

ASSESSMENT OF SPECIFIC TEACHER COMPETENCES FOR TEACHING AREA, SUBJECT AND TEACHING METHODOLOGY

Gordana Dukić

Summary: *Inclusive upbringing and education requires competent teachers, detailed planning and provision of necessary resources, so that students, regardless of differences, have equal chances to develop their capacities. The challenges of inclusive educational work and the constant need to acquire new teacher competencies influenced our determination to investigate and identify those specific competencies that shape the inclusive educational work of teachers in school. This article presents the results of empirical-non-experimental research, which was conducted on a sample of 761 teachers from 19 primary schools in the Republic of Srpska, with the application of appropriate descriptive method instruments. The goal of the research is defined: "Assessment of the specific competences of teachers for the teaching area, subject and teaching methodology with adaptation to students with special educational needs". In accordance with the set goal of the research and the defined hypotheses, specific competencies were identified for which over 50% of teachers estimated that they were qualified or fully qualified. Competencies that are undervalued have also been identified. There are no statistically significant differences in competence assessments, according to the teachers' socio-status characteristics. When choosing a training program, the majority of teachers opted for the teaching area, subject and teaching methodology with adaptation to students with special educational needs, and at the same time there are statistically significant differences of a certain level of risk according to the teacher's workplace. Pedagogical implications: professional training of teachers is necessary.*

Keywords: *assessment of competence, specific competence of teachers.*

INTRODUCTION

Competencies are a theoretical and methodological challenge, which is the focus of interest of the scientific and professional public. As a term and as a concept, they are a response to changes and demands in the world of work in which the development of employees' abilities

is sought. This is also the case with teacher competencies, which are a dynamic combination of cognitive and metacognitive knowledge, skills, and understanding, interpersonal and intellectual skills, and ethical and moral values. In addition to knowledge of the subject he teaches and interdisciplinary knowledge of his profession, the teacher should have pedagogical-psychological and didactic-methodical knowledge, understanding of the social and cultural context of education and school. Transferable, multifunctional systems of knowledge, skills and attitudes that are necessary for personal achievement, inclusion and employment are the basis for professional training and professional development of teachers. In the Study on Teacher Issues, which analyzed the professional development and effectiveness of teachers in 25 countries around the world, special attention was given to the new role of teachers in inclusive education. It is stated in the documents of the European Commission that there are specificities of inclusive educational work.

The challenges of inclusive educational work and the constant need for teachers to acquire new competencies influenced our decision to investigate and identify specific competencies that shape the inclusive educational work of teachers at school, based on teachers' views on competencies.

THEORETICAL APPROACH

The priority of the inclusive educational process is to encourage the integral and harmonious development of each student. The student is accepted and respected as he is, in his individuality and ability to socialize. Given that students do not learn in the same way or at the same speed, the learning and teaching process should be organized in such a way as to enable each student to progress according to his own abilities. The teacher becomes a key factor with professional functions that significantly occupy not only the intellectual, but also the emotional and social sphere of his personality. The changed role of the teacher requires more complex competencies, in order to achieve the expected learning outcomes. With flexible programs and adequate technology, the teacher should adapt the educational process to the student, acting in the direction of social acceptance and support, early prevention, rehabilitation, individualization and functional development of abilities, which is an important feature of inclusive education (Dukić, 2017; 2019).

According to the theoretical findings, specific competencies are systems of knowledge, skills, abilities, and motivational dispositions

that ensure the successful realization of professional activities. They are specific because they refer to a certain structure, that is, the area of work (Petković and Ilić-Milovac, 2010; Branković, 2011; Sladoje-Bošnjak, 2013; Rangelov, 2016).

In the specific case, specific competencies are professional competencies for inclusive educational work that lead to quality education for all students without observing their differences and individual abilities (Dukić, 2021). It should be emphasized that the specific competences of the teacher are the function of timely and high-quality support and help for the student. This means that the teacher's understanding of the etiology of behavioral disorders caused by a particular disorder can provide effective support and greater chances for students to actively participate and learn. It is known that behavioral disorders often occur as secondary symptoms (learning difficulties, speech disorders), or as accompanying disorders of central nervous damage and hostile patients, hostile patients. eating the environment (Milosavljević, 2003; Pintar, 2019). It requires the application of special measures that enable: psychological relaxation, finding solutions, self-discipline, building a sense of independence, socially-recognized and social relations, socially-recognized and social relations⁴; Ilić, 2009), which every teacher should know. The specific competence of the teacher also implies knowledge of assistive technologies (Hollenweger, 2016) and the possibility of its application in teaching. These are editors, which are used to increase, maintain or improve the functional capabilities of a person with disabilities (Encyclopedia of disability, 2006). In addition to good knowledge of information and communication technologies, the teacher should also have basic knowledge about assistive technology, because carefully selected and well-integrated assistive technology can significantly influence the various activities of students with disabilities. and, raising the level of self-confidence, improving the quality of life and enabling social inclusion and equal participation in classes. Also, after the wrong choice of assistive technology can be: offered self-confidence, disappointment, doubt in one's own capabilities, demotivation for further search of any kind. Therefore, specific competencies are the professional competencies of teachers for inclusive educational work, which is dominant in modern inclusive schools.

Based on the analyzed literature and study programs for teacher education, we estimate that the specific professional competencies of teachers are integrated constructs of specific groups of abilities that are presented as follows: 1. teacher competencies to support the development of students'

personalities and values of social inclusion; 2. teacher competencies for inclusive teaching and learning; 3. teacher competencies for the teaching area, subject and teaching methodology with adaptation to students with special educational needs; 4. teacher competencies for creating an inclusive learning environment; 5. teacher competencies for communication and cooperation in inclusive working conditions; 6. teacher competencies for professional development and responsibility; and 7. teacher competencies for participation in the work and development of the school and educational system (Dukić, 2019). It should be noted that the competence of teachers for the teaching area, subject and teaching methodology, with adaptation to students with special educational needs, is not a spontaneous activity, but requires a systematic approach in planning, teaching and evaluation in accordance with the outcomes and abilities of each student. They are very important for inclusive upbringing and education where the teacher should have broad pedagogical and didactic-methodical knowledge, which he applies in inclusive working conditions in which, according to Jurčić (Jurčić, 2014), the dimensions of the teacher's pedagogical competence come to the fore in a dynamic combination with the dimensions didactic competences.

METHODOLOGY

The aim of empirical, non-experimental research is to project the specific competence of teachers for the teaching area, subject, and teaching methodology with adaptation to students with special educational needs. Hypotheses were set: (1) We posit that it is possible to identify the specific competencies of teachers for the teaching area, subject, and teaching methodology, which over 50% of teachers estimate to be professional or personal; and (2) that competencies for applied assistive technology in inclusive teaching are the lowest rated. (3) We postulate that there are no statistically significant differences according to the socio-status characteristics of the teachers in terms of the assessed competence for the teaching area, subject, and teaching methodology. (4) A) It is assumed that the majority of teachers will choose today's offer, a subject called Odiku Nastave, with an extension for students with a gradual shift in the reception of the Work positions. B) Whether the locational training program is a positive sign of the new difference in the reception of the Work positions Teacher. The sample consists of 761 teachers from 19 elementary schools in the Republic of Srpska. The sample includes 83.20% female teachers and 16.80% male teachers. 44.30% are teachers with up to ten years of work

experience, 31.90% are 11 to 20 years old, 17.70% are 21 to 30 years old, and 16.80% are teachers with over 30 years of work experience. 75.40% of teachers have a university degree, 20.1% have a higher education, and 4.50% have a (specialist, master's or doctorate) degree. Therefore, the sample is dominated by teachers with up to 20 years of work experience and teachers with a higher professional education.

Measuring instruments: The PRIVOR questionnaire was received, which was designed to examine teachers' attitudes about competences and inclusive educational work. A scale for self-assessment of special competences was developed for the purposes of this research. The scale is a five-point Likert-type scale. The reliability of the entire scale was determined to be $\alpha=0.96$. The self-assessment of specific competencies was carried out by placing an x next to the strongest one with which the respondent largely agrees under one of the numbers 1 to 5. The scale is as follows: 1 – I am not qualified; 2 – I am not capable enough; 3 – I am partially qualified; 4 – I am qualified; 5 – I am fully qualified. The sensitivity of the scale was checked by calculating the Pearson coefficient. The sums of all acts correlate with the total sum at the 0.01 level. Determining the validity of the instrument was performed by checking a sample of 100 respondents. The objectivity of the self-assessment scale is precisely defined by the method of scoring, i.e. self-assessment, where a higher final score indicates a positive self-assessment. Self-estimated is the subjective experience of competence development, so that a higher assessed competence has significant development competences, and a lower projected one has significant development competences. This enabled a better understanding of pedagogical practice, and did not call into question the relevance of the research. When translating research, assumptions are made regarding access to research, obtaining consent, confidentiality and anonymity. In the research, the methods of theoretical analysis and synthesis, and Survey – a research method – were adopted. In accordance with the mentioned methods, there are corresponding research techniques. When determining the metric characteristics of the instruments and in data processing, the following were received: Pearson's correlation coefficient; item-total correlation; chi-square test; t-test, calculation of the Cronbach-alpha reliability coefficient; analysis of variance (ANOVA); measures of central tendency and standard deviation; calculation of percentage and coefficient of variability. Testing of differences was performed using T-test and F-test. The processing of the results was realized using the SPSS 20.0 software package for statistical data processing for Windows.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We present the results of the research related to the assessment of the specific competencies of teachers for the teaching area, subject, and teaching methodology. These competencies are manifested through the following indicators: the ability to adapt content to students with intellectual disabilities; didactic-methodical design of teaching content according to specific learning disabilities of students; application of teaching technology in accordance with the needs of gifted and talented students; application of assistive technology in inclusive teaching; application of cooperative and interactive learning methods; distinguishing the “essential from the unimportant” in the content that should be adapted to the student.

Results of self-assessment of the level of competence of specific competencies for the teaching area, subject and teaching methodology

Table 1 presents the empirical data of teachers' self-assessment on the level of their competence for each individual competence for the teaching area, subject, and teaching methodology (with adaptation to students with special educational needs).

Table 1. The results of self-assessment of teachers' competencies for the teaching area, subject, and teaching methodology with adaptation to students with special educational needs - frequencies, percentages, and statistical parameters

Ability level	CK13		CK14		CK15		CK16		CK17		CK18	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	48	6,3	33	4,3	4	0,5	51	6,7	44	5,8	13	1,7
2	126	16,6	120	15,8	37	4,9	132	17,3	129	17,0	57	7,5
3	240	31,5	250	32,9	159	20,9	283	37,2	286	37,6	178	23,4
4	248	32,6	278	36,5	379	49,8	230	30,2	237	31,1	326	42,8
5	99	13,0	80	10,5	182	23,9	65	8,5	65	8,5	187	24,6
Total:	761	100	761	100	761	100	761	100	761	100	761	100
M	3,29		3,33		3,92		3,17		3,20		3,81	
Me	3,00		3,00		4,00		3,00		3,00		4,00	
SD	1,086		1,004		0,827		1,029		1,008		0,948	
V	33,01		30,15		21,09		32,46		31,50		24,88	
N	761		761		761		761		761		761	

Note: The level of competence is evaluated with numbers from 1 to 5, where the numbers have the following meaning:

1 – I am not trained at all; 2 – I am insufficiently qualified; 3 – I am partially qualified; 4 – I am qualified; 5 – I am fully qualified.

SK marks have the following meanings: SK13 - ability to adapt content to students with intellectual disabilities (Down's syndrome, mental retardation); SK14 - didactically and methodically shape the content of classes according to specific learning disabilities of students (dyslexia, dysgraphia and dyscalculia); SK15 - I apply teaching technology in accordance with the needs of gifted and talented students; **SK16 – competences for the application of assistive technology in inclusive teaching**; SK17-I am qualified to use methods based on the ideas of cooperative and interactive learning in working with students with special needs; SK18 - I can separate the important from the non-essential in content that needs to be adapted to a student with special needs.

By reviewing Table 1, it can be seen that teachers have developed attitudes about specific competencies for the teaching area, subject and teaching methodology, which they expressed by self-assessing the level of competence for each individual competency. For the application of teaching technology in accordance with the needs of gifted and talented students, 73.7% of teachers estimated that they were trained or fully trained, 20.9% were partially trained, and 5.4% of teachers were insufficiently or not trained at all. The value of the arithmetic mean M is 3.92. For adapting the content to students with special needs by distinguishing the “essential from the unimportant”, 67.4% of teachers estimated that it was trained or fully trained, 23.4% partially, and 9.2% of teachers assessed that it was insufficient or not trained at all. The value of the arithmetic mean $M=3.81$. The specified specific competencies are slightly more valued than the others. We also observed the competencies that were evaluated below: competencies for didactic-methodical design of teaching content according to students' specific learning disabilities (dyslexia, dysgraphia, and dyscalculia), $M=3.33$; then competences for processing new material and adaptation to students with intellectual disabilities $M=3.29$; and competencies for the application of methods based on the ideas of cooperative and interactive learning $M=3.20$; Less than 50% of teachers estimate that they are trained or fully trained for the listed competencies. Competences for the application of assistive technology in inclusive teaching were evaluated the lowest. They include knowledge of the importance of assistive technology and the use of assistive technology in inclusive working conditions. Only 38.7% of teachers estimate that they are trained or fully trained, 37.2% that they are partially trained, 17.3% that they are insufficiently trained, and 6.7% that they are not trained at all. The value of the arithmetic mean is $M=3.17$.

In addition to the above results given in the form of frequencies and percentages, descriptive statistical indicators were also analyzed, which are presented in the second part of the table. The values of these statistical indicators are complementary to the data from the first part of the table. The average scale values (M) mostly correspond to the assessments of the level of competence (analysis of frequencies and percentages). We are also interested in the data on the variability of the results (V). With minor deviations, which are at the level of 1/100, we can say that the results are more homogeneous for “more” assessed competencies (higher homogeneity, lower variability) that we have for: the ability to apply teaching technology in accordance with the needs of gifted and talented students (21,15), Mainly lower homogeneity, greater variability in teachers’ assessments is seen in lower assessed competencies such as: application of assistive technology in inclusive teaching (32,46). It is obvious that the teachers rated those competencies lower, which they consider to be insufficiently developed, and for which they need additional knowledge and experience of application in practice.

Therefore, based on empirical findings, we identified a) competencies for applying teaching technology in accordance with the needs of gifted and talented students and competencies for adapting content to students with special needs by distinguishing “essential from non-essential”, for which over 50% of teachers estimated that they were trained or fully trained. This means that these specific competences of teachers are more developed. We assume that the teachers evaluated them that way because they perceived them as general competencies, which were acquired during formal education and which have already been applied in practice. b) We also identified a group of specific competences that were rated lower, and the lowest rated competence was the application of assistive technology in inclusive teaching. It is obvious that the teachers rated those competencies lower, which they consider to be insufficiently developed, and for which they need additional knowledge and experience of application in practice. The first hypothesis is proven.

Results of self-assessment of specific competencies for the teaching area, subject and teaching methodology, according to the socio-status characteristics of teachers.

a) The results of the self-assessment according to the gender of the teacher

Table 2. The results of the self-assessment of the specific competences of the SKN according to the teacher's gender

Sig. (2-tailed)	Gender	N	M	SD	t	P
CKH 0,460	female	633	20,66	4,80	-0,74	p >0,05
	male	128	21,00	4,52		

The results of the self-assessment of competence for the teaching area, subject and teaching methodology according to the teacher's gender are as follows: $M\check{z}=20.66$; $Mm=21.00$; $M\check{z}<Mm$; $\Delta M=-0.34$; $Sig=0.460$; $t=-0.74$; A minus in front of the t-value indicates that the difference is in favor of another variable. For a sample larger than 400, ($t<1.96$) \rightarrow ($p>0.05$) is applied, so $[(761>400) \wedge (0.74<1.96)] \rightarrow (p>0.05)$. Although a difference in the value of the arithmetic mean was identified in favor of the male respondents, the presented indicators confirm that the value of the t-test is less than 1.96, from which it follows that there is no statistically significant difference ($p>0.05$) in the assessment of competencies for the teaching area. subject and teaching methodology with regard to the gender of the teacher.

6) Self-assessment results according to the teacher's workplace

Table 3 .The results of the self-assessment of the specific competences of the SKN according to the teacher's workplace

Competences	Workplace	N	M	SD
CKH	Subject teaching	373	20,36	4,97
	Class tesching	338	21,01	4,47
	professional associates.			
	Total 761	20,72	4,76	

From the table, following primarily measures of central tendency, it was observed that there are no major, but there are minor differences in the results of self-assessment of specific competencies with regard to the teacher's workplace: subject teaching, class teaching and professional associate. $M(rm)=(20.36; 21.01; 21.42)$; The differences are somewhat greater when it comes to the professional associate category. Whether these differences, which were identified on the basis of arithmetic mean values, are statistically significant, was examined by analysis of variance (ANOVA), which is based on the F-test. In this test, the dependent variable is continuous (competence), and the independent variable is categorical (three job categories). The aim of the test is to prove that the variability between groups is greater than the variability within groups. If the variability is statistically significantly higher, then the differences

between arithmetic means are also present in the population. We presented the results in the following table with F-ratio values:

Table 4. F-ratio F-ratio Differences of arithmetic means within and between groups - workplace

F		$\sum Sq$	df	M Sq	Sig.	P
CKH 2,26	between groups	101,96	2	50,98	0,105	p>0,05
	within groups	17098,73	758	22,56		
	total: 17200,69 760					

On the SKN scale, the achieved F-ratio value: $F(df)=F(2;758)$; $F=2.26$; $Sig=0.105$; $p>0.05$; shows that there are no statistically significant differences between job categories.

v) In the same way, the existence of statistically significant differences in assessments according to the work experience and according to the teacher's professional training was examined, which can be seen from the following tables:

Table 5. F-ratio Differences of arithmetic means within and between groups - work

F		$\sum Sq$	Df	M Sq	Sig.	P
SKN 1,17	between groups	79,14	3	26,38	0,322	p>0,05
	within groups	7121,55	757	22,62		
	total: 17200.69 760					

Although there are differences in the arithmetic means according to the categories of work experience (up to 10 years, from 11 to 20 years, from 21 to 30 years and over 30 years), the realized value of the F-ratio: $F(df)=F(3;757)$; $F=1.17$; $Sig=0.322$; $p>0.05$; shows that among the categories of work experience, there are no statistically significant differences in the arithmetic means of the total score.

Table: 6. F-ratio (Differences of arithmetic means within and between groups - vocational education)

F		$\sum Sq$	df	M Sq	Sig.	p
SKN 2,69	between groups	121,14	2	60,57	0,069	p>0,05
	within groups	7079,55	758	22,53		
	total: 17200,69 760					

Realized value of F-ratio: $F(df)=F(2;758)$; $F=2.69$; $Sig=0.069$; $p>0.05$; shows that there are no statistically significant differences among the categories of vocational education.

From the above, it can be concluded that in the self-assessment of competences, there were no statistically significant differences according

to the teachers' socio-status characteristics: gender, workplace, work experience and professional training. The second hypothesis was proved.

Teacher professional development training program

a) It depends on the readiness of the teacher, his knowledge and skills, which measures he will take, which means he will choose, and especially which forms and methods to apply in inclusive educational work. That is why continuous professional development and training of teachers is very important. One of the questions from the PRIVOR questionnaire referred to the training program that teachers would choose as a priority for their professional training and professional development. The results of the responses are presented in the following table.

b) *Table 7. Training programs*

	Frequencies	Estimate %
<i>Which training program would you choose for your professional training and professional development as a priority?</i>		
to support the development of students' personalities and values of social inclusion;	188	24,7
for teaching and learning children with developmental disabilities	204	26,8
for the teaching area, subject and teaching methodology with adaptation to students with special educational needs.	369	48,5
Total:	761	100,0

On the offered options for professional training and professional development, 24.7% of teachers opted for the training program, which refers to the support of student personality development and the value of social inclusion, 26.8% of teachers chose the training program for teaching and learning children with disabilities in development, and 48.5% of teachers opted for teaching area, subject and teaching methodology with adaptation to students with special educational needs. The results indicate that the third option was chosen by the largest number of teachers, which is almost half of the examined sample. According to the above, in the creation of the professional training program for teachers, priority should be given to the teaching area, subject and teaching methodology, with adaptation to students with special educational needs.

c) When answering this question, statistically significant differences were identified with regard to the teacher's workplace. This was determined using the chi-square test.

d) Table 8. Training programs - workplace

Which training program would you choose as a priority for your professional training and professional development?								
WORKING PLACE (JOB)	To support the development of the individual student and the type of social inclusion	For teaching and learning children with developmental disabilities	For the teaching area subject and met. classes	N	c	df	Sig	p
subject teacher	102	78	193	373	37,06	4	0,000	p<0,01
class teacher	61	115	162	338				
Associate	25	11	14	50				
N	188	204	369	761				

Applying the chi-square test: ($\chi^2 = 37.06$; $df=4$; Sig. 0.000) $\Rightarrow p<0.01$; At the degree of freedom $df=4$, there are statistically significant differences in the responses according to the teacher's workplace with a degree of risk at the level of 0.01. According to this finding, subject teachers preferred the training program related to the teaching area, subject and teaching methodology with adaptation to students with special educational needs, while classroom teachers and professional assistants gave priority to the other two programs. The subject teacher has fewer opportunities to get to know the individual capacities of his students and their educational needs due to the larger number of classes he teaches, and therefore the larger number of students he needs to get to know better. The third hypothesis was confirmed.

CONCLUSIONS WITH PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Teachers have developed attitudes about the specific competences of teachers for the teaching area, subject, and teaching methodology. These attitudes are adapted to students with special educational needs.

1. a) Based on empirical findings: 73.7% of teachers estimate that they are trained or fully trained to apply teaching technology in accordance with the needs of gifted and talented students and 67.4% to adjust the content by separating the "essential from the non-essential" for students with special needs educational needs. This means that the specified specific competencies are more developed than others from the group

considered. We assume that the teachers evaluated them that way because they perceive them as general competencies that were acquired during formal education and that have already been applied in practice. b) The lowest estimated competence for the application of assistive technology in inclusive teaching was identified, for which 38.7% of teachers estimate that they are qualified or fully qualified, 37.2% that they are partially qualified, 17.3% that they are insufficient, and 6.7% that they are not enabled at all. It is obvious that the teachers rated those competencies lower, which they consider to be insufficiently developed, and for which they need additional knowledge and experience of application in practice (first hypothesis).

2. When self-assessing teachers' competencies, there were no statistically significant differences according to socio-status characteristics: gender, workplace, work experience and professional training of teachers. Therefore, the socio-status characteristics of the teachers did not influence the self-assessment (second hypothesis).

3. The results indicate the importance of continuous professional development and training of teachers. Priority should be given to the program related to the teaching area, subject and teaching methodology with adaptation to students with special educational needs, which was chosen by 48.5% of teachers, mostly subject classes. It was identified that at the degree of freedom $df=4$; there are statistically significant differences in the answers, according to the teacher's workplace at the risk level $p<0.01$; (third hypothesis). 4. Pedagogical implications: continuous professional development of teachers is necessary.

PROCJENA SPECIFIČNIH KOMPETENCIJA NASTAVNIKA ZA NASTAVNU OBLAST, PREDMET I METODIKU NASTAVE

Gordana Dukić¹

Pedagoški fakultet, Nezavisni univerzitet Banja Luka

Apstrakt: Inkluzivno vaspitanje i obrazovanje zahtijeva kompetentne nastavnike, detaljno planiranje i obezbjeđenje neophodnih resursa, kako bi učenici bez obzira na razlike imali jednake šanse za razvoj svojih kapaciteta. Izazovi inkluzivnog vaspitno-obrazovnog rada i stalna potreba za sticanjem novih kompetencija nastavnika, uticali su na naše opredjeljenje da istražimo i identifikujemo one specifične kompetencije koje oblikuju inkluzivni vaspitno-obrazovni rad nastavnika u školi. U ovom članku predstavljeni su rezultati empirijsko-neeksperimentalnog istraživanja, koje je provedeno na uzorku od 761 nastavnika iz 19 osnovnih škola Republike Srpske, uz primjenu odgovarajućeg instrumentarija deskriptivne metode. Definisan je cilj istraživanja: „Procjena specifičnih kompetencija nastavnika za nastavnu oblast, predmet i metodiku nastave uz prilagođavanje učenicima s posebnim vaspitno-obrazovnim potrebama“. ² U skladu sa postavljenim ciljem istraživanja i definisanim hipotezama identifikovane su specifične kompetencije za koje je preko 50% nastavnika procijenilo da su osposobljeni ili potpuno osposobljeni. Takođe su identifikovane i kompetencije koje su niže procijenjene. U procjenama kompetencija nema statistički značajnih razlika, prema socio-statusnim karakteristikama nastavnika. Kod odabira programa obuke većina nastavnika se opredjeljivala za nastavnu oblast, predmet i metodiku nastave uz prilagođavanje učenicima s posebnim vaspitno-obrazovnim potrebama i pri tom postoje statistički značajne razlike određenog nivoa rizika prema radnom mjestu nastavnika. Pedagoške implikacije: neophodno je stručno usavršavanje nastavnika.

Ključne riječi: *procjena osposobljenosti, specifične kompetencije nastavnika*

REFERENCES

1. Albreht, G. L. (Ed.). (2006). Encyclopedia of Disability.
2. Branković, D. (2011). Definisanje kompetencija nastavnika razredno-predmetne nastave. *Nova škola*, 8, 11.
3. Dukić, G. (2017). Asistivna tehnologija u inkluzivnom vaspitno-obrazovnom radu u osnovnoj školi. *Naša škola – časopis za teoriju i praksu vaspitanja i obrazovanja*, br. 3-4. Banja Luka: Društvo pedagoga Republike Srpske.

¹ goga.dukic@gmail.com

² Sintagma *učenici s posebnim vaspitno-obrazovnim potrebama* se odnosi na učenike kojima treba dodatna vaspitno-obrazovna podrška i pomoć (učenici s invaliditetom ili smetnjama/teškoćama u razvoju, talentovani i nadareni, učenici sa specifičnim smetnjama u učenju, sa poremećajima u ponašanju, vaspitno zapušteni učenici i drugi).

4. Dukić, G. (2019). Kompetencije i profesionalni razvoj nastavnika za inkluzivni vaspitno-obrazovni rad u školi. Neobjavljena doktorska disertacija. Istočno Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Istočnom Sarajevu.
5. Dukić, G. (2021). Kompetencije nastavnika za podršku razvoju ličnosti učenika i vrijednosti socijalne inkluzije. U: Nikolić, M. i Vantić-Tanjić, M. (ur). Tematski zbornik sa XII međunarodne naučno-stručne konferencije u Bugarskoj: „Unapređenje kvaliteta života djece i mladih“. Tuzla: Udruženje za podršku i kreativni razvoj djece i mladih, Edukacijsko-rehabilitacijski fakultet, Univerzitet u Tuzli.
6. Dukić, G. (2022). Kompetencije za inkluzivno poučavanje i učenje. U: Marković, J. i Kurteš, O. (ur). Zbornik radova sa naučnog skupa „Nauka i stvarnost“, 15, 339-358. Pale: Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Istočnom Sarajevu.
7. Dukić, G. i Sladoje-Bošnjak, B. (2022). Samoprocjena kompetencija nastavnika za komunikaciju i saradnju u inkluzivnim uslovima rada. U: Kojić, D. (ur). Zbornik radova, 701-711. XI međunarodna konferencija o društvenom i privrednom razvoju STED 2022. Banja Luka: Univerzitet PIM.
8. Golubović, S. (2014). Smetnje i ometenosti u razvoju. Banja Luka: Ministarstvo prosvjete i kulture Republike Srpske.
9. Hollenweger, J. (2016). Teacher Competencies for Inclusive Education. u: Dijalozi u obrazovanju, 39-43. Beograd: Društvo istraživača u obrazovanju u Srbiji.
10. Ilić, M. (2009). Inkluzivna nastava. Istočno Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Istočnom Sarajevu.
11. Jurčić, M. (2014). Kompetentnost nastavnika - pedagoške i didaktičke dimenzije. Pedagoška istraživanja, 11(1), 77-93. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
12. Milosavljević, M. (2003). Devijacije i društvo. Beograd: Draganić.
13. Petković, V. i Ilić-Milovac, N. (2010). Ključne kompetencije i učenje u praksi. Pedagoška stvarnost, 9-10, 839-856. Novi Sad: Univerzitet u Novom Sadu.
14. Pintar, Ž. (2019). Poremećaji u ponašanju djece - oblici i uloga prevencije. ACTA, 16(1).
15. Rangelov, J. R. (2016). Standardi za nastavničku profesiju. U projekatu: Razvoj kvalifikacijskog okvira za opšte obrazovanje, komponenta 3. British Council.
16. Sladoje-Bošnjak, B. (2013). Metakognitivne strategije u nastavi. Istočno Sarajevo: Univerzitet u Istočnom Sarajevu.