

# Inclusive education: When preparation to be a teacher doesn't match the demands to be a teacher

Ognen Spasovski, PhD,  
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology  
Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje,  
Republic of Macedonia

# On the meaning of Inclusive education

- Inclusive education is understood as developmental approach taking into account the needs for learning of all children. It provides equal opportunities to all to reach the maximum of their potential, regardless of their origin or capabilities, and physical, socio-emotional, linguistic or other differences.

---

# Aim of the study

- This empirical study *aims* to explore whether teachers education is adequate to meet the demands and challenges of inclusive educational practice,  
*because...*
-

# On international comparative studies on pupils' achievements

- Macedonian pupils show continuous decrease in measures on academic achievements,
- Although, policy makers are on on-going “regime” of implementation of reforms; and teachers are on on-going “regime” of trainings.
- Do these pessimistic results on international studies indicate deep fragmentation of:
  - Policies on teacher preparation
  - Teacher training
  - Teacher practice

# Achievements of the pupils in R. Macedonia

- PISA (2000) rank 30 (35 countries)
- TIMSS (2003) 31 (45)  
(2011) 38 (42)
- PIRLS (2001) 29 (35)  
(2006) 38 (45)

Source:

Lirije Redzepi, Tanja Andonova – Mitrevska and Olga Samardzic– Jankova, PISA 2000: Students Achievements in the Republic of Macedonia (Skopje, the Bureau for Development of Education, 2004).

Mullis, et al., TIMSS 2003 International Mathematics Report: Findings from IEA's Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study at the Fourth and Eighth Grades, Chestnut Hill: TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, 2004); In: V.S. Mullis et al., TIMSS 2003 International Science Report: Findings from IEA's Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study at the Fourth and Eighth Grades (Chestnut Hill: TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, 2004).

Mullis, Martin, Foy, and Arora. (2011) TIMSS 2011 International results in Mathematics, TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Lynch School of Education, Boston College

# Achievements of the pupils in R. Macedonia

- TIMMS-sciences: decrease of 51 points 2011-1999
- TIMMS-mathematics: decrease of 9 points 2011-2003, and 21 points 2011-1999

# Achievements of the pupils in R. Macedonia

- In the same time, at the end of the 2010/11 school year, almost half of the pupils in upper primary education (5<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> grade) finished with highest average mark A (5)  
or, 55861 out of 115598 pupils 48,3% (State Statistical Bureau, 2012).

---

# Education of children with low academic achievements

- What is the quality of education of children from vulnerable groups and communities, if general measures are so low?
  - What are systemic measures of support of children underachievers, where the family could not provide sufficient and adequate support?
-



# Education of children with low academic achievements

- The only systemic measure is obligatory organization of remedial classes  
(1 per subject weekly, a child could take maximum 2 classes per week - different subjects)

---

# The study

- The study was realized with financial and organizational support by Foundation Open Society Macedonia and Pestalozzi Children's Foundation
-

# *Methods*

- Quantitative and qualitative methods were used in 17 elementary schools with various ethnic, socio-economic, regional and rural/urban backgrounds.
- Appropriate questionnaire and discussion guide were developed for the purposes of the study
  - Focus group discussions were realized with teachers and with pupils with pupils underachievers.
  - Semi-structured interviews were realized with the school principles, psychologists, pedagogues or special educators.
  - The sample in the quantitative survey consists of 438 teachers (all the present at work at the day of administration).
  - In the qualitative part participated 120 teachers, 98 pupils with various educational needs, and 19 representatives of the expert staff.

# Schools...

	Total number of schools	Urban-rural schools		Significant –non significant proportion of Roma pupils		One or more languages of instruction	
Schools		Urban	Rural	With significant p.	No significant prop.	one	More than one
	17	13	4	7	10	13	4

# Percentages of teachers according to the subject field

	Natural sciences	Social sciences	Technical subjects	Languages	Art and PE	Class teachers
Percentages/field N = 438	22.2%	8.7%	4.6%	23.2%	8.4%	32.9%

---

# Results

---

# Way of realization of the remedial classes

	Very often	Often	Some times	Rarely	Never
in %					
I repeat the content from the regular classes once more	60	30	8.4	1.0	0.6
Pupils work on the same tasks which they didn't succeed during regular classes	48.3	42	8	1.4	0.2
I adapt the criteria of assessment to their capabilities	30.5	47.9	15.7	3.9	2
I adapt the tasks complexity and difficulty	26.8	45.7	19.2	5.8	2.4
...					

# Preparedness of the teachers for work with pupils underachievers (self-estimation)

	in %						
Question: Do you consider yourself as competent for work with children showing low achievements (on improvement of their knowledge)?	All teachers (in total)	Teachers – natural sciences	Teacher - Social sciences	Teachers – technical subjects	Teachers – Languages	Teachers – Arts and PE	Class teachers
Yes	45.6	37	67.6	37.5	34.9	48.5	52.8
No	54.4	63	32.3	62.5	65.1	51.5	47.2

In the same time, 75.4% of all teachers answered that they are not trained (they didn't attend training) for work with children with special educational needs



# Challenges for improvement of education of underachievers and SEN children (according to teachers)

Level of risk (in %)	Very high	High	Low	No
1. <b>Overloaded curricula</b> – lack of time for repetition and integration of content	38.2	37.0	23.7	1.1
2. Low level of working skills and habits in pupils	68.5	26.5	4.4	0.5
3. Low level of perseverance in learning in pupils	38.8	48.3	12.7	0.2
4. <b>Low level of enrollment in pre-school education</b>	20.2	34.8	36.1	8.8
5. <b>Lack of training for work with SEN children</b>	32.2	31.7	31.8	4.3
6. Social exclusion of SEN children	17.7	28.9	43.8	9.7
7. Lack of detailed individualized educational program	18.2	30.8	39.9	11.1
8. Lack of cooperation with parents of SEN children	23.7	33.3	36.7	6.3
9. <b>Insufficient/ inadequate involvement of expert staff in direct work with children</b>	13.2	19.2	52.7	14.9

---

*Results, in overall (from qualitative and quantitative parts of the study)*

- Study reveals that educational staffs come from university without unison understanding of inclusive education.

Frequently, to have children just enrolled in the schools is considered as satisfactory.

---

## *Results in overall (2)*

- The majority of teachers declare that they have a pupil(s) with educational difficulties in their classes, BUT in the same time more than a half of them consider themselves as not being competent to work effectively with these children.
- Teachers, have stereotypic low expectations and prejudices toward the potential of these children, creating a hidden exclusion.

---

## *Results in overall (3)*

- Teachers are not trained for individualized teaching approach. They usually lower the assessment criteria, what have detrimental long-term effects on the quality of education. Teachers experience the work with these children as difficult, being pessimistic in regard to the improvement of their education. Consequently, they “transfer” or “send” the pupils with educational difficulties to the expert staff and special educators. BUT contradictory, in the same time teachers consider expert staff as unskilled to teach the matter of their subjects.
-

---

# *Conclusion*

- The way how the issue with low academic achievements and work with SEN children is regulated is far from efficient, is highly fragmented, AND it only creates an illusion that this issue is regulated in a proper manner from the highest instance (Laws on Primary and secondary education).
-

---

# Acknowledgement

This presentation is based on part of the results of the study realized by Foundation Open Society Macedonia.

I express my gratitude for the efforts and help in conducting the research to Viktorija Bacvarova, Bore Pucoski, Makfirete Mujovi and Ismet Balazi, as well to Natasa Angeleska, Spomenka Lazarevska, Janez Krek and Janez Vogrinc for their useful comments.

---

---

**THANK YOU  
FOR YOUR ATTENTION**

---