

Socio-Pedagogical Characteristics of Students Who Need Additional Help in Learning and Behaviour Modification: Elements of a School-Based Preventive Program¹

Nataša Vlah, Orjana Marušić Štimac and Iva Galović³

² University of Rijeka, Faculty of Teacher Education, Croatia

³ Primary school "Nikola Tesla", Rijeka, Croatia

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to examine students' sociodemographic, pedagogical, and behavioural characteristics and correlate them to the assessed need for additional help in learning and behaviour modification. There were 300 students from the first to the eighth grade of elementary school participating in the research. Form teachers voluntarily made assessments completing an anonymous questionnaire. Results indicated that those students who were older and unpopular, with poorer academic performance and lower socioeconomic status were in greater need of additional help in learning, regardless of students' gender. Prosocial and cooperative behavioural patterns, which are present in students who do not need additional help in learning, have not been identified in these students. Moreover, the results suggested that students who needed additional help in behaviour modification regardless of their age and gender, were those with poorer academic performance, unpopular students, and those with a lower socioeconomic status. The behaviour of these students corresponds to aggressive and winning-seeking patterns, as opposed to their peers who do not need behaviour modification. There is a relatively larger quantity of students who need

¹ Results of this paper have previously been presented at the 11th international Balkan conference on education and science under the name THE FUTURE OF EDUCATION AND EDUCATING FOR THE FUTURE (Poreč, 12 – 14 October 2016)

additional help in learning among those who need additional help in behaviour modification. Data gained from this research could be useful for planning elements of school-based preventive programs which have been recommended according to the obtained indicators.

Keywords: *behavioural patterns in conflict situations; behavioural problems; learning difficulties; prosocial and aggressive behaviour; students with disabilities.*

Introduction

For over three decades, in the field of preventive science in Croatia and across the world, there is a shared belief that it is possible to discover at an early stage, therefore, on time, and systematically intervene as regards elements of individuals' and groups' adverse psycho-sociological development, thus enabling them to overcome those difficulties. The aforementioned paradigm is known as scientifically-based prevention of undesired developmental outcomes such as unsuccessful social adaptation and social exclusion, criminal behaviour in adolescents and adults, addictions and mental issues (Nolen-Hoeksema, Girus & Seligman, 1992; Colman, Wadsworth, Croudace & Jones, 2007; Pulkkinen, 2001; Rubin, Chen, McDougall, Bowker & McKinnon, 1995; Perry & Carroll, 2008; Shenasa, Paradis, Dolan, Wilhelm & Buka, 2012; Bašić, 2009; Bašić, Mihić & Novak, 2010). That is why efforts to create, implement, and evaluate high-quality preventive programs are crucial for a society that responsibly examines possibilities of its own progress, which is verified by the recommendations for system-based preventive programs in Croatia (Kranželić, Ferić & Jerković, 2016). Bearing in mind the context of this work, it is interesting to contemplate about school-based preventive programs (Uzelac & Bouillet, 2008; Žižak & Bouillet, 2003) which could identify students' needs (as well as their families' needs) and also respond adequately by providing specialised intervention at an early stage because of their broad scope. Bašić (2009) described several theories in the prevention approach: the theory of risk and protection, the resilience theory, the positive development theory, and the mental health improvement theory. The theory of risk and protective factors (Mrazek & Haggerty, 1994) is often used for creating preventive programs for preschoolers and elementary school children (Durlak, 1998; Catalano, Berglund, Ryan, Lonczak & Hawkins, 2004; Farrington, Gaffney, Lösel & Ttofi, 2017). One of the most common risks that leads to adverse psycho-sociological development is students' disability to achieve academic success despite adequate educational conditions (Fernandez-Rio, Cecchini, Méndez-Gimenez, Mendez-Alonso & Prieto, 2017) because of the lack of additional help in learning in their environment (Johnson, Panagioti, Bass, Ramsey & Harrison, 2017), while the second most common risk is detecting behavioural problems at an early stage, which requires additional professional help for both the student and the teacher (Vlah 2011; 2013). In this paper, we will examine the determinants of those two risks, which we hold to be relevant indicators for planning and creating preventive interventions for students, namely, school-based preventive programs.

These two risks – learning difficulties and behavioural problems – are closely related, as asserted in numerous works (Mundy, Canterford, Tucker et al. 2017; Singer 2008). To be more precise, behavioural problems which often require professional help because of their intensity, duration and adversities for the student and the environment are often, if not always, connected with difficulties in overcoming the curriculum. In those instances, additional help in learning has to be provided along with regular classes (Uzelac & Bouillet, 2008) with the aim of reaching optimal social adaptation at a young age, as well as later in adolescence and adulthood (Berc, Majdak & Bežovan, 2015).

The underlying question is: which determinants are in relation to these risks? There are many characteristics at an individual and environmental level (Pellegrini, 1990) that aggravate or facilitate developmental tasks throughout the process of growing up. We have selected those which we found to be relevant and which were available and in accordance with The Ethics of Social Research with Children (Ajduković & Kolesarić, 2003). Some resources from traditional educational systems where gender stereotypes are present suggest that boys are more prone to academic failure than girls (Collins, 2017), while others imply that girls achieve worse results in science (Hofer, 2016). However, overall, it has been established that boys and girls are equally prone to academic failure (Lohbeck, Grube & Moschner, 2017) and are both equally in need of additional help in learning. Behavioural problems² have more often been associated with boys, except for those connected to verbal and relationship abuse, which are more often identified with girls (Björkqvist, 2017). Thus, there is a contemporary approach in Croatia aimed at organizing and providing professional help for students with behavioural problems that results in different norms for boys' and girls' preventive programs, at the same time taking into account differences in the manifestation of specific types and forms of problems (Bouillet, 2016). Older elementary school students have a more demanding curriculum, with education in higher grades (5th – 8th grade), that is, according to the Croatian education system, subject-oriented, and poses greater challenges and more stress for students. Problems arise with regard to overcoming the subject matter and/or behavioural problems, which can be internalized (depression, psychosomatic problems) (Mandić, Baravan & Boranić, 2003) or externalized (aggression, authority confrontation) (Macuka, 2016). It is important to identify and address those problems on time so that students do not transfer them into the next educational period, where bigger challenges and new stressors emerge, which could worsen them and cause dropouts, delinquent behaviour, or mental problems (Ferić, Milas & Rihtar, 2010). A student's family financial situation does not necessarily have to be in relation to that student's need for additional help in learning or behaviour modification. Some

² The term "behavioural problems" refers to "a collective term for all behaviours of biological, psychological, pedagogical, or social nature, which significantly deviate from behaviour appropriate for individual's age, situation, culture or ethnic norms, and are harmful or dangerous for the individual itself or other individuals and social systems" (Koller-Trbović, Žižak & Jedud-Borić 2011, p.3). In this paper, the term "the need for additional help in behaviour modification" refers to the second or third level of behavioural problems when the form teacher (or other teachers) is no longer able to handle the situation successfully by himself/herself (Vlah, 2013).

studies suggest that positive psychosocial development is more influenced by the quality of relationships in the family and the absence of socio-pathological phenomena like alcoholism and domestic violence (Singer, 2008) than the financial situation. It is also suggested that a child's development will be successful even in a materially deprived household, provided that family resilience exists (family's belief system, models of family organization, and communication processes in the family) (Berc, 2012). However, there are other studies that indicate that severe material deprivation is a constant source of stress for parents and a psychologically exhausting factor for everyday existence, which in turn can affect parents' ability to bring up their children (Družić Ljubotina, Sabolić & Kletečki Radović, 2017). Therefore, the quality of family relations is an important concept in prevention science, the examination and explanation of which is a delicate and complicated process, especially with regard to ethical issues (Miroslavljević, Jeđud-Borić & Koller-Trbović, 2016). Students in need of additional help in learning are usually less popular among their peers and have a tendency to be socially excluded from informal social peer groups (Estell, Jones, Pearl, Van Acker, Farmer & Rodkin, 2008), while students in need of behaviour modification have an even more expressed dimension of social exclusion, since they usually have poor social skills for developing and sustaining social relations (Žic Ralić & Šifner 2015; Žižak 2003), and, therefore, are often isolated or rejected from peers while in school. Unpopular girls and boys are lonelier than average and highly popular students (Putarek & Keresteš, 2012). Academic failure reflected through negative grades and/or grade retention is a constantly reaffirmed predictor of delinquent behaviour (Singer, 2008), namely of negative self-image development and psychosocial life path that leads to negative affirmation, and more severe and dangerous behavioural problems (Vlah, 2013). Early and well-designed educational interventions in overcoming academic failure are a scientifically proven element of prevention (Kranželić Tavra, 2003) and essential from the first day of school. Adapted school programs usually include recommendations for additional professional help depending on student's difficulties. For example, if a student has dyslexia and/or dysgraphia, he or she will be provided with a speech pathologist. If they have ADHD, they will be provided with the help of a social pedagogue, according to Rijeka's model of inclusion of students with developmental disabilities. Previous research, thus, concludes that certain disabilities might need additional help, i.e. additional support for the students (Cook, 2014) in order to achieve optimal fulfilment of their potential in given curriculum frameworks. Students' social behaviour is also a significant component of successful socialization and social integration, while one of the most important indicators is behaviour in conflict situations. Behaviour in conflict situations can be observed most accurately in comparison to behavioural patterns in conflict situations and related scales and measurement systems. Unfortunately, in Croatia, this system is not utilized enough, and recently a scale has been designed so that form teachers could make their students' reliable and valid behaviour assessments according to three patterns (Vlah, 2013): (i)

cooperation as a pattern of constructive behaviour which assumes a positive attitude towards the possibility of resolving the conflict in a way that would meet the needs of both opposing parties; it requires emotional competence and social skills of conflict participants, and results in both parties being satisfied; (ii) conflict avoidance as a nonconstructive pattern because problems are not resolved, but keep accumulating, and later they escalate in an inappropriate moment with multiple negative consequences; children learn from adults how to avoid conflicts, while their task should be to encourage them to cooperate and not to avoid conflict; (iii) winning in a conflict is also a nonconstructive behavioural pattern connected to violence because winning causes harm to the other party in the conflict and neglects their needs, just to satisfy one's own needs; moreover, this pattern is characterised by superiority on one hand, and inferiority on the other, and like the previous two patterns, children acquire this one through social learning in their primary environments (Vlah, 2013). In relation to the aforementioned, prosocial and aggressive behaviour are two constructs which can also be connected to risks of adverse psycho-sociological development and which indicate which students need preventive school programs. Simons-Morton, Davis Crump, Haynie & Saylor (1999) emphasize that researchers and school authorities should pay greater attention to students' sense of school belonging. Results of their research indicate that students with a positive sense of school belonging achieve better school performance and display significantly less problematic behaviours. Sense of school belonging, according to Hawkins and Weis (1985), includes relationships with prosocial peers, acceptance of school norms and school obligations. Sense of school belonging is a broader concept than social relationship, one which contributes to student's persistence in achieving academic success and adopting adequate behavioural patterns. Hawkins and Catalano (1990) believe the sense of school belonging can be improved by encouraging the development of social skills and social competence, enhancing school climate, and through empowerment and parents' education.

In view of everything aforementioned, the purpose of this paper is to establish some elements of students' psycho-sociological developmental risk/protection, which form teachers have assessed as in need of additional help in learning and behaviour modification, and on the basis of the established elements of risk/protection, conceptualize goals of a preventive program.

The main objective of this paper is to examine some sociodemographic, pedagogical and behavioural characteristics of students and correlate them to the assessed need for additional help in learning and/or behaviour modification. In particular, to determine:

(i) percentage of students who need additional help in learning and the percentage of students who need additional help in behaviour modification, as well as a proportionate distribution between those two assessed needs;

(ii) relations between the assessed need for additional help in learning and students' sociodemographic characteristics (gender, age, student's family financial situation, quality of relations in student's family, student's popularity), student's pedagogical

characteristics (academic success, adapted school program) and characteristics of student's social behaviour (three patterns of behaviour in conflict situations: cooperation, avoidance, winning-seeking; prosocial and aggressive behaviour);

(iii) relations between the assessed need for additional help in behaviour modification and students' sociodemographic characteristics (gender, age, student's family financial situation, quality of relations in student's family, student's popularity), student's pedagogical characteristics (academic success, adapted school program) and characteristics of student's social behaviour (three patterns of behaviour in conflict situations: cooperation, avoidance, winning; prosocial and aggressive behaviour).

Methodology

Sample

This research included 300 students from the first to the eighth grade of an elementary school situated in Rijeka, a city on the northern coast of the Adriatic Sea (M=11 years; 44% girls). Of that, 44 students attended first grade (14.7%), 31 second grade (10.3 %), 29 third grade (9.7%), 56 fourth grade (18.7 %), 19 fifth grade (6.3 %), 44 sixth grade (14.7%), 21 seventh grade (7%) and 56 eighth grade (18.7 %). Of all the students, 161 (53.7%) of them have one sibling, 37 (12.3%) have two siblings, 11 (3.7%) three, 7 (2.3%) four and three (1%) have 10 siblings, while 169 (56.3%) students are firstborns. The school has 520 students, most of whom live in a family with different problems and specific deficits: families with poor financial situation and users of social assistance, multi-child families (5–10), single parents, children without parents, families with very ill and chronically ill members, students with mild developmental disabilities (individual approach with additional help of an educational rehabilitator and/or speech therapist), families with illiterate parents without elementary school degree, families where the mother and children are placed in a safe house because of domestic violence, very poor living conditions, parents' shift work etc. All of these problems are frequent in the school where the research was carried out, as well as in the wider population, and for both of these environments, there are statistical data about their prevalence and incidence.

Table 1
Distribution of pupils according to gender and grades

grade	girls		boys	
	AV	%	AV	%
first	15	11.4	29	17.3
second	19	14.4	12	7.1
third	15	11.4	14	8.3
fourth	26	19.7	30	17.9
fifth	8	6.1	11	6.5
sixth	18	13.6	26	15.5
seventh	11	8.3	10	6.0
eighth	20	15.2	36	21.4
Σ	132	100	168	100

AV= absolute value

Assessments of students' socio-pedagogical (sociodemographic, pedagogical and behavioural) characteristics were given by their form teachers (N=16), whose average age was 47 years and length of employment 21 years. In the time of research, form teachers had known their students for at least six months, and at most eight years.

As can be seen in Table 1, gender distribution is evenly dispersed with regard to grade.

Measurement Instruments and Variables

A questionnaire for form teachers named "Teachers' assessment of student's behavioural patterns in conflict situations and general information about the students"³ has been used. The first part consisted of general information about the form teacher and the student, and the second one of integrated questions and assessment scales. A list of dependent and independent variables and answers coding system follows.

Dependent variables:

- Do you think this student needs additional help in learning (1=YES, 2=NO);
- Do you think this student needs additional help in behaviour modification? (1=YES, 2=NO).
- *Independent variables:*
- student's gender (1=m, 2=f);
- student's age;
- student's family financial situation (1=worse than average, 2=average, 3=above average);
- the quality of relations in student's family (1=poor, 2=neither good nor bad, 3=high);
- student's popularity status in the classroom (1=unpopular, 2=neither unpopular nor popular, 3=popular);
- student's academic achievement (from 2=sufficient to 5=excellent);
- adapted school program (1=regular program, 2=regular program with individualised methods, 3=adapted program);
- *Assessment scale for student's behavioural patterns in conflict situations* (Družinec & Vlah, 2016) measures three behavioural patterns in conflict situations: cooperation, avoidance, winning-seeking. In the original scale construction, authors demonstrated a reliable three-factor structure in which the cooperation pattern is measured by one subscale (N=16, $\alpha = .86$), for example, *Student puts forward arguments in a conflict situation*, avoidance pattern with another subscale (N=13; $\alpha = .86$), for example *in a conflict situation, student says: "However you want"*, and winning-seeking pattern by a third subscale (N= 19; $\alpha = .85$), for example *In a conflict situation, student uses derogatory words*. Teachers assessed students' behaviour with a scale from 0=does not apply to the student at all to 4= almost always applies to the student. With this research, highly satisfying measurement instruments have been confirmed.

³ Enquiries via: natasa.vlah@uniri.hr

- With the *PROS/AG questionnaire*, teachers assessed students' prosocial and aggressive behaviour on a scale from 1 (never behaves like that) to 5 (almost always behaves like that) (Žužul & Vlahović-Štetić, 1992; Bašić & Lebedina-Manzoni, 1997; all as cited in Kranželić Tavra, 2002). The prosocial behaviour construct was measured by one subscale (N=10; $\alpha = .91$), for example, *Student shares her candy with other students*, and aggressive behaviour construct by another subscale (N=10; $\alpha = .90$), for example, *Student provokes conflicts*.

Data collecting and processing

On the school psychologist's request, form teachers anonymously and voluntarily assessed approximately 58% of students of the school. The applicative purpose of the assessment was presented to form teachers as the creation of a school-based preventive program "School afternoon just for me", which has been initiated after this research. The research is a subproject⁴ of a larger-scale project *Risk levels for behavioural problems in children of young and developmental age and professional interventions*. All data were processed by quantitative descriptive analysis, i.e. analysis of differences and relations between groups from dependent variables with a t-test, chi-square, and two discriminative analyses.

Results

In order to solve given problems, we will present frequencies and percentages of all focus variables, as well as the analysis of relations for every dependent variable of the research: the assessed need for additional help in learning and the assessed need for additional help in behaviour modification for each assessed student.

Table 2

Assessed needs for additional help in learning

	Do you think this student needs additional help in learning?	Do you think this student needs additional help in behaviour modification?
YES	65 (21.7 %)	42 (14 %)
NO	235 (78.3 %)	258 (86 %)
Σ	300	300

It has been assessed that one-fifth of the students in school need additional help in learning, while additional help in behaviour modification is needed by every ninth or tenth student (Table 2). After relations analysis, it has been established there are a lot more students in need of additional help in behaviour modification among those who simultaneously need additional help in learning ($\chi^2=23.1^{**}$; $df=1$). As follows, a group of students has been discovered who, in addition to the regular school program, require additional professional help in overcoming the curriculum and positive behaviour transformation. Given the fact that the school has around 520 students, around 70 students per year will need additional help in the above-mentioned areas of special education.

⁴ Published works from the subproject: Družinec & Vlah (2016); Družinec (2016).

Relations analysis between the assessed need for additional help in learning and students' gender has shown there is no statistically significant relationship between those two variables ($\chi^2 = .20$; $df=1$), that is, girls and boys need additional help in learning equally. Similar to that result, no statistically significant relation has been found between those two variables ($\chi^2 = 3.37$; $df=1$), that is, girls and boys need additional help in behaviour modification equally, although there is a tendency towards a significantly larger number of boys as those who have been assessed to need additional help in behaviour modification.

Table 3

Age differences in relation to the assessed need for additional help in learning

Do you think this student needs additional help in:		M	SD	t
... learning?	NO	10.89	2.40	2.0*
	YES	11.55	2.35	
... behaviour modification?	NO	11.02	2.38	.18
	YES	11.10	2.56	

M=standard value; SD=standard deviation from standard value; t=test difference between two independent groups; *= $p < 0.05$

Students assessed as needing additional help in learning are older than students who have not been assessed by their form teachers as needing additional help in learning (Table 3). The average age of students in need of additional help in learning is around eleven and a half, which is equivalent to fifth or sixth grade, with a two-year deviation. Age differences analysis has shown that students of all age groups have equally been assessed as in need of additional help in behaviour modification.

There are significantly more students who need additional help in learning and behaviour modification among those whose families' socioeconomic status is below average (Table 4), that is significantly more students whose families' socioeconomic status is above average do not need additional help in learning and behaviour modification.

There is a significantly larger number of students whom their form teacher has assessed as needing additional help in learning and behaviour modification among those whose families' human relations have been assessed as poor or neither good nor bad. In other words, there is a significantly larger number of students who do not need additional help in learning and behaviour modification among those whose families' human relations are good.

There are significantly more students whom their form teachers have assessed as needing additional help in learning and behaviour modification among those who are unpopular and neither popular nor unpopular, that is, significantly more students who do not need additional help in learning are popular in class.

As expected, there is a significantly larger number of students who need additional help in learning among those with satisfactory and good academic performance. Likewise, there is a significantly larger number of students who need additional help

			Do you think this student needs additional help in:					
			... learning?		... behaviour modification?			
			NO	YES	NO	YES	Σ	
sociodemographic characteristics of students	financial situation	below average	22 (57.9 %)	16 (42.1 %)	23 (61 %)	15 (39%)	38 (100 %)	
		average	155 (78.3 %)	43 (21.7 %)	179 (90.4 %)	19 (9.6 %)	198 (100 %)	
		above average	58 (90.6 %)	6 (9.4 %)	56 (90.6 %)	8 (12.5 %)	64 (100 %)	
				$(\chi^2=15.05^{**}; df=2)$				
	quality of human relations	poor	5 (45.5 %)	6 (54.5 %)	8 (72.7 %)	3 (27.3 %)	11 (100%)	
		neither good nor bad	55 (62.5%)	33 (37.5%)	70.5 (62.5%)	26 (29.5%)	88 (100%)	
good		175 (87.1%)	26 (12.9%)	188 (93.5%)	13 (6.5%)	201 (100%)		
			$(\chi^2=29.03^{***}; df=2)$					
pedagogical characteristics of students	popularity in class	unpopular	17 (58.6%)	12 (41.4%)	16 (55.2%)	13 (44.8%)	29 (100%)	
		neither popular nor unpopular	133 (62.5%)	41 (37.5%)	156 (89.7%)	18 (10.3%)	174 (100%)	
		popular	85 (87.1%)	12 (12.9%)	86 (88.7%)	11 (11.3%)	97 (100%)	
				$(\chi^2=11.95^{**}; df=2)$				
	academic performance	satisfactory	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	5 (100%)	
		good	6 (23.1%)	20 (76.9%)	18 (69.2%)	8 (30.8%)	26 (100%)	
very good		67 (72%)	26 (28%)	78 (83.9%)	15 (16.1%)	93 (100%)		
excellent		140 (94%)	9 (6%)	139 (93.3%)	10 (6.7%)	149 (100%)		
			$(\chi^2=73.22^{***}; df=3)$					
school program	regular	229 (81.2 %)	53 (18.8%)	246 (87.2 %)	36 (12.8%)	282 (100%)		
	regular with individualised methods	6 (37.5%)	10 (62.5%)	11 (68.8%)	5 (31.3%)	16 (100%)		
	adapted	0 (0 %)	2 (100 %)	1 (50 %)	1 (50 %)	2 (100%)		
			$(\chi^2=24.32^{***}; df=2)$					
overall			235 (78.3%)		258 (86%)	42 (14%)	300 (100%)	

in behaviour modification among those with satisfactory, good, and even very good academic performance, while a significantly larger number of students who do not need additional help in learning have excellent academic performance.

There are significantly more students who need additional help among those who attend adapted school programs. It was interesting to examine whether those students have poor academic performance, and that is why an additional analysis has been conducted which has shown there are no statistically significant relations between adapted school programs and academic performance ($\chi^2=6.63$; $df=2$). This result implies that all students, regardless of the school program they are attending, are equally academically successful (have grades from satisfactory to excellent) and teachers in this school follow the Instructions on Grading Students with Disabilities (1996). Significantly more students who do not need additional help in learning belong to the category of those who are taught in accordance with the regular elementary school curriculum. There is a significantly larger number of students whom their form teachers have assessed as needing additional help in behaviour modification among those who are taught in accordance with regular programs with individualised methods. Those students who are taught in accordance with regular programs but need additional help in behaviour modification are of particular interest for planning a school-based preventive program. These students outnumber those who are taught in accordance with regular programs with individualised methods, and they make up 12% of all participants, respectively.

Table 5

Differences in the students' assessed behaviour in relation to the assessed needs for additional help in learning and behaviour modification

			... additional help in learning			...additional help in behaviour modification		
			M	SD	F	M	SD	F
behav. patterns in conflict situations	cooperation	NO	2.74	.77	35.21***	2.71	.77	41.48***
		YES	2.09	.79		1.89	.75	
	avoidance	NO	1.23	.82	7.37**	1.24	.80	8.5**
		YES	1.53	.72		1.63	.79	
	winning-seeking	NO	.70	.66	7.59**	.62	.66	92.57***
		YES	.97	.74		1.59	.78	
PROS/AG	prosocial	NO	4.01	.82	20.47***	4.01	.81	41.27***
		YES	3.48	.87		3.15	.71	
	aggressive	NO	1.62	.72	2.41	1.52	.72	79.18***
		YES	1.77	.73		2.47	.73	

M= standard value; SD= standard deviation from standard value; F= function of ANOVA test of the difference in observed groups variation; *= $p < 0.05$, **= $p < 0.01$, ***= $p < 0.0001$

Students who need additional help in learning and those who do not differ on the level of manifestation as regards social behaviour, according to their form teachers. Differences are visible in all three behavioural patterns in conflict situations, as well as in prosocial behaviour, while there is no difference in the manifestation of aggression. Students who need additional help in learning are less cooperative and prosocial, and more inclined to avoid conflict situations or try to win in them (Table 5). Students

who need additional help in behaviour modification and those who do not differ on the level of manifestation of social behaviour, according to their form teachers. Differences are visible in all three behavioural patterns in conflict situations and in prosocial and aggressive behaviour. Students who need additional help in behaviour modification are less cooperative and prosocial, more aggressive, and inclined to avoid conflict situations or try to win them (Table 5).

For the purpose of conducting a latent analysis, two discriminative analyses have been carried out. The results showed that those students who need additional help in learning and those who do not differ in 15% of the variance in the obtained function (Table 6), whereas students who need additional help in behaviour modification and those who do not differ in 28% of the variance in the extracted function.

Table 6

Core values and the significance of a discriminative function in latent differentiation of students who need and do not need additional help in learning and behaviour modification in relation to their assessed behaviour

function	core value	% canonical correlations	Wilks' lambda	χ^2 (df)	significance	centroids	
						NO	YES
additional help in learning	.18	.39	.85	48.0 (5)	.000	.22	-.80
additional help in behaviour modification	.39	.53	.72	97.42 (5)	.000	-.25	1.54

Table 7

Discriminative coefficient (K) and correlations between factors and the canonical discriminative function (S)

	additional help in learning		additional help in behaviour modification	
	K	S	K	S
cooperation	.74	.82	-.33	-.60
avoidance	-.33	-.37	.09	.27
winning-seeking	-.26	-.38	.53	.89
prosocial	.50	.64	-.01	-.60
aggressive	.67	-.21	.36	.83

Students who need additional help in learning differ significantly from students who do not need additional help in learning in the function of the prosocial and cooperative behavioural pattern (Table 7). Students who need additional help in learning have a negative relation to that function, unlike students who do not need additional help in learning and who have a positive relation to that function in the range of approximately one standard deviation (Table 6). Hence, students who need additional help in learning display significantly less prosocial and cooperative behaviour than students who do not need such help, although differences are not very large.

Students who need additional help in behaviour modification differ significantly from students who do not need additional help in behaviour modification in the function of

the aggressive and winning-seeking behavioural pattern (Table 7). Students who need additional help in behaviour modification have a positive relation to that function, while students who do not need such help have a negative relation to that function in the range of almost two standard deviations (Table 6). Hence, students who need additional help in behaviour modification display significantly more aggressive and winning-seeking behaviour than students who do not need such help, with differences being significantly large.

Discussion

According to the form teachers' assessments, one-fifth of students in the school need additional help in learning. Who is helping those students? A few of them have been legally provided with professional rehabilitation help, pursuant to the Decision on the Adapted School Program with the additional help of a speech therapist issued by the State Administration Office. The results have shown that students who attend regular programs with individualised methods have a significantly greater need for additional help in learning. Why is that so? It is possible that those individualised methods are not carried out as professionally as they should be, which is something that should be examined in future research. Furthermore, every sixth student from the research who attends regular program needs additional help in learning. The main question for further research should be: are among those students some who should also be provided with assistance stipulated by the aforementioned Decisions and adaptations in the school program? Assuming that this is not the case, the question still remains, who is helping them? It is possible that part of them get help from their parents who assist them with their homework and learning, but an even greater issue is what happens to those students who do not get any help at home? Are they neglected by their families and school? It is our opinion that the Ministry, local communities, and schools should cooperate and organise a program for additional help in learning for those students who need it. For every tenth student in school, the form teacher (or regular teacher) needs additional help in their student's behaviour modification. This incidence corresponds to Bouillet's (2016) research conducted on a sample for the whole of Croatia, meaning the frequency is common in all elementary schools in Croatia. In addition, those students with behavioural problems have a far greater need for additional help in learning, and that is a very important piece of information for planning a school-based preventive program. Overall results imply that those who will be conducting the school-based preventive program will have to have the necessary skills for working with students with behavioural problems, which will amount to most students in the program. In Croatia, these interdisciplinary skills can be acquired at bachelor and graduate courses at the Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences in Zagreb, Department of Behavioural Disorders.

The results which have shown that boys and girls need additional help in learning equally have confirmed previous research and our expectations. Equal ratios in the

assessed need for behaviour modification are expected to an extent, although it has been noticed that boys take up a somewhat larger portion in this group. In today's society, there is an ongoing trend for girls to participate in socially unacceptable behaviours like verbal aggression and defiance against authority. Therefore, the traditional perception of boys as being the ones at risk is no longer sustainable. Pavlović (2016) found that girls in elementary schools in Rijeka involved in daily intervention program guided by social care system are at even greater risk than boys when it comes to dealing with problems, hyperactivity, and school performance. Therefore, students' gender should be taken into consideration when planning individualised professional help because "... girls use indirect aggression more than boys. Indirect aggression was conceptualized as social manipulation with the intention to harm the target person psychologically and/or socially, often attacking the target person circuitously for example through malicious gossip, or otherwise manipulating the social network of the school class in order to lower the victim's standing in the social hierarchy or perhaps even excluding her altogether from a friendship group" (Björkqvist, Lagerspetz & Kaukiainen, 1992, p.32).

When it comes to students' age, the need for additional help in learning is more evident in students attending subject-oriented classes. This can be explained by the transition to higher grades and failure to adapt to new curriculum requirements by part of the student population, which is something that has already been known from previous professional insights and scientific research. The transition to higher grades is a risky period for students who have not yet acquired social, learning, and organisational skills. On one hand, the adequacy and suitability of the curriculum (large subject quantity, too much information to learn by heart, traditional *a-cathedra* teaching) should be re-evaluated by contemporary needs and psychophysical requirements of different students in order to make a positive change and prevent the development of disorders in some students (Munjiza, Peko & Dubrovicki 2016). Attention should be given to the individual needs of each student with the aim of creating an individualised approach in teaching. Apart from these overall requirements for a reform of the subject-oriented organization of classes, some students should be provided with additional help in learning right now. The fact that there has been such a large number of students participating in this research calls for the need to create some kind of intervention, whether that be peer help or help from external associates like pedagogy students (volunteers) to help students at risk in learning and writing homework. There are no age differences when discussing the need for behaviour modification, although it is assumed that those behavioural problems will become more expressed at a later age. Therefore, even at an early developmental age, it is possible to identify students in need of interventions so they learn how to behave appropriately. However, it is also possible that teachers in lower classes (usually female) are more educated about it and more sensitive to detecting risk behaviours than teachers of subject classes. In fact, in the initial study program in Croatia and in Rijeka, at the Faculty of Teacher Education, more attention is given to courses concerning teaching special needs students (as well as students with behavioural problems) than subject-teaching faculties.

There are more students who need additional help in learning and behaviour modification among those whose families' financial situation is below average and where the quality of relations among members of the family is assessed as poor or neither good nor bad. Families who struggle with poverty on a daily basis in Croatia (Družić Ljubotina, Sabolić & Kletečki Radović 2017) encounter great challenges in children's upbringing. Hence, it is possible that the results obtained are related to parents' failure to cope with stress and their weakened capacity to overcome existential problems, to successfully fulfil their parental role, and meet the educational needs of their children. In that case, society should aid those parents who need help. Schools and Social Care Centers could and should develop intervention programs for those parents, and integrate material assistance with other measures which would guide parents in strengthening their parental skills. In that regard, the Social Care Act (*Official Gazette*, 2017) assumes the following measures of social services, pursuant to Article 73 (1): "social services include activities, measures, and programs aimed at preventing, identifying, and solving problems and difficulties of an individual and a family, and improving their quality of life in community". We believe material assistance should be integrated with measures that would include parents in educational groups for parenting support. It is obvious that more than one in ten students in this research has been assessed as living in material conditions below the average. Even though working with families is not the main objective of schools, cooperation with local, county, and state institutions, in which educated people whose primary task is to enforce the abovementioned Act are employed, or with non-profit organisations with high-quality programs, could be more than useful for students at risk. One-third of students do not live in families with good human relations, and there are 3.5 % of students who live in families with poor human relations. Given the fact that good human relations are a strong predictive factor of adverse development, it is suggested that identified students should be provided with additional support and help in order to prevent their adverse psycho-sociological development.

Unpopular students need more additional help in learning and behaviour modification, despite the fact difficulties in learning and overcoming the curriculum do not cause as much rejection by peers as behavioural problems, which is not surprising. Methodological limitations of our assessment scale should be taken into consideration due to the fact that it could have been difficult for form teachers to assess students' popularity in class on a scale from one to three. Still, the results correspond to previous research (Žic Ralić & Šifner, 2015; Žižak, 2003) and imply that a well thought through approach aimed at improving the sociometric position of a student in need of additional help is needed when creating a school-based preventive program. One way would be teachers' behaviour itself, by treating the student in a positive manner so that other students acquire a positive relationship towards that student through social learning, or by giving specific tasks to the student in need, which should be delivered in front of the whole

class and which would enable him or her to achieve personal success and approval from their peers. In addition, creating an inclusive environment in which diversities are acceptable and common, a positive and accepting school climate is being created, and social exclusion and rejection of those who are different are prevented. Finally, those students need individual work (for example, target social skills training) with the aim of strengthening their social skills in communication with other students in their class.

Additional help in learning and behaviour modification is needed by students with poorer grades to a greater extent. These results are rather logical and expected, as well as in accordance with previous criminological research (Singer 2008). By providing adequate and timely additional help for students who need additional help in learning, an improvement of their academic performance could be expected, and eventually, improvement of their self-image and self-esteem, which constitute very important segments of a child's psycho-social development. Interestingly, there are a number of students who need behaviour modification but are academically successful, that is, they have no problem in the area of learning, but do with their behaviour. A different approach should be used for these students when conceptualizing objectives, methods, and content of preventive interventions, and analysing the aetiology of their behaviour with special attention given to the functional analysis of behaviour and family background.

Moreover, additional help in learning is needed by students attending the adapted school program and regular program with individualised methods, while additional help in behaviour modification is needed much more by students attending the regular program with individualised methods. Students with developmental disabilities are a particularly vulnerable group of students because their disabilities are multidimensional, that is conditioned by biological, psychological and sociological factors, and if teachers are not sufficiently educated about the specific characteristics of those conditions and skilled for an educational and methodical adaptation of their teaching according to students' needs, the need for additional help in learning and behaviour modification will surely be more comprehensive. That is why future research should explore the connection between that result and teacher skills and attitudes towards working with students with disabilities, especially with students with ADHD, who are a particularly challenging group to teach in a regular class. One-tenth of the sample has no decision on the adapted school program but need additional help in behaviour modification, which can be ascribed either as that: (i) those students have an objective need for that kind of decision but parents have failed to carry out all necessary actions (different specialists appointments) to bring such decision into force and help the student, or (ii) students in question have disabilities which are conditioned by educational, social, economic, cultural, and language factors, and which should also be planned for school-based preventive programs but the State Administration Office does not issue the appropriate decision. According to Article 65 of the Education in Elementary and Secondary Schools Act (*Official Gazette*, 2017), this group of students also has the right to preventive protection for identified disabilities.

Students in need of additional help in learning display a significantly lower degree of prosocial and cooperative behaviour than students who do not need such help, while students in need of additional help in behaviour modification display a significantly higher degree of aggressive and winning behaviour than those who do not need such help. These results give a strong impetus to the need for structural learning of social skills to be incorporated in school-based preventive programs. Schools should hire professional staff skilled in creating and implementing school-based preventive programs. Based on the obtained results, we conclude that in addition to supporting students in learning, schools should also conduct prosocial skills and cooperative behaviour acquiring programs on a regular basis, as well as rehabilitation of impulsive and aggressive behaviour programs (Vanest, Temple-Harvey & Mason, 2009). Thereby, students' individual characteristics and particularities of the family environment should be taken into consideration.

Methodological limitations of this research can be identified in the narrow sample encompassing only one school, and thus we recommend future research to include more schools, if possible, from different parts of Croatia. Apart from that, the repeated and broadened research should preferably use multivariate instead of univariate measurements for particular constructs, which at this level of a pilot research were not analysed on a multivariate level (for example, a student's popularity in class).

Conclusions

The aim of this paper was to examine students' sociodemographic, pedagogical, and behavioural characteristics, and correlate them to the assessed need for additional help in learning and/or behaviour modification. The overall results of the research are as follows:

1. Boys and girls need equal additional help in learning and/or behaviour modification;
2. Students attending subject classes are in greater need of additional help in learning;
3. There are more students in need of additional help in learning and behaviour modification among those:
 - whose families' financial situation is below average,
 - whose families' relations between members are assessed as poor or neither good nor bad,
 - who are unpopular in class,
 - who have poor or average school performance,
 - who are schooled according to the decision on the adapted education program;
4. Students in need of additional help in learning display a significantly lower degree of prosocial and cooperative behaviour than students who are not in need of such help;
5. Students in need of additional help in behaviour modification display a significantly higher degree of aggressive and winning-seeking behaviour than students who are not in need of such help.

On those grounds, we recommend the following when developing a school-based preventive program:

- include students of both genders from the first to the eighth grade;
- employ special teachers of the program who have finished a specialised education course for working with students with behavioural problems;
- cooperate with Social Care Centers on a regular basis in order to provide families not only with material assistance but also with counselling opportunities that would help them improve human relations in the family;
- encourage academic success in all selected students every day;
- provide help of volunteers and external associates (NGO organisations perhaps) for one-on-one tutoring and professional rehabilitation services for particular students;
- systematically and continuously conduct social skills courses;
- educate workers and students on constructive ways of solving conflict situations.

In addition to that, school-based preventive programs should be all-encompassing, multidimensional and scientifically evaluated, and modified yearly. Of course, ensuring material resources for such programs is one of the conditions that should be met.

Acknowledgement

This work has been partially supported by the University of Rijeka under the project number 13.10.2.2.03.

References

- Ajduković, M., & Kolesarić, V. (2003). *Etički kodeks istraživanja s djecom*. Zagreb: Vijeće za djecu Vlade Republike Hrvatske. Državni zavod za zaštitu obitelji, materinstva i mladeži.
- Bašić, J. (2009). *Teorije prevencije*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Bašić, J., Mihić, J., & Novak, M. (2010). Risk analysis in the period of growing-up of children and youth: starting point for effective prevention. *Journal of public health*, 19(1), 3-11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-010-0362-6>
- Berc, G. (2012). Obiteljska otpornost - teorijsko utemeljenje i primjena koncepta u socijalnom radu. *Ljetopis Socijalnog Rada*, 19(1), 145-167.
- Berc, G., Majdak, M., & Bežovan, G. (2015). Perspektiva stručnih suradnika o ispadanju učenika iz srednjih škola kao novom socijalnom problemu. *Revija za socijalnu politiku*, 22(1), 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.3935/rsp.v22i1.1162>
- Björkqvist, K. (2017). Gender differences in aggression. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 19, 39-42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.03.030>
- Björkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K.M.J., & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive*

- Behavior*, 18(2), 117-127. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337\(1992\)18:2<117::AID-AB2480180205>3.0.CO;2-3](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337(1992)18:2<117::AID-AB2480180205>3.0.CO;2-3)
- Bouillet, D. (2016). Procjena potreba učenika osnovne škole u svrhu planiranja socijalnopedagoških intervencija-standardizacija mjernog instrumenta. *Kriminologija & socijalna integracija: časopis za kriminologiju, penologiju i poremećaje u ponašanju*, 24(2), 73-92. <https://doi.org/10.31299/ksi.24.2.4>
- Catalano, R. F., Berglund, M. L., Ryan, J. A., Lonczak, H. S., & Hawkins, J. D. (2004). Positive youth development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of positive youth development programs. *The annals of the American academy of political and social science*, 591(1), 98-124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716203260102>
- Collins, T. (2017). A case study of boys' 'underachievement' within the English school system. (Doctoral dissertation). Brighton: University of Sussex.
- Colman, I., Wadsworth M., Croudace, T., & Jones, P. (2007). Forty-Year Psychiatric Outcomes Following Assessment for Internalizing Disorder in Adolescence. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 164(1), 126-133. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.2007.164.1.126>
- Cook, W. (2014). *Modelling the effects of the inclusion of pupils with additional support needs (ASN) on attainment and attendance in primary schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Družić Ljubotina, O., Sabolić, T., & Kletečki Radović, M. (2017). Život obitelji s djecom u uvjetima siromaštva iz perspektive roditelja. *Ljetopis socijalnog rada*, 24(2), 243-276. <https://doi.org/10.3935/ljsr.v24i2.185>
- Družinec, V. (2016). *Relacije između različitih obilježja učenika osnovne škole i obrazaca ponašanja u socijalnim sukobima*. (Doctoral dissertation). Rijeka: Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci.
- Družinec, V., & Vlah, N. (2017). Obrasci ponašanja učenika osnovne škole u sukobima - prijedlog mjerne skale. In D. Maleš, A. Širanović & A. Višnjik Jevtić (Eds.), *Pravo djeteta na odgoj i obrazovanje: teorije, politike I prakse* (pp.110-118). Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Durlak, J. A. (1998). Common risk and protective factors in successful prevention programs. *American journal of orthopsychiatry*, 68(4), 512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0080360>
- Estell, D. B., Jones, M. H., Pearl, R., Van Acker, R., Farmer, T. W., & Rodkin, P. C. (2008). Peer groups, popularity, and social preference: Trajectories of social functioning among students with and without learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 41(1), 5-14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219407310993>
- Farrington, D. P., Gaffney, H., Lösel, F., & Ttofi, M. M. (2017). Systematic reviews of the effectiveness of developmental prevention programs in reducing delinquency, aggression, and bullying. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 33, 91-106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2016.11.003>
- Ferić, I., Milas, G., & Rihtar, S. (2010). Razlozi i odrednice ranoga napuštanja školovanja. *Društvena istraživanja*, 19(4-5), 621-642.
- Fernandez-Rio, J., Cecchini, J. A., Méndez-Gimenez, A., Mendez-Alonso, D., & Prieto, J. A. (2017). Self-regulation, cooperative learning, and academic self-efficacy: Interactions to prevent school failure. *Frontiers in psychology*, 8, 22. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00022>

- Hawkins, J. D., & Catalano, R. F. (1990). Broadening the vision of education: schools as health promoting environments. *Journal of School Health*, 60(4), 178-181. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.1990.tb05433.x>
- Hawkins, J. D., & Weis, J. G. (1985). The social development model: an integrated approach to delinquency prevention. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 6, 73-97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01325432>
- Hofer, S. (2016). Underachievement in physics: When intelligent girls fail. *Learning & Individual Differences*, 51, 119-131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2016.08.006>
- Johnson, J., Panagiotti, M., Bass, J., Ramsey, L., & Harrison, R. (2017). Resilience to emotional distress in response to failure, error or mistakes: a systematic review. *Clinical psychology review*, 52, 19-42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2016.11.007>
- Koller-Trbović, N., Žižak, A., & Jeđud Borić, I. (2011). *Standardi za terminologiju, definiciju, kriterije i način praćenja pojave poremećaja u ponašanju djece i mladih*. Zagreb: Povjerenstvo za prevenciju poremećaja u ponašanju djece i mladih Vlade Republike Hrvatske. Ministarstvo obitelji, branitelja i međugeneracijske solidarnosti.
- Kranželić Tavra, V. (2003). Programi prevencije poremećaja u ponašanju i ranih intervencija u školskom okruženju, In J. Bašić., J. & Janković, J. (Eds), *Lokalna zajednica-izvorište Nacionalne strategije prevencije poremećaja u ponašanju djece i mladih* (pp.104-116). Zagreb: Državni zavod za zaštitu obitelji, materinstva i mladeži i Povjerenstvo Vlade Republike Hrvatske za prevenciju poremećaja u ponašanju djece i mladih.
- Kranželić, V., Ferić, M., & Jerković, D. (2016). Procjena stanja i potreba u području preventivnih programa u Republici Hrvatskoj. In D. Roviš (Ed.), *Izazovi izgradnje cjelovitog pristupa prevenciji ovisnosti te liječenju, resocijalizaciji i socijalnoj reintegraciji ovisnika u Republici Hrvatskoj - Analiza stanja i potreba te iskustava Primorsko-goranske županije* (pp.123-137). Medicinski fakultet Sveučilišta u Rijeci, Nastavni zavod za javno zdravstvo Primorsko-goranske županije.
- Lohbeck, A., Grube, D., & Moschner, B. (2017). Academic self-concept and causal attributions for success and failure amongst elementary school children. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 25(2), 190-203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2017.1301806>
- Macuka, I. (2016). Emocionalni i ponašajni problemi mlađih adolescenata-zastupljenost i rodne razlike. *Ljetopis Socijalnog Rada/Annual of Social Work*, 23(1), 65-86. <https://doi.org/10.3935/ljsr.v23i1.97>
- Mandić, Z., Baraban, D., & Boranić, M. (2017). Kronične tenzijske glavobolje u školske djece -osobine ličnosti i ponašanja. *Collegium Anthropologicum*, 27(1), 159-166.
- Mirosavljević, A., Jeđud Borić, I., & Koller-Trbović, N. (2016). Interviewing family in qualitative research. *Kriminologija & socijalna integracija: časopis za kriminologiju, penologiju i poremećaje u ponašanju*, 24(1), 145-178. <https://doi.org/10.31299/ksi.24.1.6>
- Mrazek, P. J., & Haggerty, R. J. (1994). *Reducing risks for menthal disorders: Frontiers for preventive intervention research*. Washington: National Academy Press.
- Mundy, L. K., Canterford, L., Tucker, D., Bayer, J., Romaniuk, H., Sawyer, S., Lietz, P., Redmond, G., Proimos, J., Allen, N., & Patton, G. (2017). Academic Performance in Primary School Children with Common Emotional and Behavioral Problems. *Journal of School Health*, 7(8), 593-601. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12531>

- Munjiza, E., Peko, A., & Dubovicki, S. (2016). *Paradoks (pre)opterećenosti učenika osnovne škole*. Osijek: Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera, Fakultet za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti u Osijeku.
- Naputak o praćenju i ocjenjivanju učenika s teškoćama u razvoju u osnovnoj i srednjoj školi. Glasnik Ministarstva prosvjete i športa, 2/1996.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Girgus, J., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1992). Predictors and consequences of childhood depressive symptoms. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 101(3), 405-422. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.101.3.405>
- Pavlović, R. (2016). *Prosocijalne tendencije i rizični čimbenici učenika koji su uključeni u poludnevni boravak doma za odgoj djece i mladeži Rijeka*. (Neobjavljeni diplomski rad). Rijeka: Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci.
- Pellegrini, D. S. (1990). Psychosocial risk and protective factors in childhood. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics*, 11(4), 201-209. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004703-199008000-00009>
- Perry, J., & Carroll, M. (2008). The role of impulsive behavior in drug abuse. *Psychopharmacology*, 200(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-008-1173-0>
- Pulkkinen, L. (2001). Antisocial Behavior in Childhood and Adolescence. *International Encyclopedia of Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 20, 549-553 /online/. Retrived on 13th January 2018 from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com/eds/detail/detail?vid=20&sid=2551ca6e-75eb-4e79-9aab-acd1eadc7827%40sessionmgr198&hid=104&bdata=Jmxhbmc9aHlmc2l0ZT1lZHMtbg12ZQ%3d%3d#db=edselp&AN=B008043076701737X>
- Putarek, V., & Kerestes, G. (2012). Tko je popularan u ranoj adolescenciji? Povezanost percipirane popularnosti sa spolom i usamljenosti. *Društvena istraživanja*, 21(4), 949-968. <https://doi.org/10.5559/di.21.4.07>
- Rubin, K. H., Chen, X., McDougall, P., Bowker, A., & McKinnon, J., (1995). The Waterloo Longitudinal Project: Predicting Internalizing and Externalizing Problems in Adolescence. *Development & Psychopathology*, 7(4), 51-764. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400006829>
- Shenasa, E. D., Paradis A. D., Dolan, S. L., Wilhelm, C. S., & Buka, S. L. (2012). Childhood impulsive behavior and problem gambling by adulthood: a 30-year prospective community-based study. *Addiction*, 107(1), 160-168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2011.03571.x>
- Simons-Morton, B. G., Davis Crump, A., Haynie, D. L., & Saylor, K. E. (1999). Student - school bonding and adolescent problem behavior. *Oxford Journals Health Education Research*, 14(1), 99-107. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/14.1.99>
- Singer, M. (2008). *Kriminološke osobitosti maloljetničke delinkvencije*. Zagreb: Globus.
- Uzelac, S., & Bouillet, D. (2008). Preventivni rad socijalnih pedagoga u školama - iskustva iz Hrvatske. In Z. Matejić-Đuričić (Ed.), *Poremećaji ponašanja u sistemu obrazovanja* (pp.115-128). Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu Fakultet za specijalnu edukaciju i rehabilitaciju.
- Vannest, K. J., Temple-Harvey, K. K., & Mason, B. A. (2009). Adequate yearly progress for students with emotional and behavioral disorders through research-based practices. *Preventing School Failure*, 53(2), 73-83. <https://doi.org/10.3200/PSFL.53.2.73-84>
- Vlah, N. (2011). Relacije između stavova o obrascima ponašanja u socijalnim sukobima i razina poremećaja u ponašanju adolescenata. *Kriminologija i socijalna integracija*, 19(1), 15-26.
- Vlah, N. (2013). *Poželjna ponašanja mladih u konfliktima*. Zagreb: Biakova.

- Vlah, N. (2013). Samoprocjena ponašanja adolescenata na različitim razinama poremećaja u ponašanju. *Napredak*, 154(1-2), 149-166.
- Zakon o odgoju i obrazovanju u osnovnoj i srednjoj školi. *Narodne novine*, 87/08, 6/09, 92/10, 105/10, 90/11, 5/12, 16/12, 86/12, 126/12, 94/13, 152/14, 07/17.
- Zakon o socijalnoj skrbi. *Narodne novine*, 157/13, 152/14, 99/15, 52/16, 16/17, 130/17.
- Žic Ralić, A., & Šifner, E. (2015). Obilježja vršnjačke interakcije i iskustvo vršnjačkog nasilja kod djece i mladih s ADHD-om. *Ljetopis socijalnog rada*, 21(3), 453-484. <https://doi.org/10.3935/ljsr.v21i2.24>
- Žižak, A. (2003). Konceptualni aspekti učenja socijalnih vještina. *Kriminologija & socijalna integracija: časopis za kriminologiju, penologiju i poremećaje u ponašanju*, 11(2), 107-115.
- Žižak, A., & Bouillet, D. (2003). *Standardi programa prevencije poremećaja u ponašanju djece i mladih*. Zagreb: Državni zavod za zaštitu obitelji, materinstva i mladeži.

Nataša Vlah

Faculty of Teacher Education
University of Rijeka
Sveučilišna Avenija 6, 51000 Rijeka, Croatia
natasa.vlah@uniri.hr

Orjana Marušić Štimac

Primary school "Nikola Tesla"
Trg Ivana Klobučarića 1, 51000 Rijeka, Croatia
orjana@stimac.com

Iva Galović

Primary school "Nikola Tesla"
Trg Ivana Klobučarića 1, 51000 Rijeka, Croatia
iva1611@gmail.com

Socijalnopedagoška obilježja učenika kojima treba dodatna pomoć u učenju i korekciji ponašanja: elementi školskoga preventivnog programa⁵

Sažetak

Cilj je rada ispitati neka sociodemografska, pedagoška i ponašajna obilježja učenika te ih dovesti u relaciju s procjenom potrebe za dodatnom pomoći u učenju i za korekcijom ponašanja. U istraživanju je sudjelovalo 300 učenika od prvog do osmog razreda osnovne škole iz Rijeke. Anonimne i dobrovoljne procjene davali su njihovi razrednici. Istraživanje je pokazalo da u većoj mjeri dodatnu pomoć u učenju trebaju stariji i nepopularniji učenici, učenici slabijega akademskog uspjeha, lošijega SES-a, pri čemu je zastupljenost oba spola podjednaka. Kod navedenih/spomenutih učenika ne uočava se obrazac prosocijalno-suradničkoga ponašanja koji je prisutan u ponašanju njihovih vršnjaka kojima nije potrebna pomoć u učenju. Rezultati su pokazali da dodatnu pomoć u korekciji ponašanja podjednako trebaju učenici svih dobi i oba spola, učenici slabijega uspjeha, nepopularniji i lošijeg SES-a. Ovi se učenici ponašaju prema pobjeđujuće-agresivnom obrascu za razliku od njihovih vršnjaka kojima ne treba korekcija u ponašanju. Razmjerno je više učenika kojima treba dodatna pomoć u učenju među onim učenicima kojima treba dodatna pomoć u korekciji ponašanja. Rezultati mogu biti korisni pri planiranju elemenata preventivnih školskih programa koji se preporučuju s obzirom na dobivene pokazatelje.

Ključne riječi: obrasci ponašanja u sukobima; problemi u ponašanju; prosocijalno i agresivno ponašanje; teškoće u učenju; učenici s teškoćama.

Uvod

U svijetu i Hrvatskoj više je od tri desetljeća u diskursu preventivskih znanosti prihvaćeno da je moguće rano i pravovremeno uočiti i sustavno intervenirati na

⁵ Rezultati ovoga rada prethodno su prezentirani na 11. međunarodnoj balkanskoj konferenciji obrazovanja i znanosti BUDUĆNOST OBRAZOVANJA I OBRAZOVANJE ZA BUDUĆNOST (Poreč, 12.-14. listopada 2016.)

elemente nepovoljnoga psihosocijalnog razvoja za pojedince i skupine te ih osnaživati u njihovom prevladavanju. Navedena paradigma prepoznaje se kao znanstveno utemeljena prevencija nepoželjnih razvojnih ishoda poput neuspješne socijalne adaptacije i općenito socijalne isključenosti kao i kriminaliteta u adolescenciji i odrasloj dobi te bolesti ovisnosti ili mentalnih problema (Nolen- Hoeksema, Girgus i Seligman, 1992; Colman, Wadsworth, Croudace i Jones, 2007; Pulkkinen, 2001; Rubin, Chen, McDougall, Bowker i McKinnon, 1995; Perry i Carroll, 2008; Shenasa, Paradis, Dolan, Wilhelm i Buka, 2012; Bašić, 2009; Bašić, Mihić i Novak, 2010). Zato su napori u osmišljavanju, provedbi i evaluaciji kvalitetnih preventivnih programa od ključnog interesa društva koje odgovorno analizira mogućnosti vlastitoga unapređenja, što potvrđuju preporuke sustavnom pristupu preventivnim programima u Hrvatskoj (Kranželić, Ferić i Jerković, 2016). Za ovaj je rad zanimljivo u tom kontekstu promišljanje o školskim preventivnim programima (Uzelac i Bouillet, 2008; Žižak i Bouillet, 2003) koji mogu svojom sveobuhvatnošću vrlo rano detektirati područja potreba pojedinih učenika (i njihovih obitelji), ali i reagirati primjerenim diferenciranim intervencijama. Bašić (2009) je prikazala više koncepata u pristupu prevenciji - koncept rizika i zaštite, koncept otpornosti, koncept pozitivnoga razvoja, koncept unapređenja mentalnoga zdravlja. Koncept, odnosno teorija rizičnih i zaštitnih čimbenika (Mrazek i Haggerty, 1994) često je korišten i referiran u osmišljavanju preventivnih programa za djecu rane i osnovnoškolske dobi (Durlak, 1998; Catalano, Berglund, Ryan, Lonczak i Hawkins, 2004; Farrington, Gaffney, Lösel i Ttofi, 2017). Jedan od najpoznatijih rizika za nepovoljni psihosocijalni razvoj je teškoća učenika u postizanju akademskoga uspjeha usprkos adekvatnim odgojno-obrazovnim uvjetima (Fernandez-Rio, Cecchini, Méndez-Gimenez, Mendez-Alonso i Prieto, 2017) zbog neosigurane dodatne pomoći u učenju u učenikovom okruženju (Johnson, Panagiotti, Bass, Ramsey i Harrison, 2017), a drugi su rano detektirani problemi u ponašanju na razini na kojoj je za njihovu korekciju potrebna dodatna stručna pomoć učeniku, ali i učitelju koji ga poučava (Vlah, 2011; 2013). U tom smislu, u ovome radu pokušat će se istražiti determinante koje određuju navedena dva rizika, smatrajući i uvažavajući te determinante teorijski relevantnim pokazateljima planiranja i osmišljavanja preventivnih intervencija za učenika, odnosno preventivnoga školskog programa.

Ova dva rizika – teškoće u učenju i problemi u ponašanju, snažno su povezana, što je potvrđeno u brojnim nalazima u literaturi (Mundy, Canterford, Tucker i sur., 2017; Singer, 2008). Odnosno, uz probleme u ponašanju koji intenzitetom, trajanjem i nepovoljnošću za učenika i okolinu upućuju na potrebu stručne pomoći nerijetko se, a gotovo u pravilu, prepoznaju i poteškoće u svladavanju kurikula kada je pored redovitoga rada učitelja, potrebno djetetu osigurati i dodatnu pomoć u učenju (Uzelac i Bouillet, 2008), kako bi se realizirala optimalna socijalna adaptacija u dječjoj, ali i kasnijoj adolescentskoj i odrasloj dobi (Berc, Majdak i Bežovan, 2015).

Postavlja se pitanje koje su determinante povezane s rizicima poteškoća u svladavanju kurikula i društveno prihvatljivoga socijalnog ponašanja? Analizom literature uočavaju

se brojna obilježja na razini pojedinca i okoline (Pellegrini, 1990) koja otežavaju ili olakšavaju razvojne zadaće kroz odrastanje, a za ovaj rad izdvojena su neka obilježja koja su se autoricama činila relevantnima i koja su bila dostupna prikupljanju podataka u skladu s Etičkim kodeksom istraživanja s djecom (Ajduković i Kolesarić, 2003). Neki izvori elaboriraju da su dječaci u klasičnom tradicionalnom obrazovnom sustavu, gdje postoje rodni stereotipi, podložniji akademskom neuspjehu od djevojčica (Collins, 2017), dok neki ističu slabije uspjehe djevojčica u prirodnim predmetima (Hofer, 2016), no generalno je utvrđeno da djevojčice i dječaci podjednako sudjeluju u fenomenu akademskoga neuspjeha (Lohbeck, Grube i Moschner, 2017) te im je zbog toga podjednako potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju. Problemi u ponašanju⁶ u prijašnjim i novijim istraživanjima češće su se utvrđivali kod dječaka nego kod djevojčica, osim vezano uz verbalno i relacijsko nasilje djevojčice prevladavaju (Björkqvist, 2017). Stoga se u Hrvatskoj suvremenim pristupom promišljanja organiziranja i pružanja stručne pomoći učenicima s problemima u ponašanju, diferenciraju norme za preventivne programe za djevojčice i dječake (Bouillet, 2016), uzimajući u obzir razlike u manifestiranju specifičnih vrsta i oblika problema. Starijim je učenicima u osnovnoj školi kurikulum zahtjevniji te školovanje u višim razredima osnovne škole (od 5. do 8. razreda), odnosno u predmetnoj nastavi, prema sustavu školstva u Hrvatskoj, za učenike nosi veće izazove i stresove. Javljaju se problemi vezani uz svladavanje gradiva i/ili problemi u ponašanju na razini internaliziranih (depresivnost, psihosomatski problemi) (Mandić, Baraban i Boranić, 2003) ili eksternaliziranih (agresivnost, suprotstavljanje autoritetima) problema (Macuka, 2016). Važno ih je detektirati i na njih pravovremeno reagirati kako ih učenici ne bi prenosili u sljedeći stupanj školovanja gdje ih čekaju novi izazovi i novi stresori koji mogu probleme pogoršati i uzrokovati napuštanje školovanja, razvoj delinkventnoga ponašanja ili probleme mentalnoga zdravlja (Ferić, Milas i Rihtar, 2010). Materijalni status obitelji učenika može i ne mora imati uzročno-posljedične veze s činjenicom da će učeniku biti potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju ili korekciji ponašanja. Naime, neka istraživanja ukazuju da je za kvalitetan psihosocijalni razvoj bitnija kvaliteta odnosa u obitelji i odsutnost sociopatoloških pojava poput alkoholizma i obiteljskoga nasilja (Singer, 2008) nego materijalni status kao takav, te da će se dijete i u materijalno depriviranoj obitelji, ako postoji obiteljska otpornost (obiteljski sustav vjerovanja, modeli obiteljske organizacije i komunikacijski procesi u obitelji), razvijati pozitivno (Berc, 2012). No, neka istraživanja upućuju da je izrazita materijalna deprivacija konstantan izvor stresa roditeljima i faktor psihološkoga iscrpljivanja za svakodnevnu egzistenciju, što se može odraziti na kapacitete roditelja u odgoju djece (Družić Ljubotina, Sabolić i Kletečki Radović, 2017). Kvaliteta međuljudskih odnosa

⁶ Pojam „problemi u ponašanju“ predstavlja „skupni naziv za sva ona ponašanja biološke, psihološke, pedagoške ili socijalne geneze, kojima dijete/ mlada osoba značajno odstupa od ponašanja primjerenog dobi, situaciji, kulturnim i etničkim normama, te štetno ili opasno utječe na sebe i/ili druge pojedince i socijalne sustave“ (Koller-Trbović, Žižak i Jedud Borić, 2011, str.3). U ovom se radu termin potreba za dodatnom pomoći u korekciji ponašanja odnosi na drugu ili treću razinu problema u ponašanju kada se s tim ponašanjem razrednik (ili učitelj tijekom nastave) više ne može se uspješno nositi (Vlah, 2013)

u obitelji je, dakle, veoma važan koncept u preventivskoj znanosti, njeno mjerenje i zaključivanje o njoj delikatan je i složen proces, osobito s etičkoga aspekta (Miroslavljević, Jeđud-Borić i Koller-Trbović, 2016). Učenici kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju obično su manje popularni u društvu vršnjaka i imaju tendenciju biti socijalno isključeni iz neformalnih socijalnih vršnjačkih odnosa (Estell, Jones, Pearl, Van Acker, Farmer i Rodkin, 2008), dok je kod učenika kojima je potrebna korekcija ponašanja dimenzija socijalne isključenosti još izraženija budući da uglavnom imaju slabe socijalne vještine za izgrađivanje i održavanje socijalnih odnosa (Žic Ralić i Šifner, 2015; Žižak, 2003) pa ih vršnjaci u školi često izoliraju ili odbacuju. Nisko popularni učenici obaju spolova usamljeniji su od srednje popularnih i visoko popularnih učenika (Putarek i Keresteš, 2012). Negativan akademski uspjeh, odnosno akademski neuspjeh u vidu negativnih ocjena i/ili ponavljanja razreda konstantno je potvrđivan prediktivni element delinkventnoga razvoja (Singer, 2008), odnosno razvoja negativne slike o sebi i razvojnoga psihosocijalnog životnog puta prema negativnoj afirmaciji i sve intenzivnijim i opasnijim problemima u ponašanju (Vlah, 2013). Rane i dobro osmišljene odgojno-obrazovne intervencije u prevladavanju akademskoga neuspjeha znanstveno su dokazani element prevencije (Kranželić Tavra, 2003) i neophodne već od polaska u prvi razred osnovne škole. Učenici kojima je određen primjereni oblik odgoja i obrazovanja, obično imaju u svom rješenju i preporuku za dodatnu pomoć stručnjaka vezano uz teškoću koju imaju. Primjerice, ako se radi o učeniku koji ima disleksiju i/ili disgrafiju, određuje mu se pomoć logopeda, učenik koji ima poremećaj pažnje i hiperaktivnosti, pomoć socijalnoga pedagoga, prema riječkom modelu uključivanja učenika s teškoćama u razvoju. Istraživanja, dakle, upućuju da se kod određenih vrsta teškoća mogu očekivati i potrebe za dodatnom pomoći, odnosno dodatnom podrškom za učenika (Cook, 2014) kako bi se ostvarilo njegovo optimalno ispunjavanje potencijala u zadanim okvirima kurikula. Socijalno ponašanje učenika također je važno za uspješnu socijalizaciju i socijalnu integraciju, a jedan od najvažnijih indikatora je ponašanje u sukobima. Ponašanje u sukobima najbolje se može mjeriti mjerenjem ponašanja prema obrascima ponašanja u sukobima za koje postoji više skala i dimenzija sustava mjerenja. U Hrvatskoj se ovaj pristup nedovoljno koristi, a nedavno je konstruirana skala kojom razrednici mogu pouzdano i valjano procijeniti ponašanje svojih učenika u sukobima prema tri obrasca (Vlah, 2013): (i) suradnja koja je obrazac konstruktivnoga ponašanja i pretpostavlja pozitivan stav da je moguće rješenje sukoba koje zadovoljava potrebe obje strane u sukobu; koja zahtijeva emocionalnu kompetentnost i socijalne vještine sudionika u sukobu te kao ishod sukoba ostavlja zadovoljnim obje strane u sukobu; (ii) izbjegavanje sukoba koji je nekonstruktivan obrazac jer se izbjegavanjem sukoba ne rješavaju problemi koji se nagomilavaju i kasnije eskaliraju u neprimjerenom trenutku s višestrukim negativnim posljedicama; djeca uče izbjegavati sukobe jer uglavnom tako nauče od odraslih i zadaća je odraslih da ih potiču na suradnju umjesto na izbjegavanje sukoba; (iii) pobjeđivanje u sukobu također je nekonstruktivan obrazac ponašanja povezan s nasilništvom jer se pobjeđivanjem nanosi šteta drugoj strani u

sukobu i zanemaruju potrebe suprotne strane, a da bi se zadovoljile isključivo vlastite; također ovaj obrazac obilježava dominantnost jedne strane, a podređivanje suprotne strane te kao prethodna dva obrasca, djeca ga uče socijalnim učenjem u svojim primarnim sredinama (Vlah, 2013). Vezano uz prije navedeno, prosocijalno i agresivno ponašanje dva su konstrukta koji se također mogu dovesti u vezu s rizicima za nepovoljni psihosocijalni razvoj i indiciraju djecu kojima su potrebni preventivni školski programi. Simons-Morton, Davis Crump, Haynie i Saylor (1999) ističu kako je veću pozornost istraživača kao i školskih vlasti, potrebno usmjeriti na osjećaj povezanosti učenika sa školom. Dobiveni rezultati njihova istraživanja pokazuju kako učenici s pozitivnom povezanošću sa svojom školom postižu bolji školski uspjeh i pokazuju značajno manje neadekvatnih oblika ponašanja. Svjesni složenosti interakcija učenika i škole na osnovi dobivenih rezultata, osmislili su višekomponentni preventivni program s ciljem jačanja povezanosti učenika sa školom. Povezanost sa školom, prema Hawkins i Weis (1985), uključuje povezanost s prosocijalnim vršnjacima, prihvaćanje školskih normi i školskih obaveza. Dobro prilagođeni učenici povezani sa svojom školom ostaju usmjereni na školski uspjeh i rjeđe posežu za neadekvatnim obrascima ponašanja. Povezanost sa školom širi je koncept od socijalne povezanosti i doprinosi ustrajanju učenika u postizanju akademskoga uspjeha i primjeni adekvatnih obrazaca ponašanja. Hawkins i Catalano (1990) smatraju kako se povezanost sa školom može unaprijediti poticanjem razvoja socijalnih vještina i socijalne kompetencije, unapređivanjem školske klime te osnaživanjem i edukacijom roditelja.

Slijedom rečenoga, svrha ovoga rada je utvrditi neke elemente psihosocijalnoga razvojnog rizika/ zaštite učenika za koje razrednici procjenjuju da im je potrebna pomoć u učenju i korekcijom ponašanja te na temelju utvrđenih elemenata rizika/ zaštite strukturirati ciljeve preventivnoga programa.

Opći je cilj rada ispitati neka sociodemografska, pedagoška i ponašajna obilježja učenika te ih dovesti u relaciju s procjenom potrebe za dodatnom pomoći u učenju i/ili korekciji ponašanja. Specifični problemi rada su utvrditi:

- (i) postotak učenika u školi kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju i postotak učenika kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u korekciji ponašanja te razmjerne odnose između ove dvije procijenjene potrebe
- (ii) relacije između procijenjene potrebe za dodatnom pomoći u učenju i sociodemografskih obilježja učenika (spol, dob, materijalno stanje u obitelji učenika, kvaliteta međuljudskih odnosa u obitelji učenika, popularnost učenika), pedagoških obilježja učenika (akademski uspjeh, primjereni oblik odgojno-obrazovnoga programa) i obilježja socijalnoga ponašanja učenika (tri obrasca ponašanja u sukobima: suradnja, izbjegavanje, pobjeđivanje; prosocijalno ili agresivno ponašanje)
- (iii) relacije između procijenjene potrebe za dodatnom pomoći u korekciji ponašanja i sociodemografskih obilježja učenika (spol, dob, materijalno stanje u obitelji učenika, kvaliteta međuljudskih odnosa u obitelji učenika, popularnost učenika),

pedagoških obilježja učenika (akademski uspjeh, primjereni oblik odgojno-obrazovnog programa) i obilježja socijalnoga ponašanja učenika (tri obrasca ponašanja u sukobima: suradnja, izbjegavanje, pobjeđivanje; prosocijalno ili agresivno ponašanje).

Metode

Uzorak sudionika

U istraživanju je sudjelovalo 300 učenika od prvog do osmog razreda jedne osnovne škole u hrvatskom sjevernojadranskom gradu Rijeci (M=11 godina; 44 % djevojčica). Pri tome je bilo 44 (14,7 %) učenika u prvom, 31 (10,3 %) u drugom, 29 (9,7 %) u trećem, 56 (18,7 %) u četvrtom, 19 (6,3 %) u petom, 44 (14,7 %) u šestom, 21 (7 %) u sedmom i 56 (18,7 %) učenika u osmom razredu. Od svih učenika, 161 (53,7 %) učenik ima jednog brata ili sestru, 37 (12,3 %) učenika dvoje, 11 (3,7 %) troje, 7 (2,3 %) četvero i 3 (1 %) učenika ima 10 braće i sestara u obitelji, a 169 (56,3 %) učenika je prvorodeno u obitelji. Škola ima 520 učenika od kojih veći broj živi u obitelji s različitom problematikom i specifičnim deficitima: obitelji niskoga imovinskog statusa i korisnika socijalne pomoći, obitelji s više djece (5 do 11), samohrani roditelji, djeca bez roditelja, obitelji s teško i kronično oboljelim članovima, učenici s blažim teškoćama u razvoju (individualni pristup uz dodatnu pomoć edukacijskoga rehabilitatora i/ili logopeda), obitelji nepismenih roditelja bez završene osnovne škole, obitelji u kojima su majke s djecom smještene u sigurne kuće zbog nasilja u obitelji, vrlo loši stambeni uvjeti, smjenski rad roditelja itd. Svi navedeni problemi učestali su u školi u kojoj je provedeno ispitivanje kao i u široj populaciji te za oba okruženja postoje statistički podatci o njihovoj prevalenciji i incidenciji.

Procjene o učenikovim socijalno-pedagoškim (sociodemografskim, pedagoškim i ponašajnim) obilježjima dali su njihovi razrednici (N=16) prosječne dobi od 47 godina i stručnoga staža od 21 godinu. Razrednici su učenike poznavali u trenutku procjenjivanja najmanje pola godine, a najviše 8 godina.

Tablica 1.

Kao što je vidljivo u tablici 1, učenici su obzirom na spol ravnomjerno raspodijeljeni u svim razredima.

Mjerni instrumenti i varijable u istraživanju

Korišten je Upitnik za razrednike *Učiteljska procjena obrazaca učenikovih ponašanja u sukobima i opći podaci učenika*⁷ u kojem su u prvom dijelu opći podatci o razredniku i učeniku, a u drugom dijelu integrirana pitanja i skale procjene. Slijedi popis zavisnih i nezavisnih varijabli i način kodiranja odgovora.

⁷ Upit na mail: natasa.vlah@uniri.hr

Zavisne varijable:

- Mislite li da bi ovom učeniku/učenici trebala dodatna pomoć u učenju? (1 = NE, 2 = DA)
- Mislite li da bi ovom učeniku/učenici trebala dodatna pomoć u korekciji ponašanja? (1 = NE, 2 = DA).
- Nezavisne varijable:
 - spol učenika (1 = m; 2 = ž)
 - dob učenika
 - materijalno stanje u obitelji učenika (1 = lošije od prosječnog, 2 = prosječno, 3 = bolje od prosječnog)
 - kvaliteta međuljudskih odnosa u obitelji učenika (1 = loša, 2 = ni loša ni dobra, 3 = dobra)
 - popularnost učenika u razredu (1 = nepopularan, 2 = ni nepopularan ni popularan, 3 = popularan)
 - akademski uspjeh učenika (od 2 = dovoljan do 5 = odličan)
 - primjereni oblik odgojno-obrazovnog programa (1 = redovni program, 2 = redovni program uz individualizirane postupke, 3 = prilagođeni program)
 - *Skala za procjenu obrazaca ponašanja učenika u sukobima* (Družinec i Vlah, 2016) mjeri tri obrasca ponašanja u sukobima: suradnja, izbjegavanje, pobjeđivanje. U izvornom radu konstrukcije skale, autorice su pokazale pouzdanu trofaktorsku strukturu pri čemu se obrazac suradnje mjeri subskalom (N = 16; $\alpha = .86$) čiji je primjer čestice učenik/ca u sukobu iznosi argumente u razgovoru, obrazac izbjegavanja subskalom (N = 13; $\alpha = .86$) čiji je primjer čestice učenik/ca u sukobu govori: „Kako ti želiš” i obrazac pobjeđivanja subskalom (N = 19; $\alpha = .85$) čiji je primjer čestice učenik/ca u sukobu koristi pogrdne riječi. Učitelji su procjenjivali učenikovo ponašanje skalom od 0 = uopće se ne odnosi na učenika/učenicu do 4 = gotovo uvijek se odnosi na učenika/učenicu. U ovome su istraživanju potvrđene visoko zadovoljavajuće mjerne karakteristike instrumenta.
 - *Upitnikom PROS/AG* učitelji su procjenjivali prosocijalno i agresivno ponašanje učenika skalom od 1 (nikada se tako ne ponaša) do 5 (gotovo uvijek se tako ponaša) (Žužul i Vlahović-Štetić, 1992; Bašić i Lebedina-Manzoni, 1997; sve prema Kranželić Tavra, 2003). Konstrukt prosocijalnoga ponašanja mjereno je subskalom (N = 10; $\alpha = .91$) čiji je primjer čestice učenik/ca dijeli bombone i slatkiše s drugim učenicima, a konstrukt agresivnoga ponašanja subskalom (N = 10; $\alpha = .90$) čiji je primjer čestice učenik/ca izaziva sukobe.

Postupak prikupljanja i obrade podataka

Na zamolbu školskoga psihologa razrednici su anonimno i dobrovoljno procjenjivali učenike čime je procijenjeno 58 % učenika škole. Aplikativna svrha procjene je razrednicima prezentirana kao planiranje školskoga preventivnog programa Školsko poslijepodne samo za mene (koji je nakon ovoga istraživanja i pokrenut u školi).

Istraživanje je podprojekt⁸ širega projekta *Razine rizika za probleme u ponašanju djece rane i razvojne dobi i stručne intervencije*. Podatci su obrađeni kvantitativnom deskriptivnom analizom, odnosno analizom razlika i relacija između skupina iz zavisnih varijabli t-testom, hi-kvadrat testom te dvjema diskriminativnim analizama.

Rezultati

U svrhu odgovaranja na postavljene probleme, prikazat će se frekvencije i postotci svih fokusnih varijabli te analize relacija za svaku od zavisnih varijabli istraživanja: procjenu potrebe za dodatnom pomoći u učenju kao i procjenu potrebe za dodatnu pomoć u korekciji ponašanja za učenika/učenicu kojem/kojoj se radi procjena.

Tablica 2

Procijenjeno je da petina učenika škole treba dodatnu pomoć u učenju dok dodatnu pomoć u korekciji ponašanja treba svaki deveti do deseti učenik škole (tablica 2). Ispitivanjem relacija utvrđeno je da ima razmjerno više učenika koji trebaju dodatnu pomoć u korekciji ponašanja među onim učenicima koji istovremeno trebaju i dodatnu pomoć u učenju ($\chi^2=23.1^{**}$; $df=1$). Dakle, detektirana je skupina učenika za koju je evidentno da je, osim redovitoga odgojno-obrazovnoga rada učitelja u školi, neophodna i dodatna stručna pomoć u svladavanju kurikula i pozitivne transformacije ponašanja. S obzirom da cijela škola ima oko 520 učenika, može se implicirati da će oko 70 učenika godišnje u školi trebati dodatnu pomoć u navedenim područjima specijalnoga odgoja i obrazovanja.

U analizi relacija, između procijenjene potrebe dodatne pomoći u učenju i spola učenika, utvrđeno je da ne postoje statistički značajne relacije između dvije varijable ($\chi^2= .20$; $df=1$), odnosno djevojčice i dječaci podjednako imaju potrebu za dodatnom pomoći u učenju. Slično kao i u prethodnoj analizi, premda postoji tendencija u korist razmjerno većeg udjela dječaka u skupini za koju je procijenjena potreba dodatne pomoći u korekciji ponašanja, utvrđuje se kako ne postoje statistički značajne relacije između dvije varijable ($\chi^2= 3.37$; $df=1$), odnosno djevojčice i dječaci podjednako imaju potrebu za dodatnom pomoći u korekciji ponašanja.

Tablica 3

Učenici za koje se procjenjuje da trebaju dodatnu pomoć u učenju nešto su stariji od učenika za koje razrednici ne procjenjuju da im je potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju (tablica 3). Prosječna dob učenika kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju je jedanaest i pol godina što je ekvivalent petom ili šestom razredu, uz odstupanja od otprilike dvije godine. Analizom dobnih razlika utvrđuje se da je učenicima svih dobnih skupina podjednako procijenjena potreba za dodatnom pomoći u korekciji ponašanja.

Tablica 4

⁸ Objavljeni radovi u podprojektu: Družinec, & Vlah (2016); Družinec (2016)

Razmjerno je više učenika kojima treba dodatna pomoć u učenju i korekciji ponašanja među onim učenicima čije su obiteljske prilike lošije od prosječnih (tablica 4), odnosno razmjerno je više učenika kojima ne treba dodatna pomoć u učenju i korekciji ponašanja među učenicima čije su obiteljske prilike bolje od prosječnih.

Razmjerno je više učenika za koje razrednici smatraju da im je potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju i korekciji ponašanja čija se kvaliteta međuljudskih odnosa u obitelji procjenjuje kao loša ili ni loša ni dobra. Drugim riječima, razmjerno je više učenika kojima nije potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju i korekciji ponašanja među učenicima kojima je kvaliteta međuljudskih odnosa u obitelji dobra.

Razmjerno je više učenika za koje razrednici smatraju da im je potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju i korekciji ponašanja među nepopularnima, odnosno niti popularnima niti nepopularnima učenicima, tj. razmjerno je više učenika kojima nije potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju među onima koji su popularni u razredu.

U skladu s očekivanjima, razmjerno je više učenika kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju među dovoljnim i dobrim akademskim uspjehom. Istovremeno, razmjerno je više učenika kojima nije potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju među onima koji su odlični učenici. Također, razmjerno je više učenika kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u korekciji ponašanja među učenicima dovoljnoga i dobrog, čak i vrlo dobrog akademskog uspjeha, a razmjerno je više učenika kojima nije potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju među onima koji su odlični učenici.

Razmjerno je više učenika među onima za koje razrednici procjenjuju potrebu dodatne pomoći u učenju koji se školuju prema propisanim primjerenim oblicima odgoja i obrazovanja. Bilo je zanimljivo provjeriti jesu li ovi učenici ujedno i slabijega akademskog uspjeha, stoga je napravljena dodatna analiza prema kojoj je utvrđeno da nema statistički značajnih relacija između primjerenoga oblika školovanja i akademskog uspjeha ($\chi^2=6.63$; $df=2$), što znači da su svi učenici, bez obzira kojim se oblikom odgoja i obrazovanja školuju, podjednako akademski uspješni (imaju ocjene od dovoljan do odličan), što implicira da se učitelji u ovoj školi vode Naputcima za ocjenjivanje učenika s teškoćama (1996). Razmjerno je više učenika kojima nije potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju u kategoriji učenika koji pohađaju redovni program osnovnoškolskoga kurikula. Razmjerno je više učenika među onima za koje razrednici procjenjuju potrebu dodatne pomoći u korekciji ponašanja koji se školuju prema redovnom programu uz individualizirane postupke. Za osmišljavanje preventivnoga školskog programa od osobitoga su interesa učenici koji se školuju po redovnom programu, a koji imaju potrebu za dodatnom pomoći u korekciji ponašanja. Ovi su učenici u brojčanom smislu zastupljeniji od skupine učenika koji se školuju po redovnom programu uz individualizaciju, odnosno oni čine 12 % ili nešto više od desetine uzorka svih ispitanika.

Tablica 5

Učenici koji trebaju dodatnu pomoć u učenju i učenici koji ne trebaju dodatnu pomoć u učenju na manifestnoj razini, prema mišljenju njihovih razrednika, razlikuju se u

socijalnom ponašanju. Razlike su evidentne u sva tri obrasca ponašanja u sukobima te u prosocijalnom ponašanju, dok u pokazivanju agresivnosti nema razlika. Učenici kojima treba dodatna pomoć u učenju manje surađuju i manje su prosocijalni, a više izbjegavaju i više pobjeđuju u sukobu (tablica 5). Učenici koji trebaju dodatnu pomoć u korekciji ponašanja i učenici koji ne trebaju dodatnu pomoć u korekciji ponašanja, na manifestnoj razini, prema mišljenju njihovih razrednika, razlikuju se u socijalnom ponašanju. Razlike su evidentne u sva tri obrasca ponašanja u sukobima te u prosocijalnom i agresivnom ponašanju. Učenici kojima treba dodatna pomoć u korekciji ponašanja manje surađuju i manje su prosocijalni, a više izbjegavaju i više pobjeđuju u sukobu te su više agresivni (tablica 5).

U svrhu latentne analize, provedene su dvije diskriminativne analize kojima je utvrđeno da se učenici kojima treba dodatna pomoć u učenju i učenici kojima ne treba dodatna pomoć u učenju razlikuju u 15 % varijance u dobivenoj funkciji (tablica 5) te da se učenici koji trebaju dodatnu pomoć u korekciji ponašanja i učenici koji ne trebaju dodatnu pomoć u korekciji ponašanja razlikuju u 28 % varijance u ekstrahiranoj funkciji.

Tablica 6

Učenici kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju značajno se razlikuju od učenika kojima nije potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju u funkciji **prosocijalno-suradničkoga obrasca ponašanja** (tablica 7). Učenici kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju u negativnom su odnosu s ovom funkcijom, dok su učenici kojima nije potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju u pozitivnom odnosu s tom funkcijom u prostoru oko jedne standardne devijacije (tablica 6). Dakle, učenici kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju manifestiraju značajno manje prosocijalno-suradničkoga ponašanja od učenika kojima takva pomoć nije potrebna, premda razlike nisu vrlo velike.

Tablica 7

Učenici kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u korekciji ponašanja značajno se razlikuju od učenika kojima nije potrebna dodatna pomoć u korekciji ponašanja u funkciji **pobjeđujuće-agresivnoga obrasca ponašanja** (tablica 7). Učenici kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u korekciji ponašanja u pozitivnom su odnosu s ovom funkcijom, dok su učenici kojima nije potrebna dodatna pomoć u korekciji ponašanja u negativnom odnosu s tom funkcijom u gotovo dvije standardne devijacije (tablica 6). Dakle, učenici kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u korekciji ponašanja manifestiraju značajno više pobjeđujuće-agresivnoga ponašanja od učenika kojima takva pomoć nije potrebna, pri čemu su razlike razmjerno velike.

Rasprava

U školi je jednoj petini učenika, prema procjenama razrednika, potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju. Tko detektiranim učenicima pomaže u učenju? Manji broj ima Rješenje Ureda državne uprave o primjerenom obliku školovanja uz dodatnu pomoć logopeda pa je u tom smislu stručna pomoć u stručnom rehabilitacijskom smislu njima zakonski osigurana. Iz rezultata se vidi da učenici koji pohađaju redovni program uz

individualizaciju imaju značajno najviše potreba za dodatnom pomoći u učenju. Zašto je tome tako? Moguće je da se s njima individualizacija ne provodi na dovoljno stručan način, što bi trebalo provjeriti budućim istraživanjima. Dalje, svakom šestom učeniku iz istraživanja koji pohađa nastavu po redovnom programu potrebna je dodatna pomoć u učenju. Postavlja se pitanje za daljnje istraživanje: ima li među tim učenicima onih koji bi također trebali imati spomenuta rješenja i prilagodbe u radu? Uz pretpostavku da nije tako, postavlja se pitanje tko njima pomaže? Moguće je da jednom dijelu učenika roditelji pomažu u učenju i pisanju domaćih zadaća i svladavanjem kurikula, no pitanje je puno ozbiljnije što se događa s učenicima koji ne dobivaju pomoć u obitelji? Jesu li ti učenici zanemareni od obitelji i od sustava? Preporuka ovoga rada je da resorno ministarstvo, lokalne zajednice i škole suradnički organiziraju program dodatne pomoći u učenju za učenike u potrebi. Kod jednog od deset učenika škole u kojoj se provelo ispitivanje, detektira se potreba za dodatnom pomoći razredniku (učitelju) u korekciji ponašanja učenika. Učestalost je sukladna nalazima Bouillet (2016) dobivenima na uzorku za Hrvatsku, što znači da je ona uobičajena za osnovne škole u Hrvatskoj. Pored toga, a što je vrlo značajno kod planiranja izvođenja školskoga preventivnog programa, razvidno je veća učestalost potrebe za dodatnom pomoći u učenju kod učenika koji imaju ujedno i probleme u ponašanju. Sveukupni nalazi impliciraju da će djelatnici koji će provoditi školski preventivni program morati imati kompetencije za rad s učenicima s problemima u ponašanju koje će biti utvrđeno kod većeg dijela učenika u programu. To su interdisciplinarnе kompetencije koje se trenutačno u Hrvatskoj ciljano stječu tijekom dodiplomskoga i diplomskoga studija na Odsjeku za poremećaje u ponašanju Edukacijsko-rehabilitacijskog fakulteta gdje se stječe zvanje socijalnog pedagoga.

Rezultati prema kojima djevojčice i dječaci podjednako imaju potrebu za dodatnom pomoći u učenju potvrđuju prethodna istraživanja i sukladni su očekivanjima. Podjednaki omjeri u procijenjenoj potrebi za korekciju ponašanja donekle su neočekivani, premda je zabilježena tendencija da dječaka ima ipak više u toj skupini učenika. U današnje vrijeme prisutan je trend prema kojemu su djevojčice sve više prisutne u društveno neprimjerenim oblicima ponašanja kao što je verbalna agresivnost, prkos prema autoritetima pa u tom smislu treba implicirati da tradicionalno shvaćanje dječaka kao rizične rodne skupine, danas više nije uvriježeno kao nekada. Pavlović (2016) je dobila rezultat prema kojemu su djevojčice u riječkim osnovnim školama, koje su u sustavu usluge produženoga stručnog boravka pri sustavu socijalne skrbi, čak u većim rizicima od dječaka u nošenju s problemima, hiperaktivnosti i školskim postignućem. Dakle, u individualnom programiranju stručne pomoći ipak treba uzeti u obzir spol učenika jer kao što je poznato „... girls use indirect aggression more than boys. Indirect aggression was conceptualized as social manipulation with the intention to harm the target person psychologically and/or socially, often attacking the target person circuitously for example through malicious gossip, or otherwise manipulating the social network of the school class in order to lower the victim's standing in the social hierarchy or perhaps even excluding her altogether from a friendship group.” (Björkqvist, Lagerspetz i Kaukiainen, 1992, str. 32).

Potreba za pomoći u učenju izraženija je kod učenika predmetne nastave, gledajući po dobi učenika. Ovo se može objasniti prelaskom u više razrede i nesnalaženjem jednog dijela učenika u novonastalim zahtjevima kurikula, što je također poznato iz dosadašnjih stručnih uvida i teorijsko-znanstvenih istraživanja. Prijelaz u više razrede osnovne škole rizičan je period za učenike koji do tada nisu razvili socijalne vještine te vještine učenja i organiziranja. S jedne je strane potrebno preispitati adekvatnost i primjerenost kurikula (primjerice prevelik broj predmeta, suviše informacija za reprodukciju, tradicionalno *a-catedra* poučavanje) suvremenim potrebama, ali i psihofizičkim zahtjevima različitih učenika, kako bi se kvalitetnom promjenom kurikula prevenirale poteškoće pojedinih učenika (Munjiza, Peko i Dubrovicki, 2016). Trebalo bi potom usmjeriti pažnju na individualne potrebe svakog učenika i individualizirati pristup u poučavanju. Pored ovih općih zahtjeva za reformom organizacije sustava predmetne nastave, potrebno je jednom broju djece, sada i odmah, osigurati dodatnu pomoć u učenju. Prilično velik broj učenika u ovom istraživanju ukazuje na potrebu osmišljavanja nekih oblika intervencije, bilo da je to vršnjačka pomoć ili angažiranje vanjskih suradnika, primjerice studenata pedagoških usmjerenja (volontera) za pomoć u učenju i pisanju domaćih zadaća učenicima koji su u detektiranom riziku. Dobnih razlika u potrebi za korekcijom ponašanja nema, premda bi se očekivalo da će u starijoj dobi biti više uočenih problema u ponašanju. To upućuje da se i u ranijoj razvojnoj dobi mogu već detektirati učenici s kojima je potrebno pravovremeno provoditi intervencije za učenje primjerenih oblika ponašanja, a moguće je i to da su učiteljice razredne nastave educiranije i senzibiliziranije od učitelja predmetne nastave za detektiranje rizičnih ponašanja. Naime, inicijalnim studijem u Hrvatskoj, a tako i u Rijeci, na učiteljskim se fakultetima više pažnje pridaje predmetima poučavanja učenika s posebnim potrebama (među kojima su i učenici s problemima u ponašanju) nego na studijima predmetne nastave.

Više je učenika kojima treba dodatna pomoć u učenju i korekciji ponašanja među onima čije su materijalne prilike u obitelji lošije od prosjeka i čija se kvaliteta međuljudskih odnosa u obitelji procjenjuje kao loša ili ni loša ni dobra. Obitelji koje se svakodnevno nose sa stresom siromaštva u Hrvatskoj (Družić Ljubotina, Sabolić i Kletečki Radović, 2017) imaju velike izazove u odgoju djece. Zato, moguće je da je dobiveni rezultat povezan s neuspješnim nošenjem roditelja sa stresovima i njihovim oslabljenim kapacitetima da prevladavaju egzistencijalne probleme, da uspješno ispune svoju roditeljsku ulogu i zadovolje odgojno-obrazovne potrebe svoje djece. U tom slučaju društvo treba preuzeti ulogu pomagača roditeljima kojima je ta pomoć potrebna. Škole u suradnji s Centrima za socijalnu skrb mogu i trebaju osmisлити moduse intervencija tim roditeljima gdje bi se integrirala materijalna pomoć s drugim mjerama koje bi roditeljima davale smjernice u osnaživanju njihovih roditeljskih kompetencija. U tom smislu, Zakon o socijalnoj skrbi (NN, 2017) predviđa mjere socijalnih usluga kojima, prema čl. 73, st. (1) „socijalne usluge obuhvaćaju aktivnosti, mjere i programe namijenjene sprečavanju, prepoznavanju i rješavanju problema i poteškoća pojedinaca i obitelji te poboljšanju kvalitete njihovog života u zajednici“. Autorice ovoga rada

mišljenja su da se davanje materijalne potpore treba integrirati s mjerama uključivanja roditelja u edukacijske grupe potpore roditeljstvu. Vidljivo je da se za više od svakog desetog učenika u ovom istraživanju procjenjuje da žive u materijalnim okolnostima lošijim od prosječnih. Rad s obiteljima nije primarna zadaća osnovne škole, ali suradnja s lokalnim, državnim, županijskim ili gradskim institucijama u kojima su zaposleni educirani djelatnici kojima je primarna zadaća provođenje zakona kao što je gore spomenuti, ili nevladinim organizacijama koje imaju kvalitetne programe, može biti više nego korisna učenicima u riziku. Za jednu trećinu učenika iz uzorka ne može se reći kako živi u obitelji s dobrim međuljudskim odnosima, a postoji 3,5 % učenika koji žive u obiteljima s lošim međuljudskim odnosima. Znajući da je dobra kvaliteta međuljudskih odnosa u obitelji snažan prediktivni faktor nepovoljnoga razvoja, implicira se da je detektiranim učenicima potrebna podrška i pomoć u prevenciji njihova nepovoljnog psihosocijalnog razvoja.

Dodatnu pomoć u učenju i korekciju više trebaju nepopularniji učenici, premda poteškoće s učenjem i svladavanjem kurikula ne izazivaju kod vršnjaka toliko odbacivanja koliko izazivaju problemi u ponašanju, što nije iznenađujuće. Treba uzeti u obzir metodološka ograničenja mjerne skale iz našega istraživanja gdje možda razrednicima nije bilo jednostavno procijeniti na skali od tri stupnja popularnost učenika u razredu. Ipak, nalazi potvrđuju prethodna istraživanja (Žic Ralić i Šifner, 2015; Žižak, 2003) i upućuju da je u osmišljavanju preventivnoga školskog programa nužno imati jasno predviđen pristup poboljšanja sociometrijskoga položaja učenika u potrebi za dodatnom pomoći. Načini za realizaciju toga mogući su samim primjerom učitelja u pozitivnom ophođenju s učenikom pri čemu drugi učenici socijalnim učenjem preuzimaju pozitivan odnos prema učeniku, a moguće je i davanjem specifičnih zadataka učeniku koji je u potrebi, a kojima će učenik pred cijelim razredom doživjeti osobiti uspjeh i pohvalu svojih vršnjaka. Također, stvaranje inkluzivnoga okruženja, u kojemu su različitosti prihvatljive i uobičajene, stvara se ozračje prihvaćanja i prevenira socijalno isključivanje i odbacivanje onih koji su različiti. Konačno, sa samim učenikom koji je u potrebi treba individualno raditi (npr. ciljani trening fokusnih socijalnih vještina koje učenik nema) na njegovom/njezinom osnaživanju ne bi li se socijalne vještine poboljšale u komunikaciji s ostalim učenicima u razredu.

Dodatnu pomoć u učenju i korekciji ponašanja, također, u većoj mjeri trebaju učenici slabijih ocjena. Ovaj je rezultat logičan i očekivan te prati prethodna dostupna kriminološka istraživanja (Singer, 2008). Pružanjem adekvatne i pravovremene dodatne pomoći učenicima, koji trebaju dodatnu pomoć u učenju, može se očekivati i poboljšanje njihova akademskoga uspjeha, a posljedično time i njihove slike o sebi i samopoštovanja, što je jako bitan segment u psihosocijalnom razvoju djeteta. Zanimljivo je da u školi ima i određeni broj učenika kojima treba korekcija u ponašanju, premda imaju vrlo dobar akademski uspjeh, dakle nemaju problem na planu učenja, nego samo na planu ponašanja. Za ove učenike treba diferencirati pristup u osmišljavanju ciljeva, metoda i sadržaja preventivnih intervencija i dobro analizirati etiologiju njihova ponašanja s posebnim osvrtom na funkcionalnu analizu ponašanja i obiteljsko okruženje.

Dodatnu pomoć u učenju, također, trebaju učenici koji se školuju prema prilagođenom programu i redovnom programu uz individualizirane postupke, a dodatnu pomoć u korekciji ponašanja razmjerno više trebaju učenici koji se školuju prema redovnom programu uz individualizirane postupke. Učenici s teškoćama u razvoju posebno su ranjiva skupina učenika jer su njihove teškoće multidimenzionalno, odnosno bio-psiho-socijalno uvjetovane, a ako učiteljski kadar u školama nije dovoljno educiran o specifičnostima tih uvjetovanosti te osposobljen za odgojnu i didaktičko-metodičku prilagodbu ovim učenicima, odnosno kompetentan za poučavanje učenika s teškoćama u razvoju, tada će potreba za dodatnom pomoći u učenju i korekcijom ponašanja učenika biti zasigurno više nego očita. U budućim bi istraživanjima ovaj rezultat zato trebalo provjeriti u relaciji sa stavovima i kompetencijama učitelja u radu s učenicima s teškoćama u razvoju, osobito ako je riječ o učenicima s poremećajima pažnje i hiperaktivnosti koji su posebno izazovna skupina za poučavanje u redovitim razredima. Desetina uzorka svih ispitanika nema rješenje o primjerenom obliku školovanja, a treba dodatnu pomoć u korekciji ponašanja, pa se impliciraju dva moguća smjera razmišljanja: (i) radi se o učenicima koji imaju objektivnu potrebu da im se takvo rješenje izda, ali roditelji nisu obavili sve potrebne predradnje (preglede kod različitih specijalista) da bi se takvo administrativno rješenje u konačnici i donijelo i tako pomoglo učenicima, (ii) radi se o *učenicima s teškoćama uvjetovanim odgojnim, socijalnim, ekonomskim, kulturalnim i jezičnim čimbenicima* za koje je potrebno također planirati preventivne školske programe, ali za njih Ured državne uprave u Hrvatskoj ne izdaje rješenja. Ovo je skupina učenika koji prema čl. 65 Zakona o odgoju i obrazovanju u osnovnim i srednjim školama (NN, 2017), također imaju prava na preventivnu zaštitu zbog detektiranih teškoća.

Učenici kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju manifestiraju značajno manje prosocijalno-suradničkoga ponašanja od učenika kojima takva pomoć nije potrebna, a učenici kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u korekciji ponašanja manifestiraju značajno više pobjeđujuće-agresivnoga ponašanja od učenika kojima takva pomoć nije potrebna. Ovo daje snažnu preporuku da školski preventivni programi trebaju imati strukturirano učenje socijalnih vještina. Potrebno je u školama zapošljavati stručne suradnike koji su osposobljeni osmišljavati i provoditi preventivne školske programe. Na osnovi dobivenih rezultata zaključuje se da je pored podrške u učenju potrebno kontinuirano provoditi program stjecanja vještina prosocijalnoga i suradničkoga ponašanja u sukobima kao i program rehabilitacije impulzivnoga i agresivnoga ponašanja u sukobima (Vanest, Temple-Harvey i Mason, 2009). Pri tome, treba uzeti u obzir individualna obilježja te specifičnosti obiteljskoga okruženja iz kojeg učenik dolazi.

Metodološka ograničenja istraživanja očituju se u premalom uzorku provedenom samo u jednoj školi te se preporuča u daljnjim istraživanjima obuhvatiti više škola po mogućnosti u više regija Hrvatske. Također, u ponovljenom te proširenom istraživanju bilo bi poželjno umjesto univarijatnih varijabli uvesti multivarijatna mjerenja za pojedine konstrukte koji ovdje, na pilot razini, nisu mjereni multivarijatno (npr. popularnost učenika u razredu).

Zaključci

Cilj ovoga rada bio je ispitati neka sociodemografska, pedagoška i ponašajna obilježja učenika te ih dovesti u relaciju s procjenom potrebe za dodatnom pomoći u učenju i/ili korekciji ponašanja. Osnovni rezultati istraživanja su sljedeći:

1. djevojčice i dječaci podjednako imaju potrebu za dodatnom pomoći u učenju/korekciji ponašanja
2. učenici u predmetnoj nastavi imaju više potreba za dodatnom pomoći u učenju
3. više je učenika kojima treba dodatna pomoć u učenju i korekciji ponašanja među onima:
 - čije su materijalne prilike u obitelji lošije od prosjeka
 - čija se kvaliteta međuljudskih odnosa u obitelji procjenjuje kao loša ili ni loša ni dobra
 - koji su nepopularni u razredu
 - koji imaju dovoljan i dobar akademski uspjeh
 - koji se školuju prema rješenju o primjerenim oblicima odgoja i obrazovanju
4. učenici kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u učenju manifestiraju značajno manje prosocijalno-suradničkoga ponašanja od učenika kojima takva pomoć nije potrebna
5. učenici kojima je potrebna dodatna pomoć u korekciji ponašanja manifestiraju značajno više pobjeđujuće-agresivnoga ponašanja od učenika kojima takva pomoć nije potrebna.

Slijedom dobivenih rezultata, autorice rada daju sljedeće preporuke pri osmišljavanju školskoga preventivnog programa:

- uključiti učenike oba spola od 1. do 8. razreda
- kao voditelje programa zaposliti djelatnike koji imaju specijaliziranu edukaciju za rad s učenicima s problemima u ponašanju
- kontinuirano surađivati s Centrima za socijalnu skrb kako bi se obiteljima uz davanja materijalne pomoći, osigurala i savjetovanja u postizanju kvalitete međuljudskih odnosa u obitelji
- svakodnevno poticati postizanje akademskoga uspjeha kod svih učenika
- osigurati pomoć volontera i vanjskih dionika za individualne instrukcije i stručne rehabilitacijske usluge pojedinim učenicima
- planski, organizirano i kontinuirano provoditi treninge socijalnih vještina
- educirati djelatnike i učenike o konstruktivnom ponašanju u sukobima.

Osim navedenoga, potrebno je školske preventivne programe koji, kao što je razvidno, trebaju biti sveobuhvatni i multidimenzionalni, godišnje znanstveno evaluirati i temeljem evaluacije modificirati ih za sljedeći ciklus. Naravno, osiguravanje materijalnih sredstava za takve programe jedan je od preduvjeta koji treba osigurati.

„Ovaj rad je djelomično podržan potporom projekta Sveučilišta u Rijeci broj 13.10.2.2.03.”