UDC 37.01.3:811.111
376.1
Original scientific paper
Submitted 23/7/2025
Aceppted 5/3/2026
Doi: 10.5937/metpra29-60369

Saša V. Stepanović[11]
ALFA BK University

Slavica Lj. Jašić[22]
Ministry of Education, Science and Technological development

Emilija B. Lipošek[33]
Academy of Professional Studies Belgrade,
Department of Higher Tourism School
Belgrade

REPRESENTATION AND APPLICATION OF TEACHING METHODS IN INCLUSIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PRACTICE

Abstract: The aim of this research is to examine the teaching methods applied in inclusive English language instruction, with particular emphasis on the prevalence of each method in engaging students with special educational needs. Using the systematic observation technique, data were collected through structured classroom observations of 382 English language lessons in sixth and seventh grades across 16 elementary schools from different regions of Serbia attended by students with sensory impairments (N = 69). The collected data were processed and analyzed using SPSS. The findings indicate that the monologic method predominates, while dialogic methods are used to a limited extent and modern approaches are applied only minimally. The findings indicate a need for greater methodological diversity to support inclusive practice and promote active participation of all students.

Keywords: inclusion, English language, teaching methods, sensory impairments, instruction

1 drsasastepanovic@gmail.com ; https://orcid.org/0009-0003-8895-4326
2 slavica.jasic@mpn.gov.rs
3 emilija.lipovsek@assb.edu.rs

INTRODUCTION

The continued dominance of monologic instruction in inclusive English language classrooms suggests a noticeable discrepancy between contemporary theoretical recommendations and actual classroom practice. Although the literature consistently advocates dialogic, interactive, and learner-centered approaches, classroom reality indicates that teachers often remain within traditional methodological frameworks. This gap is likely not attributable solely to individual teacher choice but is also shaped by structural factors such as limited professional support, insufficient methodological preparation for inclusive contexts, and the demanding organizational conditions of everyday school practice.

The organization and realization of learning in contemporary school environments cannot be conceived without carefully selected and pedagogically justified teaching methods. *Teaching methods*, as key elements of the educational process, are not merely technical tools but frameworks through which pedagogical communication is structured, cognitive development is supported, and knowledge is constructed in the interaction between students and teachers (MacSwan, 2017). In the context of inclusive education, which aims to provide quality and equitable learning for all children, including those with sensory impairments, methodological flexibility takes on particular importance (Alexander, 2006; Videnović & Ilić, 2017).

Modern approaches emphasize a combination and adaptation of methods—from lecture-based (monological) to dialogue-based methods, as well as interactive and text-focused strategies—with the goal of engaging a greater number of students and encouraging their active role in knowledge acquisition (Tomlinson, 2014). Specifically, when working with students with hearing or visual impairments, teacher-centered instruction must give way to learner-centered approaches that focus on individual learning styles, working pace, and communication barriers (Florian, 2014).

The use of the English language in instruction—either as the language of instruction in bilingual programs or as the subject of instruction—further complicates the demands placed on teachers. *English language instruction* in an inclusive context requires carefully designed methods that combine visual, auditory, and tactile resources, along with heightened sensitivity to the phonological, grammatical, and semantic challenges faced by students with sensory impairments (Hattie, 2009).

At the same time, the effectiveness of any teaching method in inclusive English language instruction largely depends on the teacher's ability to align methodological choices with the specific sensory and communicative profiles of students. Inclusive practice therefore cannot be reduced to the formal presence of diverse methods in lesson planning; rather, it requires their purposeful and context-sensitive application. In heterogeneous classrooms, the pedagogical value of a method emerges not from its theoretical classification but from the degree to which it enables meaningful participation, comprehension, and interaction for all learners.

Methods such as oral exposition, guided discussion, reading comprehension, and written expression tasks cannot be universally applied to all students. Rather, each of these must be viewed as adaptable depending on the characteristics of the student group (Werts & Fletcher, 2012). For instance, the lecture method may be entirely ineffective in groups that include deaf students unless it is enriched with multimedia content, subtitles, or sign language interpretation (Stepanović, 2023b).

At the same time, *dialogic teaching*, as a form of instruction that fosters two-way communication, creates a space for genuine educational inclusion. It is not merely a method but a stance—a belief that every student is an active participant, regardless of their abilities. This approach allows students with hearing or visual impairments to experience full participation rather than marginalization (Stepanović & Živković, 2020; Stepanović, 2023a).

From the perspective of pedagogical and psychological sciences, it is evident that no single method can meet all educational needs. An integrative application of diverse methods—aligned with instructional goals, developmental characteristics of students, and their linguistic, sensory, and cognitive needs—forms the foundation of successful, equitable, and inclusive education. In English language teaching specifically, this involves employing *multisensory approaches* (e.g., combining visual aids, audio recordings, gestures, and tactile symbols), accompanied by systematic support and scaffolding (Stepanović, 2019a).

Ultimately, the teacher's role extends beyond knowledge transmission to the creation of an environment that enables *participation, inclusion, and engagement* for every student (Novaković & Petrović, 2018). The contemporary teacher is a mediator, organizer, and innovator—especially in foreign language teaching and in working with students with disabilities. Their competence, emotional sensitivity, and methodological flexibility are key determinants of the success of the entire process (Stepanović, 2018).

This research was conducted using the systematic observation technique, supported by document and lesson plan analysis. The collected data were processed through quantitative (frequency and percentage analysis) and qualitative descriptive analysis.

APPROACHES AND METHODS IN TEACHING ENGLISH WITHIN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

In inclusive English language teaching practice, it is essential to implement a variety of instructional methods that allow the teaching process to be adapted to students with diverse educational needs and abilities. The primary objective is to ensure that all students—regardless of their individual characteristics—are given the opportunity to participate actively, comprehend the material, and acquire language competencies (Slee, 2011).

A blended teaching approach, which combines traditional and contemporary methods, has proven to be the most effective in inclusive settings (Stepanović, 2019b). Within this framework, contemporary language pedagogy highlights several influential models. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emphasizes authentic interaction and meaningful language use, thereby creating opportunities for active participation of students with diverse abilities (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), as an extension of communicative methodology, organizes instruction around purposeful tasks that enable differentiation through varying levels of task complexity and support (Ellis, 2003). Additionally, the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework promotes proactive planning of flexible instruction by providing multiple means of representation, engagement, and expression,

which is particularly relevant in inclusive classrooms (Meyer, Rose, & Gordon, 2014). Multisensory instructional approaches, which integrate visual, auditory, and kinesthetic modalities, are also strongly recommended when working with students with sensory impairments because they enhance accessibility and retention of language input (Tomlinson, 2014).

For example, direct instruction with clearly defined goals and explicit directions, when combined with interactive techniques such as group work, educational games, and multimedia content, enhances student motivation and engagement (Stepanović, 2018a). Of particular importance is instructional differentiation—the adaptation of tasks and activities to various levels of prior knowledge and learning styles. The use of visual aids, simplified language, as well as repetition and content scaffolding, ensures that instruction remains accessible and comprehensible to all learners (Stepanović, 2018b).

Inclusive practice also entails continuous collaboration between English language teachers, support staff, parents, and the students themselves, which facilitates more effective monitoring of progress and timely intervention in case of emerging difficulties (Lyle, 2008).

The application of such methods contributes not only to language development but also to social inclusion, fostering self-confidence and cultivating a positive attitude toward learning among all students.

Taken together, these approaches indicate that effective inclusive English language instruction cannot rely on a single dominant method but instead requires a strategically integrated methodological repertoire. In practice, the value of any approach emerges only when it is thoughtfully aligned with the sensory, linguistic, and cognitive profiles of learners. It is therefore essential that teachers move beyond formal methodological pluralism toward purposeful, context-responsive implementation that genuinely supports participation and language development for all students. Strengthening methodological awareness and reflective practice among teachers remains a key prerequisite for advancing the quality and authenticity of inclusion in English language classrooms.

METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

Subject, Aim, and Research Objectives

The subject of the research is the representation and application of teaching methods in inclusive English language instruction in primary schools involving students with special educational needs.

The aim of the study is to examine which teaching methods are most frequently used and how they are applied in inclusive English language classrooms, with particular emphasis on the prevalence of each method in fostering the inclusion of students with diverse educational needs.

Based on this aim, the following research objectives were formulated:

To identify and quantify the prevalence of core teaching methods (monologic, dialogic, text-based work, written and graphical assignments, demonstration) in inclusive English language instruction.

To analyze the application of teaching methods across different parts of the lesson (introductory, main, and concluding segments).

To examine how the representation of teaching methods contributes to the active engagement of students with special educational needs.

To compare the use of methods in inclusive instruction with the recommendations of contemporary pedagogical approaches.

Research Hypotheses

- H1: Monologic and dialogic methods dominate in inclusive English language instruction, while other methods are significantly less represented.
- H2: Dialogic methods are most prevalent in the central part of the lesson, whereas monologc methods dominate the introductory and concluding parts.
- H3: A higher representation of interactive teaching methods (dialogue, text-based work, written and graphical assignments) contributes to better inclusion of students with special educational needs.

METHODS, TECHNIQUES, VARIABLES, AND RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

In order to ensure a comprehensive examination of the prevalence and application of teaching methods in inclusive English language instruction, a mixed-method research design was employed. The study relied primarily on the systematic observation technique, which enabled direct and structured monitoring of English language classes in inclusive settings using a pre-defined observation protocol. This approach was complemented by document and lesson plan analysis, which served to assess the alignment between planned and implemented teaching methods:

- **Systematic observation technique** – direct and structured monitoring of English language classes in inclusive settings using a pre-defined observation protocol.
- **Document and lesson plan analysis** – to assess the planned and implemented teaching methods. The analysis focused on identifying the teaching methods explicitly planned for each lesson and comparing them with the methods actually observed during classroom implementation.
- **Quantitative analysis** – statistical processing of observation data, including the calculation of frequencies and percentages, was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics.
- **Qualitative analysis** – interpretation of the quality of interaction and participation of students with special educational needs.
- **Dependent variables:**
  – Representation of teaching methods (monologic, dialogic, text-based work, written and graphical assignments, demonstration), expressed in percentages.

– Level of inclusion of students with special educational needs, observed qualitatively through active participation in class.

· **Independent variables:**
– Lesson segment (introductory, main, concluding).
– Type of sensory impairment of students (hearing impairment, visual impairment).

Collected data on the representation of teaching methods across different lesson segments were organized in tabular format. Frequencies and percentages of each method's representation within the total lesson duration, and separately for the introductory, main, and concluding parts, were calculated. Method usage across different lesson segments was compared using descriptive statistics.

· Basic statistical procedures, including percentage analysis and frequency comparison, were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics to test the research hypotheses..
· Qualitative data were analyzed descriptively and interpreted within the context of inclusive practice and theoretical frameworks.

To examine the prevalence and application of teaching methods and techniques in English language instruction, a systematic observation technique was employed using a protocol for recording the teaching process. The protocol includes guidelines for noting the suitability of the teaching environment, forms of communication, classroom organization, as well as the use of teaching aids. This instrument is well-suited for investigating the prevalence and quality of the implementation of various teaching methods and techniques in inclusive education.

Data were collected through direct, non-participant observation of English language lessons in inclusive classrooms. Each observed lesson was recorded using a structured observation sheet in which the presence and duration of specific teaching methods were systematically coded according to predefined categories. The observation focused on real-time classroom processes in order to ensure ecological validity and an accurate representation of everyday teaching practice.

Systematic observation was used to collect data on the following methods: text-based work method, monologic method, dialogic method, written and graphic assignments method, and demonstration method. The data were analyzed both in terms of the English lesson as a whole and its specific segments — the introductory, central, and concluding parts of the lesson.

Quantitative data were tabulated and processed using IBM SPSS Statistics, where frequencies and percentages of each method were calculated for the lesson as a whole and for individual lesson segments. In addition to quantitative processing, qualitative descriptive analysis was applied to interpret patterns of student participation and the contextual appropriateness of the observed methods within inclusive practice. The combined analytical approach enabled both numerical comparison and pedagogical interpretation of the representation and application of teaching methods in inclusive English language instruction.

RESEARCH RESULTS

The research sample included 16 primary schools from different regions of Serbia that implement inclusive English language instruction involving students with various developmental difficulties (N=69). Schools were selected based on available data on the number of students with special educational needs attending English language classes.

The study was conducted using the systematic observation technique applied to English language classes. The unit of observation was a single class period. A total of 382 English language classes were observed in the sixth and seventh grades of primary school, including 200 sixth-grade and 182 seventh-grade lessons (see Table 1) throughout the school year 2024/2025. Data were collected through direct, non-participant observation of English language lessons in inclusive classrooms.

The structure of the sample of students with developmental difficulties included students with the following types of impairments: students with visual impairments (low vision and blindness), hearing impairments (hearing loss and partial hearing), as well as students with other learning difficulties. A more detailed structure of the sample by type of impairment is presented in Table 2. The distribution of students by type of sensory impairment indicates that visually impaired students constituted the largest subgroup (50.7%), followed by hard of hearing students (24.6%) and deaf students (17.4%). Blind students represented the smallest proportion of the sample (7.2%). Overall, the findings show a clear predominance of students with partial visual impairment within the observed inclusive classrooms, while students with complete visual loss were least represented.

H1:Monologic and dialogic methods dominate in inclusive English language instruction, while other methods are significantly less represented.

To better understand the application of teaching methods in inclusive English language instruction, the research results are organized according to observation units: the lesson as a whole, as well as its phases — introductory, central, and concluding parts. This approach allows for a more detailed analysis of how different methods are used in various segments of the teaching process. Frequencies and percentages were used to analyze the prevalence of methods, providing a clear quantitative overview of classroom practice.

When considering the English lesson as a whole, the most frequently used method is the monologic method, which involves teacher-led lecturing and explanation. This method accounts for 39.7%, indicating that teachers often employ direct and structured communication to convey key information and explain teaching content. The monologic method is particularly useful for clearly presenting new language rules, grammatical structures, and vocabulary, which form the foundation for further work.

The next most prevalent method is the dialogic method, with a share of 39.2%. This method entails interaction and conversation between teacher and students, which is especially important in inclusive practice. Dialogue enables active student participation, exchange of opinions, and question-asking, contributing to individualizing instruction and adapting to diverse student needs. Students with special educational needs thus have opportunities to express themselves and receive support, which fosters their motivation and engagement.

The method of written and graphic assignments also holds a significant place in instruction, as it helps students apply learned material practically and develop language skills creatively. This method is especially important for students who learn visually or have difficulties with auditory comprehension.

On the other hand, the demonstration method, which involves showing and visually explaining, proved to be the least represented at only 2.8%. This finding may suggest that teachers rarely use this form of teaching or apply it selectively, possibly due to a lack of materials or the specific nature of English lessons.

Overall, the research results show that inclusive English language teaching balances between monologic and dialogic methods, achieving effective communication and active inclusion of all students, including those with diverse educational needs. Such an approach contributes to higher quality learning and the development of language competencies in an inclusive environment.

H2: Dialogic methods are most prevalent in the central part of the lesson, whereas monologc methods dominate the introductory and concluding parts.

A more detailed presentation of the prevalence of individual teaching methods is provided in Table 3, and the prevalance of methods in the introductory part in Table 4.

In the introductory part of the English lesson within inclusive practice, the monologue and dialogue methods are most frequently used, each accounting for 45.5% of usage. These methods form the foundation for establishing communication and setting the context of the lesson. The monologue method allows the teacher to clearly present the lesson objectives and content, as well as to introduce new material in a systematic and structured manner. On the other hand, dialogue in the introductory phase encourages active student participation, enabling them to ask questions and express prior knowledge or uncertainties, which is especially important in inclusive teaching where students differ in abilities and needs.

Methods such as written and graphic work, work with text, and demonstration are used to a much lesser extent in this part of the lesson, almost negligibly, which corresponds to their nature and function. These methods require greater student engagement and are generally applied during the central part of the lesson when active acquisition and application of material take place.

Since the introductory part of the lesson primarily serves to orient students, present lesson goals, and motivate further learning, the higher representation of monologue and dialogue methods is justified and expected. These methods enable clear communication with all students, including those with various types of impairments, and allow adjustment of the lesson pace and content to their individual needs.

A more detailed presentation of the representation of teaching methods in the central part of the lesson is given in Table 5.

The central part of the English lesson in inclusive teaching represents the key segment where various teaching methods are most intensively applied to cover topics and engage students. The results show that in this part of the lesson, the dialogue method is the most prevalent, with a share of 36.6%. This method involves active communication between the teacher and students, as well as among the students themselves, which is especially important in an inclusive environment where different students have different learning styles and needs. Dialogue as a method enables the exchange of opinions, asking

questions, practical application of the language, and immediate feedback, which further stimulates motivation and engagement of all students.

The monologue method, which consists of teacher explanations and lectures, is present to a slightly lesser extent, with 29.1%. This method still plays an important role as it allows clear guidance of the teaching process and provides necessary information and language rules that students need to master. In inclusive teaching, monologue is often combined with dialogue to facilitate understanding of the material for students with different abilities.

Written and graphic tasks hold a significant place with a share of 22.5%. These assignments allow students to develop and apply language skills through practical work, which is especially important for students with different learning styles and those who need additional visual or motor support. Including written and graphic activities also contributes to the development of creativity, concentration, and independent learning.

Work with text, which includes reading and analyzing textual materials, is less represented (8.6%). This method is important for developing reading and analytical skills but is often combined with other methods in inclusive practice to better adapt to the needs of all students.

The demonstration method, that is, visual presentation of material or activities, is used the least, with only 3.1%. Although demonstration is useful for concretizing abstract concepts and can be very effective with certain groups of students, English teachers use it less frequently in practice, possibly due to limited resources or the nature of the subject. This distribution shows that in the central part of the inclusive English lesson, preference is given to methods that encourage active interaction and practical work, which is a key factor for successfully including all students and achieving effective language learning.

A detailed presentation of the representation of teaching methods in the final part of the lesson is shown in Table 6.

In the final part of the English lesson in inclusive teaching, the monologue method dominates with a share of 44.8%. This high percentage can be explained by the fact that the teacher uses this part of the lesson to summarize, give conclusions, and provide clear guidelines for further work. The monologue segment at the end of the lesson often involves repetitive explanation of key content and homework assignments, which is very important for all students, especially those with specific educational needs who require additional clarity and structure.

The dialogue method, although slightly less represented than the monologue, still holds a significant place with 35.3%. This method allows the teacher and students to clarify any doubts, ask questions, and receive feedback. In inclusive teaching, the final part of the lesson often uses dialogue to check understanding of the material and to allow students to express their opinions or concerns, thereby encouraging active participation and reflection.

Methods involving written and graphic assignments are present to a lesser extent, while work with text and demonstration are almost negligible, similar to the introductory part of the lesson. This low representation may result from the fact that these forms of work are primarily concentrated in the central part of the lesson when the main content is being covered.

These results indicate a clearly structured final part of the lesson, emphasizing repetition and consolidation of knowledge through monologue delivery, but also allowing dialogue to verify understanding and communication. Such an approach is especially important in an inclusive environment, where clear and adapted communication is necessary so that all students, regardless of their individual needs, can successfully follow the teaching process.

The method of oral presentation (monologic method) and the dialogic method, when considered individually, show almost equal representation in English language teaching in inclusive practice. However, their combination is applied less frequently, indicating that these methods are most often used separately—that is, the teacher either predominantly presents the material or involves more interaction and conversation with the students. Such an approach can be challenging in inclusive teaching, where the balance between presentation and interaction is crucial for adequately engaging students with different educational needs.

Other teaching methods, such as demonstration, work with text, as well as written and graphic assignments, are used to a much lesser extent. However, it is interesting to note that written and graphic tasks are more frequently applied in the central part of the lesson, indicating a focus on more active forms of work precisely during the part of the lesson when new material is covered and students have the opportunity to apply what they have learned in practice.

Additionally, the results show that data from the introductory part of the lesson generally align with the overall data, which may mean that the introductory part often relies on common methods of presentation and dialogue, with fewer varied activities. On the other hand, in the central part of the lesson, dialogue predominates over monologue, while at the end of the lesson this tendency shifts in favor of the monologic method, probably due to the need for summarizing and clear conclusions.

Considering the critiques of the traditional teaching approach, which often favors predominantly monologic knowledge transfer and insufficient interaction, these findings are consistent with existing literature and indicate that inclusive English teaching is still balancing between these methods. It is important to work on further applying integrated and interactive teaching approaches to better meet the needs of all students, especially those with special educational needs.

H3: A higher representation of interactive teaching methods (dialogue, text-based work, written and graphical assignments) contributes to better inclusion of students with special educational needs.

A higher representation of interactive teaching methods (dialogue, text-based work, written and graphical assignments) appears to be associated with improved inclusion of students with special educational needs. This inference is based on a comparative examination of the frequency of interactive method use and qualitative indicators of student participation recorded during classroom observations. Lessons characterized by a greater proportion of interactive activities tended to show higher levels of active engagement, verbal or nonverbal contribution, and task involvement among students with special educational needs. Descriptive statistical analyses conducted in IBM SPSS Statistics indicated a positive trend between the prevalence of interactive methods and observed inclusion outcomes.

Comparative frequency analysis indicated that in lessons with low use of interactive methods (0–20%), active participation of students with special educational needs was observed in 35% of cases.

In lessons with moderate use (21–40%), participation increased to 52%, while in lessons with high use (>40%), participation reached 70%.

From a pedagogical standpoint, the observed pattern suggests that interactive methodologies may create more accessible participation pathways for students with diverse sensory and learning profiles. At the same time, the relationship is likely mediated by additional classroom variables, including teacher facilitation skills, availability of instructional supports, and the specific composition of the student group. Therefore, while the results lend support to contemporary inclusive pedagogy, further research employing more robust inferential designs would be necessary to establish the strength and direction of this relationship with greater precision.

DISCUSSION OF THE RESEARCH

The results of this study clearly indicate the dominant use of monologic and dialogic methods in inclusive English language teaching, which aligns with contemporary pedagogical approaches emphasizing the importance of communication and interaction in foreign language learning. The findings of the present study largely correspond with existing research indicating the continued predominance of teacher-centered and verbally oriented instruction in foreign language classrooms, even within inclusive settings. Previous studies have similarly reported that monologic forms of teaching remain structurally embedded in classroom practice despite strong theoretical advocacy for interactive and learner-centered approaches (Hattie, 2009; Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

The monologic method, with participation of nearly 40% of the total lesson time, shows that teachers often use lecturing and explanation as the primary form of knowledge transfer. This may result from the need to clearly present new material to students, especially in inclusive settings where it is necessary to adjust the pace and content to the different abilities of students.

On the other hand, the dialogic method is almost equally represented, indicating teachers' efforts to involve students in active conversation and interaction, which is essential for successful acquisition of English. This method contributes to better inclusion because it allows students with special educational needs to express themselves, ask questions, and participate in the teaching process in ways adapted to their abilities. It is particularly significant that dialogue dominates the central part of the lesson, where active engagement and application of learned material are expected, supporting the hypothesis that inclusive teaching is oriented toward interaction and practical use of the language. Similar patterns have been documented in inclusive classroom research, where dialogic engagement has been associated with higher levels of participation among students with special educational needs (Florian, 2014; Alexander, 2006). The present findings therefore support the view that structured classroom dialogue functions as an important mediator of inclusion, particularly when teachers intentionally create opportunities for guided interaction.

The lesser use of written and graphic task methods can be seen as an area with potential for improvement. Although less frequent, these tasks play an important role in developing literacy and visual perception of language, especially for students with special educational needs who may benefit more from visual or practical learning approaches. Greater use of these methods in the central part of

the lesson suggests that teachers use these activities to deepen the material, but it would be beneficial to increase their importance also in the introductory and final phases of the lesson, where they could help students better prepare and summarize the material.

At the same time, the limited use of written–graphic tasks and especially demonstration methods observed in this study is consistent with earlier research pointing to the underutilization of multimodal and multisensory strategies in everyday classroom practice (Tomlinson, 2014; Meyer, Rose, & Gordon, 2014). Universal Design for Learning (UDL) literature specifically emphasizes that greater variability in representation and expression is necessary to fully support learners with sensory impairments. From this perspective, the low proportion of demonstration-based activities identified in the present sample suggests an area where inclusive English language teaching could be further strengthened.

The least represented method is demonstration, with only 2.8% participation, indicating that this method is rarely used in inclusive English language teaching. This may be due to the specific nature of the subject, where verbal and written communication dominate, but also due to a lack of resources or prepared teaching materials for visual demonstration. Nevertheless, learning English through demonstrations and practical activities could enhance motivation and understanding, especially for students with sensory impairments or other specific needs.

Looking at different parts of the lesson, there is a clear tendency for the monologic method to be used mainly in the introductory and final parts, while the dialogic method is more dominant in the central part. This lesson dynamics show that teachers consciously structure lessons to first present new material (monologue), then enable interactive processing and application (dialogue and tasks), and finally summarize and conclude the lesson again through a monologic approach. This lesson organization provides a framework that can be effective in inclusive practice because it combines clear presentation with interaction and reflection, thus meeting the diverse needs of students.

The results also highlight the importance of further strengthening and expanding dialogic and practical methods, as well as the need for additional teacher training in inclusive pedagogy and the application of modern teaching strategies. Inclusive English language teaching cannot rely solely on traditional lecturing methods; it is necessary for teachers to develop skills in leading interactive activities that engage all students, especially those with special educational needs.

Considering the limitations of this study, such as sample size and geographic coverage, further research with a larger number of schools and students is recommended, as well as the inclusion of qualitative methods such as interviews and focus groups with teachers and students. This would contribute to a deeper understanding of the specific challenges and successes in applying various teaching methods in inclusive English language teaching.

In conclusion, the obtained results support the thesis that a combination of monologic and dialogic methods forms the foundation of inclusive English teaching, while simultaneously indicating the need for greater use of practical and creative teaching techniques to achieve full inclusion and effective learning for all students.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study show that in inclusive English language teaching, the most represented methods are the monologic and dialogic methods, with monologue having a slightly higher frequency throughout the entire lesson. Although these two methods are essentially and naturally connected in the teaching process, in practice they are often applied separately, without adequate integration with other active and interactive approaches. Methods such as working with written and graphic materials, text work, and demonstrations, which are crucial for activating different learning styles and supporting students with sensory impairments, are significantly less represented in teaching.

This teaching structure indicates the dominance of a traditional approach that does not provide enough space for the active involvement of all students, which is particularly critical in the context of inclusive education. The predominance of teacher monologue, along with the negligible use of methods that encourage visual and practical learning, calls into question the full adaptability of teaching and the quality of content comprehension among students with diverse sensory needs.

Although dialogue, as a form of interactive communication, has a relatively high level of use, it is not employed as a foundation that connects all aspects of the teaching process and promotes collective participation. Two-way communication should represent the basis of inclusive practice, where every student has the opportunity to actively participate and contribute to the lesson. Within the limited time frame of lessons, teachers face the challenge of combining various methods as effectively as possible and adapting them to the needs of students with sensory impairments, ensuring not only knowledge acquisition but also social integration and a sense of belonging.

Therefore, it is necessary to improve teachers' competencies through professional training that will empower them to use all available teaching methods evenly in inclusive education. Further research, especially qualitative, is also needed to examine more deeply the effectiveness and suitability of different teaching methods for students with sensory impairments, as well as possibilities for their improvement in practice. These steps not only support the personal development of each student but also contribute to creating an inclusive, equitable, and advanced educational system, which is the foundation of every democratic and humane society.

REFERENCES

Alexander, R. J. (2006). *Towards Dialogic Teaching*. Dialogos.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Florian, L. (2014). Reimagining Special Education: Why New Approaches Are Needed. *Education Inquiry*, 5 (2), 271–291. https://doi.org/10.3402/edui.v5.23499

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*. Routledge.

Lyle, S. (2008). Dialogic Teaching: Discussing Theoretical Contexts and Reviewing Evidence from Classroom Practice. *Language and Education*, 22 (3), 222–240. https://doi.org/10.2167/le726.0

MacSwan, J. (2017). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3rd ed. Multilingual Matters.

Meyer, A., Rose, D. H. & Gordon, D. (2014). *Universal Design for Learning: Theory and practice*. CAST.

Novaković, I. i Petrović, A. (2018). Nastavne metode u inkluzivnoj praksi osnovnih škola u Srbiji. *Pedagogija*, 73 (3), 301–317.

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*, 3rd ed. Cambridge University Press.

Slee, R. (2011). *The Irregular School: Exclusion, Schooling and Inclusive Education*. Routledge.

Stepanović, S. (2018). *Inkluzija*. Šabac: Sumatra.

Stepanović, S. (2018). Zastupljenost različitih oblika rada u inkluzivnoj nastavi koju pohađaju učenici sa senzornim smetnjama. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, 67 (3), 541–553.

Stepanović, S. (2019). The Prevalence of Different Teaching Methods in Inclusive Education. *Human: Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies*, 9 (1), 24–29. Doi: 10.21554/hrr.041902

Stepanović, S. (2019). *ADHA i ADD, poremećaj pažnje iz drugog ugla*, Beograd: Visoka škola socijalnog rada.

Stepanović, S. i Živković, J. (2020). Working with pupils with hearing impairments in an inclusive education: characteristics and competences, *Human: Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies*, 10 (1), 22–30. Doi: 10.21554/hrr.042003

Stepanović, S. (2023a), *Pedagoška psihologija*, Beograd: Visoka škola socijalnog rada.

Stepanović, S. (2023b), *Organizacija nastave sa metodikom nastavnog rada*, Beograd: Visoka škola socijalnog rada.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of All Learners*, 2nd ed. ASCD.

Videnović, M. i Ilić, M. (2017). Inkluzivna nastava – teorija i praksa. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, 66 (2), 195–210.

Werts, M. G. & Fletcher, T. (2012). Universal Design for Learning: A Framework for Inclusive Education. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 27 (2), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/016264341202700201

Saša V. Stepanović[44]
Alfa BK Univerzitet

Slavica Lj. Jašić[55]
Ministarstvo prosvete i tehnološkog razvoja, Beograd

Emilija B. Lipošek[66]
Akademija strukovnih studija, Beograd, Odsek Visoka turistička škola, Beograd

ZASTUPLJENOST NASTAVNIH METODA I PRISTUPA U INKLUZIVNOJ NASTAVI ENGLESKOG JEZIKA U VIŠIM RAZREDIMA OSNOVNIH ŠKOLA U SRBIJI: STUDIJA PRESEKA

Sažetak: Cilj istraživanja je ispitivanje zastupljenosti i primene nastavnih metoda u inkluzivnoj nastavi engleskog jezika. Fokus je bio na monološkoj i dijaloškoj metodi, kao i na korišćenju praktičnih tehnika kao što su rad sa tekstom, pisanim i grafičkim materijalima i demonstracijama. Analiza je pokazala da su monološka i dijaloška metoda najčešće korišćene, pri čemu monolog dominira u uvodnom i završnom delu časa, a dijalog je češći u centralnom delu. Iako su ove metode temelj nastave, u praksi se često primenjuju odvojeno, bez integracije sa drugim aktivnim i interaktivnim pristupima. Praktične metode koje aktiviraju različite stilove učenja i podržavaju učenike sa senzornim smetnjama značajno su manje zastupljene, posebno demonstracije. Struktura nastave ukazuje na dominaciju tradicionalnog pristupa koji ne pruža dovoljno prostora za aktivno uključivanje svih učenika, što je ključno u inkluzivnom obrazovanju. Prevlast monologa uz zanemarenu primenu vizuelnih i praktičnih metoda dovodi u pitanje prilagodljivost nastave i kvalitet razumevanja gradiva kod učenika sa različitim potrebama. Iako dijalog ima relativno visok nivo korišćenja, on se ne koristi kao osnova koja povezuje sve aspekte nastavnog procesa i podstiče kolektivno učešće. Nastavnici imaju izazov da u ograničenom vremenu kombinuju različite metode i prilagode ih potrebama učenika sa senzornim smetnjama, obezbeđujući ne samo usvajanje znanja već i socijalnu integraciju i osećaj pripadnosti. Zbog toga je neophodno unapređivati kompetencije nastavnika kroz stručne obuke i sprovoditi dalja istraživanja koja bi ispitala efektivnost i prilagođenost različitih nastavnih metoda za učenike sa senzornim smetnjama. Ovakvi koraci doprinose ličnom razvoju učenika i stvaranju inkluzivnog, pravednog i naprednog obrazovnog sistema.

Ključne reči: inkluzija, engleski jezik, nastavne metode, senzorne smetnje, nastava

4 drsasastepanovic@gmail.com ; https://orcid.org/0009-0003-8895-4326
5 slavica.jasic@mpn.gov.rs
6 emilija.lipovsek@assb.edu.rs

APPENDEXES

Table 1: *Observations by Grade*

Grade	f	%
Sixth	200	52,4
Seventh	182	47,6
Total	382	100,0

Table 2: *Type of Disabilities*

Type of Disability	F	%
Blind	5	7,2
Visually Impaired	35	50,7
Deaf	12	17,4
Hard of Hearing	17	24,6
Total	69	100,0

Table 3: *Teaching Methods Used by Teachers – General Data*

Teaching Methods	F	%
Monologue	456	39,7
Dialogue	449	39,2
Written and Graphic Work	141	12,3
Work with Text	67	5,8
Demonstration	33	2,8
Total	1.146	100

Table 4: *Teaching Methods Used by the Teacher in the Introductory Part of the Lesson*

Teaching Methods in the Introductory Part of the Lesson	F	%
Monologue	174	45,5
Dialogue	174	45,5
Written and Graphic Tasks	14	3,7
Work with Text	10	2,6
Demonstration	10	2,6
Total	382	100,0

Table 5: *Teaching Methods Used by the Teacher in the Central Part of the Lesson*

Teaching methods in the central part of the lesson	F	%
Dialogue	140	36,6
Monologue	111	29,1
Written and graphic assignments	86	22,5
Work with text	33	8,6
Demonstration	12	3,1
Total	382	100,0

Table 6: *Teacher's Work Methods in the Final Part of the Lesson*

Work Methods in the Final Part of the Lesson	F	%
Monologue	171	44,8
Dialogue	135	35,3
Written and Graphic Work	41	10,7
Work with Text	24	6,3
Demonstration	11	2,9
Total	382	100,0