

Educational Support to Students with Behavioural Problems in Elementary School

Zlatko Bukvić
Center for Education Tomislav Špoljar

Abstract

The relationship between behavioural problems and problems in education is an important aspect of student school success. Behavioural problems correlate negatively with the overall student academic, educational, and social success, and they are a frequent cause of student failure. Behavioural problems appear as a reaction to disadvantageous school context. The existence of risk factors in the school environment adversely contributes to student behavioural problems.

The aim of this paper is to describe the behavioural problems of elementary school students and to determine whether they are related to the support provided by their teachers. Behavioural problems are described by analysing the frequency of manifesting some behavioural problems with respect to the age and gender of the student. Links of behavioural problems with support provided for such students by their teachers have been analysed through a correlation analysis of the provided and received support in the educational process and manifested problems in the student behaviour. The survey sample consists of students and their teachers from the 4th, 6th, and 8th grades.

The results show that externalized behavioural problems are more manifested in the population of male students. In relation to the chronological age or the grade that students attend, there are no significant differences in the manifestation of externalised and internalised behavioural problems and difficulties in learning. Teachers issue significantly more warnings and rules reminders directly to male students, and primary classroom teachers praise their students more often. Significant correlations have been identified between the externalised, internalised, and problems in the students' performance and their estimated experience of justness, equality, and demanding teachers.

Keywords: *externalised and internalised behavioural problems, individualised approach, teacher's interest, teacher relationship*

Introduction

Student behaviour is an important aspect of school success as a result of behavioural and educational problems interrelationship (Stevans & Lingo, 2005; Payne et al., 2007; Bouillet, 2013). Behavioural problems are negatively correlated with the school's general academic, educational, and social success (Mikas, 2012). The status of students with behavioural problems in the school environment is determined by their gained reputation, and because of that, some other student qualities are neglected by peers and teachers (MacLure et al., 2011). Consequently, a student with behavioural problems often develops negative attitudes towards education (Maretić & Sindik, 2013). Among the authors there is a consensus that students with behavioural problems do not have the same opportunities for social and academic development and are compared to students with other disabilities in unfavourable position (Smeets, 2009; Bouillet, 2014). Sullivan et al. (2014) state that teachers mostly consider students responsible for their behaviour. Apart from behavioural problems being a common cause of school failure and poor interaction with peers, they also appear as a reaction to an unfavourable school context. Students with academic difficulties and students who experience failure become exposed to increased risk for inappropriate behaviour in school (Tidwell et al., 2003).

Pupils with behavioural problems are characterized by behaviours that deviate from the age appropriate, the situation in which they participate, expected cultural and social norms with adverse effects on themselves and their environment (Bouillet et al., 2018). We talk about the continuum starting from simpler behaviours of less severity and effected danger and harm to those who are defined by the legislature and are the subject of sanctions with more severe consequences and needs for treatment (Koller-Trbović et al., 2011). Student behavioural problems are reflected on their educational, social, and personal skills (Anderson, 2012).

The usual classification of behavioural problems implies a group of externalised problems that are insufficiently controlled and are directed to others such as imposition, defiance, disobedience, negativity, confrontation, hyperactivity, running away, aggression (Mihić & Bašić, 2008; Ricijaš et al., 2010; Mikas, 2012; Maglica & Jerković, 2014; Ali et al., 2014; Blazar & Kraft, 2017); and a group of internalised problems such as timidity, reticence, and apathy (Mihić & Bašić, 2008; Ricijaš et al., 2010). Prevalence data show a higher incidence of externalised behavioural problems in the population of boys and internalised behavioural problems in girls (Ricijaš et al., 2010; Janković & Lakića, 2011). Burke et al. (2009, according to Bouillet, 2013) provide information about 20 % of the school population that manifests externalised or internalised behavioural problems. On the sample of younger school age pupils, Pavin Ivanec (2015) finds that 20 % of students have difficulties in performing school tasks, internalised behavioural problems manifest in around 10 %, and externalised problems in about 7 % of students.

Sullivan et al. (2014) state that even mild problems in student behaviour can also be described as behavioural deviations, if they are frequently manifested. As examples of

such behaviours, the authors pointed out interrupting the other person's speech because they are extremely stressful and challenging for teachers. Because of that teachers become dissatisfied and are more likely to experience professional burnout. Reducing the frequency of behavioural problems should lead to student-oriented preventive activities with characteristics of pedagogic prevention carried out for strengthening protective factors in the pedagogical environment. Pedagogic prevention programs imply the modernisation of the curriculum compliant with the students' abilities, so that the methods and forms of teaching encourage student active participation and the relation to school content with the aim of achieving success (Meščić -Blažević, 2007). Blazar and Kraft (2017) identified the correlation between emotional support and class organization with student behaviour. Quality programs of behavioural problems prevention lead to the student's success in school activities the earlier the implementation starts, the higher is the success (Ali et al., 2014). Studies have also found that inattention, impulsiveness, and hyperactivity can be improved with adequate support and interventions, but also that in the absence or lack of support these difficulties can be more severe (Anderson et al., 2011).

Acting in prevention of behavioural problems is based on the concept of risk and protective factors that are observed as personal characteristics of students themselves and of immediate living environment (Bašić, 2009). As students' personal characteristics, Doležal (2006) considers their resistance and the ability to deal with risk factors and decrease negative environmental effects, while Banerjee et al. (2016) emphasise students' social competence, problem-solving skills, autonomy, sense of purpose, and effectiveness. Important components of a student environment that have a protective role are family, school, and peers (Bouillet & Bičanić, 2015).

Regardless of the cause and the interpretation of the behavioural phenomenon, all behaviours in any environment inevitably provoke one's positive or negative reactions and responses. It is well known that different risk factors may affect the manifestation of student behavioural problems which would not be manifested in some other situations and circumstances (Jolivette & Steed, 2010). The manifestation of student behavioural problems is strengthened by an unsupported pedagogical environment characterised by the use of language of non-acceptance, inequality of demand and opportunities, inappropriate educational practices, and inappropriate teaching strategies (Bouillet, 2010). Schurch (2014) argues that these students are faced with the obstruction of their participation in classroom activities, inadequate professional services, and negative attitudes of peers and school staff. Meščić-Blažević (2007) pointed out that lack of appropriate support for students with behavioural problems is associated with the loss of self-esteem and the experience of incompetence.

As already mentioned above, behavioural problems are results of interactions between different contextual and individual factors (Payne-Woolridge, 2010; Flea and Gligorović, 2013; Sullivan et al. 2014) and it is therefore necessary to think about ways for their identification at an early age. Early discovery of student behavioural problems allows prevention of potential major socialization and behavioural problems, in the

case where appropriate professional support is provided (Bouillet, 2014). There is still a lack of planned and organized support for students with behavioural problems in many schools, although scientifically assessed intervention models which significantly reduce pupil behavioural problems are developed (Payne-Woolridge, 2010; Bouillet et al., 2018). Koller-Trbović and Žižak (2012) stress the complexity and mutability of behavioural problems that are not dealt with continuously but with sensationalism and focus on the protection of society, without addressing individuals, alongside the tolerance for behavioural problems and general presence of double criteria in assessing social responsibility all cause the prevalence of children and young people's behavioural problems.

At the same time, the early life age of school children abounds in numerous opportunities in which teachers can influence student behaviour before it develops in a deviated form and norm (Jolivet & Steed, 2010), because schools play an important socialization role (MacLure et al., 2011) and are places where certain undesirable behaviours can be detected for the first time (Maglica & Jerković, 2014).

The aim of this paper is to describe and analyse the behavioural problems of elementary school students and to determine whether they are related to the support provided by their teachers. Behavioural problems are described through the frequency of manifesting certain behavioural problems with respect to age and gender of the students. The association of student behavioural problems with the support that they receive from their teachers is analysed with the correlation coefficient through assessments of provided and received support in the educational process and behaviour manifestation.

To accomplish the defined research objective, the following research tasks were to:

- describe behavioural problems in elementary school pupils and evaluate given and received support from teachers
- evaluate differences in behavioural problems with regard to age and gender of the students
- analyse whether there is a statistically significant correlation between the behaviour of students and the estimated received and provided support from teachers.

In accordance with the research tasks, the following research hypotheses have been set:

There are statistically significant differences in the frequency of behavioural problems manifestation across age and gender of students, with these behaviours more often manifested in older and male students (Ricijaš et al., 2010; Pavin Ivanec, 2015).

Considering that appropriate procedures and teaching strategies contribute to the desired student behaviour (Bouillet, 2010; Anderson et al., 2011), just as nonsupportive pedagogical environment (the language of rejection, incompatibility of requirements and opportunities, inappropriate teaching strategies) contributes to the occurrence of behavioural problems (Bouillet, 2010), the hypothesis that student behaviour patterns are strongly related to the level of support provided by their teachers was set.

Methods

Sample of research

The research was conducted on a sample of regular elementary school students and their teachers in the Republic of Croatia at the end of the school year 2014/2015 and during the school year 2015/2016.

After the consent of the students' parents/guardians, a total of 634 students participated in the study, out of which 59.0 % were boys and 41.0 % girls. The 29.6 % of surveyed students were in the fourth grade, 34.7 % were in the sixth, and 35.6 % were in the eighth grade.

Measuring instruments

The data were collected during the PhD thesis research *School Engagement of Students with Disabilities* (Bukvić, 2018). The questionnaires used for data collection are: *The Student Behavioural Questionnaire – Teacher Version* (Bouillet and Pavin Ivanec, 2014); *Student Support Questionnaire – Teacher Version* (Bukvić, 2018); and *Student Support Questionnaire – Version for Students* (Bukvić, 2018).

The Student Behavioural Questionnaire – Teacher Version (Bouillet and Pavin Ivanec, 2014) was used to assess students' behaviour by their teachers. With the use of the questionnaire, data on the general socio-demographic characteristics of students were collected: the conditions in which the student lives, co-operation of parents or guardians with the school, assessment of the acceptance of pupils among the peers, existence of difficulties, form of education etc. The questionnaire measures externalised and internalised problems in student behaviour, difficulty in learning and performing school tasks, appropriate students' representations of themselves and their needs, a four degree scale is used (1-never, 2-rare, 3-sometimes, 4-often).

Student Support Questionnaire – Teacher Version, is aimed at examining the support and the procedures that teachers apply in working with students, having in mind the particular pupil. The questionnaire contains variables for general information about the teacher, their knowledge of work with students with disabilities, and the way they treat the students. A five-degree Likert scale from 1 (not accurate at all) to 5 (completely accurate) is used.

Student Support Questionnaire – Version for Students was used to assess the support students experience from their teachers during their education. The questionnaire contains questions about age, gender, grade, overall success in school, and the statements by which the students expressed their degree of agreement on a five-degree Likert scale from 1 (not accurate at all) to 5 (completely accurate).

Data processing

The data were processed by the SPSS statistical program. Descriptive and multivariate statistical methods are used. Factor analysis was applied. The confidence level of the questionnaires used is shown with the Cronbach alpha coefficients. An estimation of

the distribution's normality was made by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and skewness and kurtosis measures.

Determining the correlation between student behaviour and support that they are experiencing has been made with the use of correlation analysis. Analysis of differences and comparison was performed on latent variables. The Mann-Whitney test was used to determine differences in relation to student gender, and Kruskal-Wallis was used to determine differences in relation to the age of students.

Results

On the statements of *The Student Behavioural Questionnaire – Teacher version*, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test (KMO=.933) and Bartlett spherical test ($\chi^2_{df496}=11834.090$; $p=.000$) determined the suitability of data for performing factor analysis. Factor analysis was performed by the principal component method with varimax rotation. According to the original questionnaire, the extraction was limited to a maximum of 4 factors which accounted for 59.08 % of variance. However, variables with communalities below 0.3 are removed from further analysis. Through repeated criteria of factor analysis, the default four factors together explain 65.64 % of the variance and were named externalised behaviour problems, difficulty in tasks performing, internalised problems, and assertiveness.

Externalised behavioural problems in the sense of intrusive communication to gain attention are manifested by 9.5 % of pupils, in achieving peer attention 6.6 % of the students behave inappropriately, and 4.7 % of them use invasive behaviour to get the attention of adults. 8.3 % of the students disturb class by loud talking, disrupting other students, or interrupt the teacher and others. According to the teachers' estimate, 4.3 % of students use lies in order to achieve some of their goals, and the teacher's boundaries are tested by the behaviour of 6.8 % students. Most students, in teachers' opinion, have difficulties in learning and performing school tasks. There were 33.1 % of them who give up tasks and started activities, 30.2 % of students show difficulties in concentration during class, and 29.3 % of them have difficulties in understanding the content taught. School functioning and completing school responsibilities are part of psychological functioning (Janković & Jaklija, 2011). In addition to other factors, low educational outcomes and difficulties related to education increase students' risk for developing behavioural problems (according to Kranzelić Tavra, 2002). Approximately 8 % of students expressed an excessive timidity in test situations and tend to isolate themselves, which Keresteš (2006) classifies as emotional difficulties. In case they do not understand something, 21.4 % of the students ask for clarification, 12.1 % seek help in solving their problems, while 25.7 % of the students behave well in looking for peer attention. Taking a stand for themselves and their personal needs, especially in the context of school and adopting the educational content, is considered an indicator of a student's adaptive functioning.

The latent variables were tested on distribution normality. Results show that the deviations are significant (Table 2), and therefore, the hypothesis about the differences between male and female students in the manifestation of behavioural problems are verified by nonparametric Mann-Whitney test (Table 3).

Table 1

Behavioural problem factors, explained variance, coefficients of confidence and frequency on statements

Externalised behavioural problems (Eigenvalue 9.985, explained variance 35.66 %, Cronbach alpha .942) <i>A student...</i>	Never %	Sometimes %	Often %	coefficient
..uses intrusive forms of communication to achieve attention	58.2	32.3	9.5	.815
uses invasive (inappropriate) behaviours in order to receive attention of peers	68.4	25.0	6.6	.843
uses invasive (inappropriate) behaviours in order to receive attention of adults	70.5	24.8	4.7	.835
disturbs teaching (gallantry, disruption of other students, interruption of teaching, interrupting others)	66.2	25.6	8.3	.807
behaves in a way that disturbs other students	62.8	29.9	7.4	.834
uses lies to achieve goals	69.4	26.3	4.3	.733
tests the teacher's limits	68.8	24.4	6.8	.838
requires too much attention	51.2	42.7	6.0	.702
Difficulties in performing tasks (Eigenvalue 4.460; explained variance 15.93 %, Cronbach alpha .912)	Never %	Sometimes %	Often %	coefficient
quickly gives up on solving tasks and started activities	19.5	47.4	33.1	.790
has difficulties concentrating during class	24.4	45.3	30.2	.775
has difficulties in content understanding	27.6	43.1	29.3	.812
Internalised behavioural problems (Eigenvalue 2.008, explained variance 7.17 %, Cronbach alpha .643)	Never %	Sometimes %	Often %	coefficient
has a tendency to isolatehim/herself	45.4	46.9	7.8	.803
refuses to participate in games and activities with other children during breaks	62.4	33.8	3.8	.783
shows frightfulness in test situations	35.3	56.7	7.9	.498
Assertiveness (Eigenvalue 1.926; explained variance and 6.88 %; Cronbach alpha .583)	Never %	Sometimes %	Often %	coefficient
requires an explanation when something is not understood	11.9	66.7	21.4	.709
seeks help in solving tasks	20.6	67.3	12.1	.825
achieves peers' attention in an appropriate manner	14.0	60.3	25.7	.483

Table 2

Mean Values, Standard Deviation, Normality Distribution Indicators of Student Behaviour

	Mean	SD	Kolmogorov - Smirnov		skewness	kurtosis
			statistic	Sig.		
Externalized behavioural problems	1.50	.675	229	.000	1.555	1.537
Difficulties in Tasks performing	3.00	.823	120	.000	-0.331	1.837
Internalized behavioural problems	1.83	.711	150	.000	0.672	-0.310

Students who achieve average values <3 or in the range between *never* and *sometimes* are at low risk; those who achieve average values in the range between *sometimes* and *often* are classified as at moderate risk (values 3≤3,49), and at a high risk if the mean score is >3.5 (according to the Pavin Ivanec model, 2015). According to these criteria, less than 2 % of students in the sample of this research are at high risk, 6.2 % are at moderate risk behaviour, and low risk behaviour is manifested with 92.5 % of students. Recognising and monitoring the students’ risk behaviours is important because they contribute to the probability of unwanted and negative consequences for individuals, their psychosocial development, and the environment (Ricijaš et al., 2010).

Table 3

Mann-Whitney test in relation to student gender and behavioural problems

	Gender student	mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	Sig.*
Externalised behavioural problems	female	230.01	26271.500	.000
	male	289.53		
Difficulties in performing tasks	female	288.60	28753.500	.003
	male	248.45		
Internalised behavioural problems	female	275.88	31528.000	.165
	male	257.38		

*p <0.05

The average rank scores (Table 3) in male and female students are significantly different on the factors of externalised behavioural problems and the difficulties in performing tasks. These significant differences show that boys frequently externalise behavioural problems, and girls have more difficulty in performing tasks.

Examination of the differences in relation to the grade (Year) that students attend was performed using the Kruskal-Wallis test (Table 4).

The results show (Table 4) that there is no statistically significant difference in behavioural manifestation regarding the grade that students attend. Similar results were obtained in the research where Keresteš (2006) found that there is no difference in the frequency of behavioural problems in relation to primary school student age. Interpretation is possible with relatively small age differences among the examined

students. However, this may also indicate the persistence of behavioural problems and their continuity in the school period with all the risks for the development of more serious behavioural problems at a later stage.

Table 4

Results Kruskal-Wallis test for factors of behavioural problems in relation to the grade

	Class	N	mean Rank	Sig.*
Externalised behavioural problems	4	161	271.12	.390
	6	181	272.10	
	8	187	252.86	
Difficulties in performing tasks	4	161	272.84	.623
	6	181	266.19	
	8	187	257.10	
Internalised behavioural problems	4	161	266.97	.973
	6	181	263.18	
	8	187	265.06	

*Kruskal - Wallis; $p < 0.05$

To estimate teacher support during class, we take out of the questionnaire the variables with approximate normal distribution, in which the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test ($KMO=.917$) and the Bartlett test of sphericity ($\chi^2=1904.381$; $p=.000$) determined that performing factor analysis is appropriate. One factor is extracted that explains a 57.65 % variance. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of this factor is .876.

Table 5

View factor and frequency response on teacher support variables

Individualised Approach (Eigenvalues 4.036; variance explained 57.65 %, Cronbach α .876)	Coefficient	Mostly and completely accurate %
I personally help a student in learning outside school hours.	.687	23.8
During the lesson I help this student more than the others.	.827	28.4
I examine the knowledge of this student more individually than I do with other students.	.810	38.9
To work with this student, I often ask for expert advice.	.773	26.7
I prepare additional teaching materials for this student.	.713	31.6
To teach this student, I use peer support.	.781	30.8
I reach an agreement with the student's parents on how to help the student in learning.	.712	45.5

Self-reported teacher evaluation shows that less than a third of the students receives their support during the teaching process. The procedure that teachers most apply is agreeing with parents on how to help the student learn (45.5 %). The next most

frequent procedure is individual examination of the student’s knowledge (38.9 %) and preparing additional teaching materials for 31.6 % of students. Student peer support is available to 30.8 % of students. All of these indicate that the teacher’s support for these students is mostly oriented towards the educational school component.

In relation to the specific teacher behaviour to the students, the frequency of the warnings and praise to the students was examined. It was found that between 20 and 22 % of students were often warned and reminded of classroom rules by their teachers.

Table 6

The results of the Mann-Whitney test in relation to the teacher position, the student’s gender, and the use of warning and praise

	Teacher	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	Sig.*	students	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	Sig.*
I often remind students about classroom behaviour rules	1	265.53	24923.500	.165	female	215.74	23138.500	.000
	2	247.60			male	279.09		
I often warn this student	1	269.60	24457.000	.068	female	217.42	23487.500	.000
	2	246.59			male	278.68		
I use every opportunity to praise this student	1	280.09	20862.000	.001	female	247.45	29733.000	.347
	2	242.08			male	257.72		

Teacher: 1-primary class teacher; 2-subject teacher

According to the Mann-Whitney test (Table 6), there are no significant differences between primary class teachers and subject teachers in the use of warnings and reminding the students of classroom behaviour rules, but primary class teachers are much more likely to praise the students. In relation to the students’ gender, boys are more often warned by their teachers.

According to the criteria of distribution normality, seven variables (Table 7) were selected from the *Student Support Questionnaire – Version for Students*. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO=.659) and Bartlett’s sphericity test ($\chi^2_{df21}=490.907$; $p=.000$) criteria of data adequacy for factor analysis was verified. Two factors of teacher support experience were extracted and they explain 50.73 % of the variance.

About 12.5 % of students estimate that teachers do not provide extra explanation of lessons, 15 % find that teachers do not check their performance, and about 6 % of students estimate that teachers do not check their attention during class. This indicates the existence of teachers uninterested in the needs of students. A third of the students think that they get a better or worse rating than they really deserve, and 25 % of the students feel that the teachers have too many expectations. About 13 % of teachers complain about student behaviour. The perceived educational environment can point to the teachers’ interest and their consistency in their behaviour toward students, both of which are important in creating a positive school environment and preventing behavioural problems. The teachers’ support experienced is analysed by two factors:

the teacher's interest, with a reliability coefficient Cronbach α .635, and the teacher's attitude, with the reliability coefficient Cronbach α .526.

Table 7

Experienced support factors, associated variables, response frequencies and coefficients

Teacher's interest (eigenvalues 1.881; explained variance 26.87 %, Cronbach α .635)	Not at all and mostly not accurate %	Mostly and completely accurate %	coefficient
Teachers check my attention during class.	5.9	81.7	.707
I feel that teachers are trying harder to explain the content of the lesson to me.	12.5	70.7	.679
After I finish a task, the teachers check if I have done it correctly	15.0	69.7	.730
Teacher relationship (eigenvalues 1.671; explained variance 23.86 %, Cronbach α .526)	Not at all and mostly not accurate %	Mostly and completely accurate %	coefficient
I get a worse rating than I deserve.	45.9	34.7	.647
I get a better rating than I deserve.	45.8	35.9	.720
I have a feeling that teachers expect too much from me.	52.7	25.4	.472
Teachers complain about my behaviour.	77.4	12.9	.547

Table 8

Average values, standard deviation, normality distribution indicators on teacher support factors

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov					
	mean	SD	statistic	Sig.	skewness	kurtosis
Individualised approach	2.81	1.13	.096	.000	-0.124	-1.148
Teacher's interest	4.11	0.830	.165	.000	-0.818	0.178
Teacher's attitude	2.54	0.880	.068	.000	0.243	-0.263

The assumption of distribution normality and the absence of outliers are not fulfilled, therefore, to verify hypotheses about the correlation between behavioural problems of students with the support they experience from the teacher, the Spearman correlation analysis was used.

Table 9 shows significant positive and negative correlations between the factors. The externalised problems are significantly correlated with difficulties in performing tasks, internalised behavioural problems, and the perceived teacher's attitude. The difficulty of performing tasks has significant negative correlations, including assertiveness, internalised behavioural problems, individualised approach, and teacher's attitude

or relations. The factor of experienced teacher’s interest for student activities is not significantly related to other factors. However, the teacher’s attitude (relationship) factor correlates significantly with all behavioural problems.

Table 9

Spearman correlation coefficients

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Warning students	.760**	-.091*	.595**	-.484**	.074	.120**	.336**	.075	.278**
2. Reminding about the rules	1.000	-.109*	.649**	-.504**	.077	.167**	.393**	.081	.319**
3. Praising students		1.000	-.103*	.112*	-.129**	-.035	.123**	.071	-.071
4. Externalised behavioural problems			1.000	-.547**	-.013	.232**	.336**	.077	.334**
5. Difficulties in performing tasks				1.000	-.144**	-.493**	-.617**	-.056	.456**
6. Assertiveness					1.000	.159**	-.034	-.016	.040
7. Internalised behavioural problems						1.000	.361**	.053	.213**
8. Individualised approach							1.000	.095*	.326**
9. Teacher’s interest								1.000	-.042
10. Teacher’s attitude									1.000

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

Discussion

This paper starts with the hypothesis that behavioural problems are significantly more manifested in the male student population. This is based on data suggesting that boys are more prominent in externalised behavioural problems and learning problems. The Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests were used to check the hypothesis about the differences between the groups of students in terms of their age and gender. At the significance level ($p < 0.01$), there are differences among male and female students with regard to externalised behavioural problems. Greater values on the factor of externalised behavioural problems are obtained from male students. They manifest in externalised impulsive behaviours that, according to teachers’ assessment, are disruptive for teaching, and are directed towards peers and adults. The above results confirm the current research that boys are more prominent in externalised behavioural problems (Ricijaš et al., 2010; Pavin Ivanec, 2015). Similarly, Keresteš (2006) states that teachers respond more strongly to those behaviours that they consider to be disturbing and

harassing in teaching, and attention deficit disorder and hyperactivity of students are considered the most problematic behavioural problems.

The testing of differences regarding student age or grade was carried out by the Kruskal Wallis test. There are no differences in the manifestation of behavioural problems between younger and older students. The frequency of behavioural problems in the fourth, sixth, and eighth grade is approximately in the same ratio that was confirmed in younger children (Pavin Ivanec, 2015), but with a higher percentage of students showing problems in performing school duties. This could be affected by the structure of a sample involving pupils with an appropriate form of education (individualised approach and adaptation of content), but also by the fact that these kinds of difficulties are first noticed in the school age and teachers can recognise them easier than other difficulties (Keresteš, 2006).

The teacher's attitude is described by expectations from teachers, which Jeđud and Lebedina-Manzoni (2008) examined through justness, equality, and teacher's demands. Blazar and Kraft (2017) advocate a strong link between strategies and teaching methods with educational outcomes but, at the same time, weak correlation with student behaviour. Ali et al. (2014) indicate the correlation of student behavioural problems with a feeling of ignorance and neglect by teachers and peers. Students with that kind of experience manifest different behaviours in order to gain attention from them. The correlation of students' behaviour with support provided by their teachers (from the teacher's and the student's perspectives) was tested with Spearman's correlation. Externalised and internalised problems in student behaviour correlate significantly with individualised approach and the experience of the teacher's attitude. The results show that the characteristics of the environment are related to the manifestation of behaviour problems and that teachers can play an important role in preventing behavioural problems, but in terms of building mutual relationships. Ali et al. (2014) remind that frequent warnings of students lose their meaning and effectiveness over time in regulating student behaviour. They point out that a positive response is certainly more effective in promoting the desired forms of behaviour. However, as shown in the results, teachers are largely oriented towards learning support. This is not irrelevant, especially because the students' school achievement is perceived as a significant protective factor in preventing behavioural problems. This was stressed by McWilliam et al. (2003), noting that working with students individually, and working in small groups of students are associated with better student behaviour. That is also supported by Smeets (2009) who concludes that cooperative learning and peer support are preventive in the appearance of behaviour problems. Hundert (2007) also concludes that direct teaching, feedback on performance, and student supervision improves their progress in terms of quality and frequent interaction with peers and achieving desirable learning outcomes.

However, it is questionable whether teachers consider students' difficulties in performing school tasks partly as behavioural problems or point to the teachers' orientation

mainly toward the academic component of education. This is an important dilemma because the underlying aspects of the school environment for the prevention of social, emotional, and behavioural difficulties are an appropriate learning environment, a supportive socio-emotional climate, and a systematic process of identification and intervention (Smeets, 2009). In evaluating teacher support, chosen variables show that important preventive factors of behavioural problems are included in the form of teacher engagement and the involvement of peers and parents. This is important because student motivation is related to the achieved relationships and support (Shirley, 2011), in a way that the support and behaviour of teachers with clear expectations represent a stimulating environment for students (Jurčić, 2006; Shirley, 2011). All of this indicates that teacher behaviour and supportive environment positively correlate with desirable student behaviour.

Conclusion

Behavioural problems are manifested in a minority of the sample in this study, which means that less than 10 % of students expressed externalised and internalised behaviour problems and 30 % of students who have difficulty in concentration and understanding of the content taught. The limitations of this research are the absence of the behaviour's assessment from students and their parents and the insight into concrete teacher behaviour and their support strategies towards students. Although teachers are a better source of student behavioural assessment, literature points to insufficient teacher familiarity with student behavioural manifestations. The results are descriptive and correlative, so it is difficult to talk about causal relationships between the analysed factors, or the manifestation of behavioural problems as a result of inadequate support, although there is a correlation between them. This paper also failed to analyse other indicators of student performance such as school success, regularity of attendance, or peer acceptance, which act as protective factors. For the prevention of behavioural problems, interaction between different parts of the living environment and the family situation is important, and it is therefore advisable to assess the correlation of parenting behaviour with the behaviour of students.

References

- Ali, M.M., Abdullah, R. & Majid, R.A. (2014). Teacher trainees strategies for managing the behaviours of students with special needs. *International Education Studies*, 7(13), 271-277. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n13p271>
- Anderson, S.R. (2012). Psycho-educational processes as strategies for students presenting with emotional and behavioural disorders. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(7), 25-36.

- Banerjee, R., McLaughlin, C., Cotney, J., Roberts, L., & Peereboom, C. (2016). Promoting emotional health, well-being and resilience in primary schools. University of Sussex.
- Bašić, J. (2009). *Prevenција poremećaja u ponašanju i rizičnih ponašanja djece i mladih*. Školska knjiga.
- Blazar, D., & Kraft, M.A. (2017). teacher and teaching effects on students' attitudes and behaviors. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, 39(1), 146-170. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373716670260>
- Bouillet, D., & Žižak, A. (2008). Standardi u radu s djecom i mladima s poremećajima u ponašanju. *Ljetopis socijalnog rada*, 15(1), 21-48.
- Bouillet (2010). *Izazovi integriranog učenja i poučavanja*. Školska knjiga.
- Bouillet, D., (2014). Procjena i samoprocjena problema u ponašanju učenika razredne nastave: prilike i izazovi. *Kriminologija i socijalna integracija*, 22(1), 105-128.
- Bouillet, D., & Pavin-Ivanec, T. (2014). Problemi u ponašanju djece rane školske dobi – fenomenološki aspekti. *Forum za slobodu odgoja*, www.fso.hr
- Bouillet, D., & Bičanić, J. (2015). Teorijska osnova razvoja modela rane odgojno-obrazovne intervencije u osnovnoj školi. U D. Bouillet (Ur.) *Razvoj modela rane odgojno-obrazovne intervencije u osnovnoj školi: od ideje do evaluacije* (45-48). Forum za slobodu odgoja.
- Bouillet, D., Bičanić, J., Ivančan, A., Novosel Guszak, D., Rovis Brandić, A., & Sitar, M. (2018). *Socijalnopedagoški mozaik: razvoj modela potpore učenicima s problemima u ponašanju*. Školska knjiga.
- Brojčin, B., & Glumbić, N. (2012). Internalizovani oblici problematičnog ponašanja kod dece sa lakom intelektualnom ometenošću školskog uzrasta. *Specijalna edukacija i rehabilitacija*, 11(1), 3-20.
- Buha, N., & Gligorović, M. (2013). Problemi u ponašanju kod osoba sa intelektualnom ometenošću: osnovni pojmovi, učestalost i faktori rizika. *Specijalna edukacija i rehabilitacija*, 12(2), 203-219.
- Bukvić, Z. (2018). *Zaokupljenost školom učenika s teškoćama. (Doktorska disertacija)*. Zagreb: Učiteljski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Doležal, D. (2006). Otpornost i prevencija poremećaja u ponašanju. *Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja*, 42(1), 87-102.
- Janković, J., & Lakića, M. (2011). Povezanost ranih roditeljskih poruka i neželjenih oblika ponašanja djece osnovnoškolske dobi. *Kriminologija i socijalna integracija*, 19(2), 27-43.
- Jeđud, I., & Lebedina-Manzoni, M. (2009). Doživljaj školskog (ne)uspjeha kod djece i mladih s problemima u ponašanju. *Napredak*, 149(4), 404-425.
- Jolivet, K., & Steed, E.A. (2010). Classroom management strategies for young children with challenging behavior within early childhood settings. *NHSA Dialog*, 13(3), 198-2013. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15240754.2010.492358>
- Keresteš, G. (2006). Učiteljske procjene problematičnosti i učestalosti emocionalnih teškoća i teškoća u ponašanju učenika nižih razreda osnovne škole. *Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja*, 42(1), 3-15.
- Koller-Trbović, N., Žižak, A., & Jeđud Borić, I. (2011). *Standardi za terminologiju, definiciju, kriterije i način praćenja pojave poremećaja u ponašanju djece i mladih*. Ministarstvo obitelji, branitelja i međugeneracijske solidarnosti.

- Koller-Trbović, N., & Žižak, A. (2012). Problemi u ponašanju djece i mladih i odgovori društva: višestruke perspektive. *Kriminologija i socijalna integracija*, 20(1), 49-62.
- MacLure, M., Jones, L., Holmes, R., & MacRae, C. (2011). Becoming a problem: behaviour and reputation in the early years classroom. *British Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 447-471. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2011.552709>
- Maglica, T., & Jerković, D. (2014). Procjena rizičnih i zaštitnih čimbenika za internalizirane probleme u školskom okruženju. *Školski vjesnik*, 63(3), 413-431.
- Maretić, E., & Sindik, J. (2013). Agresivno ponašanje, zaštitni čimbenici i školsko postignuće učenika izvan i unutar sustava institucionalne skrbi. *Specijalna edukacija i rehabilitacija*, 12(1), 43-62. <https://doi.org/10.5937/specedreh12-3429>
- Meščić-Blažević, Lj. (2007). Pedagoška prevencija poremećaja u ponašanju adolescenata. *Pedagoška istraživanja*, 4(2), 301-308.
- Mihić, J., & Bašić, J. (2008). Preventivne strategije – eksternalizirani poremećaji u ponašanju i rizična ponašanja djece i mladih. *Ljetopis socijalnog rada*, 15(3), 445-471.
- Mikas, D. (2012). Utjecaj emocionalnih i ponašajnih problema na školski uspjeh učenika. *Pedagoška istraživanja*, 9(1-2), 83-101.
- Pavin Ivanec, T. (2015). Potrebe učenika za ranom odgojno-obrazovnom intervencijom: fenomenologija i rasprostranjenost problema u ponašanju. U D. Bouillet (Ur.) *Razvoj modela rane odgojno-obrazovne intervencije u osnovnoj školi: od ideje do evaluacije* (31-44). Forum za slobodu odgoja.
- Payne-Woolridge, R. (2010). Classroom behaviour and facework: balancing threats and enhancements. *Classroom Discourse*, 1(2), 167-180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2010.514193>
- Ricijaš, N., Krajcer, M., & Bouillet, D. (2010). Rizična ponašanja zagrebačkih srednjoškolaca. *Odgojne znanosti*, 12(1), 45-63.
- Schurch, V. (2014). *Behavioural problems in inclusive settings; coping with challenging situations*. Comenius association.
- Smeets, E. (2009). Managing social, emotional, and behavioural difficulties in schools in the Netherlands. *The international journal of emotional education*, 1(1), 50-63.
- Sullivan, A.M., Johnson, B., Owens, L., & Conway, R. (2014). Punish them or engage them? Teachers' views of unproductive student behaviours in the classroom. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(6), 43-56. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n6.6>

Zlatko Bukvić

Centar za odgoj i obrazovanje Tomislav Špoljar
Koretinec 64; 42243 Maruševac, Croatia
zlatkobukvic@net.hr

Odgojno-obrazovna podrška učenicima s problemima u ponašanju u osnovnoj školi

Sažetak

Povezanost problema u ponašanju s problemima u obrazovanju predstavlja važan aspekt školskoga uspjeha učenika. Dokazano je da problemi u ponašanju recipročno negativno koreliraju sa školskim općim akademskim, odgojnim i socijalnim uspjehom učenika, a osim što su česti uzrok neuspjeha učenika, problemi u ponašanju su reakcija na nepovoljni školski kontekst. Postojanje rizičnih čimbenika u školskom okruženju nepovoljno doprinosi pojavi problema u ponašanju učenika. Izostanak primjerene potpore učenicima s problemima u ponašanju povezuje se s njihovim doživljajem vlastite nekompetentnosti.

Cilj je ovoga rada opisati probleme u ponašanju učenika osnovne škole i utvrditi jesu li oni povezani s podrškom koju im pružaju njihovi učitelji. Problemi u ponašanju opisani su putem analize učestalosti manifestiranja pojedinih problema u ponašanju s obzirom na dob i spol učenika. Povezanost problema u ponašanju s podrškom koju im pružaju njihovi učitelji analizirana je putem korelacijske analize procjene pružene i primljene podrške u odgojno-obrazovnom procesu i manifestiranja problema u ponašanju učenika. Uzorak istraživanja čine učenici i njihovi učitelji iz 4., 6., i 8. razreda.

Dobiveni rezultati pokazuju da eksternalizirane probleme u ponašanju značajnije više manifestiraju učenici muškoga spola. Utvrđeno je da u odnosu na kronološku dob učenika nema značajnih razlika u manifestaciji eksternaliziranih i internaliziranih problema u ponašanju te teškoća u učenju. Učitelji značajno više opominju i upozoravaju na pravila muške učenike, a učitelji razredne nastave češće pohvaljuju svoje učenike. Utvrđene su značajne korelacije eksternaliziranih, internaliziranih i problema u izvršavanju zadataka učenika s procijenjenim doživljajem pravednosti, ravnopravnosti i zahtjevnosti učitelja.

Ključne riječi: *eksternalizirani i internalizirani problemi u ponašanju, individualizirani pristup, odnos učitelja, zainteresiranost učitelja*

Uvod

Ponašanje učenika važan je aspekt školskoga uspjeha, što proizlazi iz međusobne povezanosti problema u ponašanju i problema u obrazovanju (Stevans i Lingo, 2005; Payne i sur., 2007; prema Bouillet, 2013). Problemi u ponašanju recipročno negativno

koreliraju sa školskim općim akademskim, odgojnim i socijalnim uspjehom učenika (Mikas, 2012). Položaj učenika s problemima u ponašanju u školskom okruženju određen je stečenom reputacijom zbog koje su druge kvalitete učenika zapostavljene od strane vršnjaka i učitelja (MacLure i sur. 2011), pa učenici s problemima u ponašanju često razvijaju negativan odnos prema obrazovanju (Maretić i Sindik, 2013). Među autorima postoji slaganje da učenici s problemima u ponašanju nemaju jednake mogućnosti za ostvarivanje socijalnoga i akademskoga razvoja te su i u usporedbi s učenicima s drugim teškoćama u nepovoljnijem položaju (Smeets, 2009; Bouillet, 2014). Sullivan i sur. (2014) navodi da učitelji smatraju da je glavni „krivac” za ponašanje učenik. Osim što su problemi u ponašanju česti uzrok školskoga neuspjeha učenika i njihove slabe interakcije s vršnjacima, oni se istovremeno javljaju i kao reakcija na nepovoljni školski kontekst. Učenici koji imaju akademskih teškoća i doživljavaju neuspjeh u povećanom su riziku za iskazivanje neprimjerenoga ponašanja u školi (Tidwell i sur., 2003).

Učenike s problemima u ponašanju karakteriziraju ponašanja koja odstupaju od uobičajenih za njihovu dob, situacije u kojoj se nalaze, kulturnih i društvenih normi sa štetnim posljedicama na njih same i njihovo okruženje (Bouillet i sur., 2018). Radi se o ponašanjima na kontinuumu od jednostavnijih i manje težine, opasnosti i štetnosti do onih koji su definirani i podložni sankcijama kroz propise te često s težim posljedicama i potrebama za tretmanom (Koller-Trbović, Žižak i Jeđud Borić, 2011). Problemi u ponašanju odražavaju se na obrazovne, socijalne i osobne vještine učenika (Anderson, 2012).

Uobičajena podjela problema u ponašanju podrazumijeva skupinu eksternaliziranih problema koja su nedovoljno kontrolirana i usmjerena na druge poput nametljivosti, prkosa, neposlušnosti, negativističkoga ponašanja, suprotstavljanja, hiperaktivnosti, bježanja, agresivnosti (Mihić i Bašić, 2008; Ricijaš, Krajcer i Bouillet, 2010; Mikas, 2012; Maglica i Jerković, 2014; Ali i sur., 2014; Blazar i Kraft, 2017) i skupinu internaliziranih problema poput plašljivosti, povučенosti i bezvoljnosti (Mihić i Bašić, 2008; Ricijaš, Krajcer i Bouillet, 2010). Prevalencijski podatci pokazuju veću učestalost eksternaliziranih problema u ponašanju u populaciji dječaka, a internaliziranih problema u ponašanju u populaciji djevojčica (Ricijaš, Krajcer i Bouillet, 2010; Janković i Laklija, 2011). Burke i sur. (2009, prema Bouillet, 2013) iznose podatak o 20 % školske populacije koja manifestira eksternalizirane ili internalizirane probleme ponašanja. Na uzorku učenika mlađe školske dobi Pavin Ivanec (2015) utvrđuje da teškoće u izvršavanju školskih obveza ima 20 % učenika, da internalizirane probleme u ponašanju manifestira oko 10 %, a eksternalizirane probleme u ponašanju oko 7 % učenika.

Sullivan i sur. (2014) navode da se problemi u ponašanju učenika mogu opisati i kao blaga odstupanja u ponašanju, ako se učestalo manifestiraju. Kao primjere takvih ponašanja autori navode upadanje u riječ i prekidanje nastave jer su izrazito stresna i izazovna za učitelje koji postaju nezadovoljni i brže doživljavaju profesionalno izgaranje. Do smanjivanja učestalosti problema u ponašanju trebale bi dovoditi prema učenicima usmjerene preventivne aktivnosti koje imaju obilježja pedagoške prevencije, a provode se s ciljem jačanja zaštitnih čimbenika u pedagoškom okruženju učenika.

Programi pedagoške prevencije podrazumijevaju osuvremenjivanje nastavnih programa usklađenih sa sposobnostima učenika, tako da metode i oblici rada potiču aktivno sudjelovanje učenika i odnos prema nastavnim sadržajima s ciljem doživljaja uspjeha (Meščić-Blažević, 2007). Povezanost emocionalne podrške i razredne organizacije s ponašanjem učenika utvrdili su Blazar i Kraft (2017). Kvalitetni programi pedagoške prevencije problema u ponašanju dovode do uspješnosti učenika u školskim aktivnostima, koja je utoliko veća, ukoliko se programi počinju ranije provoditi (Ali i sur., 2014). Istraživanjima je također utvrđeno da učenici koji manifestiraju nepažnju, impulzivnost i hiperaktivnost mogu se uz odgovarajuću podršku i intervencije poboljšati, a u slučaju izostanka podrške navedene se teškoće još učvršćuju (Anderson i sur., 2011).

Preventivno djelovanje na pojavu problema u ponašanju temeljeno je na konceptu rizičnih i zaštitnih čimbenika koje promatramo kao osobna obilježja samih učenika i obilježja neposredne životne okoline (Bašić, 2009). U odnosu na osobna obilježja učenika Doležal (2006) značajnim smatra otpornost učenika i njihovu sposobnost suočavanja s rizičnim čimbenicima i umanjivanja nepovoljnih utjecaja okoline, a Banerjee i sur. (2016) ističu socijalnu kompetentnost, vještine rješavanja problema, autonomiju, osjećaj svrhovitosti i djelotvornosti. Važne komponente okruženja učenika koje imaju ulogu zaštitnih čimbenika su obitelj, škola i odnosi s vršnjacima (Bouillet i Bičanić, 2015).

Neovisno o uzroku i interpretaciji pojavnosti ponašanja, sva ponašanja u neposrednoj okolini neizostavno izazivaju nečije pozitivne ili negativno orijentirane reakcije ili odgovore. Poznato je da različiti rizični čimbenici mogu nepovoljno doprinosti problemima u ponašanju učenika, koje u nekim drugim situacijama ne bi bilo manifestirano (Jolivet i Steed, 2010). Manifestaciji problema u ponašanju učenika doprinosi nepodržavajuće pedagoško okruženje koje karakterizira korištenje jezika neprihvatanja, neujednačenost zahtjeva i mogućnosti, neprimjereni odgojni postupci i neprilagođene strategije poučavanja (Bouillet, 2010). Schurch (2014) smatra da su učenici s problemima u ponašanju suočeni s opstruiranjem njihova sudjelovanja u razrednim aktivnostima, nedostatnim profesionalnim uslugama te negativnim stavovima vršnjaka i školskoga osoblja. Meščić-Blažević (2007) izostanak primjerene potpore učitelja učenicima s problemima u ponašanju povezuje s gubitkom samopouzdanja i samopoštovanja te doživljaja nekompetentnosti tih učenika.

U skladu s time, problemi u ponašanju rezultat su interakcije kontekstualnih i individualnih čimbenika (Payne-Woolridge, 2010; Buha i Gligorović, 2013; Sullivan i sur. 2014) i stoga je potrebno promišljati o načinima njihove identifikacije u najranijoj dobi. Rano otkrivanje problema u ponašanju učenika pridonosi prevenciji potencijalnih većih socijalizacijskih i ponašajnih problema učenika, ako im se pruži primjerena stručna podrška (Bouillet, 2014). U mnogim školama i dalje izostaje planirana i organizirana podrška učenicima s problemima u ponašanju iako su razvijeni i znanstveno evaluirani modeli intervencija koje značajno umanjuju probleme u ponašanju učenika (Payne-Woolridge, 2010; Bouillet i sur., 2018). Koller-Trbović i Žizak (2012) ističu složenost i promjenjivost problema u ponašanju kojima se ne pristupa kontinuirano već

senzacionalistički, s usmjerenošću na zaštitu društva i bez usmjeravanja na pojedince s problemima, uz povećanje tolerancije prema problemima u ponašanju i općenito prisutnost dvostrukih mjerila u procjenjivanju društvene odgovornosti za prevalenciju problema u ponašanju djece i mladih.

Istodobno, rano životno razdoblje školske djece obiluje brojnim prilikama u kojima učitelji mogu djelovati na ponašanja učenika prije no što ona postanu obrazac i norma budućega ponašanja (Jolivet i Steed, 2010), jer škole imaju i važnu socijalizacijsku ulogu (MacLure i sur., 2011) i mjesta su na kojima se određena nepoželjna ponašanja mogu prvi put uočiti (Maglica i Jerković, 2014).

Cilj je ovoga rada opisati probleme u ponašanju učenika osnovne škole i utvrditi jesu li oni povezani s podrškom koju im pružaju njihovi učitelji. Problemi u ponašanju analizirani su na osnovi učestalosti manifestiranja pojedinih problema u ponašanju s obzirom na dob i spol učenika. Povezanost problema u ponašanju s podrškom koju im pružaju njihovi učitelji analizirana je putem korelacijske analize procjene pružene i primljene podrške u odgojno-obrazovnom procesu i manifestiranja problema u ponašanju učenika.

Radi postizanja definiranoga cilja istraživanja, postavljeni su sljedeći istraživački zadatci:

- opisati probleme u ponašanju učenika osnovne škole te procijenjenu pruženu i primljenu podršku od strane učitelja
- utvrditi razlike u problemima u ponašanju s obzirom na dob i spol učenika
- ustanoviti postoji li statistički značajna povezanost između ponašanja učenika i procijenjene primljene i pružene podrške učeniku od strane učitelja.

Sukladno istraživačkim zadacima, postavljene su sljedeće hipoteze istraživanja:

Postoji statistički značajna razlika među učenicima u učestalosti manifestacije problema u ponašanju s obzirom na dob i spol učenika, pri čemu ta ponašanja češće manifestiraju stariji i učenici muškoga spola (Ricijaš, Krajcer i Bouillet, 2010; Pavin Ivanec, 2015).

Imajući u vidu da primjereni postupci i strategije poučavanja doprinose manifestaciji poželjnih oblika ponašanja (Bouillet, 2010; Anderson i sur., 2011), a nepodržavajuće pedagoško okruženje (jezik neprihvatan, neujednačenost zahtjeva i mogućnosti, neprimjereni odgojni postupci i neprilagođene strategije poučavanja) manifestaciji problema u ponašanju (Bouillet, 2010), postavljena je hipoteza da su problemi u ponašanju učenika značajno povezani s razinom podrške koju im pružaju njihovi učitelji.

Metode istraživanja

Uzorak istraživanja

Istraživanje je provedeno na uzorku učenika redovnih osnovnih škola i njihovih učitelja razredne, odnosno učitelja predmetne nastave na području cijele Republike Hrvatske krajem školske godine 2014./2015. i tijekom školske godine 2015./2016.

Nakon prikupljenih suglasnosti roditelja/staratelja učenika, u istraživanju je sudjelovalo ukupno 634 učenika. U uzorku je 59,0 % dječaka i 41,0 % djevojčica. Četvrti razred pohađa 29,6 % ispitanih učenika, šesti razred pohađa 34,7 %, a osmi razred pohađa 35,6 % učenika obuhvaćenih ovim istraživanjem.

Mjerni instrumenti

Podatci su prikupljeni tijekom izrade doktorske disertacije Zaokupljenost školom učenika s teškoćama (Bukvić, 2018). Korišteni upitnici su *Upitnik o ponašanju učenika - verzija za učitelje* (Bouillet i Pavin Ivanec, 2014); *Upitnik procjene podrške učeniku - verzija za učitelje* (Bukvić, 2018) i *Upitnik procjene podrške učeniku - verzija za učenike* (Bukvić, 2018).

Upitnik o ponašanju učenika - verzija za učitelje (Bouillet i Pavin Ivanec, 2014) korišten je za procjenu ponašanja učenika od strane njihovih učitelja. Upitnikom su prikupljeni podatci o općim sociodemografskim obilježjima učenika, a odnose se na uvjete u kojima učenik živi, suradnju roditelja ili skrbnika sa školom, procjenu prihvaćenosti učenika među vršnjacima, postojanje teškoća, oblik školovanja i sl. Upitnikom se mjere eksternalizirane i internalizirane problemi u ponašanju učenika; poteškoće u učenju i izvršavanju školskih obveza te primjereno zauzimanje učenika za sebe i svoje potrebe na skali s četiri stupnja (1-nikad; 2-rijetko; 3-ponekad; 4-često).

Upitnik procjene podrške učeniku - verzija za učitelje, usmjeren je na ispitivanje podrške, odnosno na postupke koje učitelji primjenjuju u radu s učenicima imajući u vidu konkretnoga učenika. Upitnik sadrži pitanja za prikupljane općih informacija o učitelju, njihovo poznavanje rada s učenicima s teškoćama te tvrdnje u odnosu na postupanje s učenicima. Tvrdnje imaju karakteristike skale Likertova tipa s pet stupnjeva od 1 (uopće nije točno) do 5 (u potpunosti je točno).

Upitnik procjene podrške - verzija za učenike, korišten je za procjenu podrške koju učenici doživljavaju tijekom svojega školovanja od njihovih učitelja. Upitnik sadrži pitanja o dobi, spolu, razredu koji pohađaju, općem uspjehu te tvrdnje na kojima su učenici izražavali svoj stupanj slaganja na skali Likertova tipa s pet stupnjeva od 1 (uopće nije točno) do 5 (u potpunosti je točno).

Obrada podataka

Podatci su obrađeni statističkim programom SPSS. U obradi podataka su uz deskriptivne korištene i odgovarajuće multivarijatne statističke metode. Primijenjena je faktorska analiza. Razina pouzdanosti korištenih upitnika prikazana je Cronbach alfa-koefficijentima. Učinjena je procjena normalnosti distribucije rezultata Kolmogorov-Smirnovim testom te mjerama simetričnosti i zaobljenosti.

Utvrđivanje povezanosti između ponašanja učenika i podrške koju doživljavaju i koja im je dostupna provedeno je korelacijskim analizama. Analize razlika i uspoređivanja provedene su na latentnim varijablama. Za utvrđivanje razlike u odnosu na spol učenika korišten je Mann-Whitney test, a Kruskal-Wallis za utvrđivanje razlika u odnosu na dob učenika.

Rezultati

Na tvrdnjama *Upitnika o ponašanju učenika-verzija za učitelje* Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin testom ($KMO = ,933$) i Bartlettovim testom sfericiteta ($\chi^2_{df496} = 11834.090$; $p = .000$) utvrđena je prikladnost podataka za provođenje faktorske analize. Faktorska analiza provedena je metodom glavnih komponenti uz varimax rotaciju. Prema originalnom upitniku, ekstrakcija faktora ograničena je na maksimalno 4 koji su ukupno objašnjavali 59,08 % varijance. Međutim, varijable s komunalitetima manjim od 0,3 uklonjene su iz daljnje analize. Uz ponovljene uvjete faktorske analize, zadana četiri faktora zajedno objašnjavaju 65,64 % varijance i imenovani su eksternalizirani problemi u ponašanju, teškoće izvršavanja zadataka, internalizirani problemi u ponašanju i zauzimanje za sebe.

Tablica 1.

Eksternalizirane probleme u ponašanju u smislu nametljive komunikacije za dobivanje pažnje pokazuje 9,5 % učenika, neprimjereno ponašanje za zadobivanje pažnje vršnjaka koristi 6,6 % učenika, a za dobivanje pažnje odraslih napadnim ponašanjem koristi se njih 4,7 %. Galamom, ometanjem drugih učenika, prekidanjem nastave i upadanjem u riječ, nastavu remeti 8,3 % učenika. Prema procjeni učitelja 4,3 % učenika koristi se neistinama kako bi ostvarili neki svoj cilj, a granice učitelja svojim ponašanjem iskušava 6,8% učenika. Najviše učenika, procjenom njihovih učitelja, ima teškoće u učenju i izvršavanju zadataka. Naime, njih 33,1 % brzo odustaje od zadataka i započetih aktivnosti, teškoće koncentracije tijekom nastave ima njih 30,2 %, a teškoće u razumijevanju nastavnih sadržaja pokazuje 29,3 % učenika. Područje školskoga funkcioniranja i ispunjavanja školskih obveza pripadaju u psihološko funkcioniranje (Janković i Jaklija, 2011). Uz ostale čimbenike, niski školski uspjeh i teškoće povezane s obrazovanjem dovode učenike u rizik za razvoj problema u ponašanju (prema Kranželić Tavra, 2002). Približno 8 % učenika iskazuje pretjeranu plašljivost u ispitnim situacijama i sklono je osamljivanju, a koje Keresteš (2006) svrstava u skupinu emocionalnih teškoća učenika. U slučaju da nešto ne razumiju, objašnjenje traži 21,4 % učenika, pomoć u rješavanju zadataka njih 12,1 % dok pozornost vršnjaka na primjeren način traži 25,7 % učenika. Zauzimanje učenika za sebe i osobne potrebe, a posebno u kontekstu usvajanja obrazovnih sadržaja, pokazatelj je adaptivnoga funkcioniranja učenika.

Test normalnosti distribucije proveden je na latentnim varijablama i pokazuje da su odstupanja značajna (tablica 2) stoga će hipoteza o postojanju razlika među učenicima muškoga i ženskoga spola u odnosu na probleme u ponašanju biti provjerena neparametrijskim Mann-Whitney testom (tablica 3).

Tablica 2.

Učenici koji na faktorima postižu prosječne vrijednosti < 3 , odnosno u rasponu *nikada i ponekad* niskoga su rizika, oni koji postižu prosječne vrijednosti u rasponu između *ponekad i često* razvrstani su u umjereno rizične (vrijednosti $3 \leq 3.49$) i u visoko rizične s vrijednostima $> 3,5$ (prema uzoru na Pavin Ivanec, 2015). Prema tim

kriterijima manje od 2 % učenika u uzorku ovoga istraživanja ponaša se visokorizično, umjereno rizičnoga ponašanja sveukupno je 6,2 % učenika, a nisko rizično ponašanje manifestira 92,5 % učenika. Prepoznavanje i praćenje rizičnih ponašanja učenika važno je jer oni doprinose vjerojatnosti neželjenih i negativnih posljedica za pojedince, njihov psihosocijalni razvoj i okolinu (Ricijaš i sur., 2010).

Tablica 3.

Mann-Whitney U test (tablica 3) pokazuje da se prosječne vrijednosti rangova u skupini muških i ženskih učenika značajno razlikuju na faktoru eksternaliziranih problema u ponašanju i na faktoru teškoća izvršavanja zadataka. Utvrđene značajne razlike u odnosu na spol pokazuju da dječaci učestalije manifestiraju eksternalizirane probleme u ponašanju, a djevojčice imaju više teškoća u izvršavanju zadataka.

Provjera razlika u odnosu na dob i razred koji učenici pohađaju izvršena je primjenom Kruskal-Wallis testa (tablica 4).

Tablica 4.

Rezultati pokazuju (tablica 4) da u odnosu na razred koji učenici pohađaju nema statistički značajne razlike u manifestaciji problema u ponašanju. Slični rezultati dobiveni su u istraživanju Keresteš (2006) kojim je utvrđeno da u odnosu na dob nema razlike u učestalosti problema u ponašanju, a tumače ih relativno malim dobnim razlikama među učenicima. Međutim, ovo može ukazivati i na postojanost problema u ponašanju odnosno njihov kontinuitet u školskom razdoblju sa svim rizicima za razvoj ozbiljnijih problema u ponašanju u kasnijoj dobi.

Za procjenu podrške učitelja u nastavi iz *Upitnika podrške* izdvojene su varijable s približno normalnom distribucijom, a na kojima je Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin testom (KMO = .917) i Bartlettovim testom sfericiteta ($\chi^2_{df55} = 1904,381$; $p = .000$) utvrđena smislenost provođenja faktorske analize. Izdvojen je jedan faktor koji objašnjava 57,65 % varijance. Cronbach alpha-koeficijent ovoga faktora iznosi ,876.

Tablica 5.

Vidljivo je da sveukupno postupke podrške u nastavi prema procjeni njihovih učitelja prima manje od trećine učenika. Postupci koje učitelji primjenjuju prema učenicima najizraženiji su u odnosu na dogovaranje s roditeljima o tome kako pomoći učenicima u učenju (45,5 %). Sljedeće po intenzitetu je individualno češće provjeravanje znanja učenika s 38,9 % i pripremanje dodatnih nastavnih materijala za 31,6 % učenika. Vršnjačku pomoć u poučavanju koristi 30,8 % učitelja. Navedeno ukazuje da je podrška učitelja prema učenicima orijentirana na obrazovnu komponentu.

U odnosu na specifična ponašanja učitelja prema učenicima ispitana je učestalost primjene opomena i pohvaljivanja učenika. Utvrđeno je da između 20 i 22 % učenika njihovi učitelji često opominju i upozoravaju na razredna pravila.

Tablica 6.

Mann-Whitney testom (tablica 6) utvrđeno je da nema značajnih razlika između učitelja razredne i predmetne nastave u primjeni opomena i upozoravanja na pravila ponašanja, ali učitelji razredne nastave značajno češće pohvaljuju učenike. U odnosu na spol učenika, učitelji značajno više opominju dječake i upozoravaju ih na razredna pravila.

Prema kriteriju normalnosti distribucije iz upitnika o doživljenoj podršci učenika odabrano je sedam varijabli (tablica 7). Kriterijem Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin testa ($KMO = .659$) i Bartlettovim testom sfericiteta ($\chi^2_{df21} = 490,907; p = .000$) potvrđena je prikladnost podataka za faktorsku analizu te su izdvojena dva faktora koja zajedno objašnjavaju 50,73 % varijance doživljene podrške učitelja.

Tablica 7.

Faktori doživljene podrške s pripadajućim varijablama i frekvencije odgovora

Učenici, njih 12,5 %, procjenjuju da se učitelji ne trude dodatno im objasniti nastavne sadržaje, njih 15 % doživljava da učitelji ne provjeravaju uspješnost u izvršavanju zadataka, a oko 6 % učenika procjenjuje da učitelji ne provjeravaju prate li nastavu. Navedeno ukazuje na postojanje nezainteresiranih učitelja za potrebe učenika. Trećina učenika smatra da dobiju bolju ili lošiju ocjenu od one koju stvarno zaslužuju, 25 % učenika ima osjećaj da učitelji imaju prevelika očekivanja od njih. Na ponašanje učenika žali se oko 13 % učitelja. Percipirano obrazovno okruženje može ukazivati na zainteresiranost učitelja za učenike i njihovu dosljednost u ponašanju, a oboje važno u stvaranju pozitivnoga školskog okruženja i prevenciji problema u ponašanju učenika. Podrška učitelja koju doživljavaju učenici bit će analizirana preko dva faktora, prvi je *Zainteresiranost učitelja* s koeficijentom pouzdanosti Cronbach $\alpha .635$, a drugi je faktor *Odnos učitelja* s koeficijentom pouzdanosti Cronbach $\alpha .526$.

Tablica 8.

Pretpostavke o normalnosti distribucije i odsutnost *ekstremnih vrijednosti* nisu ispunjene te je stoga za provjeru hipoteze o povezanosti problema u ponašanju učenika s podrškom koju doživljavaju od učitelja korištena Spearmanova korelacijska analiza.

Tablica 9.

U tablici 9 vidljive su značajne pozitivno i negativno usmjerene korelacije među zadanim faktorima. Eksternalizirani problemi u ponašanju značajno koreliraju s teškoćama u izvršavanju zadataka, internaliziranim problemima u ponašanju i percipiranom odnosu učenika s učiteljima. Teškoće izvršavanja zadataka imaju sve značajne negativne korelacije, uključujući zauzimanje za sebe, internalizirane probleme u ponašanju, individualizirani pristup i odnos učitelja. Faktor doživljaja zainteresiranosti učitelja za aktivnosti učenika nije značajno povezan s drugim faktorima. Međutim faktor odnosa učitelja značajno korelira sa svim faktorima problema u ponašanju.

Rasprava

U ovom radu polazi se od hipoteze da su problemi u ponašanju značajno više manifestirani u populaciji učenika muškoga spola. Navedeno je temeljeno na podatcima koji ukazuju da su u dječaka izraženiji eksternalizirani problemi u ponašanju i problemi u učenju. Za provjeru hipoteze o postojanju razlika među skupinama učenika s obzirom na njihovu dob i spol korišteni su Mann-Whitney i Kruskal Wallis test. Na razini značajnosti ($p < 0.01$) potvrđena je hipoteza da među učenicima muškoga i ženskoga spola u odnosu na eksternalizirane probleme u ponašanju postoje značajne razlike. Veće vrijednosti na faktoru eksternaliziranih problema u ponašanju s obzirom na spol učenika ostvaruju učenici muškoga spola. Oni manifestiraju eksternalizirana nametljiva ponašanja koja prema procjeni učitelja smetaju u održavanju nastave, usmjerena su prema vršnjacima i odraslim osobama. Navedeni rezultati potvrđuju dosadašnja istraživanja da su u dječaka izraženiji eksternalizirani problemi u ponašanju (Ricijaš, Krajcer i Bouillet, 2010; Pavin Ivanec, 2015). Jednako tako, Keresteš (2006) navodi da učitelji jače reagiraju i zamjećuju ona ponašanja koja smatraju ometajućima i uznemirujućima u nastavi te poremećaje pažnje i hiperaktivnost učenika smatraju najvećim problemima u ponašanju.

Testiranje razlika u odnosu na kronološku dob učenika, odnosno razreda u koji polaze provedena je Kruskal Wallis testom pri čemu je utvrđena jednakost na testiranim faktorima, odnosno ne postoje razlike u manifestiranju problema u ponašanju između mlađih i starijih učenika. Učestalost problema u ponašanju učenika četvrtoga, šestoga i osmoga razreda približno je u omjeru utvrđenom na uzorku učenika mlađe školske dobi (Pavin Ivanec, 2015), s time da je u uzorku ovoga istraživanja veći postotak učenika koji pokazuju probleme u izvršavanju školskih obveza. To svakako može biti uvjetovano i strukturom uzorka istraživanja u koji su uključeni učenici s primjerenim oblikom školovanja (individualizirani pristup i prilagodba sadržaja), ali i činjenicom da se ove teškoće najprije primjećuju u školskoj dobi te ih učitelji u odnosu na druge teškoće lakše prepoznaju (Keresteš, 2006).

Faktor odnosa učitelja sadržajno opisuje očekivanja od učitelja, a koje su Jeđud i Lebedina-Manzoni (2008) ispitali kroz doživljaj pravednosti, ravnopravnosti i zahtjevnosti učitelja. Blazar i Kraft (2017) navode snažnu povezanost strategija i metoda poučavanja s obrazovnim ishodima, ali istovremeno slabu povezanost s ponašanjem učenika. Ali i sur. (2014) navode povezanost problema u ponašanju učenika s osjećajem ignoriranja i zanemarivanja od strane učitelja i vršnjaka. Učenici tada manifestiraju različita ponašanja u cilju pridobivanja njihove pažnje. Korelacija ponašanja učenika s podrškom koju im pružaju njihovi učitelji (iz gledišta učitelja i učenika) provjerena je Spearmanovim korelacijskim koeficijentom. Eksternalizirani i internalizirani problemi u ponašanju učenika značajno koreliraju s individualiziranim pristupom i doživljajem odnosa učitelja. Dobiveni rezultati pokazuju da su obilježja okoline povezana s manifestacijom problema u ponašanju i da svojim djelovanjem učitelji mogu imati važnu ulogu u prevenciji nastanka problema u ponašanju, ali u smislu izgradnje međusobnih odnosa. Ali i sur. (2014) podsjećaju da učestalo upozoravanje i opominjanje učenika

s vremenom gube smisao te prestaju biti djelotvorni u regulaciji ponašanja učenika. Ističu da je pozitivno pokrepljenje svakako djelotvornije u promicanju poželjnih oblika ponašanja i uspostavi odnosa. No, kako je prikazano u rezultatima, učitelji su u najvećoj mjeri orijentirani na podršku u učenju. Ovo nije nevažno, a posebno jer se školski uspjeh učenika percipira kao značajan zaštitni čimbenik u prevenciji problema u ponašanju. Na to su upozorili McWilliam i sur. (2003) napominjući da je individualni rad s učenicima i rad u manjim grupama učenika povezan s boljim ponašanjem učenika. To potkrepljuje i Smeets (2009) sumirajući da kooperativno učenje i vršnjačka podrška djeluju preventivno na pojavu problema u ponašanju. Hundert (2007) isto tako zaključuje da izravno poučavanje, davanje povratnih informacija o uspješnosti i supervizija učenika poboljšavaju njihov napredak u smislu kvalitetnih i učestalih interakcija s vršnjacima te postizanja ciljanih obrazovnih rezultata.

Uпитno je međutim smatraju li učitelji opisane teškoće učenika u izvršavanju školskih obveza dijelom problema u ponašanju ili ukazuju na primarnu orijentiranost učitelja prema komponenti obrazovanja. Ovo je važna dilema jer su temeljni aspekti školskoga okruženja za prevenciju socijalnih, emocionalnih i ponašajnih teškoća primjereno okruženje za poučavanje, podržavajuća socioemocionalna klima te sustavni proces identifikacije i intervencija (Smeets, 2009). U procjeni podrške učitelja odabrane varijable pokazuju da su zastupljeni važni preventivni faktori pojave problema u ponašanju u obliku angažiranosti učitelja, uključivanja vršnjaka i roditelja. Navedeno je važno jer je motivacija učenika povezana s doživljajem ostvarenih odnosa i podrške (Shirley, 2011), a na način da podrška i ponašanje učitelja s jasnim očekivanjima predstavljaju poticajno okruženje za učenike (Jurčić, 2006; Shirley, 2011). Sve navedeno ukazuje da ponašanje učitelja i podržavajuće okruženje pozitivno koreliraju s poželjnim ponašanjima učenika.

Zaključak

Problemi u ponašanju manifestirani su kod manjeg broja ispitanika ovoga istraživanja, a to konkretno znači da manje od 10 % učenika izražava eksternalizirane i internalizirane probleme u ponašanju te do 30 % učenika koji imaju teškoće koncentracije i razumijevanja nastavnih sadržaja. Ograničenja koja proizlaze iz rezultata ovoga istraživanja su izostanak procjene ponašanja od strane samih učenika i njihovih roditelja te uvid u konkretno ponašanje i strategije podrške učitelja prema učenicima. Iako su učitelji bolji izvor procjene ponašanja učenika, literatura ukazuje na nedovoljno učiteljsko poznavanje manifestacija problema u ponašanju učenika. Rezultati su prikazani deskriptivno i korelacijski te je teško govoriti o uzročnim vezama između analiziranih faktora, odnosno manifestaciji problema u ponašanju kao posljedice izostanka primjerene podrške iako među njima postoji povezanost. U ovom radu također nisu analizirani drugi pokazatelji uspješnosti učenika kao što su školski uspjeh, redovitost dolaska na nastavu, prihvaćenost među vršnjacima i slično koji djeluju kao zaštitni čimbenici. Za prevenciju problema u ponašanju važna je interakcija različitih dijelova životnoga okruženja i obiteljske prilike, stoga bi bilo uputno procijeniti i povezanost roditeljskoga ponašanja s ponašanjem učenika.