljnji samostalan razvoj. Acedo (2008) stoga navodi da su potrebe za razvojem kompetencija nastavnika za inkluzivnu nastavu samo donekle zadovoljene. Nastavnici imaju osnovna znanja i vještine potrebne za personalizirane pristupe nastavi te u svom svakodnevnom radu prilagođavaju kurikule određenim učenicima koristeći se različitim oblicima procjene, međutim, svjesni su da im je potrebno dodatno osposobljavanje u osmišljavanju i provođenju individualizirane nastave putem cjeloživotnog učenja i stručnog usavršavanja.

Prema Ivančić (2010, str. 7) za „kvalitetnu primjenu obrazovne inkluzije potrebna je promjena u našim stavovima, uvjerenjima, znanjima i umijećima pomoću kojih razumijevamo različite potrebe učenika." Razvijanje svijesti o prihvaćanju različitosti kod učenika i mijenjanje stavova prema njima važan je preduvjet za uspješnu provedbu inkluzije u školi. Prema nekim autorima stavovi nastavnika o inkluziji smatraju se najvažnijom preprekom za njezinu uspješnu provedbu (Sebba i Sachev, 1997). Oni se mijenjaju nabolje ako je nastavnik u svojoj praksi imao iskustvo rada s tim učenicima, a negativni su ako nastavnici rad s tim učenicima osjećaju nametnutim, osjećaju nedovoljnu kompetentnost u radu i sl. (Mittler, 2006).

Iako je inkluzija više zaživjela u osnovnim nego u srednjim školama, prema Ljubić i Kiš-Glavaš (2003) osnovnoškolski nastavnici iskazuju negativnije stavove prema inkluzivnom uključivanju učenika. Učitelji s većim iskustvom rada s učenicima s posebnim potrebama svjesniji su brojnih nedostataka u praktičnoj provedbi inkluzije, zbog čega su potrebna daljnja istraživanja analize njezinih objektivnih, subjektivnih i organizacijskih preduvjeta. Osnovnoškolski učitelji smatraju da je škola ta koja se mora pripremiti za prihvat učenika s posebnim potrebama, ne misle da učenik s teškoćama loše djeluje na uspjeh razrednog odjela i posebno ističu potrebu zapošljavanja edukacijsko-rehabilitacijskog stručnjaka u redovne škole.

„Neka istraživanja utvrdila su da nastavnici imaju različitu koncepciju u odnosu na vrste teškoća u razvoju, imaju manja očekivanja u odnosu na učenike s teškoćama, negativne stereotipe te se prema učenicima s teškoćama ponašaju negativnije nego prema vršnjacima tipičnog razvoja" (Leutar i Frantal, 2006). Što se tiče pomoćnika u nastavi, učitelji naglašavaju da njihova prisutnost pozitivno djeluje na učenike pa ih

učitelji procjenjuju kao veliko olakšanje i pomoć (Ivančić, 2010; Krampač-Grljušić, Žic Ralić i Lisak, 2010).

Kao i u Hrvatskoj, u Sjevernoj Irskoj kao glavni razlog otpora inkluziji učitelji navode njihov nedostatak kompetencija (Ivančić i Stančić, 2013), a u Australiji je to dodatni individualni rad s učenicima s teškoćama (Forlin, 2012). Učitelji u Norveškoj kao veliku pomoć u radu s tim učenicima ističu dodatne edukacije koje im pomažu u praktičnom radu, planiranju i poučavanju (Tangen, 2005). Iz svega navedenog vidi se da učitelji u Hrvatskoj uglavnom dijele stavove o obrazovnoj inkluziji sa svojim europskim kolegama.

Cilj, problemi i hipoteze istraživanja

Osnovni cilj ovog istraživanja bio je procjena provedbe inkluzivne prakse učitelja i nastavnika osnovnih i srednjih škola kako bi se utvrdilo sadašnje stanje, objasnilo njihove razloge u suodnosu s rezultatima sličnih istraživanja, a sve u smjeru teorijskih postavki za promjene nabolje.

Iz ovog cilja istraživanja proizašli su sljedeći problemi:

1. Ispitati kako učitelji i nastavnici Ličko-senjske županije procjenjuju provedbu odgojno-obrazovne inkluzije?
2. Ispitati razlike u procjenama provedbe inkluzije između učitelja osnovnih i nastavnika srednjih škola Ličko-senjske županije?
3. Ispitati doprinos nekih socio-demografskih obilježja učitelja (kao prediktora) procjenama provedbe odgojno-obrazovne inkluzije (kao kriterija)?

U skladu s postojećim teorijskim spoznajama i dosadašnjim rezultatima istraživanja postavljene se sljedeće hipoteze:

H1: Učitelji imaju pozitivnu procjenu provedbe odgojno-obrazovne inkluzije.

H2: Učitelji izražavaju nesigurnost u pogledu uključivanja učenika s teškoćama u razvoju u redovni odgojno-obrazovni sustav zbog njihova dodatnog radnog opterećenja i obveza te njihove kompetentnosti, što može pogoršati njihove ukupne razredne rezultate.

H3: Postoji značajna razlika u procjeni provedbe odgojno-obrazovne inkluzije između učitelja osnovnih škola i nastavnika srednjih škola u korist učitelja osnovnih škola.

H4: Postoje značajne razlike u procjeni provedbe inkluzije s obzirom na dob, godine radnog staža, stručnu spremu, dodatno inkluzivno obrazovanje, podršku škole, suradnju učitelja sa stručno-razvojnom službom u školi i stručnjacima izvan škole i dr. Učitelji koji su završili VSS, s manje godina radnog staža, koji su slušali kolegije o inkluzivnom obrazovanju za vrijeme studija i oni koji su se dodatno obrazovali o toj temi, koji bolje surađuju sa stručno-razvojnom službom i imaju podršku ravnatelja škole te oni koji su tijekom radnog iskustva imali učenike s teškoćama u razvoju pozitivnije procjenjuju provedbu odgojno-obrazovne inkluzije.

Metode

Sudionici istraživanja

Istraživanje je provedeno na uzorku od 197 sudionika istraživanja (prosječne dobi M=40,3; SD=1,73), 155 učitelja razredne i predmetne nastave iz osnovnih škola (78,68%) i 42 nastavnika iz srednjih škola (21,32%) Ličko-senjske županije.

Mjerni instrumenti

Upitnik o procjeni inkluzivne odgojno-obrazovne prakse

Upitnik o procjeni inkluzivne odgojno-obrazovne prakse autorica Kudek Mirošević i Jurčević Lozančić (2014) ima 37 tvrdnji. Odgovore na tvrdnje u upitniku sudionici istraživanja daju na peterostupanjskoj ordinalnoj skali Likertova tipa s vrijednostima: 1 – nikada, 2 – rijetko, 3 – ponekad, 4 – često, 5 – redovito. Pouzdanost upitnika izračunatog u istraživanju Kudek Mirošević i Jurčević Lozančić (2014) procijenjena na temelju izračuna koeficijenta pouzdanosti tipa unutarnje konzistencije – Cronbah alpha iznosi 0,78, a u ovom istraživanju iznosi 0,73, čime se potvrđuje zadovoljavajuća pouzdanost ovog upitnika. Upitnik mjeri 6 latentnih dimenzija ili faktora: 1) Uključivanje učenika s teškoćama u sustav odgoja i obrazovanja (primjer čestice: *Smatram da učenici s teškoćama trebaju polaziti redovne odgojno-obrazovne ustanove s vršnjacima bez teškoća*); 2) Metodičko-didaktički aspekti rada (odabiranje adekvatnih metoda/načina rada) (primjer čestice: *Odabirem, primjenjujem i prilagođavam metode rada pojedinačnim potrebama učenika*); 3) Prihvaćanje učenika s teškoćama od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja (primjer čestice: *Učenici bez teškoća nisu tolerantni prema učenicima s teškoćama*); 4) Kompetentnost u radu s učenicima s teškoćama i njihovim roditeljima (primjer čestice: *Smatram da mi je potrebno još dodatnih edukacija za stjecanje kompetencija u radu s učenicima s teškoćama*); 5) Primjena individualiziranih odgojno-obrazovnih programa (primjer čestice: *Smatram da sam dovoljno educiran/a za rad s učenicima s teškoćama)*; 6) Stručno usavršavanje i suradnja u okviru odgojno-obrazovne ustanove (primjer čestice: *U mojoj ustanovi organiziramo različite oblike cjeloživotnog obrazovanja*).

Anketni list

Anketnim listom prikupljen je niz podataka o učiteljima: spol, dob, stručna sprema, broj učenika u razredu, obrazovanje za inkluzivni rad u studiju i/ili iskustvo rada u školi, dosadašnje iskustvo rada s tim učenicima, potpora škole inkluziji, suradnja s roditeljima i stručno-razvojnom službom škole.

Postupak istraživanja

Istraživanje je provedeno u šk. god. 2016./2017. tako da su *Upitnik* i *Anketni list podataka* poslani u svih 15 osnovnih i 5 srednjih škola Ličko-senjske županije[2], a

[2] Prema Državnom zavodu za statistiku iz 2016., u osnovnim školama Ličko-senjske županije 2015. godine bilo je 456 učitelja, a u srednjim školama 308 nastavnika.

istraživačima su vraćeni popunjeni *Upitnici* i *Anketni listovi* iz 11 osnovnih i 3 srednje škole. Prethodno je dobivena suglasnost *Stručnog vijeća Odjela za nastavničke studije u Gospiću Sveučilišta u Zadru*, a ravnateljima škola poštom je upućena zamolba za sudjelovanje učitelja u ovom istraživanju. Nakon suglasnosti nastavničkih vijeća škola koje su sudjelovale u istraživanju istraživači su upitnike učiteljima dali na popunjavanje na sljedećim nastavničkim vijećima. Popunjavanje upitnika je trajalo oko 40 minuta te je bilo u skladu s Etičkim kodeksom provedbe istraživanja.

Rezultati

Podatci su obrađeni uz pomoć računalnog paketa *Statistica 13* za statističku obradu podataka. Najprije su izračunati temeljni deskriptivni pokazatelji za ispitani uzorak učitelja.

Tablica 1

Iz Tablice 1 vidi se da je raspon vrijednosti gotovo na svim česticama maksimalan (1-5), što implicira da čestice dobro pokrivaju spektar odgovora: od krajnje negativne do krajnje pozitivne percepcije učitelja o provedbi inkluzije kao predmetu mjerenja. S obzirom na specifičnosti distribucije većina varijabli je blago negativno asimetrična, što na skali implicira *preferenciju učitelja i nastavnika prema pozitivnim vrijednostima percepcije obrazovne inkluzije*. Kada je riječ o spljoštenosti distribucije (kurtosis), većina je čestica blago platikurtična (kurtosis s negativnim vrijednostima), što implicira veću disperziju rezultata oko aritmetičke sredine, odnosno spljoštenu distribuciju. Vrijednosti mjera centralne tendencije ukazuju na to da *većina učitelja i nastavnika uglavnom ima pozitivnu percepciju prema obrazovnoj inkluziji*, čime je potvrđena prva hipoteza.

Iz Tablice 2 vidi se da je uzorak učitelja osnovnih škola, kao i nastavnika srednjih škola, pretežno ženskog spola, dobi između 35 i 55 godina, pretežno VSS-e, odnosno završenog 4-godišnjeg stručnog ili sveučilišnog studija, uglavnom s 15 – 25 učenika u razredu, što je u skladu s rezultatima OECD-ova istraživanja TALIS 2013. provedenog u RH (NSZSSH, 2013). U uzorku učitelja osnovnih škola najviše je onih razredne nastave i humanističkog profila, većina ih nije imala kolegij(e) o obrazovanju učenika s teškoćama za vrijeme studija, međutim, to su obrazovanje uglavnom stekli iskustvom rada u školi. Većina učitelja je do sada imala iskustvo rada s tim učenicima. U uzorku nastavnika srednjih škola pretežno je onih prirodoslovnog profila, za vrijeme obrazovanja na studiju uglavnom nisu slušali kolegij(e) vezan(e) uz obrazovanje učenika s teškoćama, kao što se s tom temom nisu puno susretali ni za vrijeme obrazovanja tijekom iskustva rada u školi. Dosadašnje iskustvo rada s tim učenicima im je slabije. Potpora škole učiteljima i nastavnicima u radu s tim učenicima uglavnom je umjerena, suradnja s roditeljima i stručno-razvojnom službom škole za potrebe rada s tim učenicima uglavnom je ostvarena, a suradnja sa stručnjacima izvan škole uglavnom nije.

Potom su provedene korelacijske analize kojima su ispitane povezanosti pokazatelja procjene inkluzivne prakse, kao i povezanosti pokazatelja procjene inkluzivne prakse s nekim socio-demografskim podatcima učitelja i nastavnika.

Tablica 2

Osnovni deskriptivni rezultati socio-demografskih karakteristika učitelja osnovnih škola i nastavnika srednjih škola

Karakteristike učitelja	OSNOVNA ŠKOLA					SREDNJA ŠKOLA				
	N	M	SD	Min	Max	N	M	SD	Min	Max
Spol	155	1,73	0,445	1	2	42	1,79	0,410	1	2
Dob	155	1,83	0,731	1	3	42	1,52	0,663	1	2
Stručna sprema	155	2,11	0,802	1	4	42	2,40	0,758	1	4
Broj učenika u razredu	155	1,57	0,547	1	3	42	1,88	0,324	1	2
Profil učitelja	155	2,17	1,265	1	5	42	2,76	0,811	1	4
Inkluzivno obrazovanje na studiju	155	1,63	0,484	1	2	42	1,71	0,452	1	2
Inkluzivno obrazovanje iskustvom	155	1,34	0,476	1	2	42	1,60	0,491	1	2
Dosadašnje iskustvo rada s učenicima s teškoćama	155	1,12	0,321	1	2	42	1,19	0,393	1	2
Sadašnje iskustvo rada s učenicima s teškoćama	155	1,35	0,478	1	2	42	1,36	0,474	1	2
Potpora škole u radu s učenicima s teškoćama	155	2,25	0,565	1	3	42	1,91	0,569	1	3
Suradnja s roditeljima	155	1,21	0,406	1	2	42	1,26	0,430	1	2
Suradnja sa stručno-razvojnom službom	155	1,03	0,305	1	2	42	1,12	0,324	1	2
Suradnja sa stručnjacima izvan škole	155	1,61	0,490	1	2	42	1,71	0,432	1	2

Legenda: spol: M – 1, Ž – 2; dob: od 25 do 35 god. – 1, od 35 do 55 g. – 2 , od 55 do 65 g. – 3; stručna sprema: VŠS – 1, VSS (četverogodišnji studij) – 2, VSS (petogodišnji studij) – 3, magisterij ili doktorat – 4; broj učenika u razredu: < 15 – 1, od 15 do 25 – 2, od 25 do 35 – 3; profil nastavnika: učitelj razredne nastave – 1, nastavnik humanističkog profila – 2, nastavnik društvenog profila – 3, nastavnik prirodoslovnog profila – 4, nastavnik umjetničkog profila – 5; inkluzivno obrazovanje na studiju: da – 1, ne – 2; inkluzivno obrazovanje iskustvom: da – 1, ne – 2; dosadašnje iskustvo rada s učenicima s teškoćama: da – 1, ne – 2; sadašnje iskustvo rada s tim učenicima: da – 1, ne – 2; potpora škole: slaba – 1, umjerena – 2, jaka – 3; suradnja s roditeljima: da – 1, ne – 2; suradnja sa stručno-razvojnom službom škole: da – 1, ne – 2; suradnja sa stručnjacima izvan škole: da – 1, ne – 2.

Tablica 3

Dobiveni rezultati u Tablici 3 pokazuju statistički značajne korelacije (Pearsonov koeficijent korelacije), od niskih do umjerenih između *faktora 1*: Uključivanje učenika s teškoćama u razvoju u sustav odgoja i obrazovanja i *faktora 3*: Prihvaćanje tih učenika od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja ($r = 0,37$; $p < 0,05$), što znači da su većim uključivanjem tih učenika u odgojno-obrazovni sustav oni bolje prihvaćeni od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja; *faktora 2*: Metodičko-didaktički aspekti rada i *faktora 4*: Kompetentnost u radu s tim učenicima i njihovim roditeljima ($r = 0,40$; $p < 0,05$), kao i *faktora 5*: Primjena individualiziranih programa ($r = 0,53$; $p < 0,05$) i *faktora 6*: Stručno usavršavanje i suradnja ($r = 0,40$; $p < 0,05$), što znači da boljim metodičko-didaktičkim oblikovanjem nastave u radu s tim učenicima, učitelji pozitivnije procjenjuju vlastitu kompetentnost u radu s njima, individualizaciju programa, stručno usavršavanje i suradnju u okviru ustanove. *Faktor 1*: Uključivanje učenika s teškoćama u sustav odgoja i obrazovanja nisko je negativno statistički značajno povezan s *faktorom 2*: Metodičko-didaktički aspekti rada ($r = - 0,16$; $p < 0,05$), što znači da su većim uključivanjem tih učenika u sustav odgoja i obrazovanja procjene metodičko-didaktičkih aspekata rada negativnije. *Faktor 1*: Uključivanje učenika s teškoćama u sustav odgoja i obrazovanja nisko je negativno statistički značajno povezan s *faktorom 4*: Kompetentnost u radu s tim učenicima i njihovim roditeljima ($r = - 0,20$; $p < 0,05$) i *faktorom 5*: Primjena individualiziranih programa ($r = - 0,26$; $p < 0,05$), što znači da većim uključivanjem tih učenika, procjene kompetentnosti učitelja postaju negativnije, a primjena individualiziranih programa manja. *Faktor 2*: Metodičko-didaktički aspekti rada neznatno je negativno povezan s *faktorom 3*: Prihvaćanje učenika s teškoćama od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja ($r = - 0,19$; $p < 0,05$), što znači da većim metodičko-didaktičkim oblikovanjem nastave za te učenike, procjene njihova prihvaćanja od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja postaju negativnije. *Faktor 3*: Prihvaćanje tih učenika od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja statistički je značajno, nisko i negativno povezan s *faktorom 4*: Kompetentnost u radu s tim učenicima i njihovim roditeljima ($r = - 0,15$; $p < 0,05$), što ukazuje na to da što je veće prihvaćanje tih učenika od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja, procjene kompetentnosti učitelja u radu s njima su negativnije. *Faktor 4*: Kompetentnost u radu s učenicima s teškoćama i njihovim roditeljima statistički je značajno nisko povezan s *faktorom 5*: Primjena individualiziranih programa ($r = 0,31$; $p < 0,05$) i *faktorom 6*: Stručno usavršavanje i suradnja ($r = 0,26$; $p < 0,05$), što znači da se učitelji procjenjuju kompetentnijima u radu s tim učenicima što više primjenjuju individualizirane programe i što se više usavršavaju i surađuju. *Faktor 5*: Primjena individualiziranih programa statistički je značajno umjereno pozitivno povezan s *faktorom 6*: Stručno usavršavanje i suradnja ($r = 0,54$; $p < 0,05$), što znači da učitelji koji više primjenjuju individualizirane programe, imaju i pozitivnije procjene vlastitog usavršavanja i suradnje.

Tablica 4

Koeficijenti korelacije (Spearmanov r_s) između faktora Upitnika o procjeni inkluzivne prakse i nekih socio-demografskih podataka učitelja

Faktori	Spol	Dob	Stručna sprema	Broj učenika u razredu	Profil nastavnika	Obrazovanje na studiju
F1	-0,12	0,16*	-0,15*	0,10	-0,11	0,08
F2	0,18*	0,00	-0,01	0,01	-0,15*	-0,15*
F3	0,01	0,11	-0,14*	0,06	-0,04	0,06
F4	0,01*	0,07	0,07	0,01	0,01	-0,10
F5	-0,00	-0,10	0,02	0,08	-0,03	-0,29*
F6	-0,04	-0,01	-0,05	0,03	0,05	-0,15*

Faktori	Obrazovanje iskustvom rada u školi	Dosadašnje iskustvo	Sadašnje iskustvo	Potpora škole
F1	0,09	0,10	0,04	-0,12*
F2	-0,22*	-0,21*	0,02	0,27*
F3	0,13	-0,04	0,00	-0,19*
F4	-0,16*	-0,16*	-0,13	0,18*
F5	-0,38*	-0,13	-0,05	0,35*
F6	-0,32*	0,09	-0,16*	0,52*

N = 197; p < 0,05;

Legenda: F1: Uključivanje učenika s teškoćama u sustav odgoja i obrazovanja, F2: Metodičko-didaktički aspekti rada, M3: Prihvaćanje učenika s teškoćama od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja, M4: Kompetentnost u radu s učenicima s teškoćama i njihovim roditeljima, M5: Primjena individualiziranih odgojno-obrazovnih programa, M6: Stručno usavršavanje i suradnja u okviru odgojno-obrazovne ustanove; spol: M – 1, Ž – 2; dob: od 25 do 35 god. – 1, od 35 do 55 g. – 2, od 55 do 65 g. – 3; radni staž: do 5. g. – 1, od 5 do 25 – 2; > 25 g. – 3; stručna sprema: VŠS – viša šk. ili trogodišnji stručni studij – 1, VSS – četverogodišnji stručni ili sveučilišni studij – 2, VSS – petogodišnji sveučilišni studij – 3, magisterij ili doktorat – 4; broj učenika u razredu: < 15 – 1, od 15 do 25 – 2, od 25 do 35 – 3; profil nastavnika: učitelji razredne nastave – 1, nastavnik humanističkog profila – 2, nastavnik društvenog profila – 3, nastavnik prirodoslovnog profila – 4, nastavnik umjetničkog profila – 5; obrazovanje na studiju o radu s učenicima s teškoćama: da – 1, ne – 2; obrazovanje iskustvom rada u školi: da – 1, ne – 2; dosadašnje iskustvo rada s tim učenicima: da – 1, ne – 2; sadašnje iskustvo rada s ovim učenicima: da – 1, ne – 2; potpora škole u radu s tim učenicima: slaba – 1, umjerena – 2, jaka – 3.

Dobiveni rezultati u Tablici 4 pokazuju statistički značajne korelacije između metodičko-didaktičkih aspekata rada učitelja i slabijeg obrazovanja učitelja o radu s učenicima s teškoćama u razvoju iskustvo rada u školi (r_s = -0,22; p < 0,05), kao i slabijeg dosadašnjeg iskustva rada s tim učenicima u školi (r_s = -0,22; p < 0,05) te veće potpore škole u radu s tim učenicima (r_s = 0,27; p < 0,05). Također, statistički značajne korelacije pokazuju se između primjene individualiziranih programa i slabijeg obrazovanja na studiju o radu s tim učenicima (r_s = -0,29; p < 0,05), kao i slabijeg obrazovanja iskustvom rada u školi (r_s = -0,38; p < 0,05) te, s druge strane, veće potpore škole (r_s = 0,35; p < 0,05). Statistički značajne korelacije pokazuju se i između stručnog usavršavanja i suradnje, kao i slabijeg obrazovanja o radu s tim učenicima iskustvom rada u školi (r_s = -0,32; p < 0,05) te, s druge strane, veće potpore škole (r_s = 0,52; p < 0,05). Iz rezultata je vidljivo da je djelomično potvrđena druga hipoteza. Ostale statistički značajne, ali niske korelacije, prikazane su u Tablici 4.

Razlike u procjenama provedbe obrazovne inkluzije između učitelja osnovnih i nastavnika srednjih škola izračunate su uz pomoć *t-testa* za velike nezavisne uzorke (Tablica 5).

Tablica 5
Razlika u procjeni provedbe obrazovne inkluzije između učitelja osnovnih škola i nastavnika srednjih škola Ličko-senjske županije

FAKTORI	OŠ			SŠ			t-test	df
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD		
F1: Uključivanje učenika s teškoćama u sustav odgoja i obrazovanja	155	3,00	0,636	42	3,00	0,599	0,00	195
F2: Metodičko-didaktički aspekti rada	155	4,26	0,477	42	3,98	0,639	3,12*	195
F3: Prihvaćanje učenika s teškoćama od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja	155	2,66	0,517	42	2,72	0,468	0,66	195
F4: Kompetentnost u radu s učenicima s teškoćama i njihovim roditeljima	155	3,90	0,437	42	3,77	0,489	1,59	195
F5: Primjena individualiziranih odgojno-obrazovnih programa	155	3,30	0,768	42	2,72	0,844	4,29*	195
F6: Stručno usavršavanje i suradnja u okviru odgojno-obrazovne ustanove	155	3,55	0,730	42	2,93	0,721	4,85*	195

Legenda: N – broj sudionika; M – aritmetičke sredine; SD – standardna devijacija; t-test – (za velike nezavisne uzorke) – testiranje značajnosti razlike između dviju aritmetičkih sredina; df – broj sudionika po grupama; p<0.05 – vjerojatnost

Iz Tablice 5 vidi se da su statistički značajne razlike u procjeni provedbe obrazovne inkluzije između učitelja osnovnih škola i nastavnika srednjih škola Ličko-senjske županije na *faktoru 2*: Metodičko-didaktički aspekti rada (*t-test* = 3,12; *df* = 195; $p < 0,05$), na *faktoru 5*: Primjena individualiziranih programa (*t-test* = 4,29; *df* = 195; $p < 0,05$) i *faktoru 6*: Stručno usavršavanje i suradnja (*t-test* = 4,85; *df* = 195; $p < 0,05$). Učitelji iz osnovnih škola statistički značajno pozitivnije procjenjuju upotrebu adekvatnih metoda i načina rada s učenicima, primjenu individualiziranih programa, stručno usavršavanje i suradnju u odnosu na nastavnike srednjih škola. Iz navedenih rezultata vidljivo je da je potvrđena treća hipoteza.

Da bi se ispitao doprinos nekih socio-demografskih obilježja učitelja (kao prediktora) objašnjenju *procjenama provedbe obrazovne inkluzije učitelja* (kao kriterija), provedene su hijerarhijske logističke regresijske analize u kojima je kao prediktor u prvom koraku uvršteno *obrazovanje učitelja o radu s učenicima s teškoćama u razvoju*, a kao dodatni prediktori u drugom koraku dodani su *dinamika rada škole* i u trećem koraku *socio-demografske karakteristike učitelja* (Tablica 6).

Tablica 6

Rezultati hijerarhijske regresijske analize sa 6 faktora procjene provedbe obrazovne inkluzije (kao kriterija) i nekih socio-demografskih varijabli učitelja (kao prediktora)

Kriteriji	Uključivanje učenika s teškoćama u sustav odgoja i obrazovanja	Metodičko-didaktički aspekti rada	Prihvaćanje učenika s teškoćama od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja	Kompetencije u radu s učenicima s teškoćama i njihovim roditeljima	Primjena individualiziranih odgojno-obrazovnih programa	Stručno usavršavanje i suradnja u okviru odgojno-obrazovne ustanove
Prediktori	β	β	β	β	β	β
1. korak						
Završeno obrazovanje	**-0,15***	-0,02	**-0,15***	-0,06	-0,00	-0,05
Obrazovanje na studiju	0,03	-0,11	0,00	-0,05	**-0,21****	-0,08
Obraz. iskustvom rada	0,09	**-0,19****	0,13	-0,14	**-0,32****	**-0,30****
R=	0,18	0,24	0,19	0,17	0,43	0,33
R^2=	0,03	0,06	0,04	0,03	0,18	0,11
Adjusted R^2	0,02	0,04	0,23	0,02	0,17	0,10
F $(_{3,193})$	2.,20*	3,86*	2,51*	2,03	14,47**	7,88*
2. korak						
Završeno obrazovanje	**-0,19****	0,04	**-0,15***	-0,01	0,06	-0,01
Obrazovanje na studiju	0,00	-0,09	0,00	-0,02	**-0,16****	-0,03
Obraz. iskustvom rada	0,07	-0,14	0,11	-0,10	**-0,30****	**-0,25****
Broj učenika u razredu	0,12	-0,01	0,08	-0,01	0,06	-0,01
Potpora škole	-0,10	**0,23****	**-0,27****	0,16	**0,21****	**0,42****
Suradnja sa stručnjacima izvan šk.	0,05	-0,08	-0,07	0,02	-0,04	0,03
R=	0,33	0,40	0,31	0,34	0,58	0,63
R^2=	0,11	0,17	0,10	0,03	0,18	0,39
Adjusted R^2	0,06	0,12	0,05	0,16	0,17	0,36
F $(_{10,186})$	2,31*	3,73*	1,98*	2,03	9,22**	11,93**
3. korak						
Spol	-0,13	0,12	0,01	-0,02	-0,10	-0,06
Dob	0,08	0,05	0,00	0,10	0,01	0,03
Završeno obrazovanje	-0,13	0,04	-0,15	0,04	0,08	0,02
Broj učenika u razredu	**-0,16***	-0,02	0,07	-0,05	0,07	-0,03
Profil nastavnika	**-0,18****	-0,07	-0,03	0,06	0,01	0,05
Obrazovanje na studiju	-0,01	-0,07	0,01	-0,05	**-0,17****	-0,04
Obraz. iskustvom rada	0,05	-0,12	0,12	-0,10	**-0,31****	**-0,25****
Dosadašnje iskustvo	0,06	**-0,17***	-0,07	-0,04	-0,00	0,09
Sadašnje iskustvo	0,03	0,10	0,01	-0,11	-0,01	**-0,16***
Potpora škole	-0,09	**0,25****	**-0,26****	**-0,19****	**0,21****	**0,41****
Suradnja s roditeljima	0,05	-0,03	-0,00	0,06	**-0,17****	**-0,13***
Suradnja sa stručno-razvojnom službom	0,05	0,04	-0,00	0,00	0,06	-0,07
R=	0,40	0,46	0,32	0,37	0,58	0,65
R^2=	0,16	0,22	0,10	0,14	0,34	0,42
Adjusted R^2	0,09	0,15	0,03	0,69	0,29	0,37
F $(_{15,181})$	2,27*	3,31*	1,37*	1,96*	6,24**	8,73*

N= 197; *p<0,05; **p<0,01

Da bi se ispitao doprinos nekih socio-demografskih obilježja učitelja (kao prediktora) procjenama provedbe obrazovne inkluzije (kao kriterija), provedene su hijerarhijske logističke regresijske analize. Iz *Tablice 6* vidi se da imamo tri bloka unosa varijabli, za svaki blok varijabli navedene su iste informacije. Nakon uvođenja tri prediktora u 1. koraku vezanih uz *obrazovanje učitelja* (stupanj završenog formalnog obrazovanja, obrazovanje za rad s tim učenicima za vrijeme studija i obrazovanje iskustvom rada u školi) multipla korelacija je $R = 0,18$ i ovaj set prediktora značajno pridonosi 3% objašnjenja svih kriterija procjene provedbe inkluzivne prakse ($R^2 = 0,03$). Kao značajni prediktori pokazali su se: *završeni stupanj obrazovanja* ($\beta = -0,15$; $p < 0,05$) za 1. kriterij *Uključivanja učenika s teškoćama u sustav odgoja i obrazovanja*, što znači da učitelji s manjim stupnjem formalnog obrazovanja imaju pozitivnije procjene uključivanja učenika s teškoćama u razvoju u sustav odgoja i obrazovanja; *obrazovanje učitelja iskustvom* rada u školi ($\beta = -0,19$; $p < 0,01$) za 2. kriterij *Metodičko-didaktički aspekti rada*; *obrazovanje učitelja za rad s učenicima s teškoćama tijekom studija* ($\beta = -0,21$; $p < 0,01$) i *obrazovanje učitelja* za rad s tim učenicima *iskustvom rada u školi* ($\beta = -0,32$; $p < 0,01$) za 5. kriterij *Primjena individualiziranih programa*, što znači da učitelji koji su manje obrazovani tijekom studija ili iskustvom rada u školi za rad s tim učenicima imaju pozitivnije procjene primjene individualiziranih programa; *obrazovanje učitelja iskustvom rada u školi* ($\beta = -0,30$; $p < 0,01$) za 6. kriterij *Stručno usavršavanje i suradnju*, što znači da manje obrazovani učitelji za rad s tim učenicima iskustvom rada u školi imaju pozitivnije procjene stručnog usavršavanja i suradnje. U 2. koraku uz prediktore iz 1. koraka unesen je još set prediktora vezanih uz *dinamiku rada škole* (broj učenika u razredu, potpora škole, suradnja s roditeljima, suradnja sa stručno-razvojnom službom i suradnja sa stručnjacima izvan škole) te je $R = 0,33$, odnosno dodavanjem tih varijabli moguće je objasniti dodatnih 8% varijance kriterija, odnosno prediktori zajedno iz 1. i 2. koraka objašnjavaju 11% varijance kriterija. Pojedinačni značajni prediktori iz 1. koraka čija je značajnost potvrđena i u 2. koraku su: *završeno obrazovanje* ($\beta = -0,19$; $p < 0,01$) za 1. kriterij *Uključivanje učenika s teškoćama u sustav odgoja i obrazovanja*; *završeno formalno obrazovanje* ($\beta = -0,15$; $p < 0,05$) za 3. kriterij *Prihvaćanje učenika od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja*; *obrazovanje na studiju* ($\beta = -0,16$; $p < 0,01$) i *obrazovanje iskustvom rada u školi* ($\beta = -0,30$; $p < 0,01$) za 5. kriterij *Primjena individualiziranih programa*; *obrazovanje iskustvom rada u školi* ($\beta = -0,25$; $p < 0,01$) za 6. kriterij *Stručno usavršavanje i suradnja*. Učitelji s manjom razinom formalnog obrazovanja imaju pozitivnije procjene uključivanja učenika u odgojno-obrazovni sustav te imaju pozitivnije procjene njihova prihvaćanja od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja. Učitelji koji su tijekom studija ili iskustvom rada u školi manje obrazovani za rad s tim učenicima, imaju pozitivnije procjene primjene individualiziranih programa. Učitelji koji su manje obrazovani iskustvom rada u školi za rad s tim učenicima imaju pozitivnije procjene stručnog usavršavanja i suradnje. U 2. koraku kao značajni prediktori još su se pokazali: *potpora škole tim učenicima* ($\beta = 0,23$; $p < 0,01$) za 2. kriterij *Metodičko-didaktički aspekti rada*, za 3. kriterij *Prihvaćanje tih učenika od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja*, za 5. kriterij *Primjena individualiziranih programa* i za 6. kriterij *Stručno usavršavanje i*

suradnja, što ukazuje na to da s većom potporom škole učitelji pozitivnije procjenjuju metodičko-didaktičko oblikovanje nastave, prihvaćanje tih učenika od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja, primjenu individualiziranih programa, stručno usavršavanje i suradnju. U 3. koraku uz prediktore iz 1. i 2. koraka unesen je još set prediktora vezanih uz *socio-demografske-karakteristike učitelja* (spol, dob, profil nastavnika i iskustvo) te je $R = 0,40$, odnosno dodavanjem tih varijabli moguće objasniti dodatnih 5% varijance kriterija, odnosno prediktori zajedno iz sva tri koraka ukupno objašnjavaju 16% varijance kriterija. Pojedinačni značajni prediktori iz 1. i 2. koraka, čija je značajnost potvrđena i u 3. koraku, su: *obrazovanje o radu s tim učenicima tijekom studija* ($\beta = -0,17$; $p < 0,01$) i *obrazovanje iskustvom rada u školi* ($\beta = -0,31$; $p < 0,01$) za 5. kriterij *Primjena individualiziranih programa*, čime je ponovno potvrđeno da učitelji koji su manje obrazovani za rad s tim učenicima tijekom studija ili iskustvom rada u školi imaju pozitivnije procjene primjene individualiziranih programa; *obrazovanje iskustvom rada u školi* ($\beta = -0,25$; $p < 0,01$) za 6. kriterij *Stručno usavršavanje i suradnja*, čime je potvrđeno da manje obrazovani učitelji za rad s tim učenicima iskustvom rada u školi imaju pozitivnije procjene stručnog usavršavanja i suradnje. U 3. koraku kao značajni prediktori još su se pokazali: *broj učenika u razredu* ($\beta = -0,16$; $p < 0,05$) i *profil učitelja* ($\beta = -0,18$; $p < 0,01$) za 1. kriterij *Uključivanje učenika s teškoćama u sustav odgoja i obrazovanja*, što znači da s manjim brojem učenika u razredu te humanističkim i društvenim profilom nastavnika procjene prema uključivanju tih učenika u sustav postaju pozitivnije; dosadašnje iskustvo ($\beta = -0,17$; $p < 0,05$) i potpora škole ($\beta = 0,25$; $p < 0,01$) za 2. kriterij *Metodičko-didaktički aspekti rada*. *Potpora škole* ($\beta = -0,26$; $p < 0,01$) za 3. kriterij *Prihvaćanje tih učenika od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja*, što znači da s manjom potporom škole tim učenicima učitelji imaju pozitivnije procjene prihvaćanja učenika s teškoćama od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja. *Potpora škole* ($\beta = 0,41$; $p < 0,01$) za 5. kriterij *Primjena individualiziranih programa*, što znači da većom potporom škole učitelji imaju pozitivnije procjene primjene individualiziranih programa i *potpora škole tim učenicima* ($\beta = 0,21$; $p < 0,01$) za 6. kriterij *Stručno usavršavanje i suradnja*, što znači da većom potporom škole učitelji imaju pozitivniju procjenu stručnog usavršavanja i suradnje. Nadalje, *suradnja s roditeljima* ($\beta = -0,19$; $p < 0,01$) za 4. kriterij *Kompetentnost u radu s učenicima s teškoćama i njihovim roditeljima*; *suradnja s roditeljima* ($\beta = -0,17$; $p < 0,01$) za 5. kriterij *Primjena individualiziranih programa* i *suradnja s roditeljima* ($\beta = -0,13$; $p < 0,01$) za 6. kriterij *Stručno usavršavanje i suradnja*, što pokazuje da što je suradnja s roditeljima tih učenika manja, učitelji imaju pozitivniju procjenu kompetentnosti u radu s tim učenicima, primjene individualiziranih programa i stručnog usavršavanja. S tim rezultatima djelomično je potvrđena četvrta hipoteza.

Rasprava

„U odgojno-obrazovnom procesu učenika s teškoćama u razvoju u redovnoj školi, glavnu bi ulogu trebali imati nastavnici, zato dobro pripremljeni, a glavnu bi suradničku pomoć trebali trajno osigurati u radu s edukacijsko-rehabilitacijskim stručnjacima"

(Mustać i Vicić, 1996, str. 52). Zbog toga je osnovni cilj ovog istraživanja bio ispitati kako učitelji i nastavnici osnovnih i srednjih škola Ličko-senjske županije procjenjuju provedbu odgojno-obrazovne inkluzije te je utvrđeno da većina uglavnom ima pozitivnu percepciju njezine provedbe. Međutim, spoznaje iz domaće literature sugeriraju da učitelji i nastavnici nisu dobro pripremljeni za rad s učenicima s teškoćama, a često nemaju ključno potrebnu suradničku pomoć edukacijsko-rehabilitacijskog stručnjaka, osobito u srednjim školama (Karamatić Brčić, 2013; **Žic** Ralić i Ljubas, 2013). Najbogatije zemlje svijeta također nisu uspjele osigurati preduvjete za integraciju te djece, što ostavlja puno prostora za daljnji rad na toj stručnoj problematici (Ljubić i Kiš-Glavaš, 2003). Koncept inkluzivnog obrazovanja u skladu sa socijalnim modelom nije moguć ako odgojno-obrazovni djelatnici nemaju razvijene potrebne stavove, vještine, znanja i motivaciju, odnosno kompetencije i podršku odgojno-obrazovne i društvene okoline (Acedo, 2008; Jones, 2004). Vizek Vidović (2005) stoga naglašava da je obrazovanje i profesionalni razvoj učitelja ključno pitanje u svakoj zemlji koja nastoji unaprijediti odgojno-obrazovni sustav i učiniti ga dostupnijim, prohodnijim i fleksibilnijim. Odgojno-obrazovna inkluzija podrazumijeva primjerenu izobrazbu učitelja i nastavnika na razini inicijalnog obrazovanja, a potom neprestano stručno usavršavanje i cjeloživotno učenje tijekom radnog vijeka. Problemi s kojima se suočavaju učitelji, nastavnici i stručni suradnici rješavaju se profesionalnim usavršavanjem u području onih kompetencija koje nisu stekli tijekom stjecanja temeljne prakse. Za pojedine teškoće potrebna je i posebna specijalizacija te je potrebno fleksibilno prilagođavati nastavni plan i program, kao i osigurati dodatno vrijeme za provedbu individualizacije. Prema Kudek Mirošević i Jurčević Lozančić (2014) učitelji smatraju da imaju nedostatna znanja za rad s učenicima s posebnim potrebama uopće, a postojeća stručna usavršavanja koja su im namijenjena nisu dovoljno praktična. Prema rezultatima OECD-ova istraživanja TALIS 2013., prosječno 63% hrvatskih učitelja radi u školama u kojima nedostaju učitelji za poučavanje učenika s posebnim potrebama (TALIS prosjek iznosi 48%), umjerene su stope sudjelovanja u programima osposobljavanja koji su učiteljima najpotrebniji (46%), a jedan od takvih programa je upravo poučavanje učenika s posebnim potrebama. Prosječno 23% učitelja izvještava o malom ili nikakvom pozitivnom utjecaju programa koji obrađuju teme poučavanja učenika s posebnim potrebama i upravljanja razredom, a 80% učitelja govori o umjerenoj ili velikoj važnosti koja se pridaje temi poučavanja učenika s posebnim potrebama (TALIS prosjek iznosi 82%)(NSZSSH, 2013). Prema Čepić, Tatalović Vorkapić, Lončarić, Anđić, Skočić Mihić, Kalin, i Šteh (2017) hrvatski poput slovenskih učitelja procjenjuju se osposobljenima za inkluzivno poučavanje uz primjenu savjeta stručnih suradnika, primjenu individualiziranih postupaka, suradnju i oblikovanje razrednog ozračja jačanjem socijalnih vještina svih učenika i pozitivnom razrednom disciplinom.

Učitelji i nastavnici iz Ličko-senjske županije povećanje broja učenika s teškoćama u razredu smatraju negativnim čimbenikom jer se time njihova kompetentnost

smanjuje, kao i mogućnost provođenja individualizacije nastave. S druge strane, oni procjenjuju da vlastitu kompetentnost mogu povećati unapređivanjem metodičko-didaktičkog oblikovanja nastave. S povećanjem kompetentnosti lakše primjenjuju individualizaciju nastave koja je nužna u radu s tim učenicima te imaju veću potrebu za dodatnim stručnim usavršavanjem i suradnjom unutar odgojno-obrazovne ustanove. Prepoznaju nužnost pomoći i podrške, kako rehabilitacijsko-edukacijskih stručnjaka, tako i asistenata u nastavi formiranjem posebnih razrednih odjela, posebno za učenike s težim, složenijim dijagnozama. Učitelji prepoznaju da njihovo bolje metodičko-didaktičko oblikovanje nastave, dugotrajnije stručno usavršavanje i suradnja poboljšavaju primjenu individualiziranih programa. Učiteljima je lakše provoditi individualizaciju programa kada se dodatno stručno usavršavaju i metodičko-didaktički prilagođuju pojedinim teškoćama, a kada s druge strane u školi i lokalnoj zajednici postoji suradnja stručnjaka, gdje je učitelj samo jedan od dionika. Kada je potpora škole u radu s tim učenicima veća, učitelji iz osnovnih škola više metodičko-didaktički oblikuju nastavu za potrebe tih učenika. Međutim, kada potpora škole izostaje, procjena samih učitelja o uključivanju tih učenika postaje pozitivnija, a vršnjaci i njihovi roditelji te učenike još bolje prihvaćaju jer izgleda da kada potpora škole (kao cjeline) izostaje, učitelji, učenici i roditelji preuzimaju odgovornost za rad, rast i razvoj učenika s teškoćama u razvoju. Učitelji iz te županije, poput onih iz cijele Hrvatske, pokazuju zabrinutost za odgojno-obrazovni proces ako se veći broj učenika s teškoćama integrira u redovni razred, a s druge strane izostane stručna timska pomoć, kao i podrška škole i lokalne zajednice (Ljubić i Kiš-Glavaš, 2003). Učitelji iz te županije izražavaju jasne stavove o potrebnim programskim, ergonomskim i tehničkim prilagodbama škole za integraciju tih učenika, potrebnoj pomoći zajednice u ostvarenju inkluzivne kulture škole i sl. S druge strane, rezultati istraživanja pokazuju da se većina ispitanih učitelja nije adekvatno obrazovala za rad s tim učenicima u vrijeme formalnog obrazovanja, zbog čega su to iskustvo stjecali tijekom rada u školi. Većina učitelja do sada je imala iskustvo rada s učenicima s teškoćama i to više učitelji iz osnovnih škola u odnosu na nastavnike iz srednjih škola, a potporu škole u radu s njima većina ih procjenjuje umjerenom. Suradnja učitelja s roditeljima i stručno-razvojnom službom škole za potrebe rada s tim učenicima uglavnom je ostvarena, za razliku od suradnje sa stručnjacima izvan škole koja uglavnom nije ostvarena. Rezultati istraživanja pokazuju i to da su učitelji koji su manje obrazovani za rad s tim učenicima, kao i oni s manjim iskustvom rada u školi s njima i oni koji imaju manju potporu škole, više usmjereni na to da svoje „nedostatke" nadoknade metodičko-didaktičkim oblikovanjem nastave. Također, učitelji koji su manje obrazovani za rad s tim učenicima kako tijekom studija, tako i iskustvom rada u školi, uz veću potporu škole, više primjenjuju individualizirane programe. Ponovno kao da individualizacijom programa žele „nadoknaditi" svoje slabije obrazovanje za rad s tim učenicima. Isto tako slabije obrazovanje za rad s tim učenicima žele nadoknaditi stručnim usavršavanjem i boljom suradnjom, koje je također bolje uz veću potporu

škole. Rezultati istraživanja pokazuju da učitelji iz osnovnih škola značajno bolje odabiru adekvatne metode i načine rada s tim učenicima u odnosu na nastavnike iz srednjih škola. Mogući razlozi tome su: veće iskustvo učitelja osnovnih škola u radu s tim učenicima jer neki razredi srednjih škola nemaju integrirane učenike s teškoćama zbog zahtjevnosti i težine programa; fakulteti za obrazovanje učitelja i nastavnika, posebno učitelja razredne nastave, u posljednjih petnaestak godina imaju više kolegija za odgoj i obrazovanje učenika s posebnim potrebama (kako onih s teškoćama, tako i darovitih učenika) i veću satnicu didaktičko-metodičkih kolegija. Prema rezultatima ovog istraživanja učitelji iz osnovnih škola više primjenjuju individualizaciju programa te se više stručno usavršavaju u tom području, što se moglo i očekivati s obzirom na veći broj učenika s teškoćama integriranih u osnovne škole. Ljubić i Kiš-Glavaš (2003) također navode da je i integracija više zaživjela u osnovnim u odnosu na srednje škole u Hrvatskoj. Njezine objektivne i organizacijske pretpostavke više su zadovoljene u osnovnim u odnosu na srednje škole, međutim, nisu u potpunosti zadovoljene, što se vidi i iz ovog istraživanja. Pozitivnije stavove prema inkluziji imaju učitelji koji nisu imali puno iskustva u radu s učenicima s teškoćama, odnosno učitelji vlastitim iskustvom rada s tim učenicima postaju svjedoci brojnih nedostataka u praktičnoj provedbi inkluzije, zbog čega su potrebna daljnja istraživanja analize njihovih objektivnih, subjektivnih i organizacijskih preduvjeta. Kranjčec Mlinarić, Žic Ralić, i Lisak (2016) navode da učitelji iskazuju načelnu potporu procesu inkluzije, ali uočljivo je da se različito nose s tim profesionalnim izazovima. Oni je uglavnom smatraju pozitivnom i dobrom za učenike s teškoćama, kao i za njihove vršnjake tipičnog razvoja. Vidljivo je da na njihovo mišljenje utječe i vrsta teškoće učenika, kao i razredi s velikim brojem učenika, što za posljedicu ima nemogućnost posvećivanja učenicima s teškoćama u njihovu radu. Prema Skočić Mihić, Gabrić i Bošković (2016) postoje značajne razlike u razini slaganja učitelja s tvrdnjom da inkluzivno obrazovanje doprinosi razvoju svih učenika u odnosu na dob, godine radnog staža, vrstu i sadržaj studijskog programa. Oni koji su završili sveučilišni studij, s manje godina radnog staža (mlađi), koji su slušali kolegij(e) o inkluzivnom obrazovanju, iskazuju višu razinu slaganja s tvrdnjom da inkluzivno obrazovanje doprinosi razvoju učenika s teškoćama, kao i razvoju tipičnih vršnjaka. Učitelji koji imaju bolju suradnju i podršku stručnih suradnika i ravnatelja osjećaju se kompetentnije te imaju pozitivnije stavove o inkluziji učenika s teškoćama u redovni odgojno-obrazovni sustav. Oni koji su u dosadašnjem radnom vijeku imali te učenike ili ih trenutno imaju, pozitivnijih su stavova o inkluziji.

Nadalje, u istraživanju je multivarijantnom analizom potvrđeno da učitelji s manjim stupnjem obrazovanja, imaju pozitivnije procjene o uključivanju tih učenika u odgojno-obrazovni sustav i individualizaciju nastave. Oni kao da žele manji stupanj vlastitog obrazovanja „kompenzirati" pozitivnijim procjenama inkluzije, kao i većim nastavnim angažmanom. S obzirom na to da obrazovanje utječe na formiranje stavova, očekivalo se da bi povećanjem obrazovanja, a time i većim brojem kolegija o inkluziji i učenicima s teškoćama u visokoškolskim kurikulima, posebice učiteljskih fakulteta, učitelji i nastavnici trebali razviti pozitivnije stavove prema tim pitanjima. S obzirom

na to da je dobiveni rezultat u suprotnosti s očekivanim, ostaje prostora za njegovu dodatnu provjeru u budućim istraživanjima. Ovi učitelji imaju i pozitivnije stavove prema metodičko-didaktičkim aspektima rada, individualizaciji programa, stručnom usavršavanju i suradnji te pozitivnije procjene prihvaćanja tih učenika od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja. Ponovno kao da se radi o „kompenzaciji", ali i usmjerava neka buduća istraživanja na dodatne provjere tih rezultata. Što je potpora škole tim učenicima veća, učitelji imaju pozitivnije procjene metodičko-didaktičkih aspekata rada, prihvaćanja učenika s teškoćama od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja, primjene individualiziranih odgojno-obrazovnih programa stručnog usavršavanja i suradnje u okviru odgojno-obrazovne ustanove. Što je suradnja s roditeljima manja, učitelji imaju pozitivnije procjene vlastite kompetentnosti u radu s tim učenicima i njihovim roditeljima, čime je potvrđeno da su roditelji učenika s teškoćama nastavnicima ponekad „smetnja" u radu, odnosno oni svojim subjektivnim upletanjima ne dopuštaju objektivnost i profesionalizam učitelja, posebno na nižim razinama obrazovanja. Što je manji broj učenika u razredu i profil nastavnika humanistički i društveni, imaju pozitivnije procjene uključivanja tih učenika u odgojno-obrazovni sustav. Što je dosadašnje iskustvo rada s tim učenicima manje, a potpora škole veća, učitelji imaju pozitivnije procjene metodičko-didaktičkih aspekata rada s njima. Što je potpora škole u radu s tim učenicima manja, učitelji imaju pozitivnije procjene prihvaćanja tih učenika od vršnjaka i njihovih roditelja. Čini se da se izostajanjem potpore škole povećava svijest samih nastavnika, ali i učenika i njihovih roditelja o važnosti inkluzije učenika s teškoćama. Što je potpora škole tim učenicima veća, učitelji imaju pozitivnije procjene primjene individualiziranih programa, stručnog usavršavanja i suradnje. S druge strane, što je suradnja s roditeljima tih učenika manja, učitelji imaju pozitivnije procjene vlastite kompetentnosti u radu s tim učenicima i njihovim roditeljima, kao i primjene individualiziranih programa i stručnog usavršavanja. Kao što je navedeno, profesionalni pristup učitelja tim učenicima zahtijeva objektivan pristup, kao i dodatni angažman i usavršavanje, a roditelji često kompleksnost te problematike ne razumiju i/ili subjektivno pristupaju vlastitom djetetu.

Ograničenja ovog istraživanja odnose se na mali i selekcionirani uzorak, razlike u broju učitelja i nastavnika osnovnih i srednjih škola te upitnička i anketna mjera samoprocjene sa svojim nedostatcima (npr. retrospektivna metoda davanja odgovora, pitanje iskrenosti odgovora). Usprkos nedostatcima istraživanja ono nam daje odgovore na postavljena istraživačka pitanja te ih je moguće uspoređivati s rezultatima drugih istraživanja, ponajprije onima u Republici Hrvatskoj, a sve kao preduvjet daljnjeg razvoja inkluzivne prakse.

Zaključak

Istraživanje o procjeni provedbe obrazovne inkluzije učitelja i nastavnika Ličko-senjske županije, što je vidljivo u *Tablici 1*, pokazalo je da oni uglavnom imaju pozitivne procjene, čime je potvrđena prva hipoteza. Međutim, izražavaju nesigurnost u pogledu sve većeg broja učenika s teškoćama koji se uključuju u redovne razrede, u vezi s roditeljskim upletanjem u profesionalni rad učitelja (posebno na nižim razinama

obrazovanja), čime je djelomično potvrđena druga hipoteza (vidljivo u *Tablici 4*). Provedba odgojno-obrazovne inkluzivne prakse više je zaživjela u osnovnim nego u srednjim školama Ličko-senjske županije, što je vidljivo iz *Tablice 5,* čime je potvrđena treća hipoteza. Istraživanjem je utvrđeno (*Tablica 6*) da odgojno-obrazovnu inkluziju pozitivnije procjenjuju učitelji s manje godina radnog staža (mlađi, što je očekivano), nižeg formalnog obrazovanja i nižeg obrazovanja za rad s učenicima s teškoćama za vrijeme rada u školi (što nije očekivano te otvara prostor daljnjih provjera), kao i oni koji imaju bolju suradnju sa stručno-razvojnom službom škole te podršku škole u radu s tim učenicima (što je očekivano), čime je djelomično potvrđena četvrta hipoteza.