

Interkulturna osetljivost nastavnika u kulturno heterogenom kontekstu u Srbiji: prihvatanje kulturnih razlika ili precenjivanje sopstvene interkulturene osetljivosti?¹

Bojana Dimitrijević² 

Fakultet pedagoških nauka Univerziteta u Kragujevcu, Jagodina, Srbija

Danijela Petrović 

Odeljenje za psihologiju, Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu,
Beograd, Srbija

Blagica Zlatković 

Pedagoški fakultet u Vranju, Univerzitet u Nišu, Vranje, Srbija

Jelena Starčević 

Fakultet pedagoških nauka Univerziteta u Kragujevcu, Jagodina, Srbija

Apstrakt

Predmet ovog rada jeste interkulturna osetljivost nastavnika u kulturno heterogenom kontekstu u Srbiji, koja je određena u skladu sa razvojnim modelom interkulturene osetljivosti Milтона Beneta. Osnovni cilj ovog istraživanja je da se ustanovi: a) prosečan skor razvojne i opažene orijentacije nastavnika; b) učestalost ispitanika u različitim razvojnim fazama interkulturene osetljivosti; c) da li postoje statistički značajne razlike između razvojne i opažene orijentacije ispitanika; d) da li diskrepancija između opažene i razvojne orijentacije varira među različitim razvojnim stadijumima u skladu s pretpostavkom o Daning-Krugerovom efektu. Uzorak je činilo 76 nastavnika razredne nastave iz AP Vojvodine i južne Srbije. Primenjen je instrument zasnovan na teorijskim postavkama razvojnog modela interkulturene osetljivosti – Inventar interkulturnog razvoja (u daljem tekstu IDI®)). Rezultati su pokazali da je razvojna orijentacija nastavnika u proseku u okvirima minimizacije, dok oni procenjuju sopstvenu interkulturnu osetljivost višom, u skladu etnorelativističkom orijentacijom u fazi prihvatanja. Razlike između opažene i razvojne orijentacije su statistički značajne. Diskrepancija između opažene i

1 Realizaciju ovog istraživanja finansiralo je Ministarstvo nauke, tehnološkog razvoja i inovacija Republike Srbije (Ugovor sa Filozofskim fakultetom Univerziteta u Beogradu, br. 451-03-66/2024-03/200163 i Ugovor sa Fakultetom pedagoških nauka Univerziteta u Kragujevcu br. 451-03-65/2024-03/200140).

2 bojana.dimitrijevic@pefja.kg.ac.rs

razvojne orijentacije opada s porastom interkulture osetljivosti, odnosno interkulturalno osetljiviji nastavnici objektivnije procenjuju svoju interkulturalnu osetljivost od onih koji su manje interkulturalno osetljivi. Implikacije ovih rezultata kada je reč o profesionalnoj ulozi i razvoju nastavnika kao refleksivnih praktičara su razmotrene u radu.

Ključne reči: *Razvojni model interkulture osetljivosti; Nastavnici; Inventar interkulturalnog razvoja – IDI®; Razvojna i opažena orijentacija; Daning-Krugerov efekat.*

Uvod

Učenici iz marginalizovanih kulturnih grupa često doživljavaju školski neuspeh, kao i niz drugih teškoća u obrazovanju. Takve poteškoće su se nekada pripisivale kognitivnim ili nekognitivnim „nedostacima“ (Bernstein, 2003; Hess & Shipman, 1965; Lewis, 1998; Payne, 2005), ili „otporu prema obrazovanju“ (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986; Ogbu, 2004). Savremena naučna objašnjenja akademskog podbacivanja učenika iz manjinskih grupa zasnovana su na premisi multikulturalnog obrazovanja o neprilagođenosti školskog programa i nastave kulturnim razlikama (Gay, 2013, 2015; Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2012), ili na pretpostavkama kritičke teorije o sistematskom reprodukciji nejednakosti kroz obrazovanje (Apple, 2011; Freire, 2014; Gorski, 2008; Skubic Ermenc, 2016). Ove promene u pristupu problemu akademskog podbacivanja dovode do naglašavanja značaja razvoja nastavničkih kompetencija, uključujući razvijanje svesti o etičkim pitanjima u vezi s profesijom (Banks, 2006), kao i kritičke kulturne svesti i samosvesti (Gay & Howard, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2007).

Prema popisu stanovništva iz 2022. godine, u Srbiji živi dvadeset jedna etnička grupa, sa više od dve hiljade samoizjašnjenih pripadnika, među kojima su najbrojniji Mađari, Bošnjaci i Romi (Republički zavod za statistiku, 2022). Ovakva raznolikost postavlja različite izazove za obrazovni sistem, posebno u vezi s pitanjima kvaliteta i pravičnosti. Dokazano je da je romska kulturna grupa u nepovoljnom položaju kada je reč o obrazovanju. Nastavnici smatraju da Romi ne vrednuju školu i obrazovanje (Dimitrijević, 2019; Dimitrijević i sar., 2017; Macura-Milovanović & Peček, 2013; Petrović, 2010). Obuhvat ranim, predškolskim i osnovnim obrazovanjem romske dece je nizak (Baucal, 2012), napuštanje obrazovanja je učestalo (Baucal, 2012; Macura-Milovanović, 2008), a kvalitet nastave i obrazovni ishodi romskih učenika su ispod proseka (Baucal, 2006; Macura-Milovanović, 2008). Pored toga, obrazovna inkluzija dece izbeglica s Bliskog istoka i učenika muslimanskog kulturnog porekla postaje sve važnije pitanje poslednjih godina. Postoje indicije da su učenici migranti odbačeni od strane svojih vršnjaka, da nastavnici snižavaju očekivanja i nedovoljno individualizuju nastavu da bi se prilagodili obrazovnim potrebama ovih učenika (Simić & Vranješević, 2019). Imigracija iz Ukrajine i Ruske Federacije kao posledica rata u Ukrajini takođe je naglasila potrebu za preispitivanjem aktuelnih praksa i mogućnosti za uključivanje u obrazovanje učenika iz različitih etničkih grupa, naročito imajući u vidu njihovo nepoznavanje srpskog jezika.

Pitanja u vezi s multikulturalnošću delimično su prepoznata u zakonima i pravilnicima koji regulišu oblast obrazovanja i odgovornosti nastavnika u Srbiji. U članu 8. *Zakona o osnovama sistema obrazovanja i vaspitanja* (2023), među osnovne ciljeve obra-

zovanja i vaspitanja uvršteni su „razvoj i poštovanje rasne, nacionalne, kulturne, jezičke, verske, rodne, polne i uzrasne ravnopravnosti, tolerancije i uvažavanje različitosti“, „razvijanje ličnog i nacionalnog identiteta“ i „razvijanje interkulturalnosti“. Zvanični propis o standardima kompetencija za profesiju nastavnika i njihovog profesionalnog razvoja (*Pravilnik o standardima kompetencija za profesiju nastavnika i njihovog profesionalnog razvoja*, 2011) navodi sposobnost razumevanja kulturnih razlika među učenicima kao jednu od ključnih nastavničkih kompetencija. Prepoznato je, međutim, da nedostaju naponi usmereni ka unapređenju interkulture kompetentnosti, kako tokom inicijalnog obrazovanja nastavnika tako i tokom kasnijeg profesionalnog razvoja (Petrović, 2016; Zlatković i Petrović, 2016).

S obzirom na nekadašnju i sadašnju kulturnu heterogenost Srbije, kao i značajnu ulogu koju nastavnici imaju u redukovanju akademskog neuspeha učenika iz manjinskih zajednica, važno je ispitati nivo kompetentnosti nastavnika u radu s učenicima iz drugih kultura. Ovaj rad se bavi interkulturalnom osetljivošću nastavnika kao ključnih aktera u oblasti obrazovanja. Interkulturalna osetljivost je konceptualizovana u skladu s ubedljivo najpoznatijim modelom – Razvojnim modelom interkulture osetljivosti (Bennett, 1986, 2004).

Teorijske osnove istraživanja

Kompetencije za podučavanje u kulturno heterogenim odeljenjima: Razvojni model interkulture osetljivosti

U polju interkulture interakcije razvijeni su brojni koncepti koji bi trebalo da objasne zbog čega su neke osobe uspešnije u interakciji s pripadnicima drugih kulturnih grupa. Dominiraju heterogena i uopštena određenja teorijski neutemeljenih konstrukata (Deardorff, 2006; Starčević, 2011). Zajednički imenitelj različitih konceptualizacija interkulture kompetentnosti je sposobnost da se prevaziđe etnocentrični pogled na svet i da se „uravnoteži“ sopstvena perspektiva s perspektivama drugih (Starčević, 2018). Postoje, međutim, i upadljive razlike među modelima. Većina modela interkulture kompetentnosti su kompozitni modeli koji su usmereni na identifikaciju konstituentna kompetentnosti (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). „Razvojni“ modeli su ređi i usredsređeni su na objašnjenje transformacije načina na koji ljudi doživljavaju i razumeju kulturne razlike na različitim stadijumima duž pretpostavljenog razvojnog kontinuuma (Hammer, 2015; Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009).

Prema Benetu (Bennett, 1986, 2009), interkulturalna osetljivost predstavlja specifičan oblik opažanja i pripisivanja značenja kulturnim razlikama koji varira na relativno pravilan način kroz stadijume duž kontinuuma od etnocentrizma do etnorelativizma. Etnocentrizam se odnosi na pojavu da pogled na svet i uverenja, usvojeni kroz primarnu socijalizaciju, nisu preispitivani te su tako postali norma i osnova za donošenje sudova o kulturnim razlikama (Bennett, 1986). U najeksplicitnijoj formi etnocentrizam je oličan u *poricanju kulturnih razlika*, viđenju prema kome svi ljudi opažaju svet na isti način, odnosno svi dele iste norme i uverenja. Pogled na svet u fazi *odbrane* odlikuje napredak u uočavanju i

prepoznavanju razlika (Bennett, 1986, 2004). Etnocentričan je svojom prirodom jer osoba preterano ističe opažene međugrupne razlike i naglašava njihove negativne konotacije (Bennett, 1986, 2004). Odbrana može imati formu isticanja superiornosti sopstvene grupe, ili u obrnutoj varijanti, formu veličanja „druge grupe” (Bennett, 1986, 2004; Bennett & Bennett, 2004). Napominjemo da Hamer (Hammer, 2011) koristi termin polarizacija za označavanje ove razvojne faze i uvodi odbranu i obrtanje u suprotnost kao dve forme faze polarizacije. Odbrana u okviru Razvojnog modela (Bennett, 1986, 2004) i polarizacija u Hamerovim razmatranjima (Hammer, 2011) u osnovi imaju isto značenje i razlike su isključivo terminološke. Faza *minimizacije* upućuje na razvoj specifičnijih kategorija za konceptualizaciju razlika, ali uključuje i potcenjivanje značaja razlika i isticanje univerzalne ljudskosti bez obzira na kulturnu pripadnost (Bennett, 1986). Minimizacija se ponekad posmatra kao prelazna faza između etnocentričnog i etnorelativističkog pogleda na svet (Bennett, 2004; Hammer, 2011).

Etnorelativistički pogled na svet karakteriše smeštanje kulture s kojom se čovek identifikuje u kontekst postojanja drugih kultura, koje se smatraju mogućim i podjednako vrednim načinima sagledavanja stvarnosti (Bennett, 1986). U prvoj etnorelativističkoj fazi *prihvatanja*, druge kulture i pogledi na svet (npr. uverenja, vrednosti, norme) vide se podjednako složenim kao i sopstveni, a osoba usvaja samorefleksivan stav (Bennett, 2004). Kompetentnost za interakciju s osobama različitog kulturnog porekla javlja se u fazi *adaptacije* (Bennett, 1986). Konačno, poslednja razvojna faza, *integracija*, ne podrazumeva unapređenje prethodno dostignutog nivoa kompetentnosti (Bennett, 2004), već se odnosi na redefinisane kulturnog identiteta osobe, koji sada uključuje više kulturnih okvira (Bennett, 2004; Bennett & Bennett, 2004).

Odnos između interkulturalne osetljivosti nastavnika i njihovih uverenja o kulturnim razlikama obrađen je u nekoliko studija koje su se zasnivale na kvalitativnim pristupima. Utvrđeno je da su uverenja i percepcije nastavnika uglavnom u skladu s pretpostavkama koje potiču iz Razvojnog modela. Ispitanici u fazama poricanja ili odbrane opažaju razlike isključivo iz perspektive većinske kulturne grupe (Mantel et al., 2012) i anticipiraju konflikte u vezi s pitanjima kulture i kulturnih razlika (Leutwyler et al., 2014; Mahon, 2003, prema Mahon, 2009). Ispitanici u fazi minimizacije pokušavali su da razmotre situaciju iz više uglova (Mantel et al., 2012), izražavajući radoznalost i spremnost da razumeju predmet potencijalnog konflikta iz obe perspektive (Mahon, 2003, prema Mahon, 2009). Takođe su naglasili kulturnu univerzalnost vrednovanja akademskog postignuća i obrazovanja (Leutwyler et al., 2014). Drugim rečima, bili su fokusirani na sličnosti, a ne na razlike među studentima različitog kulturnog porekla (Leutwyler et al., 2014).

Operacionalizacija Razvojnog modela interkulturalne osetljivosti: Inventar interkulturalnog razvoja (IDI®)

Na osnovu teorijskih pretpostavki Razvojnog modela, u saradnji s Miltonom Benetom, razvijen je *IDI*® (Hammer, 2008, 2011; Hammer et al., 2003). Instrument zauzima istaknuto mesto u istraživačkom polju u odnosu na ostale mere interkulturalne kompetentnosti

naročito kada je reč o istraživanjima na velikim uzorcima i kroskulturnim istraživanjima (Hammer, 2011). Pregledne studije metrijskih karakteristika i relacija *IDF* s drugim relevantnim merama završavaju zaključkom da je instrument validan (Matsumoto & Hwang, 2013; Zhang, 2014). Na uzorcima nastavnika ili studenata nastavničkih fakulteta ustanovljena je pozitivna korelacija interkulture osetljivosti sa starošću ispitanika, samoprocenom kompetentnosti za interkulturno obrazovanje i stavovima prema različitim aspektima inicijalnog obrazovanja nastavnika (Jokić & Petrović, 2016), stepenom kooperativnosti (Mahon, 2009), heterogenošću školskog konteksta i vremenom provedenim u drugačijem kulturnom kontekstu (Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010).

Distribuciju i administraciju inventara, kao i davanje povratne informacije ispitanicima, može da vrši samo kvalifikovani administrator koji je prošao obuku. Prvi i drugi autor rada su kvalifikovani administratori za *IDF*. Stoga su imali licencu da kupe i primenjuju instrument, kao i da pruže povratne informacije učesnicima. *IDF* je dostupan u elektronskoj formi na više jezika, uključujući srpski.

Razvojna i opažena orijentacija

Razvojna orijentacija ukazuje na distinktivan način opažanja i odnošenja prema kulturnim razlikama koji će pojedinac najčešće primenjivati kada je suočen s različitošću. Opažena orijentacija ukazuje na to kako osobe ocenjuju sopstvenu interkulturnu osetljivost (Hammer, 2008, 2011). Izveštaj o individualnom profilu na *IDF* sadrži informacije o skorovima razvojne orijentacije, skorovima opažene orijentacije i o njihovoj razlici (engl. *orientation gap*). Pošto termin nije preveden na srpski jezik, u nastavku ćemo koristiti termine diskrepancija ili razlika. Konstruktori instrumenta su naveli da se supstancijalnom u pogledu toga da li ispitanici precenjuju ili potcenjuju svoju interkulturnu osetljivost može smatrati ona razlika između skora opažene i skora razvojne orijentacije koja je veća ili jednaka od sedam (Hammer, 2009).

Rezultati prethodnih studija pokazuju da je najčešća razvojna orijentacija ili prosečan skor razvojne orijentacije nastavnika i studenata nastavničkih fakulteta u rasponu faze minimizacije (Jokić & Petrović, 2016; Mahon, 2009; Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen & Grossman, 2009). Ista tendencija se može primetiti u istraživanjima usredsređenim na evaluiranje obuka namenjenih razvoju interkulture osetljivosti na malim uzorcima nastavnika i studenata nastavničkih fakulteta (Cushner & Chang, 2015; He et al., 2017). U jednoj studiji prosečna razvojna orijentacija ispitanika je u rasponu orijentacije poricanja/odbrane (Yuen, 2010). U prethodnoj verziji *IDF* koja je korišćena u navedenoj studiji, stavke iz kategorija poricanja i odbrane su imale zasićenja na istom faktoru. Shodno tome, učesnici u fazama poricanja i odbrane nisu diferencirani. S druge strane, opažena orijentacija je u većini studija u rasponu faze prihvatanja (Cushner & Chang, 2015; DeJaeghere & Zhang, 2008; He et al., 2017; Mahon, 2009; Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010; Yuen & Grossman, 2009). Dostupni istraživački podaci prikazuju upadljive razlike između skorova razvojne i opažene orijentacije i kod nastavnika i kod studenata nastavničkih fakulteta (Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010; Yuen & Grossman, 2009), ali ne uključuju informacije o statističkoj značajnosti ovih razlika. Istraživanje na nenastavničkom uzorku dokumentuje da

je razlika statistički značajna pri čemu je opažena orijentacija značajno viša od razvojne (Snodgrass et al., 2018). Ipak, nije nam poznata nijedna studija koja je istraživala da li je veličina diskrepancije između razvojne i opažene orijentacije pod uticajem stepena interkulture osetljivosti, kao što je Hamer nedavno sugerisao (Hammer, 2022). Naime, baveći se ograničenjima kvalitativnih istraživanja zasnovanih na samooizjašnjavanju, Hamer skreće pažnju na to da ova istraživanja ne uzimaju u obzir tzv. Daning-Krugerov efekat. Ovaj efekat se opisuje kao tendencija osoba s niskim postignućima ka precenjivanju sopstvenih kompetencija u socijalnom i intelektualnom domenu, moguće usled metakognitivnih ograničenja, dok osobe s višim postignućima imaju realističnije samoprocene (Dunning, 2011). Hamer (Hammer, 2022) je takođe sugerisao da se u slučaju *ID1* Daning-Krugerov efekat može empirijski utvrditi kao razlika između skorova opažene i razvojne orijentacije.

Metod

Predmet i cilj studije

Predmet ovog rada je interkulturalna osetljivost nastavnika u kulturno heterogenim sredinama u Srbiji, određena u skladu sa Razvojnim modelom Milтона Beneta i procenjena instrumentom koji predstavlja operacionalizaciju modela. Prvi cilj istraživanja bio je da se utvrde prosečni skorovi razvojne i opažene orijentacije nastavnika, kao i broj nastavnika u svakoj od faza interkulture osetljivosti. Drugi cilj bio je ispitivanje odnosa između razvojne i opažene orijentacije. Prema dosadašnjim istraživanjima, srednja vrednost razvojne orijentacije nastavnika je u opsegu minimizacije, iako nastavnici imaju tendenciju da procenjuju svoju opaženu orijentaciju kao da se nalazi u opsegu prihvatanja (Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010; Yuen & Grossman, 2009); tako je naša pretpostavka da postoji značajna razlika između razvojne i opažene orijentacije kod nastavnika u Srbiji, pri čemu je opažena orijentacija viša (H1). Pretpostavljamo takođe da je diskrepancija između opažene i razvojne orijentacije veća kod ispitanika sa nižim nivoima interkulture osetljivosti (H2), što bi bilo u skladu s pretpostavkom o Daning-Krugerovom efektu (Dunning, 2011).

Uzorak

Uzimajući u obzir značaj interkulturalnih kompetencija za nastavnike koji rade u multikulturalnim sredinama, geografske regije Vojvodine i južne Srbije su namerno odabrane za sprovođenje našeg istraživanja. Međutim, izbor pojedinačnih škola bio je prigodan, tj. spremnost direktora škola da olakšaju kontakt između istraživača i nastavnika bio je glavni kriterijum za odabir škola. Neprobabilistički uzorak u ovoj studiji je obuhvatio 76 nastavnika osnovnih škola, od kojih je šest bilo muških, a 70 ženskih. Oni su bili zaposleni u 12 različitih škola: šest škola u Vojvodini i drugih šest u južnoj Srbiji. Nastavnici iz Vojvodine čine 56,6% uzorka (43 nastavnika), dok nastavnici iz južne Srbije čine 43,4% uzorka (33

nastavnika). Reč je o veoma iskusnim nastavnicima čije prosečno trajanje radnog staža u školi iznosi nešto manje od 21 godine ($M = 20.58$, $SD = 7.69$).

Svi nastavnici u odabranim školama bili su obavešteni o svrsi istraživanja i garantovana im je potpuna anonimnost pre nego što su pristali da učestvuju. Takođe im je objašnjena mogućnost da se u bilo kom trenutku povuku iz istraživanja bez posledica. Nastavnicima su bili dostupni elektronski obrasci *IDf* upitnika na srpskom jeziku, koje su mogli da popune individualno, kada im to odgovara. Nakon toga su dobili personalizovani izveštaj o *IDf* profilu u pisanom obliku, praćen povratnim informacijama kvalifikovanog administratora, u individualnoj sesiji u vidu telefonskog poziva ili onlajn sastanka.

Instrument

Inventar interkulturnog razvoja (Hammer, 2008, 2011; Hammer et al., 2003) je prethodno opisan kao operacionalizacija Razvojnog modela interkulture osetljivosti (Bennett, 1986, 2004). U ovom istraživanju je korišćena treća verzija *IDf*. Instrument obuhvata 50 stavki u okviru sedam petostepenih supskala Likertovog tipa i upitnik u vezi s demografskim karakteristikama ispitanika (Hammer, 2011). Šest supskala predstavlja operacionalizaciju faza Razvojnog modela: Poricanje – sedam stavki ($\alpha = .66$), Polarizacija/Odbrana – šest stavki ($\alpha = 0.72$), polarizacija/Obrtanje u suprotnost – devet stavki ($\alpha = 0.78$), Minimizacija – devet stavki ($\alpha = 0.74$), Prihvatanje – pet stavki ($\alpha = 0.69$) i Adaptacija – devet stavki ($\alpha = 0.71$) (Hammer, 2011). Sedma supskala, Skala izmeštenosti iz sopstvene kulture (engl. *Cultural Disengagement Scale*), ne smatra se operacionalizacijom razvojnog kontinuuma interkulture osetljivosti pa tako nije predmet ovog istraživanja. Primeri objavljenih stavki *IDf* su: „U svetu bi bilo manje problema ukoliko se kulturološki različite grupe ne bi mešale“ (poricanje); „Ljudi iz drugih kultura nisu toliko bez predrasuda koliko ljudi iz naše kulture“ (polarizacija/odbrana); „Ljudi su u osnovi isti uprkos očiglednim razlikama u izgledu“ (minimizacija); „Prilagodno je da ljudi iz drugih kultura nemaju nužno iste vrednosti i ciljeve kao ljudi iz moje kulture“ (prihvatanje); „Kada dođem u kontakt s ljudima iz druge kulture, primećujem da menjam svoje ponašanje kako bih se prilagodio/la njihovom“ (adaptacija) (Paige et al., 2003).

Skorovi razvojne i opažene orijentacije istraživačima su dostupni u formi standardizovanih skorova ($M = 100$, $SD = 15$), dok je sirov skor nedostupan. Kako je Hamer naveo, skor razvojne orijentacije izračunava se primenom ponderisane formule koja je u skladu s pretpostavkama Razvojnog modela, dok se skor opažene orijentacije izračunava na osnovu neponderisane formule prethodno pomenutih supskala (Hammer, 2011). Kronbahova alfa za skalu razvojne orijentacije u celini iznosila je $\alpha = .83$, dok je za skalu opažene orijentacije u celini $\alpha = .82$ (Hammer, 2011).

Obrada podataka

Za obradu podataka korišćen je SPSS 20.0.

Rezultati

Deskriptivna statistika: Razvojna i opažena orijentacija nastavnika

U Tabeli 1 prikazani su deskriptivni statistički pokazatelji za skale razvojne i opažene orijentacije i njihovu međusobnu diskrepanciju. Prosečan skor razvojne orijentacije na uzorku u celini u opsegu je *minimizacije* ($M = 91.53$, $SD = 13.77$), dok prosečan skor opažene orijentacije ($M = 119.01$, $SD = 4.85$) pripada fazi *prihvatanja* (raspon skorova za svaku od faza je naveden u Tabeli 2). Primenom Man-Vitnjevog U-testa utvrđeno je da između ispitanika iz dva kulturno i geografski različita poduzorka, Vojvodine i južne Srbije, nema statistički značajnih razlika ni u pogledu razvojne orijentacije ($Z = -.36$, $p = .718$, $r = .04$) ni u pogledu opažene orijentacije ($Z = .88$, $p = .382$, $r = .10$).

Distribucije skorova razvojne i opažene orijentacije na uzorku u celini, kao i na poduzorku nastavnika iz Vojvodine, u skladu su s normalnom raspodelom. Distribucije dve vrste skorova na poduzorku nastavnika iz južne Srbije su izdužene i odstupaju od normalne raspodele. Tabela 1 prikazuje vrednosti Kolmogorov-Smirnovljevog testa za uzorak u celini, budući da ima više od 50 ispitanika. Za poduzorke su navedene vrednosti Šapiro-Vilkovog testa.

Tabela 1

Deskriptivni statistički pokazatelji i značajnost razlika između prosečnih skorova razvojne i opažene orijentacije

Skala	N	M	SD	Raspon	Skjunis	Kurtosis	K-S/ S-W	t (df) / z	d/r
ROu	76	91.53	13.77	48.99-120.03	-.697	.833	.064	-25.24** (75)	2.90
OOu	76	119.01	4.85	104.63-130.69	-.247	.350	.051		
Dlu	76	27.66	9.41	10.66 – 55.64	.763	.771	.070		
ROv	43	92.50	12.62	58.95-120.03	-.251	.005	.982	-20.12** (42)	3.07
OOv	43	118.83	4.72	110.31-130.69	.324	-.260	.980		
Dlv	43	26.33	8.58	10.66-51.36	.467	.308	.976		
ROjs	33	90.25	15.26	48.99-110.24	-.974	1.091	.918*	-5.012**	0.62
OOjs	33	119.25	5.08	104.63-126.91	-.890	1.420	.935*		
Dljs	33	29.39	10.28	15.31-55.64	.900	.704	.927*		

Napomena. ROu – Razvojna orijentacija na uzorku u celini; OOu – Opažena orijentacija na uzorku u celini; Dlu – Diskrepancija između OOu i ROu; ROv – Razvojna orijentacija na poduzorku Vojvodina; OOv – Opažena orijentacija na poduzorku Vojvodina; Dlv – Diskrepancija između OOv i ROv; ROjs – Razvojna orijentacija na poduzorku južna Srbija; OOjs – Opažena orijentacija na poduzorku južna Srbija; Dljs – Diskrepancija između OOjs i ROjs; K-S – Kolmogorov-Smirnovljev test; S-W – Šapiro-Vilkov test; t – t test za zavisne uzorke; z – Vilksonov test ekvivalentnih parova; d/r – mera veličine uticaja; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$.

Deskriptivna statistika: Faze interkulturene osetljivosti nastavnika

Broj nastavnika u svakoj od faza interkulturene osetljivosti može se pročitati u Tabeli 2. U Tabeli je takođe naveden broj nastavnika u „prelaznim“ kategorijama koje neposredno prethode sledećoj fazi (tj. prelaz ka polarizaciji, prelaz ka minimizaciji i prelaz ka prihvatanju). Za ove prelazne kategorije konstruktori ne specifikuju teorijski raspon skorova, ali ih kategorizuju u niži stadijum (na primer, prelaz ka prihvatanju se smatra potfazom minimizacije). Rezultati pokazuju da je većina nastavnika u fazi minimizacije, dok 30.3% ispitanika ostvaruje čak i niže skorove, koji ih smeštaju na etnocentrični kraj spektra. Najviši stadijum u uzorku je prihvatanje i na njemu se nalazi samo jedan ispitanik.

Tabela 2

Učestalost i procenat ispitanika u odnosu na faze interkulturene osetljivosti

	Faza	Teorijski raspon skorova	<i>F</i>	%	Kumulativni %
1	Poricanje	≤ 69	4	5.3	5.3
	Prelaz ka polarizaciji		1	1.3	6.6
2	Polarizacija/Odbrana	70–84	8	10.5	17.1
	Polarizacija/Obrtanje u suprotnost		5	6.6	23.7
	Prelaz ka minimizaciji		5	6.6	30.3
3	Minimizacija	85–114	47	61.8	92.1
	Prelaz ka prihvatanju		5	6.6	98.7
4	Prihvatanje	115–129	1	1.3	100
5	Adaptacija	≥ 130	0	0.0	
	Ukupno <i>N</i>		76	100.0	

Značajnost razlika između razvojne i opažene orijentacije

Vrednosti t-testa za zavisne uzorke, navedene u Tabeli 1 za uzorak u celini i za poduzorak iz Vojvodine, pokazuju da postoji statistički značajna razlika između skorova razvojne orijentacije i opažene orijentacije. Srednje vrednosti prikazane u istoj tabeli pokazuju da ispitanici imaju više skorove na opaženoj orijentaciji, što implicira da precenjuju svoju interkulturnu osetljivost.

S obzirom na to da na poduzorku iz južne Srbije raspodele skorova razvojne i opažene orijentacije odstupaju od normalne krive, korišćen je Vilkoksonov test ekvivalentnih parova za proveru značajnosti razlika između ovih skorova. Test je otkrio da je i na ovom poduzorku razlika značajna. Pored toga, parametri veličine uticaja (*d* ili *r*) pokazuju da se diskrepancija može smatrati velikom i na oba poduzorka i na uzorku u celini (Cohen, 1988). Tabela 3 nas dodatno informiše da svaka osoba precenjuje svoju interkulturnu osetljivost, uzimajući u obzir činjenicu da je minimalna diskrepancija između skorova opažene i razvojne orijentacije bila 10.66. Kao što je prethodno navedeno, da bi se diskrepancija smatrala supstancijalnom, mora biti jednaka ili veća od sedam (Hammer, 2009).

Značajnost razlika prosečne diskrepancije razvojne i opažene orijentacije među ispitanicima u različitim fazama interkulturalne osetljivosti

Kako bismo ustanovili da li ispitanici u različitim fazama i potfazama u različitoj meri procenjuju svoju interkulturalnu osetljivost, primenili smo analizu varijanse (ANOVA). Iz analize su isključene potkategorije sa samo jednim ispitanikom (prelaz ka polarizaciji i prihvatanje). Rezultati su pokazali da postoji minimalno jedna statistički značajna razlika među ispitanicima iz različitih potkategorija, $F(5, 68) = 39.22, p < .001$, sa velikim efektom $\eta^2 = .74$.

Tabela 3 pokazuje srednje vrednosti diskrepancije između skorova razvojne i opažene orijentacije koje postepeno opadaju duž razvojnog kontinuuma i rezultate naknadnih poređenja srednjih vrednosti diskrepancije, dobijene primenom Tukijevog HSD testa (pretpostavka homogenosti varijansi nije narušena, Leveneov test homogenosti varijanse je bio neznačajan, $F(5, 68) = 1.92, p = .102$). Tabela 3 prikazuje da s porastom interkulturalne osetljivosti ispitanika raste i objektivnost u procenjivanju sopstvene interkulturalne osetljivosti, što znači da opada diskrepancija između skorova razvojne i opažene orijentacije. Ispitanici čija je interkulturalna osetljivost u skladu s poricanjem najviše procenjuju svoju osetljivost. Za njima slede ispitanici u fazama polarizacija/odbrana, polarizacija/obrtanje u suprotnost i prelaz ka minimizaciji, među kojima nema statistički značajnih razlika. Ispitanici iz ove tri kategorije procenjuju svoju interkulturalnu osetljivost u manjoj meri u odnosu na ispitanike u fazi poricanja i u većoj meri u odnosu na one koji su u fazama minimizacije i prelaza ka prihvatanju. Konačno, ispitanici iz faza minimizacije i prelaza ka prihvatanju, među kojima nema statistički značajne razlike, najmanje procenjuju svoju interkulturalnu osetljivost, što znači da imaju najmanju prosečnu diskrepanciju između razvojne i opažene orijentacije.

Nalazi u Tabeli 3 takođe pokazuju da se potkategorije koje su teorijski kategorizovane u istu fazu u pogledu prosečne diskrepancije razvojne i opažene orijentacije zaista statistički ne razlikuju (na primer, potkategorije minimizacija i prelaz ka prihvatanju su svrstane u istu kategoriju – fazu minimizacije). Ovi nalazi podržavaju pretpostavku da su faze homogeni supsetovi u pogledu prosečne diskrepancije: poricanje kao zaseban supset; polarizacija u obe forme i prelaz ka minimizaciji kao drugi supset; minimizacija i prelaz ka prihvatanju kao treći supset.

Tabela 3

Prosečna diskrepancija razvojne i opažene orijentacije i značajnost razlika prosečne diskrepancije između ispitanika na različitim stadijumima/podstadijumima

Faza	<i>Md</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Raspon <i>Md</i>	Polarizacija/ Odbrana	Polarizacija/ Obrtanje	Prelaz ka minimizaciji	Minimizacija	Prelaz ka prihvatanju
Poricanje	50.93 (6.55)	41.54-55.64	14.78 **	14.58**	17.58**	27.18**	33.27**
Prelaz ka polarizaciji	44.95 (/)	/					

Polarizacija/ Odbrana	36.15 (3.12)	31.14-39.71	-	-0.20	2.80	12.40**	18.49**
Polarizacija/ Obrtanje	36.35 (3.00)	32.97-39.74		-	3.00	12.60**	18.69**
Prelaz ka minimizaciji	33.35 (2.15)	29.93-34.95			-	9.60**	15.69**
Minimizacija	23.75 (5.13)	13.33-32.86				-	6.09
Prelaz ka prihvatanju	17.66 (4.97)	12.86-26.01					-
Prihvatanje	10.66 (/)	/					-

Napomena. *Md* – srednja vrednost diskrepancije između razvojne i opažene orijentacije; ** $p \leq .001$

Diskusija

Prvi cilj ovog istraživanja ticao se utvrđivanja nivoa interkulturene osetljivosti nastavnika koji rade u školama u kulturno heterogenim sredinama u Srbiji i skoro su svakodnevno u kontaktu s učenicima iz drugih kultura ili njihovim roditeljima. Specifičnost ovog istraživanja u poređenju s prethodnim ogleda se u detaljnom ispitivanju odnosa između razvojne i opažene orijentacije, tj. toga kako nastavnici opažaju kulturne razlike i kako se odnose prema njima (razvojna orijentacija), a kako sebe procenjuju u vezi s tim (opažena orijentacija).

Rezultati ove studije pokazuju da nastavnici imaju prosečan skor razvojne orijentacije u opsegu faze minimizacije, što je takođe najučestalija razvojna orijentacija u našem uzorku. Ovi nalazi su podudarni s rezultatima prethodnih studija na uzorcima nastavnika (Jokić i Petrović, 2016; Mahon, 2009; Westrick & Yuen, 2007). Studija je takođe otkrila da postoji značajan broj ispitanika sa skorom nižim od minimizacije – 23,7% nastavnika u fazi polarizacije i 6,6% u fazi poricanja – više nego što bi bilo očekivano u odnosu na rezultate istraživanja na velikim uzorcima (Hammer, 2011), ali u skladu s prethodnim istraživanjem u Srbiji na uzorku nastavnika (Jokić & Petrović, 2016). Međutim, treba primetiti da prethodno istraživanje nije sprovedeno isključivo u sredinama u Srbiji koje se smatraju kulturno heterogenim.

Koje su moguće karakteristike pogleda na svet i percepcije kulturnih razlika nastavnika u fazama polarizacije i poricanja? Prema pretpostavkama Razvojnog modela, etnocentrična viđenja u njihovom najotvorenijem vidu u fazi poricanja karakteriše neuočavanje kulturnih razlika koje je rezultat ili situacione izolacije od drugih grupa ili namerne separacije. Fazu polarizacije karakteriše hijerarhijsko vrednovanje i stereotipi o kulturnim grupama (Bennett, 1986). Postojeći nalazi sugerišu da nastavnici u fazi polarizacije i odbrane pozicioniraju sebe kao one koji su „izvan” iskustva pripadnika manjinske grupe, bez ispoljavanja namere da uzmu u obzir višestruke perspektive (Mantel et al., 2012). Ovi nastavnici takođe anticipiraju mogućnost konflikta s roditeljima iz manjinskih grupa, ali u znatno manjoj meri sa samim učenicima, za koje misle da su pod uticajem kulturne grupe kojoj pripadaju (Leutwyler et al., 2014). Tako je očekivano da u skladu s pretpostavkama Razvojnog modela i citiranim kvalitativnim istraživanjima opisana etnocentrična uverenja i stavove deli približno trećina uzorka u ovoj studiji. U svetlu

ovih i pređašnjih sličnih nalaza u Srbiji (Jokić i Petrović, 2016), smatramo da je neophodno rešavati pitanje unapređivanja kompetencija nastavnika za rad s učenicima iz drugih kulturnih grupa i njihovim porodicama.

Osobe u fazi minimizacije, u kojoj je većina nastavnika u ovoj studiji, ali i inače, uočavaju razlike među različitim kulturnim grupama, međutim, umanjuju im značaj i smatraju norme sopstvene kulturne grupe univerzalno primenljivim (Bennett, 1986). U svom kasnijem radu Milton Benet (Bennett, 2004) sugerise da faza minimizacije ima elemente prelaza ka etnorelativizmu jer se „drugi” uglavnom ne sagledavaju na stereotipiran način i priznaje se ljudskost pripadnika svih kulturnih grupa. Nastavnici u fazi minimizacije mogu izražavati uverenja da kultura ima mali značaj u poređenju s biološkim sličnostima svih ljudi, kao i da su svi ljudi slični u pogledu svojih potreba, motivacije za postizanjem uspeha, težnje za slobodom i individualnošću, religijskim iskustvima itd. (Bennett, 1986). Univerzalni principi koji se primenjuju na sve ljude bez obzira na njihovo kulturno poreklo potiču iz sopstvenog kulturnog referentnog okvira i nedostaje kulturne samosvesti da bi se poreklo referentnog okvira potpuno razumelo (Bennett, 2004). To implicira da nastavnici koji smatraju da su svi ljudi u suštini isti, što znači da ih pokreću ili bi trebalo da ih pokreću slični motivi i težnje, posledično mogu prenebre-gnuti kulturne razlike ili potceniti njihov značaj u interakciji s učenicima i roditeljima iz raznolikih kulturnih zajednica. Iz istih razloga mogu ređe prilagođavati svoje ponašanje u interakciji s ovim učenicima i roditeljima, kao i svoje instrukcije, aktivnosti namenjene učenju i pristupe ocenjivanju učenika.

Obe istraživačke hipoteze u pogledu odnosa razvojne i opažene orijentacije su potvrđene u ovoj studiji. Naime, razlika između dve orijentacije je značajna i nastavnici su, u proseku, opažali sebe kao da su u fazi prihvatanja (tj. njihova opažena orijentacija je viša, kao što je navedeno u H1). Nastavnici veruju da procenjuju jednako kompleksnim druge kulture i sopstvenu kulturu, da su sposobni da opažaju razlike u suštinskim vrednostima i ponašanjima, kao i da zauzimaju samorefleksivan stav (Bennett, 2004). Drugim rečima, nastavnici opažaju sami sebe kao tolerantne i sposobne da promišljaju pitanja kulturnih razlika. Ovaj nalaz je takođe u skladu s prethodnim istraživanjima (Mahon, 2009; Westrick & Yuen, 2007). Neobjektivna samoprocena može biti dodatna prepreka za razvoj jer se ne uviđa potreba za unapređivanjem kompetencija (Dunning, 2011).

Prema saznanjima koje imamo, jedinstveni doprinos ovog istraživanja postojećem korpusu empirijskih činjenica jeste u nalazu da postoji dosledan obrazac u odnosu između razvojne i opažene orijentacije: ispitanici sa nižim skorovima na razvojnoj orijentaciji imaju veću diskrepanciju između razvojne i opažene orijentacije nego ispitanici sa višim skorovima. U suštini, veća diskrepancija između razvojne i opažene orijentacije znači da se više precenjuje sopstvena interkulturalna osetljivost (Hammer, 2022). Stepem precenjivanja opada sa porastom interkulturalne osetljivosti. Naša druga hipoteza je time takođe potvrđena. Verujemo da ova pravilnost, kao što je nedavno sugerisao konstruktor instrumenta (Hammer, 2022), a za koju postoje jasni pokazatelji u ovim nalazima (u srednjim vrednostima diskrepancija, rezultatima Tukijevog HSD testa), odražava delovanje Daning-Krugerovog efekta.

Praktične implikacije

Sklonost refleksiji nad sopstvenom praksom smatra se važnom i poželjnom karakteristikom nastavnika uopšte (Korthagen, 2014; Radulović, 2011), ali i elementom specifičnijih kompetencija za podučavanje u kulturno heterogenom kontekstu (Banks, 2006; Gay & Howard, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2007). Stoga, relativno niska interkulturalna osetljivost nastavnika udružena s tendencijom precenjivanja sopstvene interkulturalne osetljivosti ukazuje na značajnu potrebu za unapređivanjem kompetencija nastavnika. Precenjivanje interkulturalne osetljivosti (najvidljivije kod osoba čija je interkulturalna osetljivost na najnižem nivou) implicira neuspešnu refleksiju nad sopstvenim profesionalnim iskustvom i posledično teškoće u istraživanju i unapređivanju sopstvene nastavne prakse. Verujemo da je ovakvo precenjivanje posebno nepovoljno kada je reč o samorefleksiji u pogledu važnih elemenata u profesionalnom razvoju nastavnika, kao što su samoprocena kompetencija, preispitivanje sopstvenih uverenja, profesionalnog identiteta i profesionalne misije (Korthagen, 2014).

Neuspešnost u tome da se uoči da postoji potreba za promenom (na metakognitivnom nivou) i mogući otpor promeni mogle bi biti glavne prepreke za inicijalno obrazovanje i profesionalni razvoj koji bi imali za cilj unapređenje interkulturalne kompetentnosti nastavnika. Optimalno bi bilo da programi profesionalnog razvoja budu dizajnirani u skladu s trenutnim nivoom interkulturalne osetljivosti nastavnika, umesto da se fokusiraju na učenje specifičnih sadržaja (Bennett, 2004; Dimitrijević i Petrović, 2014; Petrović, 2018). Programi koji su usmereni na redukovanje stereotipa i predrasuda, s posebnim naglaskom na sličnostima među ljudima, bili bi prikladni za nastavnike u etnocentričnim fazama. Za nastavnike u fazi minimizacije neophodno je naglašavati značaj zapostavljenih razlika i njihovih obrazovnih implikacija (Bennett & Bennett, 2004). Bilo bi posebno korisno ako bi nastavnici pohađali obuke prilagođene njihovim specifičnim potrebama, na osnovu procene njihovih trenutnih kompetencija, i sprovedene na podržavajući način.

Ograničenja i preporuke za buduća istraživanja

Osnovno ograničenje ove studije proističe iz činjenice da je *IDJ* zaštićen autorskim pravom i da sirovi podaci nisu dostupni istraživačima. Dodatna ograničenja proizlaze iz prigodnog odabira škola (unutar namerno odabranih multikulturnih sredina) i veličine uzorka nastavnika, što u celini uzev zahteva oprez prilikom generalizacije nalaza. U budućim istraživanjima trebalo bi da se proširi uzorak i da se ciljano odaberu ispitanici s bogatim međunarodnim iskustvom, kako bi se povećala verovatnoća identifikacije i uključivanja ispitanika u fazama prihvatanja i adaptacije. Na taj način bi bilo moguće proveriti pretpostavke o Daning-Krugerovom efektu i kada je reč o ispitanicima u višim fazama interkulturalne osetljivosti.

Zaključci

Ovo istraživanje pružilo je uvid u interkulturalnu osjetljivost, tj. razvojnu orijentaciju iskusnih nastavnika koji rade u multikulturalnim sredinama u Srbiji, kao i njihovu procenu sopstvene interkulturalne osjetljivosti, tj. opaženu orijentaciju. Utvrđena je značajna razlika između razvojne i opažene orijentacije i zaključeno je da nastavnici precenjuju svoju interkulturalnu osjetljivost. Konačno, analiza podataka u vezi s ovom diskrepancijom otkrila je obrazac koji ima kako teorijski tako i praktični značaj.

Literatura

- Apple, M. W. (2011). Global crises, social justice, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(2), 222–234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487110385428>
- Banks, J. A. (2006). *Cultural diversity and education, foundations, curriculum, and teaching*. Pearson Education.
- Baucal, A. (2006). Development of mathematical and language literacy among Roma students. *Psihologija*, 39(2), 207–227. <https://doi.org/10.2298/PSI0602207B>
- Baucal, A. (2012). Deca i mladi iz romske zajednice u obrazovnom sistemu Srbije: Marginalizovani u društvu i marginalizovani u obrazovnom sistemu. U T. Varadi i G. Bašić (ur.), *Promene identiteta, kulture i jezika Roma u uslovima planske socijalno-ekonomske integracije* (str. 349–363). SANU.
- Bennett, M. J. (1986). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Cross-cultural orientation: New conceptualizations and applications* (pp. 27–70). University Press of America.
- Bennett, M. J. (2004). Becoming intercultural competent. In J. Wurzel (Ed.), *Toward multiculturalism: A reader in multicultural education* (pp. 62–77). Intercultural Resource Corporation.
- Bennett, M. J. (2009). Defining, measuring, and facilitating intercultural learning: A conceptual introduction to the Intercultural Education double supplement. *Intercultural Education*, 20 (sup 1), S1–S13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980903370763>
- Bennett, J. M., & Bennett, M. J. (2004). Developing intercultural sensitivity: An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett, & M. J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training*, 3rd ed. (pp.147–165). SAGE Publications.
- Bernstein, B. (2003). *Class, codes and control: Vol. 1. Theoretical Studies Towards a Sociology of Language*. Routledge. (Original work published 1971)
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cushner, K., & Chang, S. C. (2015). Developing intercultural competence through overseas student teaching: Checking our assumptions. *Intercultural Education*, 26(3), 165–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2015.1040326>
- Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 10(3), 241–266. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306287002>

- DeJaeghere, J. G., & Zhang, Y. (2008). Development of intercultural competence among US American teachers: Professional development factors that enhance competence. *Intercultural Education*, 19(3), 255–268. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980802078624>
- Dimitrijević, B. M. (2019). *Interkulturalna osetljivost i uverenja nastavnika o kulturnim razlikama u školskom kontekstu* (doktorska disertacija). NARDUS (123456789/12225)
- Dimitrijević, B. M., i Petrović, D. S. (2014). Pristupi i strategije za multikulturalno obrazovanje nastavnika – Iskustva Sjedinjenih Američkih Država. *Zbornik Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja*, 46(1), 69–90. <https://doi.org/10.2298/ZIP1401069D>
- Dimitrijević, B. M., Petrović, D. S., i Leutwyler, B. (2017). Implicitna uverenja nastavnika o učenicima romske i mađarske kulturne grupe. *Zbornik Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja*, 49(1), 55–76. <https://doi.org/10.2298/ZIP1701055D>
- Dunning, D. (2011). The Dunning-Kruger effect: On being ignorant of one's own ignorance. In J. M. Olson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 44 (pp. 247–296). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-385522-0.00005-6>
- Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of 'acting white'". *The Urban Review*, 18(3), 176–206. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01112192>
- Freire, P. (2014). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury Academic. (Original work published 1970)
- Gay, G. (2013). Teaching to and through cultural diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 43(1), 48–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/curi.12002>
- Gay, G. (2015). The what, why, and how of culturally responsive teaching: International mandates, challenges, and opportunities. *Multicultural Education Review*, 7(3), 123–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2015.1072079>
- Gay, G., & Howard T. C. (2000). Multicultural teacher education for the 21st century. *The Teacher Educator*, 36 (1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730009555246>
- Gay, G., & Kirkland, K. (2003). Developing cultural critical consciousness and self-reflection in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice*, 42(3), 181–187. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4203_3
- Gorski, P. C. (2008). Good intentions are not enough: A decolonizing intercultural education. *Intercultural Education*, 19(6), 515–525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980802568319>
- Hammer, M. R. (2008). The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI): An approach for assessing and building intercultural competence. In M. A. Moodian (Ed.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Understanding and utilizing cultural diversity to build successful organizations* (pp. 203–218). Sage.
- Hammer, M. R. (2009). Intercultural Development Inventory v.3 (IDI) individual profile report. Retrieved from http://www.idiinventory.com/pdf/idi_sample.pdf
- Hammer, M. R. (2011). Additional cross-cultural validity testing of the Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35(4), 474–487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.02.014>
- Hammer, M. R. (2015). The developmental paradigm for intercultural competence research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 48, 12–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.03.004>
- Hammer, M. R. (2022). A Response to Punti and Dingel's Critique of the Validity of the Intercultural Development Inventory for BIPOC Students. Comment on Punti, G.; Dingel, M. Rethinking Race,

- Ethnicity, and the Assessment of Intercultural Competence in Higher Education. *Educ. Sci.* 2021, 11, 110. *Education Science*, 12(3), 176. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12030176>
- Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(4), 421–443. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(03\)00032-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(03)00032-4)
- He, Y., Lundgren, K., & Pynes, P. (2017). Impact of short-term study abroad program: Inservice teachers' development of intercultural competence and pedagogical beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 66, 147–157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.04.012>
- Hess, R. D., & Shipman, V. C. (1965). Early experience and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. *Child Development*, 36(4), 869–886. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1126930>
- Jokić, T. i Petrović, D. S. (2016). Interkulturalna osetljivost nastavnika i činioci uspešnog sprovođenja interkulturalnog obrazovanja u Srbiji. U D. S. Petrović i T. Jokić (ur.), *Interkulturalno obrazovanje u Srbiji – Regulativni okvir, stanje i mogućnosti za razvoj* (str. 128–154). Centar za obrazovne politike.
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2014). Promoting core reflection in teacher education: Deepening professional growth. *International Teacher Education: Promising Pedagogies (Part A)*, 22, 73–89. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-368720140000022007>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2012). Through a glass darkly: The persistence of race in education research & scholarship. *Educational Researcher*, 41(4), 115–120. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12440743>
- Leutwyler, B., Mantel, C., Petrović, D., Dimitrijević, B. M., & Zlatković, B. (2014). Teachers' beliefs about intercultural education: Different levels of intercultural sensitivity in schooling and teaching. *Educational Research*, 5(8), 280–289. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14303/er.2014.196>
- Lewis, O. (1998). The culture of poverty. *Society*, 35, 7–9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02838122>
- Macura-Milovanović, S. (2008). Specifični problemi u obrazovanju romske dece. *Uzdanica*, 5(2), 177–185.
- Macura-Milovanović, S., & Peček, M. (2013). Attitudes of Serbian and Slovenian student teachers towards causes of learning underachievement amongst Roma pupils. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(6), 629–645. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2012.703247>
- Mahon, J. (2009). Conflict style and cultural understanding among teachers in the western United States: Exploring relationships. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33(1), 46–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.12.002>
- Mantel, C., Simić, N., Petrović, D., & Leutwyler, B. (2012). Notions of cultural differences amongst teacher education students in the Serbian and Swiss Context. In A. Baucal, & J. Radišić (Eds.), *Patchwork. Learning diversities: Conference proceedings of the EARLI conference* (pp. 183–190). Institute of Psychology.
- Matsumoto, D., & Hwang, H. C. (2013). Assessing cross-cultural competence: A review of available tests. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 44(6), 849–873. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113492891>
- Ogbu, J. U. (2004). Collective identity and the burden of "acting white" in black history, community, and education. *The Urban Review*, 36(1), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:URRE.0000042734.83194.f6>
- Paige, R. M., Jacobs-Cassuto, M., Yershova, Y. A., & DeJaegherea, J. (2003). Assessing intercultural sensitivity: An empirical analysis of the Hammer and Bennett Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(4), 467–486. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(03\)00034-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(03)00034-8)

- Payne, R. (2005). *A Framework for Understanding Poverty* (4th rev. ed.). Aha process Inc.
- Petrović, D. S. (2010). To what extent do teachers perceive Roma discrimination in Serbian educational system. In M. Patricia (Ed.), *Intercultural education as project for social transformation – Linking theory and practice towards equity and social justice: Conference proceedings* (pp. 156–172). INTER Network.
- Petrović, D. S. (2016). Pregled akreditovanih programa stručnog usavršavanja nastavnika u oblasti interkulturalnog obrazovanja. U D. S. Petrović & T. Jokić (ur.), *Interkulturalno obrazovanje u Srbiji – Regulativni okvir, stanje i mogućnosti za razvoj* (str. 128–154). Centar za obrazovne politike.
- Petrović, D. S. (2018). Sticanje interkulturalnih kompetencija u svetlu Razvojnog modela interkulturalne osetljivosti Milтона Beneta. *Godišnjak Pedagoškog fakulteta u Vranju*, 9(2), 27–44. <https://doi.org/10.5937/gufv1802027P>
- Pravilnik o standardima kompetencija za profesiju nastavnika i njihovog profesionalnog razvoja* (2011). Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, Prosvetni glasnik, br. 5/2011.
- Radulović, L. (2011). *Obrazovanje nastavnika za refleksivnu praksu*. Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.
- Republički zavod za statistiku (2022). *Nacionalna pripadnost: Podaci po opštinama i gradovima*. Retrieved from <https://publikacije.stat.gov.rs/G2023/Pdf/G20234001.pdf>
- Simić, N., & Vranješević, J. (2019). Refugee children in formal education in Serbia – Multi-perspective views on challenges and good practices. In K. Górak-Sosnowska, M. Pachocka, & J. Misiuna (Eds.), *Muslim minorities and the refugee crisis in Europe* (pp. 135–147). SGH publishing house, SGH Warsaw school of economics.
- Skubic Ermenc, K. (2016). Intercultural dimensions of education. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, 65(1), 7–16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5937/nasvas16010075>
- Snodgrass, L. L., Morris, P. V., & Acheson, K. (2018). Assessing the intercultural sensitivity of students in an agriculture diversity and social justice course. *Multicultural Education Review*, 10(4), 292–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2018.1532222>
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing intercultural competence. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence*, (pp. 2–52). SAGE.
- Starčević, J. S. (2011). Razlike u konceptualizaciji interkulturalne kompetentnosti: problem ili suština pojma. *Uzdanica*, 8(2), 117–125.
- Starčević, J. S. (2018). *U potrazi za suštinom individualnih razlika u interkulturalnoj interakciji*. Fakultet pedagoških nauka Univerziteta u Kragujevcu.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2007). The culturally responsive teacher. *Educational Leadership*, 64(6), 28–33.
- Westrick, J. M., & Yuen, C. Y. M. (2007). The intercultural sensitivity of secondary teachers in Hong Kong: A comparative study with implications for professional development. *Intercultural Education*, 18(2), 129–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980701327247>
- Yuen, C. Y. M. (2010). Dimensions of diversity: Challenges to secondary school teachers with implications for intercultural teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(3), 732–741. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.10.009>
- Yuen, C. Y. M., & Grossman, D. L. (2009). The intercultural sensitivity of student teachers in three cities. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 39 (3), 349–365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920802281571>

Zakon o osnovama sistema obrazovanja i vaspitanja (2023). Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, Prosvetni glasnik br. 88/2017, 27/2018 - dr. zakon, 10/2019, 27/2018 - dr. zakon, 6/2020, 129/2021 i 92/2023.

Zhang, J. (2014). Test review: The Intercultural Development Inventory Manual. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 32(2), 178–183. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282913505075>

Zlatković, B. i Petrović, D. S. (2016). Interkulturalno obrazovanje budućih učitelja u Srbiji. U D. S. Petrović i T. Jokić (ur.), *Interkulturalno obrazovanje u Srbiji – Regulativni okvir, stanje i mogućnosti za razvoj* (pp. 128–154). Centar za obrazovne politike.

Primljeno: 26.03.2024.

Korigovana verzija primljena: 15.05.2024.

Prihvaćeno za štampu: 20.05.2024.

Bojana Dimitrijević

Fakultet pedagoških nauka Univerziteta u Kragujevcu, Jagodina, Srbija
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4599-4005>

Danijela Petrović

Odeljenje za psihologiju, Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Beograd, Srbija
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6838-1191>

Blagica Zlatković

Pedagoški fakultet u Vranju, Univerzitet u Nišu, Vranje, Srbija
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3786-2491>

Jelena Starčević

Fakultet pedagoških nauka Univerziteta u Kragujevcu, Jagodina, Srbija
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7742-992X>

Intercultural Sensitivity of Teachers in a Culturally Heterogeneous Context in Serbia: Accepting Cultural Differences or Overrating One's Intercultural Sensitivity?¹

Bojana Dimitrijević² 

Faculty of Education, University of Kragujevac, Jagodina, Serbia

Danijela Petrović 

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy,
University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

Blagica Zlatković 

Pedagogical Faculty in Vranje, University of Niš, Vranje, Serbia

Jelena Starčević 

Faculty of Education, University of Kragujevac, Jagodina, Serbia

Abstract

This paper looks at the intercultural sensitivity of teachers in a culturally heterogeneous context in Serbia, defined in accordance with Milton Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. The main objective of this research was to determine the following: a) the average developmental orientation and perceived orientation scores of the teachers; b) the frequency of participants in different stages of developmental orientation; c) whether there are significant differences between the developmental and the perceived orientation of teachers; d) whether the gap between the perceived and the developmental orientation varies across the developmental continuum in line with the supposition of the Dunning–Kruger effect. The sample consisted of 76 primary school teachers from Vojvodina and South Serbia. Furthermore, the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI®), used in this research, is based on the theoretical foundations of the selected model of intercultural sensitivity. The results indicate that the mean developmental orientation of teachers is in the range of minimization, while they perceive themselves as more interculturally sensitive, in alignment with the ethno-relativistic orientation of acceptance. The differences between the perceived and the developmental orientations are significant. The

¹ This work was funded by the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the Republic of Serbia (Contract No. 451-03-66/2024-03/ 200163 with the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade and Contracts No. 451-03-65/2024-03/ 200140 with the Faculty of Education, University of Kragujevac).

² bojana.dimitrijevic@pefja.kg.ac.rs

gap between the perceived and the developmental orientations decreases with higher intercultural sensitivity, meaning that those teachers who are interculturally sensitive are more objective in assessing their own intercultural sensitivity in comparison with those who are less interculturally sensitive. The implications of the obtained results, when it comes to the professional roles of teachers and their development as reflexive practitioners, are further discussed in this article.

Keywords: *Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, teachers, Intercultural Development Inventory – IDI®, developmental and perceived orientation, Dunning–Kruger effect.*

Introduction

Students from marginalized cultural groups often experience academic underachievement, as well as a number of other difficulties in education. Such difficulties used to be ascribed to cognitive or non-cognitive “deficits” (Bernstein, 2003; Hess & Shipman, 1965; Lewis, 1998; Payne, 2005), or “opposition to education” (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986; Ogbu, 2004). Contemporary scientific explanations of the academic failure of minority students are founded on the multicultural education premise that schools have not adapted the curriculum and instruction to cultural differences (Gay, 2013, 2015; Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2012), or on the critical theory assumptions that inequalities have been systematically reproduced through education (Apple, 2011; Freire, 2014; Gorski, 2008; Skubic Ermenc, 2016). These changes in addressing the issue of academic underachievement have led to placing additional emphasis on the importance of developing teacher competencies, including raising their awareness about teaching-related ethical questions (Banks, 2006), as well as enhancing critical cultural awareness and self-awareness (Gay & Howard, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2007).

According to the 2022 population census, there are twenty-one ethnic groups with more than two thousands self-declared members in Serbia, with Hungarians, Bosniaks and Roma being the most numerous (Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, 2022). Such diversity poses various challenges to the educational system especially regarding the issues of quality and equity. It is well documented that the Roma cultural group is in a disadvantaged position. Teachers believe that the Roma do not value schools and education (Dimitrijević, 2019; Dimitrijević et al., 2017; Macura-Milovanović & Peček, 2013; Petrović, 2010). The number of Roma children enrolled in kindergarten, preschool, and primary education is low (Baucal, 2012), early school leaving is frequent (Baucal, 2012; Macura-Milovanović, 2008), while the quality of education they receive and the learning outcomes of Roma students are substandard (Baucal, 2006; Macura-Milovanović, 2008).

Additionally, the educational inclusion of Middle Eastern refugee children and students of Muslim cultural backgrounds has become an increasingly important issue in recent years. There are indications that migrant students are rejected by their peers, and that teachers are lowering their expectations and insufficiently individualizing instruction to accommodate the educational needs of these students (Simić & Vranješević, 2019). The immigration from Ukraine and the Russian Federation as a consequence of the war in Ukraine has also emphasized the need for the re-evaluation of current practices and

opportunities for the educational inclusion of students from various ethnic groups, especially considering their lack of Serbian language proficiency.

The issues related to multiculturalism have been partially recognized within the laws and regulations regulating the domain of education and teachers' responsibilities in Serbia. Article 8 of the *Law on the Foundations of the Education System* (2023) of the Republic of Serbia recognizes "the development of and respect for racial, national, cultural, religious, gender, sexual, and age equality, tolerance and appreciation for differences", "development of personal and national identity," and "development of interculturality", among the other primary goals of education. The official regulation on the standards of competence for the teaching profession and teachers' professional development (*Rulebook on the Standards of competencies for the Profession of Teacher and their Professional Development*, 2011) specifies the ability to understand cultural differences among students as a key teacher competence. It has been acknowledged, however, that efforts aimed at improving intercultural competence are lacking, both during initial teacher education and subsequent professional development (Petrović, 2016; Zlatković & Petrović, 2016).

Considering both the former and the current cultural heterogeneity of Serbia, and the significant role that teachers have in mitigating the academic failure of minority students, it is important to examine teachers' level of competence in working with students from other cultures. This paper deals with the intercultural sensitivity of teachers as key actors in the field of education. Intercultural sensitivity is conceptualized within the framework of the arguably most well-known model – Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (hereinafter referred to as DMIS) (Bennett, 1986, 2004).

Theoretical Foundations of the Research

Competencies for Teaching in Culturally Heterogeneous Classrooms: Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)

In the field of intercultural interaction numerous concepts have been developed to explain why certain individuals are more successful in interacting with members of cultural groups different from one's own. The field is dominated by heterogeneous and general descriptions of the theoretically insufficiently founded constructs (Deardorff, 2006; Starčević, 2011). A common denominator of various conceptualizations of intercultural competence is the ability to overcome the ethnocentric worldview and to "balance" one's own perspective with the perspectives of others (Starčević, 2018). There are, however, some noticeable differences between models. Most models of intercultural competence are composite models and are focused on identifying the constituents of competence (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). "Developmental" models are focused on explaining the transformation of the way people experience and understand cultural differences in different stages of the assumed developmental continuum, and are less common (Hammer, 2015; see also Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009).

According to Bennett (1986, 2009), intercultural sensitivity is a specific form of perceiving and attributing meaning to cultural differences that varies in a relatively regular

manner through the stages along the continuum from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism. Ethnocentrism refers to the phenomenon that views and beliefs adopted through primary socialization have not been questioned, and have thus become a norm and a foundation for making judgments about cultural differences (Bennett, 1986). In its most explicit form, ethnocentrism is reflected in the *denial of cultural differences*, a perception that all people see the world in the same way as them, that is, that everyone shares the same norms and beliefs. The *defense* stage worldview is characterized by progression in the ability to perceive and identify differences (Bennett, 1986, 2004). It is ethnocentric in its nature because a person excessively emphasizes perceived intergroup differences and stresses their negative connotations (Bennett, 1986, 2004). Defense can have the form of asserting the superiority of one's own group, and the reversal form of glorifying the "other group" (Bennett, 1986, 2004; Bennett & Bennett, 2004). It should be noted that Hammer (2011) uses the term polarization for this stage, and introduces defense and reversal as two forms of polarization. Defense in the DMIS and polarization in the IDI² essentially mean the same, and the differences between the two are purely terminological. The *minimization* stage refers to the development of more specific categories for conceptualizing differences, but it also involves the process of underestimating the significance of differences and emphasizing universal humanity regardless of cultural affiliation (Bennett, 1986). The minimization is sometimes seen as a transitional stage between ethnocentric and ethnorelativistic worldviews (Bennett, 2004; Hammer, 2011).

The ethnorelativistic worldview is characterized by placing a culture that a person identifies with into the context of coexistence with other cultures, which are considered to be alternative and equally valuable ways of perceiving reality (Bennett, 1986). In the first ethnorelativistic stage of *acceptance*, other cultures and views (e.g., beliefs, values, norms) are seen as equally complex as one's own, and an individual adopts a self-reflexive attitude (Bennett, 2004). Competence for interaction with individuals with different cultural backgrounds emerges in the *adaptation* stage (Bennett, 1986). Finally, the last developmental stage, *integration*, does not imply the enhancement of the previously reached level of competence (Bennett, 2004), but is related to redefining the cultural identity of a person, which now incorporates multiple cultural frameworks (Bennett, 2004; Bennett & Bennett, 2004).

The relationship between the intercultural sensitivity of teachers and their beliefs about cultural differences have been addressed in several studies that were based on qualitative approaches. It was found that teachers' beliefs and perceptions were mostly in alignment with the assumptions originating from the DMIS. The respondents in the stages of denial or defense perceived differences solely from the perspective of the majority cultural group (Mantel et al., 2012), and anticipated conflicts regarding the issues of culture and cultural differences (Leutwyler et al., 2014; Mahon, 2003, according to Mahon, 2009). The respondents in the minimization stage attempted to consider the situation from multiple standpoints (Mantel et al., 2012), expressing curiosity and willingness to understand the subject of potential conflict from both perspectives (Mahon, 2003, according to Mahon, 2009). They also stressed the cultural commonality of valuing academic achievement and education (Leutwyler et al., 2014). In other words, they were

focused on similarities rather than differences among students of different cultural backgrounds (Leutwyler et al., 2014).

Operationalization of the DMIS: Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI®)

The IDI® was developed and grounded on the theoretical assumptions of the DMIS, and in collaboration with Milton James Bennett (Hammer, 2008, 2011; Hammer et al., 2003). The instrument occupies a prominent position in the research field in comparison with other measures of intercultural competence, especially regarding the use in studies on large samples and cross-cultural studies (see Hammer, 2011). The review studies of the psychometric properties of the IDI® and the relations of IDI® with other relevant measures ended with the conclusion that the instrument is valid (Matsumoto & Hwang, 2013; Zhang, 2014). The studies conducted on samples of teachers or pre-service teachers have found a positive correlation between the intercultural sensitivity and the respondents' age, self-evaluation of competence for intercultural education, and attitudes towards the various aspects of initial teacher education (Jokić & Petrović, 2016), degree of cooperativeness (Mahon, 2009), heterogeneity of the school context, and the time spent in a cultural context different from one's own (Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010).

The distribution and administration of the inventory, as well as the provision of feedback to the respondents, can only be realized by a qualified administrator who has been certified. The first and the second author of this paper are qualified administrators of the IDI®. They were, therefore, licensed to purchase and administer the instrument, as well as to provide feedback to the respondents. IDI® is available in electronic form in various languages, including Serbian.

Developmental and Perceived Orientations

Developmental orientation refers to the distinctive manner of perceiving cultural differences and engaging with cultural differences an individual is most likely to employ when he or she is being faced with differences. *Perceived orientation* indicates how an individual evaluates one's own intercultural sensitivity (Hammer, 2008, 2011). The individual profile report from the IDI® contains information about the developmental orientation score, perceived orientation score and the discrepancy between the two measures, i.e., *orientation gap*. Constructors of the instrument have stated that an orientation gap equal to or higher than seven can be considered substantial in determining whether respondents underestimate or overestimate their intercultural sensitivity (Hammer, 2009).

Results of previous studies indicate that the most frequent developmental orientation or average developmental orientation score of teachers and pre-service teachers is in the range of the minimization stage (Jokić & Petrović, 2016; Mahon, 2009; Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen & Grossman, 2007). The same tendency can be observed in small sample studies focused on the evaluation of the effects of training courses designed to influence the intercultural sensitivity of teachers or pre-service teachers (e.g., Cushner & Chang, 2015; He et al., 2017). In a study using the previous version of the IDI®, respondents' main

developmental orientation was in the range of denial/defense stage (Yuen, 2010). Participants in the denial and defense stages were not distinguished, as items from both stages saturated a single factor. On the other hand, the perceived orientation in most studies was in the range of the acceptance stage (Cushner & Chang, 2015; DeJaeghere & Zhang, 2008; He et al., 2017; Mahon, 2009; Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010; Yuen & Grossman, 2007). Available research data present salient differences between the developmental and perceived orientation scores of teachers or pre-service teachers (for example Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010; Yuen & Grossman, 2007), however, they do not include information about the statistical significance of these differences. A study of a non-teaching sample has documented that the difference is statistically significant, with the perceived orientation significantly higher than the developmental orientation (Snodgrass et al., 2018). Still, we are not aware of any study that investigated whether the discrepancy between the perceived and developmental orientation score (orientation gap) is influenced by the level of intercultural sensitivity of the respondents, as Hammer (2022) recently suggested. Namely, pointing out the limitations of qualitative studies based on self-evaluations, Hammer draws attention to the fact that such studies do not consider the Dunning-Kruger effect. This effect is described as a tendency of individuals with low achievements to overrate their competence in the social or intellectual domain, possibly due to metacognitive limitations, while individuals with higher achievements tend to have more realistic self-evaluations of competence (Dunning, 2011). Hammer (2022) also suggested that in the case of IDI* the Dunning-Kruger effect can be determined empirically as a discrepancy between the scores of the perceived and the developmental orientation.

Method

The Present Study

The subject of this paper is the intercultural sensitivity of teachers in culturally heterogeneous regions in Serbia, defined in accordance with the DMIS of Milton James Bennett and assessed by the instrument representing operationalization of the model. The first aim of the research was to determine the average developmental and perceived orientation scores of the teachers, and additionally to determine the frequency of participants in each of the stages of intercultural sensitivity. The second aim of the research was to explore the relationship between the developmental and the perceived orientation. According to the studies realized thus far, the mean developmental orientation of teachers is in the range of minimization, although teachers tend to assess their perceived orientation as being in the range of acceptance (for example Westrick & Yuen, 2007; Yuen, 2010; Yuen & Grossman, 2007); thus, our assumption was that there is a significant difference between the developmental and perceived orientation of teachers in Serbia, with perceived orientation being higher (H1). It was also anticipated that the discrepancy between the perceived and developmental orientation (i.e., orientation gap) is higher in those respondents who have lower levels of intercultural sensitivity (H2), which would be in line with the supposition of the Dunning-Kruger effect (Dunning, 2011).

Participants

Considering the significance of intercultural competencies for teachers working within multicultural contexts, the geographic regions of Vojvodina and South Serbia have been purposely chosen for conducting our research. However, the selection of particular schools was convenient, i.e., the willingness of school principals to facilitate contact between researchers and teachers was the main criterion of school selection. The non-probability sample in this study included 76 primary school teachers, six of whom were male, and 70 of whom were female. They were employed in 12 different schools: six schools in Vojvodina and another six in South Serbia. Teachers from Vojvodina constituted 56.6% of the sample (43 teachers), while teachers from South Serbia made up 43.4% of the sample (33 teachers). The participants were considered to be very experienced teachers with an average teaching experience of nearly 21 years ($M = 20.58$, $SD = 7.69$).

All the teachers in the selected schools were informed about the general purpose of the study and were guaranteed full anonymity prior to consenting to participate. They were also made aware of the option to withdraw from the research at any time without consequences. The teachers were provided with electronic forms of the IDI[®] inventory in the Serbian language that they could access individually when it was convenient for them. Subsequently they received a personalized IDI[®] profile report in written form followed by an individual feedback session with the qualified administrator in the form of a phone call or an online meeting.

Instrument

The Intercultural Development Inventory (Hammer, 2008, 2011; Hammer et al., 2003) has been previously described as an operationalization of the DMIS (Bennett, 1986, 2004). In this study, the third version of the IDI[®] was utilized. The instrument comprises 50 items across seven 5-point Likert-type sub-scales, and a questionnaire about the demographic characteristics of respondents (Hammer, 2011). Six sub-scales represent the operationalization of the developmental stages of the DMIS: Denial – seven items ($\alpha = .66$), Polarization/Defense – six items ($\alpha = 0.72$), Polarization/Reversal – nine items ($\alpha = 0.78$), Minimization – nine items ($\alpha = 0.74$), Acceptance – five items ($\alpha = 0.69$), and Adaptation – nine items ($\alpha = 0.71$) (Hammer, 2011). The seventh sub-scale, Cultural Disengagement Scale, is not considered to be an operationalization of the developmental continuum of intercultural sensitivity and thus is not the subject of this research. Some examples of the published items from the IDI[®] are as follows: “Society would be better off if culturally different groups kept to themselves” (Denial); “People from other cultures are not as open-minded as people from my own culture” (Polarization/Defense); “People are the same despite outward differences in appearance” (Minimization); “It is appropriate that people from other cultures do not necessarily have the same values and goals as people from my own culture” (Acceptance); “When I come in contact with people from a different culture, I find I change my behavior to adapt to theirs” (Adaptation) (Paige et al., 2003).

Developmental and perceived orientation scores are available to the researchers in the form of standardized scores ($M = 100$, $SD = 15$), while the raw data is unavailable. As Hammer indicated, the developmental orientation score is calculated using a weighted formula that was in accordance with the DMIS suppositions, while the perceived orientation score is calculated based on the unweighted formula of the aforementioned subscales (Hammer, 2011). Cronbach's alpha for the Developmental Orientation Scale was $\alpha = .83$, while for the Perceived Orientation Scale it was $\alpha = .82$ (Hammer, 2011).

Data Analysis

SPSS 20.0 was used for data analysis.

Results

Descriptive Statistics: Developmental and Perceived Orientation of Teachers

Descriptive statistical indicators for developmental and perceived orientation scales and for orientation gap are presented in Table 1. The average developmental orientation score across the entire sample is in the range of the minimization ($M = 91.53$, $SD = 13.77$), while the average perceived orientation score ($M = 119.01$, $SD = 4.85$) belongs to the acceptance stage (ranges of scores for each of the stages are presented in Table 2). By conducting Mann-Whitney U tests it was established that there are no statistically significant differences between the participants from the two culturally and geographically different sub-samples, either in terms of developmental orientation ($Z = -.36$, $p = .718$, $r = .04$) or perceived orientation ($Z = .88$, $p = .382$, $r = .10$).

The distributions of the developmental and perceived orientation scores across the entire sample, as well as the sub-sample of teachers from Vojvodina, follow the normal curve. Distributions of the two types of scores in the sub-sample of teachers from South Serbia are rather peaked and deviate from the normal curve. Table 1 presents the values of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for the entire sample, given that it exceeds 50 participants. For the sub-samples the values of the Shapiro-Wilk test are listed.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics and significance of differences between mean scores of developmental and perceived orientation

Scale	N	M	SD	Range	Skew	Ku	K-S/ S-W	t(df)/z	d/r
DO	76	91.53	13.77	48.99-120.03	-.697	.833	.064	-25.24**	2.90
PO	76	119.01	4.85	104.63-130.69	-.247	.350	.051	(75)	
Gap	76	27.66	9.41	10.66 – 55.64	.763	.771	.070		

DOv	43	92.50	12.62	58.95-120.03	-.251	.005	.982	-20.12**	3.07
POv	43	118.83	4.72	110.31-130.69	.324	-.260	.980	(42)	
Gapv	43	26.33	8.58	10.66-51.36	.467	.308	.976		
DOss	33	90.25	15.26	48.99-110.24	-.974	1.091	.918*	-5.012**	0.62
POss	33	119.25	5.08	104.63-126.91	-.890	1.420	.935*		
Gapss	33	29.39	10.28	15.31-55.64	.900	.704	.927*		

Note. DO – Developmental Orientation Scale; PO – Perceived Orientation Scale; Gap – orientation gap; DOv – Developmental Orientation Scale in the Vojvodina sub-sample; POv – Perceived Orientation Scale in the Vojvodina sub-sample; Gapv – orientation gap in the Vojvodina sub-sample; DOss – Developmental Orientation Scale in the South Serbia sub-sample; POss – Perceived Orientation Scale in the South Serbia sub-sample; Gapss – orientation gap in the South Serbia sub-sample; K-S – Kolmogorov-Smirnov test; S-W – Shapiro-Wilk test; *t* – paired-samples *t*-test; *z* – Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test; *d/r* – effect size; * *p* < 0.05; ** *p* < 0.01.

Descriptive Statistics: The Stages of Intercultural Sensitivity of Teachers

The frequency of teachers in each stage of intercultural sensitivity can be found in Table 2. The table also lists the frequencies of teachers in “transitional” categories that immediately precede the next stage (i.e., Cusp of polarization, Cusp of minimization, and Cusp of acceptance). For these transitional categories constructors do not specify the theoretical range of scores, but categorize them into the lower stage (for example, cusp of acceptance is considered to be a sub-stage of minimization). The results indicate that the majority of teachers are in the minimization stage, while 30.3% of participants have even lower scores placing them on the ethnocentric end of the spectrum. The highest stage in the sample is acceptance, with only one respondent in that stage.

Table 2
Frequency and percentage of participants in relation to the stages of intercultural sensitivity

	Stage	Theoretical range of scores	<i>F</i>	%	Cumulative %
1.	Denial	≤ 69	4	5.3	5.3
	Cusp of polarization		1	1.3	6.6
2.	Polarization/Defense	70–84	8	10.5	17.1
	Polarization/Reversal		5	6.6	23.7
	Cusp of minimization		5	6.6	30.3
3.	Minimization	85–114	47	61.8	92.1
	Cusp of acceptance		5	6.6	98.7
4.	Acceptance	115–129	1	1.3	100
5.	Adaptation	≥ 130	0	0.0	
	Total <i>N</i>		76	100.0	

Significance of Differences between the Developmental and the Perceived Orientation

The values of the paired-sample t-tests, given in Table 1 for the entire sample and for the sub-sample from Vojvodina, indicate that there is a significant difference between the scores of the developmental orientation and the perceived orientation. The means presented in the same table show that the participants have higher scores of perceived orientation, which implies that they overrate their intercultural sensitivity.

Given the fact that for the sub-sample from South Serbia the distributions of scores of developmental and of perceived orientation deviate from the normal curve, the Wilcoxon signed rank test was used to examine the significance of the difference between these scores. The test revealed that the difference is statistically significant for this sub-sample as well. Besides, the parameters of effect size (d or r) showed that the discrepancy is considered to be large in both sub-samples and in the whole sample (see Cohen, 1988). Table 3 additionally informs us that each individual overrated their own intercultural sensitivity, considering the fact that the minimal orientation gap between the scores of perceived and developmental orientation was 10.66. As previously mentioned, in order for the gap to be marked as substantial, it has to be seven or higher (Hammer, 2009).

Significance of Differences in the Average Orientation Gap between Participants in Different Stages of Intercultural Sensitivity

In order to establish whether participants in different stages and sub-stages overrate their intercultural sensitivity to different degrees, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. Sub-categories with only one participant (cusp of polarization and acceptance) were excluded from the analysis. The results have shown that there was at least one statistically significant difference between participants from different subcategories, $F(5, 68) = 39.22, p < .001$, with a large effect size, $\eta^2 = .74$.

Table 3 shows the values of the orientation gap means that are gradually declining along the developmental continuum, and results of post-hoc comparisons of mean orientation gap values, using the Tukey HSD test (the homogeneity of variance assumption was not violated, i.e., Levene's test for homogeneity of variances was insignificant, $F(5, 68) = 1.92, p = .102$). Table 3 also shows that as the intercultural sensitivity of participants increases, the objectivity in evaluating intercultural sensitivity also increases, meaning that the discrepancy between scores of developmental and perceived orientation (i.e., average orientation gap) decreases. The participants whose intercultural sensitivity is in line with the denial stage tend to overrate their sensitivity the most. They are followed by participants from the polarization–defense, polarization–reversal, and cusp of minimization, among whom there are no statistically significant differences. Participants in these three categories overrate their intercultural sensitivity to a lesser degree in comparison with the participants who are in the denial stage, and to a greater degree than those who are in the minimization and cusp of acceptance categories. Finally, the respondents from the minimization and cusp of acceptance, among whom there are no statistically significant

differences, overrate their intercultural sensitivity the least, meaning that they show the lowest discrepancy between developmental and perceived orientation.

The findings in Table 3 also indicate that sub-categories which are theoretically categorized into the same stage indeed do not statistically differ in the average orientation gap (for instance, minimization and cusp of acceptance are both categorized into the minimization stage). These findings support the assumption that stages are considered to be homogeneous subsets when it comes to the average orientation gap: denial as a separate subset; polarization in both forms and the cusp of minimization as the second subset; minimization and the cusp of acceptance as the third subset.

Table 3

The average orientation gap and the significance of mean differences in the orientation gap between participants in different stages/sub-stages

	Mgap (SD)	Range of Mgap	Polarization – Defense	Polarization – Reversal	Cusp of minimization	Minimization	Cusp of acceptance
Denial	50.93 (6.55)	41.54-55.64	14.78 **	14.58**	17.58**	27.18**	33.27**
Cusp of polarization	44.95 (/)	/	-				
Polarization – Defense	36.15 (3.12)	31.14-39.71	-	-0.20	2.80	12.40**	18.49**
Polarization – Reversal	36.35 (3.00)	32.97-39.74		-	3.00	12.60**	18.69**
Cusp of minimization	33.35 (2.15)	29.93-34.95			-	9.60**	15.69**
Minimization	23.75 (5.13)	13.33-32.86				-	6.09
Cusp of acceptance	17.66 (4.97)	12.86-26.01					-
Acceptance	10.66 (/)	/					-

Note. ** $p \leq .001$

Discussion

The first goal of this research was to determine the level of intercultural sensitivity of teachers who work in schools in culturally heterogeneous regions of Serbia and are in contact with students or parents from other cultures on a daily basis. A distinctive characteristic of this research in comparison to previous studies is reflected in a thorough examination of the relationship between developmental and perceived orientation, that is, how teachers perceive and relate to cultural differences (developmental orientation), and how they evaluate themselves with regard to them (perceived orientation).

The results of this study indicate that teachers have an average developmental orientation score within the range of the minimization stage, which is also the most frequent developmental orientation in our sample. These findings are consistent with the results of previous studies on samples of teachers (Jokić & Petrović, 2016; Mahon, 2009; Westrick & Yuen, 2007). The study has also revealed that there are a number of respondents below minimization – 23.7% of teachers in the polarization stage and 6.6% in the denial stage – more than would be anticipated when compared to the results of research on large samples (Hammer, 2011), but in alignment with previous research on teacher samples in Serbia (Jokić & Petrović, 2016). However, it should be noted that previous research was not conducted exclusively in the regions of Serbia that are considered to be culturally heterogeneous.

What are the possible characteristics of the teachers' worldviews and perceptions of cultural differences in the polarization and denial stages? According to the DMIS, ethnocentric views in their most salient form in the denial stage are distinguished by failing to notice cultural differences, as a result of either situational isolation from other groups or purposeful separation (Bennett, 1986). The polarization stage is characterized by the hierarchical evaluation and stereotyping of other cultural groups (Bennett, 1986). Existing findings suggest that teachers who are in the polarization and denial stages position themselves as being "outside" of the minority experience, with no intention to take into consideration multiple perspectives (Mantel et al., 2012). These teachers also anticipate the possibility of conflicts with minority parents, but to a significantly lesser degree with minority students, who are perceived as being influenced by the cultural group they belong to (Leutwyler et al., 2014). Thus, in line with the DMIS premises and cited qualitative research, the described ethnocentric beliefs and attitudes are expected to be shared by approximately one-third of the sample in this study. Considering these findings alongside prior similar results in Serbia (Jokić & Petrović, 2016), we believe that there is a necessity for addressing the issue of enhancing teacher competencies related to interacting with students from diverse cultural backgrounds and their families.

Individuals in the minimization stage, which encompasses the majority of teachers in this study, as well as in the general population, acknowledge the differences among diverse cultural groups but diminish their importance, and regard the norms of their own cultural group as universally applicable (Bennett, 1986). In his later work, Milton James Bennett (2004) suggested that minimization has elements of transitioning towards ethnorelativism, because "others" are generally not viewed in a stereotypical manner, and the common humanity of all cultural groups is recognized. Teachers in the minimization stage may express the beliefs that cultural differences bear minor significance in comparison to biological similarities of all people, as well as that all people are similar with regard to their needs, motivation to succeed, aspirations to achieve freedom and individuality, religious experiences, etc. (Bennett, 1986). Universal principles applied to all people regardless of their cultural background stem from a person's cultural frame of reference, however, a person lacks cultural self-awareness to fully comprehend the origins of such a frame of reference (Bennett, 2004). This implies that the teachers who think that people are essentially all the same, meaning that they are driven, or should be driven by similar motives

and aspirations, may consequently overlook cultural differences or underestimate their importance in interaction with students and parents from diverse cultural communities. For the same reasons, they may less frequently adapt their behavior in interactions with these students and parents, as well as their instruction, learning activities and approaches to student assessment.

Both research hypotheses regarding the relationship between the developmental and the perceived orientation have been confirmed in this study. Namely, the difference between the two orientations is significant and teachers, on average, perceived themselves to be in the range of the acceptance stage (i.e., their perceived orientation is higher, as stated in H1). Teachers believe that they appraise other cultures as equally complex as their own, and that they are able to perceive differences in core values and behaviors, as well as that they have adopted a self-reflexive stance (Bennett, 2004). In other words, teachers see themselves as tolerant and capable of reflecting on the issues of cultural differences. This finding is also in alignment with previous studies (Mahon, 2009; Westrick & Yuen, 2007). Unobjective self-evaluation may be an additional obstacle to the development of competencies, since the need for improvement is overlooked (see Dunning, 2011).

The unique contribution of this research to the existing corpus of empirical facts, according to our knowledge, lies in the finding that there is a consistent pattern in the relationship between developmental and perceived orientation: the respondents with lower scores on the developmental orientation exhibit a larger orientation gap than respondents with higher scores. Namely, a larger orientation gap means overrating one's own intercultural sensitivity to a greater extent (Hammer, 2009). The degree of overestimation drops with the rise in intercultural sensitivity. Our second research hypothesis is thus also confirmed. We believe that this regularity, as recently suggested by the instrument constructor (Hammer, 2022), and clearly indicated in our findings (mean discrepancy/orientation gap values, results of the Tukey HSD test), reflects the Dunning-Kruger effect.

Practical Implications

The tendency to reflect upon one's own practice is regarded as an important and desirable characteristic of teachers in general (Korthagen, 2014; Radulović, 2011), but also as an element of more specific competencies for teaching in culturally heterogeneous contexts (Banks, 2006; Gay & Howard, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2007). Thus, relatively low intercultural sensitivity of teachers, accompanied with the tendency to overrate one's intercultural sensitivity, strongly suggests a need for enhancement of teachers' competencies. Overestimation of one's intercultural sensitivity (the most visible in persons whose intercultural sensitivity is at the lowest level) implies unsuccessful reflection on one's own professional experience, and consequently difficulties in researching and improving one's teaching practice. We believe that such overrating is particularly unfavorable when it comes to self-reflection concerning important elements of the professional development of teachers, such as self-evaluation of competencies, questioning one's own beliefs, professional identity, and professional mission (Korthagen, 2014).

Failure to perceive that there is a need for change (on a metacognitive level), and a possible resistance to change, could be the main obstacles to initial education and professional development aiming to improve the intercultural competence of teachers. Professional development programs should optimally be designed in accordance with the current level of intercultural sensitivity of teachers, instead of focusing on learning of specific content (Bennett, 2004; Dimitrijević & Petrović, 2014; Petrović, 2018). The programs focusing on reduction of stereotypes and prejudice, with special emphasis on similarities between people, would be appropriate in the case of teachers in ethnocentric stages. For those in the minimization stage it is necessary to prioritize the importance of the neglected differences and their educational implications (Bennett & Bennett, 2004). It would be particularly beneficial if teachers would attend training tailored to their specific needs, based on assessment of their current competencies, and conducted in a supportive manner.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The primary limitations of this study stem from the fact that the IDI[®] is protected by copyright and that raw data are not available to researchers. Additional limitations arise from the convenience sampling of schools (within the chosen multicultural regions) and the size of the teachers' sample, all of which necessitate caution when generalizing the findings. For future reference, researchers should broaden the sample, as well as purposefully select respondents with ample international experience in order to increase the probability of identifying and including respondents in the acceptance and adaptation stages. Thus it would be possible to verify the suppositions of the Dunning-Kruger effect when it comes to the respondents in the higher stages of intercultural sensitivity.

Conclusion

This research provided insight into the intercultural sensitivity, i.e., the developmental orientation of experienced teachers working in multicultural regions in Serbia, as well as their evaluations of their own intercultural sensitivity, i.e., perceived orientation. A significant difference was found between the developmental and perceived orientations, and it was concluded that teachers overestimate their intercultural sensitivity. Finally, data analyses revealed the pattern of this discrepancy, which holds both theoretical and practical significance.

References

- Apple, M. W. (2011). Global crises, social justice, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(2), 222–234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487110385428>
- Banks, J. A. (2006). *Cultural diversity and education, foundations, curriculum, and teaching*. Pearson Education.

- Baucal, A. (2006). Development of mathematical and language literacy among Roma students. *Psihologija*, 39(2), 207–227. <https://doi.org/10.2298/PSI0602207B>
- Baucal, A. (2012). Deca i mladi iz romske zajednice u obrazovnom sistemu Srbije: Marginalizovani u društvu i marginalizovani u obrazovnom sistemu. U T. Varadi i G. Bašić (ur.), *Promene identiteta, kulture i jezika Roma u uslovima planske socijalno-ekonomske integracije* (str. 349–363). SANU.
- Bennett, M. J. (1986). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Cross-cultural orientation: New conceptualizations and applications* (pp. 27–70). University Press of America.
- Bennett, M. J. (2004). Becoming intercultural competent. In J. Wurzel (Ed.), *Toward multiculturalism: A reader in multicultural education* (pp. 62–77). Intercultural Resource Corporation.
- Bennett, M. J. (2009). Defining, measuring, and facilitating intercultural learning: A conceptual introduction to the Intercultural Education double supplement. *Intercultural Education*, 20 (sup 1), S1–S13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980903370763>
- Bennett, J. M., & Bennett, M. J. (2004). Developing intercultural sensitivity: An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett, & M. J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training 3rd ed.* (pp.147–165). SAGE Publications.
- Bernstein, B. (2003). *Class, codes and control: Vol. 1. Theoretical Studies Towards a Sociology of Language*. Routledge. (Original work published 1971)
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cushner, K., & Chang, S. C. (2015). Developing intercultural competence through overseas student teaching: Checking our assumptions. *Intercultural Education*, 26(3), 165–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2015.1040326>
- Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 10(3), 241–266. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306287002>
- DeJaeghere, J. G., & Zhang, Y. (2008). Development of intercultural competence among US American teachers: Professional development factors that enhance competence. *Intercultural Education*, 19(3), 255–268. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980802078624>
- Dimitrijević, B. M. (2019). *Interkulturalna osetljivost i uverenja nastavnika o kulturnim razlikama u školskom kontekstu* (doktorska disertacija). NARDUS (123456789/12225)
- Dimitrijević, B. M., & Petrović, D. S. (2014). Pristupi i strategije za multikulturalno obrazovanje nastavnika – Iskustva Sjedinjenih Američkih Država. *Zbornik Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja*, 46(1), 69–90. <https://doi.org/10.2298/ZIP11401069D>
- Dimitrijević, B. M., Petrović, D. S., & Leutwyler, B. (2017). Implicitna uverenja nastavnika o učenicima romske i mađarske kulturne grupe. *Zbornik Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja*, 49(1), 55–76. <https://doi.org/10.2298/ZIP11701055D>
- Dunning, D. (2011). The Dunning-Kruger effect: On being ignorant of one's own ignorance. In J. M. Olson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology Vol. 44* (pp. 247–296). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-385522-0.00005-6>
- Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the „burden of acting white“. *The Urban Review*, 18(3), 176–206. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01112192>
- Freire, P. (2014). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury Academic. (Original work published 1970)

- Gay, G. (2013). Teaching to and through cultural diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 43(1), 48–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/curi.12002>
- Gay, G. (2015). The what, why, and how of culturally responsive teaching: International mandates, challenges, and opportunities. *Multicultural Education Review*, 7(3), 123–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2015.1072079>
- Gay, G., & Howard T. C. (2000). Multicultural teacher education for the 21st century. *The Teacher Educator*, 36 (1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730009555246>
- Gay, G., & Kirkland, K. (2003). Developing cultural critical consciousness and self-reflection in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice*, 42(3), 181–187. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4203_3
- Gorski, P. C. (2008). Good intentions are not enough: A decolonizing intercultural education. *Intercultural Education*, 19(6), 515–525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980802568319>
- Hammer, M. R. (2008). The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI): An approach for assessing and building intercultural competence. In M. A. Moodian (Ed.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Understanding and utilizing cultural diversity to build successful organizations* (pp. 203–218). Sage.
- Hammer, M. R. (2009). *Intercultural Development Inventory v.3 (IDI) individual profile report*. Retrieved from http://www.idiinventory.com/pdf/idi_sample.pdf
- Hammer, M. R. (2011). Additional cross-cultural validity testing of the Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35(4), 474–487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.02.014>
- Hammer, M. R. (2015). The developmental paradigm for intercultural competence research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 48, 12–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.03.004>
- Hammer, M.R. (2022). A Response to Punti and Dingel's Critique of the Validity of the Intercultural Development Inventory for BIPOC Students. Comment on Punti, G.; Dingel, M. Rethinking Race, Ethnicity, and the Assessment of Intercultural Competence in Higher Education. *Educ. Sci.* 2021, 11, 110. *Education Science*, 12(3), 176. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12030176>
- Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(4), 421–443. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(03\)00032-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(03)00032-4)
- He, Y., Lundgren, K., & Pynes, P. (2017). Impact of short-term study abroad program: Inservice teachers' development of intercultural competence and pedagogical beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 66, 147–157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.04.012>
- Hess, R. D., & Shipman, V. C. (1965). Early experience and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. *Child Development*, 36(4), 869–886. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1126930>
- Jokić, T. i Petrović, D. S. (2016). Interkulturalna osetljivost nastavnika i činioci uspešnog sprovođenja interkulturalnog obrazovanja u Srbiji. U D. S. Petrović i T. Jokić (ur.), *Interkulturalno obrazovanje u Srbiji – Regulativni okvir, stanje i mogućnosti za razvoj* (str.128–154). Centar za obrazovne politike.
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2014). Promoting core reflection in teacher education: Deepening professional growth. *International Teacher Education: Promising Pedagogies (Part A)*, 22, 73–89. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-368720140000022007>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2012). Through a glass darkly: The persistence of race in education research & scholarship. *Educational Researcher*, 41(4), 115–120. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12440743>

- Leutwyler, B., Mantel, C., Petrović, D., Dimitrijević, B. M., & Zlatković, B. (2014). Teachers' beliefs about intercultural education: Different levels of intercultural sensitivity in schooling and teaching. *Educational Research*, 5(8), 280–289. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14303/er.2014.196>
- Lewis, O. (1998). The culture of poverty. *Society*, 35, 7–9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02838122>
- Macura-Milovanović, S. (2008). Specifični problemi u obrazovanju romske dece. *Uzdanica*, 5(2), 177–185.
- Macura-Milovanović, S., & Peček, M. (2013). Attitudes of Serbian and Slovenian student teachers towards causes of learning underachievement amongst Roma pupils. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(6), 629–645. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2012.703247>
- Mahon, J. (2009). Conflict style and cultural understanding among teachers in the western United States: Exploring relationships. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33(1), 46–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.12.002>
- Mantel, C., Simić, N., Petrović, D., & Leutwyler, B. (2012). Notions of cultural differences amongst teacher education students in the Serbian and Swiss Context. In A. Baucal, & J. Radišić (Eds.), *Patchwork. Learning diversities: Conference proceedings of the EARLI conference* (pp. 183–190). Institute of Psychology.
- Matsumoto, D., & Hwang, H. C. (2013). Assessing cross-cultural competence: A review of available tests. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 44(6), 849–873. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113492891>
- Ogbu, J. U. (2004). Collective identity and the burden of “acting white” in black history, community, and education. *The Urban Review*, 36(1), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:URRE.0000042734.83194.f6>
- Paige, R. M., Jacobs-Cassuto, M., Yershova, Y. A., & DeJaegherea, J. (2003). Assessing intercultural sensitivity: An empirical analysis of the Hammer and Bennett Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(4), 467–486. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(03\)00034-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(03)00034-8)
- Payne, R. (2005). *A Framework for Understanding Poverty* (4th rev. ed.). Aha process Inc.
- Petrović, D. S. (2010). To what extent do teachers perceive Roma discrimination in Serbian educational system. In M. Patricia (Ed.), *Intercultural education as project for social transformation – Linking theory and practice towards equity and social justice: Conference proceedings* (pp.156–172). INTER Network.
- Petrović, D. S. (2016). Pregled akreditovanih programa stručnog usavršavanja nastavnika u oblasti interkulturalnog obrazovanja. U D. S. Petrović i T. Jokić (ur.), *Interkulturalno obrazovanje u Srbiji – Regulativni okvir, stanje i mogućnosti za razvoj* (str.128–154). Centar za obrazovne politike.
- Petrović, D. S. (2018). Sticanje interkulturalnih kompetencija u svetlu Razvojnog modela interkulturalne osetljivosti Milтона Beneta. *Godišnjak Pedagoškog fakulteta u Vranju*, 9(2), 27–44. <https://doi.org/10.5937/gufv1802027P>
- Pravilnik o standardima kompetencija za profesiju nastavnika i njihovog profesionalnog razvoja* (2011). Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, Prosvetni glasnik, br. 5/2011.
- Radulović, L. (2011). *Obrazovanje nastavnika za refleksivnu praksu*. Filozofski fakultet
- Republički zavod za statistiku (2022). *Nacionalna pripadnost: Podaci po opštinama i gradovima*. Retrieved from <https://publikacije.stat.gov.rs/G2023/Pdf/G20234001.pdf>
- Simić, N., & Vranješević, J. (2019). Refugee children in formal education in Serbia – Multi-perspective views on challenges and good practices. In K. Górak-Sosnowska, M. Pachocka, & J. Misiuna (Eds.), *Muslim minorities and the refugee crisis in Europe* (pp. 135–147). SGH publishing house, SGH Warsaw school of economics.
- Skubic Ermenc, K. (2016). Intercultural dimensions of education. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, 65(1), 7–16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5937/nasvas1601007S>

- Snodgrass, L. L., Morris, P., V., & Acheson, K. (2018). Assessing the intercultural sensitivity of students in an agriculture diversity and social justice course. *Multicultural Education Review*, 10(4), 292–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2018.1532222>
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing intercultural competence. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence*, (pp. 2–52). SAGE.
- Starčević, J. S. (2011). Razlike u konceptualizaciji interkulturene kompetentnosti: problem ili suština pojma. *Uzdanica*, 8(2), 117–125.
- Starčević, J. S. (2018). *U potrazi za suštinom individualnih razlika u interkulturnoj interakciji*. Fakultet pedagoških nauka Univerziteta u Kragujevcu.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2007). The culturally responsive teacher. *Educational Leadership*, 64(6), 28–33.
- Westrick, J. M., & Yuen, C. Y. M. (2007). The intercultural sensitivity of secondary teachers in Hong Kong: A comparative study with implications for professional development. *Intercultural Education*, 18(2), 129–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980701327247>
- Yuen, C. Y. M. (2010). Dimensions of diversity: Challenges to secondary school teachers with implications for intercultural teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(3), 732–741. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.10.009>
- Yuen, C. Y. M., & Grossman, D. L. (2009). The intercultural sensitivity of student teachers in three cities. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 39 (3), 349–365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920802281571>
- Zakon o osnovama sistema obrazovanja i vaspitanja*. Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, Prosvetni glasnik br. 88/2017, 27/2018 - dr. zakon, 10/2019, 27/2018 - dr. zakon, 6/2020, 129/2021 i 92/2023.
- Zhang, J. (2014). Test review: The Intercultural Development Inventory Manual. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 32(2), 178–183. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282913505075>
- Zlatković, B., i Petrović, D. S. (2016). Interkulturalno obrazovanje budućih učitelja u Srbiji. U D.S. Petrović i T. Jokić (ur.), *Interkulturalno obrazovanje u Srbiji – Regulativni okvir, stanje i mogućnosti za razvoj* (str.128–154). Centar za obrazovne politike.

Article received: 26.03.2024.

Updated version received: 15.05.2024.

Accepted for publishing: 20.05.2024.

Bojana Dimitrijević

Faculty of Education, University of Kragujevac, Jagodina, Serbia
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4599-4005>

Danijela Petrović

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6838-1191>

Blagica Zlatković

Pedagogical Faculty in Vranje, University of Niš, Vranje, Serbia
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3786-2491>

Jelena Starčević

Faculty of Education, University of Kragujevac, Jagodina, Serbia
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7742-992X>