

DOI 10.51558/2490-3647.2024.9.1.379

UDK 376:811.111

811.111:371.3

Primljeno: 27. 02. 2024

Izvorni naučni rad

Original scientific paper

**Alma Žero**

## **A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE STUDENT AND TEACHER TRAINING IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AND SPECIFIC LEARNING DIFFICULTIES IN CANTON SARAJEVO IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA**

The aim of this study was to conduct a comparative analysis of topics on inclusive education and Specific Learning Difficulties (SpLDs) provided in initial and continuing training opportunities for English language students and teachers in Canton Sarajevo in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The study follows a convergent mixed methods design with an explanatory nature. A questionnaire was used to gather both quantitative and qualitative data on student and teacher views about training in inclusive education and SpLDs at the English Department of the University of Sarajevo and the formal English language teacher professional development programs in Canton Sarajevo. The results suggest that teachers are exposed to more topics on inclusion and SpLDs in their professional training compared to students and potential future English language teachers in their initial training, with a focus on strategies of reflective practice to inclusive language teaching and language learning processes of students with SpLDs.

**Key words:** English language teacher training; inclusive education; specific learning difficulties

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of inclusion emerged as a fundamental catalyst in comprehensive educational change towards more just and equitable societies. It has been explored from multiple perspectives and conceptualized based on context-embedded connotations but the widely accepted understanding situates inclusive education at the core of addressing and responding to learner diversity through increasing their participation and reducing barriers in the learning process (UNICEF 2014). Initial and continuing teacher training is at the heart of the current study since quality preparation and professional development programs are key to advancing quality inclusive practice and education for all. The UN *Guidelines for Inclusion* (2005) highlight teacher training as one of the major global and cross-regional concerns in ensuring inclusive education. With the onset of such a global paradigm shift in education, “little attention has been paid to the implications of these ideas for initial teacher training and further professional learning of teachers” (Forlin 2010: xix). Training in inclusive education has been found to positively affect teacher beliefs and attitudes (see Avramidis and Norwich 2002), teacher knowledge (Forlin and Chambers 2011), and teacher self-efficacy (Forlin, Sharma, and Loreman 2014; Sharma and Sokal 2015). However, the content, design, and structure of training programs vary across contexts. In their research on student and teacher available training, Pinnock and Nicholls (2012) look at topics ranging from enabling environments to learner participation, with a focus on needs analysis and assessment adjustments. Florian and Spratt (2013), however, emphasize practical implications with the Inclusive Practice Project (IPP). Three course units were developed for the IPP: ‘Understanding Learning’, ‘Social Justice’, and ‘Becoming an Active Professional’, with the aim to develop a diversity-inclusive approach to initial training based on the principles of inclusive pedagogy and to ensure that student teachers become ‘inclusive practitioners’. In addition, the *Profile of Inclusive Teachers* (European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education [EASNIE] 2012) has become a global guideline in designing quality training in both initial and continuing professional learning as it outlines key inclusive values; namely, valuing learner diversity, supporting all learners, working with others, and personal professional development of teachers and educators. The study at hand explores the extent to which some of these aspects and topics are addressed in English language student and teacher training but adds the dimension of language-based difficulties that English language learners might experience. Hence, we investigate training in both inclusive education and Specific Learning Difficulties (SpLDs). SpLDs are neurodevelopmental

tal disorders with a biological origin and genetic and environmental factors that affect the brain's ability to process both verbal and nonverbal information (American Psychiatric Association [APA] 2013). The most widely researched SpLD is dyslexia as it manifests most prominently in learners of English as a foreign language due to its deep orthography (Daloiso 2017). Clearly, English language initial and continuing teacher training in SpLDs seems more than relevant and highly necessary, especially in connection to inclusive practice in the English language classroom.

### **1.1. Research problem and research question**

Thus, the aim of this study is to investigate both student and teacher training in inclusive education and SpLDs in Canton Sarajevo in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with a focus on the content covered by available initial and continuing programs. Bosnia and Herzegovina is comprised of two entities and one district; the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Republika Srpska, and Brčko District. The Federation is then further divided into ten cantons, one of which is the research sample Canton Sarajevo. Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), and Canton Sarajevo, started the process of inclusive education in 2004 but considerable challenges have delayed that process since then, such as the aforementioned decentralized education sector with multiple administrative levels, architectural and attitudinal barriers, insufficiently prepared teachers, lack of inter-sectoral cooperation, and low levels of family-school support (Žero 2022; Žero and Pižorn 2022). However, several documents have contributed to the development of training initiatives for teachers and other educators in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *The Framework Law on Primary and Secondary Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina* (Official Gazette of BiH, 18/2003) does not explicitly mention teacher training for inclusion but it does state (Article 21, 18/03) that teaching staff, pedagogues, psychologists, special education teachers, speech therapists, and school principals are to be included in training programs, professional development and evaluation procedures, with the goal to upgrade their knowledge and skills. *Recommendations for Inclusive Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina* (Ministry of Civil Affairs [MCP] 2019), a breakthrough document, emphasizes the importance of increasing school capacity to create an inclusive environment and improving teacher competencies. In addition, the *Guidelines for Inclusive Education* (Agencija za predškolsko, osnovnoškolsko i srednjoškolsko obrazovanje [APOS0] 2020) serves as a non-mandatory basis for the development of educational programs and as a guide in the systemic development of inclusive education in BiH. While inclusive education

has thus been a more prominent topic, SpLDs are yet to become a focal point in legislation and training programs in Canton Sarajevo. The first comprehensive training program in teaching students with SpLDs was held in 2022, with both English language students and teachers participating. Other programs or research in English language teacher and student training in SpLDs is inconclusive or non-existent at the time of writing this paper. Although relatively small-scale, this research study is the first attempt in analyzing training program topics as they relate to inclusive education and SpLDs. Since the purpose of this study is to provide a comparative analysis of English language and student training in inclusive education and SpLDs, the main research question is *To what extent are topics related to inclusive education and specific learning difficulties covered in training programs for English language students and teachers in Canton Sarajevo?*

## **2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Due to the comparative nature of the research, a mixed methods approach was used in order to gather reliable and comprehensive data on the research problem, as suggested by Cohen et al. (2007). The research follows a convergent design with an explanatory nature (Creswell and Creswell 2018) as quantitative data was gathered through Likert-scale items while open-ended questions allowed for a more fine-grained analysis and understanding of the gathered results.

### **2.1. Participants**

Both English language students and teachers in Canton Sarajevo were asked to complete the questionnaire. Across the entire sample (N=211), 184 female and 26 male participants completed the questionnaire accounting for 87.2% female respondents, which reflects the current English language teacher and student population.

All students from the Department of English Language and Literature of the University of Sarajevo were invited to participate in the research. Undergraduate students are enrolled in years 1-3 of the Bachelor's study program (BA students). Graduate students are enrolled in years 4-5 of the university program, i.e. years 1-2 of the Master's program in teacher education (MA students). However, teacher qualifications and requirements are not harmonized at the national level and students who complete the BA program are eligible to teach in primary schools across different regions in BiH (Abadžija 2015). For that reason, both BA and MA programs were considered

in this study, as both BA and MA students might join the teaching workforce after completing their studies. The student response rate to the questionnaire was satisfactory, 144 (92% of the total N=157). A total of 130 undergraduate students and all graduate students (N=14) completed the questionnaire. Table 1 gives a demographics overview of the student respondents.

**Table 1.** Demographics overview of student respondents (N=144)

	Undergraduate students (N=130)		Graduate students (N=14)		Total (N=144)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
<b>Gender</b>						
Male	21	16	1	7	22	15
Female	108	83	13	93	121	84
Other	1	1	1	1	1	1
<b>Age</b>						
18-19	24	18			24	17
20-25	102	78	9	64	111	77
> 25	4	3	5	36	9	6
<b>Year of study</b>						
1 (BA)	48	37			48	33
2 (BA)	27	21			27	19
3 (BA)	55	42			55	38
4 (MA)			6	43	6	4
5 (MA)			8	57	8	6

In contrast, a total of 67 primary school English language teachers completed the questionnaire, which is approximately 40% of the total primary school English language teaching population in Canton Sarajevo. In terms of their formal education, the majority of teachers obtained their degree in the pre-Bologna system (57%) followed by teachers who completed a Master's program in the Bologna system (28%). However, 9% of the respondents teach in primary school with a Bachelor's degree, while 6% of the respondents obtained another type of formal degree in the pre-Bologna system which consisted of 2 study years in order to obtain a teaching license. Table 2 gives a more detailed demographics overview of the teacher respondents.

**Table 2.** Demographics overview of primary school teacher respondents (N=67)

	Frequency	%
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	4	6
Female	63	94
<b>Age</b>		
< 29	7	10
30-39	24	36
40-49	23	34
50-59	11	16
> 60	2	3
<b>Education</b>		
Secondary school or equivalent		
4 years (pre-Bologna system)	38	57
3 years (Bologna system), Bachelor’s degree	6	9
3+2 years (Bologna system), Master’s degree	19	28
Other	4	6

**2.2. Instrument**

The questionnaire is comprised of two sections adapted to both English language teachers and students. Section A consists of demographics- and profile-related questions with continuous and categorical scales; more specifically, pre-set response options, yes-no responses, and multiple-response options. Both students and teachers were asked to further explain questions relating to their teaching and training experience. Section B is the main questionnaire scale on student and teacher preparation regarding topics about inclusive foreign language teaching and specific learning difficulties. It consists of 12 Likert-scale items that were extracted from the UNICEF Inclusive Teacher Development Survey by Pinnock and Nicholls (2012) and then further adapted to topics on SpLDs and teaching students with SpLDs. Likert scales were used because they “build in a degree of sensitivity and differentiation of response while still generating numbers” (Cohen et al. 2007: 325). The scale was designed around the aspect of attention given to specific topics in student and teacher training and, thus, responses ranged from *No attention given*, *Attention occasionally given*, *Some attention given*, *Regularly covered*, *Well covered*, and *Do not know*. In addition, open-ended questions offered a more in-depth analysis of quantifiable responses. The instrument was piloted on a small sample of students, and their comments were taken into consideration in designing the final questionnaire.

The complete questionnaire is provided in Appendix 1.

### **2.3. Data collection and analysis**

The questionnaire was distributed via a Microsoft forms link to the students of the Department of English Language and Literature at the University of Sarajevo and to all primary school English language teachers in Canton Sarajevo. Participation was on a voluntary basis. The link was shared with the students through the official corresponding email on January 15, 2022 and stayed open for 2 months, until March 15, 2022. The link was shared with teachers through the former representative of the English language teacher body of Canton Sarajevo on January 15, 2022 and stayed open until March 25, 2022. On February 21, 2022, the Ministry of Education forwarded the link to the questionnaire to every primary school asking principals to share the information with English language teachers in their schools. The researcher sent a follow-up email two weeks before closing the link, as per standard procedure.

There were two data sets in the analysis; the first including questions for both teachers (N=67) and students (N=144) for a total of N=211; the second including different questions for teachers and students on their teaching and training experience (view Appendix 1). Frequencies of responses were determined for both students and teachers, after which open-ended questions were analyzed following Creswell's (2014) six-step procedure for qualitative data analysis. Statistical significance was tested only for the overall difference in student-teacher response. Internal reliability of the questionnaire was ensured through McDonald's omega. The entire scale has a very high internal reliability (0.93), indicating that some items might be redundant. However, it might be possible that this is a product of general low vs. high quality training that some respondents receive, and it is deemed useful to keep all items in case certain trends in later studies report specific differences. When testing for statistical significance, the threshold was  $p < 0.05$ . Reliability testing was performed using JASP v.0.12, while statistical significance was analyzed using STATISTICA v.12.

### **2.4. Ethical considerations**

All study participants were asked to participate on a voluntary basis and to give informed consent. Questionnaire respondents were asked to submit their consent with the questionnaire (see Appendix 1). All participants were assured that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential, and used strictly for research purposes.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to test the difference in student and teacher responses with regard to topics on inclusive education and SpLDs, an independent t-test was performed between students and teachers on their results on the Likert scale. The t-test indicates that teachers are exposed to slightly more topics on inclusion and SpLDs in their professional training in comparison to students and potential future English language teachers in their initial training ( $t=1.9$ ,  $df=201$ ,  $p=0.05$ ). A comparative overview of percentage frequencies of student and teacher responses to selected statements is shown in Table 3, with a follow-up discussion that integrates the results with the participants' open-ended responses.



**Table 3.** Percentage frequencies of student and teacher responses to covered topics on inclusive education and specific learning difficulties in initial and continuing training

Percentage frequency of responses to selected statements						
	No attention	Occasional attention	Some attention	Regularly covered	Covered well	Do not know
Statement	Theoretical/practical concepts and principles of inclusive education					
Teachers	13.4%	25.4%	38.8%*	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%
BA students	16.9%	27.7%*	30%	6.9%	4.6%	13.8%
MA students	7.1%	35.7%	42.9%*	7.1%	7.1%	
Statement	Methods/strategies for reflective practice to inclusive language teaching.					
Teachers	13.4%	25.4%	40.3%*	7.5%	3%	10.4%
BA students	22.3%	32.3%*	21.5%	3.8%	3.8%	16.2%
MA students	50%*	28.6%	21.4%			
Statement	Different models/approaches to student language learning.					
Teachers	7.5%	17.9%	37.3%*	19.4%	9%	9%
BA students	13.8%	23.1%	31.5%*	10.8%	8.5%	12.3%
MA students	7.1%	7.1%	14.3%	28.6%	42.9%*	
Statement	Varied learning activities to engage a diverse range of students.					
Teachers	7.5%	23.9%	34.3%*	13.4%	14.9%	6%
BA students	14.6%	26.2%*	25.4%	10.8%	10.8%	12.3%
MA students		21.4%	28.6%	7.1%	35.7%*	7.1%
Statement	Language learning processes of students with SpLDs					
Teachers	16.4%	29.9%	34.3%*	11.9%	3%	4.5%
BA students	20%	26.2%*	24.6%	6.2%	4.6%	18.5%
MA students	28.6%	42.9%*	28.6%			
Statement	Meeting the needs of students with SpLDs in ELT					
Teachers	13.4%	28.4%	37.3%*	11.9%	3%	6%
BA students	22.3%	33.1%*	18.5%	5.4%	3.8%	16.9%
MA students	28.6%	28.6%	35.7%*		7.1%	
Statement	Assessing, testing or evaluating students with SpLDs in ELT					
Teachers	25.4%*	23.9%	25.4%*	13.4%	3%	9%
BA students	26.2%*	23.8%	20%	6.2%	4.6%	19.2%
MA students	35.7%	50%*	14.3%			

\* most frequent response

Based on student and teacher responses, inclusive education and SpLDs seem to be generally neglected in their initial and continuing training in Canton Sarajevo. Both pre-service and in-service teachers said that occasional or some attention is dedicated to concepts and principles of inclusive education and to methods and strategies for reflective practice on inclusive foreign language teaching. More than 16% of undergraduate students did not know whether reflective practice is an integral component of their education while 50% of graduate students stated that no attention is given to that topic, which is a concerning result considering that reflection constitutes a

critical aspect of student and teacher professional learning. However, qualitative data suggests that reflective practice is a foundational element of the MA teaching program but that the students lack training in applying reflective strategies for the development of inclusive skills (“We do many activities that include reflection... we write reflections after observing classes, after we teach a class, and after important modules were covered in class but I’m not sure how we can use these reflections for inclusive education”); “There should be some connection to inclusion when we talk about reflective strategies because we don’t know yet how to apply them to the context of inclusion”). In addition, the results evidently suggest that the MA program covers different models and approaches to language learning (42.9%) and varied learning activities to engage diverse learners (35.7%). This result is in agreement with Forlin (2010) as it suggests the need for more implications of subject-matter content for inclusive practice in order for students to make organic connections between those two aspects throughout their activities. Similarly, teachers (see Table 3 for quantitative data) provided numerous explanations on the varied opportunities in interactive and innovative teaching methodology but, once again, rare links to the tenets of inclusive education and inclusive principles (“Truth be told, there were very few seminars on the topic of inclusive education, but none dealt with language teaching specifically”), subject-specific training (“Lectures usually end with general theory that I don’t know how to apply in my English class”), and English language learners (“Topics covered by professional development in the Sarajevo Canton are greatly focused on learning about different styles but it would be better if more attention was given to the language learning processes of students with the most common difficulties in English class”). These results align with Florian and Spratt (2013) who confirm that more comprehensive training programs ensure the development of ‘inclusive practitioners’, a concept mostly absent from the participants’ responses in this study. However, teacher and MA student responses are different from the BA students’ qualitative data as it suggests that students who complete BA studies and decide to become English language teachers in regions other than Canton Sarajevo do not have a critical understanding of English language teaching methodology and language learner diversity, let alone inclusive principles and practices (“I believe that one course in teaching methodology during the Bachelor’s program is not enough”; “We cover the main ideas in the methodology of teaching English but there is no space to go deeper into the topics for us to feel truly knowledgeable”). Although the harmonization of teacher qualification is beyond the scope of this study, the results do emphasize the need for urgent renegotiation in that regard for the sake of quality education for all across BiH.

Topics related to students with SpLDs, such as meeting their needs, understanding their language learning processes, or assessing them in English language teaching (ELT), were almost equally critically evaluated by all three groups. While the results indicate that teacher training gives some attention to language learning processes of students with SpLDs (34.3%), both BA and most MA students state that SpLDs are only occasionally tackled. Meeting the needs of diverse learners is a key inclusive principle, and yet, meeting the needs of learners with SpLDs in English language teaching has also been sporadically covered according to the results (similar to Žero and Pižorn 2022). That notion particularly concerned the students due to their need for more practical experience in working with students with SpLDs. In that regard, the importance of understanding the causes and characteristics of SpLDs was emphasized by MA students (“I can’t name any ways in which some learning difficulties manifest themselves in students and that scares me because there have been reports of more students with difficulties such as dyslexia every year”) while teachers showed practical understanding due to direct classroom experience and contact. This affirms the impact that significant training has on the participants’ beliefs (Avramidis and Norwich 2002), knowledge (Forlin and Chambers 2011), and self-efficacy in teaching inclusively (Sharma and Sokal 2015).

However, the most concerning aspect for all three groups was the assessment, evaluation, and testing of students with SpLDs in English language classrooms. While the quantitative data suggests some or occasional attention (see Table 3), further analysis of participants’ responses suggests that the topic of assessment of students with disabilities and SpLDs is not given any significant attention in their initial and continuing professional learning (“It is really difficult to grade a student with dyslexia when you don’t even know how to design the test” stated one teacher while an MA student said that “Almost all of our courses skip the topic of assessment. We did work on alternative ideas but not on formal testing that we’ll have to do once we start working in formal school systems”). All three groups highlight the need for more training in how to adequately assess students with diverse needs, especially when standardized testing is required (“We have this standard test at the end of the year called ‘eksterna matura’ and the evaluation of students with disabilities is done with an individualised test but it only applies to students who follow the individual program. We need more topics that deal with assessing students with difficulties that don’t follow specific individual programs and that is usually the case with students with difficulties such as dyslexia and dysgraphia. But how would the system allow us to provide assessment that is inclusive when all matura tests are the same?”). Hence, the important question

of inclusive practice in teaching and assessing all students despite the programs that they follow at school was raised, in particular students with SpLDs who are undiagnosed and/or tend not to apply for individualized school programs, as well as the question of systemic support in providing meaningful accommodation in assessment. This result also corroborates the mixed methods approach in the present research since it implies that quantitative data with regard to direct experience should be followed by qualitative response options in order to fully grasp the contextual aspect of the researched topic.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

Inclusive foreign language teaching is at a pre-emergent stage in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with rare subject-specific training for both English language students and teachers. While SpLDs and teaching students with SpLDs are rarely covered in initial and continuing training programs in Canton Sarajevo, the tenets of inclusive education have become more prominent topics. According to Florian and Rouse (2009), the task of initial training is to prepare future teachers for a profession that accepts individual and collective responsibility for improving the learning and participation of all children, and thus it is key to ensuring quality inclusive education. However, this study confirms that students and potential future English language teachers in Canton Sarajevo explore less topics on inclusive education and language-based difficulties such as SpLDs than practicing teachers. While both teachers and MA students report quality dedication to varied English language teaching approaches, reflective practice, and theoretical concepts of inclusive principles that are inherent to English language methodology, BA students confirm the need for more attention to teaching methodology in general study programs that take on the role of initial training in context-specific situations where BA graduates join the teaching workforce. Eventually, all participants are concerned about the lack of subject-related links and practical implications, as well as scarce focus on diverse learner needs and assessment strategies in inclusive English language classrooms. It is essential to revise training opportunities and subject-specific topics that will ensure more inclusive practices and critical reflection on current barriers to the learning and teaching process.

## REFERENCES

1. Abadžija, Maja (2015), *Inicijalno obrazovanje predmetnih nastavnika u BiH* [Initial professional teacher education in BiH], Centar za politike i upravljanje, Sarajevo
2. Agencija za predškolsko, osnovnoškolsko i srednješkolsko obrazovanje u BiH [APOS0] (2020), *Smjernice za inkluzivni odgoj i obrazovanje* [Guidelines for Inclusive Education]; <https://aposo.gov.ba/sadrzaj/uploads/Smjernice-inkluzija.pdf>
3. American Psychiatric Association [APA] (2013), *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM-5)* (5th ed.), American Psychiatric Publishing
4. Avramidis, Elias, Brahm Norwich (2002), "Teachers' attitudes towards integration /inclusion: a review of the literature", *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 17(2), 129-147.
5. Cohen, Louis, Lawrence Manion, Keith Morrison (2007), *Research Methods in Education* (6th ed.), Routledge
6. Creswell, John W. (2014), *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.), Sage Publications
7. Creswell, John W., David J. Creswell (2018), *Research design: A qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches*, SAGE Publications
8. Daloso, Michele (2017), *Supporting Learners with Dyslexia in the ELT Classroom*, Oxford University Press
9. European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education [EASNIE] (2012). *Profile of Inclusive Teachers*, European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education; <https://www.european-agency.org/sites/default/files/Profile-of-Inclusive-Teachers.pdf>
10. Florian, Lani, Martyn Rouse (2009), "The inclusive practice project in Scotland: Teacher education for inclusive education", *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(4), 594-601.
11. Florian, Lani, Jennifer Spratt (2013), "Enacting inclusion: a framework for interrogating inclusive practice", *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 28(2), 119-135.
12. Forlin, Chris (Ed.) (2010), *Teacher education for inclusion: Changing paradigms and innovative approaches*, Routledge

13. Forlin, Chris, Dianne Chambers (2011), "Teacher preparation for inclusive education: Increasing knowledge but raising concerns", *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1), 17-32.
14. Forlin, Chris, Umesh Sharma, Tim Loreman (2014), "Predictors of improved teaching efficacy following basic training for inclusion in Hong Kong" *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 18(7), 718-730.
15. Ministarstvo civilnih poslova [Ministry of Civil Affairs – MCP]. (2019), *Preporuke za inkluzivni odgoj i obrazovanje u Bosni i Hercegovini* [Recommendations for Inclusive Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina], <https://rm.coe.int/recommendations-for-inclusive-education-in-bih-2019-final-bhs/1680a37844>
16. Official Gazette [BiH] (2003), *Framework Law on Primary and Secondary Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina*; <https://aposo.gov.ba/sadrzaj/uploads/Framework-Law.pdf>
17. Pinnock, Helen, Hayley Nicholls (2012), *Global teacher training and inclusion Survey: Report for UNICEF Rights, Education and Protection Project (REAP)*, Australian Government and UNICEF Education
18. Sharma, Umesh, Laura Sokal (2015), "The impact of a teacher education course on pre-service teachers' beliefs about inclusion: an international comparison", *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 15, 276-284.
19. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO] (2005), *Guidelines for Inclusion: Ensuring Access to Education for All*, UNESCO
20. United Nations Children's Emergency Fund [UNICEF] (2014), *Companion technical booklet 2 (CTB 2)*, United Nations
21. Žero, Alma (2022), "Inclusive Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Exploring English language teachers' competencies", *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 284-309.
22. Žero, Alma, Karmen Pižorn (2022), "Undergraduate and Graduate Students' Beliefs about Dyslexia: Implications for Initial Foreign Language Teacher Education", *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal (CEPS)*, 12(4), 101-127.

## Appendix 1. Research questionnaire

### **Questionnaire on Training in Inclusive Education and Specific Learning Difficulties**

You are invited to participate in research designed by Alma Žero (Senior Teaching Assistant, University of Sarajevo; PhD Researcher, University of Ljubljana), with the purpose to explore and comparatively analyze student and teacher training in inclusive education and Specific learning difficulties (SpLDs).

Participation in this questionnaire is entirely voluntary. You can withdraw at any time. It will take you approximately 10 minutes to complete. We believe that there are no known risks associated with this research and your answers will remain entirely confidential and anonymous. No personally identifiable information will be collected and responses cannot be traced back to the respondent. The obtained data and reporting of results will only be used for research purposes.

If you have any questions, please contact the researcher at [alma.zero@ff.unsa.ba](mailto:alma.zero@ff.unsa.ba).

By submitting this questionnaire, you agree that the information may be used in the research study.

---

#### **Section A: Personal Information and Background (Pre-service teachers)**

(1) Please indicate your gender:

- Male
- Female
- Other

(2) Please indicate your age:

- 18-19
- 20-25
- above 25

(3) Please indicate your current year of study:

- 1 (BA)
- 2 (BA)
- 3 (BA)
- 4 (1<sup>st</sup> MA)
- 5 (1<sup>st</sup> MA)

(4) Have you studied a module or enrolled in a course on inclusive education?

- yes
- no

Please provide further explanation:

(5) Have you studied about the language learning processes of students with specific learning difficulties?

- yes
- no

Please provide further explanation:

(6) Have you had experience working in a school in some form of teaching and/or teacher support role?

- yes
- no

Please provide further explanation:

### **Section A: Personal Information and Background (In-service teachers)**

(1) Please indicate your gender:

- Male
- Female
- Other

(2) Please indicate your age:

- 29 or below
- 30-39 years
- 40-49 years
- 50-59 years
- 60 or above



(3) Your highest level of completed education is:

- Secondary school or its equivalent
- 4 years (pre-Bologna system)
- 3 years (Bologna system), Bachelor's Degree
- 3+2 years (Bologna system), Master's Degree
- Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

(4) How many years of experience have you had teaching English?

less than 5 years

- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- more than 20 years

(5) How would you rate the amount of training in inclusive education that you had?

- high (more than 40 hours)
- some (less than 40 hours)
- none

Please provide further explanation:

(6) How would you rate the amount of training in teaching students with specific learning difficulties that you had?

- high (more than 40 hours)
- some (less than 40 hours)
- none

Please provide further explanation:

### **Section B: Teacher Preparation and Training**

The following statements pertain to preparation and training in inclusive education and teaching students with specific learning difficulties. Please indicate whether you disagree or agree with the following statements by selecting a score to represent your view.

(7) In your experience, to what extent are the following topics covered by teacher training and preparation in the Sarajevo Canton?

	No attention ever given to this	Attention occasionally paid to this	Some attention is paid to this issue	This issue is regularly covered	This is usually covered well	Do not know
1. Theoretical/practical concepts and principles of inclusive education						
2. Methods and strategies for reflective practice to inclusive language teaching						
3. Different models and approaches to student language learning						
4. Using varied learning activities to engage a diverse range of students						
5. Language learning processes of students with specific learning difficulties						
6. Meeting the needs of students with disabilities in language teaching and learning						
7. Meeting the needs of students with emotional and/or behavioral difficulties in language teaching and learning						
8. Meeting the needs of students with audiovisual impairments in language teaching and learning						
9. Meeting the needs of students with specific learning difficulties in language teaching and learning						
10. Meeting the needs of students with mobility or physical coordination impairments in language teaching and learning						
11. Assessing, testing or evaluating the language learning of students with disabilities						
12. Assessing, testing or evaluating the language learning of students with specific learning difficulties						

(8) Please share any examples or further points to help illustrate your answers to the previous question:

## **KOMPARATIVNA ANALIZA OBUKE STUDENATA I NASTAVNIKA ENGLESKOG JEZIKA IZ INKLUZIVNOG OBRAZOVANJA I SPECIFIČNIH TEŠKOĆA U UČENJU U KANTONU SARAJEVO U BOSNI I HERCEGOVINI**

### **Sažetak:**

Cilj ovog istraživanja je komparativna analiza tema o inkluzivnom obrazovanju i specifičnim teškoćama u učenju koje se obrađuju tokom inicijalnog obrazovanja studenata engleskog jezika i kontinuiranog usavršavanja nastavnika engleskog jezika u Kantonu Sarajevo u Bosni i Hercegovini. Studija prati dizajn konvergentne mješovite metode sa eksplanatornom prirodom. Upitnik je korišten za prikupljanje kvantitativnih i kvalitativnih podataka o stavovima studenata na Odsjeku za engleski jezik i književnost na Univerzitetu u Sarajevu i nastavnika engleskog jezika u Kantonu Sarajevo. Rezultati ukazuju na to da nastavnici obrađuju više tema o inkluziji i specifičnim teškoćama u učenju u odnosu na studente i potencijalne buduće nastavnike engleskog jezika u njihovoj početnoj obuci, sa fokusom na strategije refleksije o inkluzivnoj nastavi jezika i procesa učenja jezika kod učenika sa specifičnim teškoćama u učenju.

**Ključne riječi:** obuka nastavnika engleskog jezika; inkluzivno obrazovanje; specifične teškoće u učenju

Author's address

Adresa autorice

Alma Žero

University of Sarajevo

Faculty of Philosophy

alma.zero@ff.unsa.ba

