

MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN SERBIAN LANGUAGE TEACHING

UDC 371.26::811.163.41; 371.3::811.163.41

Buba Stojanović

Pedagogical Faculty in Vranje, University of Niš, Serbia

Abstract. *The importance of Serbian language teaching for the proper development and education of primary school students requires the teachers to act responsibly both regarding the learning goals and learning objectives, and regarding the contents used in the classroom to achieve these goals, but especially concerning the student activities that need to be properly assessed. The learning goals for Serbian language lessons and the final learning objectives depend on carefully designed activities that will help to develop students' linguistic and speaking skills, and also to constantly monitor and assess the overall engagement both in and outside of the classroom. Classroom experience worldwide shows that the results of the teaching process in general, and in particular language teaching, are perceived through the students' knowledge acquired and their behavior, their linguistic and speaking skills, interaction with each other, individual traits, interests, which all imposes the need for both formative and summative assessment in primary school, in order for student performance to be observed in a thorough and objective manner. Contrary to this, evaluation in Serbia is mostly numerical, except in the first grade of primary school where it is descriptive. This paper, among other things, explains how the fourth grade students perceive their teachers' attitude towards evaluation, which contents of the Serbian language lessons he/she most often evaluates, the feedback he/she provides or does not provide and the importance that he/she does or does not give to feedback, as well as the "self-image" that students create based on the assessment and the grade given to them by their teacher.*

Key words: *serbian language teaching, students, monitoring, assessment, grading, development*

Received November 20, 2019/Accepted December 11, 2019

Corresponding author: Buba Stojanović

Pedagogical Faculty in Vranje, University of Niš, Partizanska 14, 75000 Vranje, Serbia

Phone: +381 17 422 962 • E-mail: bubast@pfvr.ni.ac.rs

1. INTRODUCTION

Modern teaching practice should be characterized by well-defined goals, elaborated tasks, detailed standards, but also permanently planned activities for monitoring and assessing students' activities along with transparent and timely feedback. The final objectives of the education process when it comes to teaching Serbian language should not only include the verbal and non-verbal skills of the students and their way of thinking (expressed through language), but also the actions they take. Therefore, the objectives of this course do not or should not only relate to students' knowledge, but also the interests, skills and habits, as well as personality traits that are important for their overall development and further progress.

With regard to Serbian language lessons, they provide numerous possibilities for educational and functional tasks, so the impact these lessons have on the development of students' versatile personality traits is almost invaluable. The fact that language and speech, as well as reading and writing skills, cannot be acquired without consciously thinking and speaking, presupposes that student has the active role in the education process. Academic achievement in general, especially mastering a language, greatly depends on the feedback the child receives from people around him or her, firstly from parents (because speech is first learned at home) and then from educators, teachers and others involved in the education process. Feedback is an important segment for students to build a positive image of themselves and a strong motivation to move forward. If feedback comes at the right moment, if it is continuous, thorough and clear, student success is guaranteed not only at school but also in other segments of life. If students do not get any feedback, or if the feedback most frequently involves a bad grade, the consequences for the development of students' personality can be serious. That is why language and literature learning objectives, as well as the specific learning content, impose the need, or maybe even the obligation on the teacher for a detailed understanding of students' performance, which should include students' oral and written language skills, but also their behavior and actions.

2. EVALUATION, MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT

Along with the development of humanity, and with the new roles school has received, new demands needed to be met. Over time, an awareness developed that child should be seen as a developing personality, which implied the active role of students in the learning process. Thus, school has become more important for the development of student personality, and more responsible for that matter. Well-designed and productive learning process, with carefully selected learning content, also involves detailed monitoring, assessment and evaluation of students, which provides students with feedback on how successful they were.

Evaluation (examination, notation, оценивать) - is "any activity that assesses student performance" (Kyriacou, 2001, 159). It represents "assigning a specific grade to student performance, or classifying students into specific categories based on their learning outcomes and the previously agreed criteria" (Matijević, 2004, 12). In the past, evaluation was solely related to students' knowledge (Pedagogical Encyclopedia), so in scholasticism, a student would be given a good grade only if he or she could repeat certain content word for word. The demand for reproduction-directed learning, where what the students recite in class is seen as learned (which often is not the case, unless it is the result of conscious, intrinsically motivated student activity, and the use of an analytic and synthetic approach) is

merely a sign of rote learning or memorization, devoid of critical thinking and interpretation, which is especially valuable for language and literature learning. Therefore, teaching this course requires a different approach, both when choosing the teaching methodology and when evaluating students.

Evaluation provides students with feedback on their level of knowledge acquired and their abilities, as well as the motivation to move forward. It allows the student “to objectively evaluate his or her own and other students’ achievements, to set personal learning goals, to develop a value system and to respect the general principles of education system established by law” (Guidelines on Primary School Student Evaluation, 2019). The main principles of evaluation are: objectivity, relevance, fairness, regularity, timeliness, appreciation of individual student characteristics, as well as a variety of techniques and methods. In order for these principles to be followed, evaluation has to be preceded by monitoring and assessment of student activity.

Monitoring is a complex and continuous activity where the teacher uses the appropriate techniques and instruments to obtain information on the development of students’ personalities and levels of achievement of the intended learning goals and objectives. It is “a pedagogical/educational activity that encompasses the application of appropriate methodological procedures, techniques and instruments for monitoring and self-monitoring the quality of the achieved results of all participants, at all stages of the education process, from the standpoint of the established learning goals” (Vilotijević, 1992, 101). Monitoring begins with formative and ends with summative assessment.

As an analytic scoring model, the descriptive (formative) assessment involves the use of descriptive grades to assess students’ knowledge, with regard to the achievement of prescribed outcomes and standards, student engagement, to the progress compared to the previous period, and recommendations for further progress. Its main advantage is that it can focus on student performance in general or on parts of it that are evaluated separately, which substantially reinforces student engagement. The use of both the holistic and analytic scoring model makes this evaluation method particularly valuable when it comes to evaluation of language and literature knowledge. In contrast to descriptive assessment, the numerical assessment is overall and quantitative, with all aspects of a student’s personality and engagement expressed by using a single number, which is almost impossible to do properly when it comes to language and literature achievements. Summative assessment is “a complex and responsible process that involves a critical, analytical and synthetical evaluation of student performance in order to analyze and summarize their knowledge, that is, the information and data obtained by monitoring and assessing students throughout the school year” (Jovanović, 2017, 23). It compares student achievement with the goals and standards set by the curriculum... Summative assessment is based on a thorough analysis of information obtained by monitoring students’ learning outcomes and activities in the classroom, which is why it is also referred to as “assessment of learning, and formative assessment, as assessment for learning...” (Looney, 2011, 7).

In addition to monitoring and evaluation, an important segment of language and literature lessons is the assessment of student engagement, which is a detailed process whose goal is to as objectively as possible identify and measure the results of the education process. The main purpose of assessment is to determine the degree and quality of achievement of the goals set, which is not only focused on specific learning outcomes, but also refers to broader personality changes caused by educational activities, which should also be an integral part of summative assessment.

Evaluation, as the final step of the student monitoring and assessment process, as well as the self-evaluation of teaching, has a dual role. One relates to students, because the aim of evaluation is to encourage their development, and the other relates to the teaching process as the “central process in an efficient school” (Wiliam, 2013, 15), the aim being to improve the teaching process. We are interested in evaluation as the final step of monitoring and assessing student performance, but it is also significant motivation for student development that needs to be focused on specifically.

3. EXPERIENCE OF OTHER COUNTRIES IN MONITORING, EVALUATING AND ASSESSING STUDENTS

The analysis of teaching practice worldwide shows different experiences when it comes to student evaluation. Descriptive evaluation is mostly used, while numerical assessment is introduced as late as possible, and there is a practice of combining these two. Namely, in many countries, numerical evaluation is perceived as a threat to the development of student personality from the earliest school age, so this type of assessment is delayed until the older primary school grades, as is the case in Argentina, Austria, Australia, Sweden (for more: Jovanović, 2017, 35).

In some countries, numerical grading has been completely replaced with descriptive (Canada, USA, England, Portugal, Denmark, Slovenia, Greece, Italy, Croatia, Germany, Netherlands, France, Norway, etc.) (Ibid, 2017, 35). Descriptive evaluation is characteristic of early primary school grades, and it varies from country to country how long it is used for. For example, in our country only first grade students are evaluated descriptively; in Germany, it is the first and second graders, or even all four grades in some provinces; while in Denmark and Sweden, descriptive evaluation is used in the first seven years of schooling (Ibid, 2017, 35). The combination of descriptive and numerical evaluation is used to assess the achievements of students in Italy (used for all subjects); or students might receive numerical grades in some subjects, and descriptive grades in other, as is the case in Germany and the Netherlands.

It is very interesting to take a look at the Finnish education system, which is seen as one of the most successful in the world. During the nine years of compulsory education, a combination of descriptive and numerical evaluation is applied. Students from grade one to grade four are evaluated descriptively, although this type of evaluation often continues until grade seven. In addition to student knowledge, the following aspects are also evaluated: their activities, skills, behavior, diligence, individual characteristics, moral development. It is evident that this type of evaluation is intended to encourage student development.

A combination of descriptive and numerical evaluation is also used in England, and much attention is paid to student individuality and traits such as meticulousness and accuracy, consistency, attitude towards learning, discipline, collaboration with other students, benevolence, etc. (Jovanović, 2017, 39-40).

In Canada, descriptive evaluation in the native language covers three components by grade four: reading, writing and speaking. Beside this, student abilities and learning habits, such as independence, initiative, problem solving, use of information, classroom collaboration and more, are descriptively evaluated (Jovanović, 2017, 38). It should be noted that the descriptive grade always has a positive form and shows the level of student achievement, which is a strong motivation to create a positive self-image that is very important for further development. Analytic scoring model and the evaluation of multiple components of student

engagement in language learning is also characteristic of the education system in the Netherlands.

In the developed countries in our region, student performance is also evaluated descriptively. For example, in Slovenia, students are evaluated based on teacher observation, continuous monitoring and written and oral assessment, from grade one to grade three of primary school.

As for the evaluation practice in Serbia, it has changed over time. In the past, students would firstly be evaluated only descriptively, and later only numerically. Descriptive evaluation along with numerical has become compulsory since 1960, when certain subjects (mathematics, mother tongue, and nature and society) were numerically evaluated in the former Yugoslavia, while some other subjects were evaluated descriptively (fine arts, music lessons and physical education), though not in all the republics and provinces in the same way. This was particularly evident in Slovenia where students in the first semester of the first grade were not graded at all, and in Croatia where descriptive evaluation was introduced in the first grade of the 1982/83 school year (cited from: Jovanović, 2017, 49).

The positive results and long-standing practice of descriptive evaluation of students in Slovenia and Croatia may be related to their good results in international student assessment (carried out continuously since 1997, and with students in Serbia in 2001, 2003, 2006, 2009 and 2012) organized by the OECD, because on the PISA scale of scientific, reading and mathematical literacy, they were ahead of students from other countries in the region (for more: Pavlović-Babić, Baucal, 2013).

It was only at the beginning of this century that descriptive evaluation in compulsory, elective, and optional courses, in the first grade only, was introduced in Serbia, with the aim of increasing objectivity in assessing student performance at the beginning of their education process. However, it is important to consider the individual abilities and personality traits of students in other primary school grades as well. The shortcomings of the student monitoring and evaluation system in Serbia are also reflected in the results from the aforementioned international assessments, which show the under-developed reading, mathematical and scientific skills in our 15-year-olds.

Compared to other countries in the region participating in this assessment, “the reading skills of students from Serbia are at the same level as that of students from Bulgaria and Romania; slightly better than that in students from Montenegro and Albania, but around 40 points lower than in students from Slovenia and Croatia” (Pavlović-Babić, Baucal, 2013: 72). Poor performance of students from Serbia is due to, among other things, the inadequate monitoring and evaluation process, as only paper-and-pencil tests are used, while cross-curricular competencies are not evaluated enough (for more: Pavlović-Babić, Baucal, 2013) and these can be significantly improved with successful Serbian language teaching and learning.

With the new Guidelines (Guidelines on Primary School Student Evaluation, “The Official Gazette of the RS, No. 34 of May 17, 2019), the evaluation process focuses more on students themselves, it is adapted to their individual characteristics, it is more objective, it has a positive attitude to learning and knowledge and to motivating students to learn. The latest changes improved the learning content and teaching methods (project-based learning, optional school activities), types of evaluation (obligatory formative and summative evaluation, with descriptive assessment in the first grade, and numerical assessment in other grades), the way the student learns, the degree of his/her independence in learning, the level of collaboration with other students in the classroom. Students should be evaluated based

on their presentations (work exhibitions, research results, models, drawings, posters, design solutions, etc.), their participation in debates and discussions, writing essays, homework, participation in various forms of group work, projects, portfolios” (Article 10 of the aforementioned Guidelines), all in accordance with the curriculum of the compulsory subject, or the elective subject or activity. Scientists have also intensely dealt with the issues of student monitoring, assessment and evaluation, trying to help teachers to organize their teaching as effectively as possible, but also to be able to observe students' commitment more objectively (Maksimović, 2016/2: 279-296; Dejić, Milenković, 2016/2: 15–24; Stojanović, Cvetanović, 2014/1: 55–64), and offering specific methodological solutions (Purić, 2012).

4. FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE EVALUATION – NECESSITY IN SERBIAN LANGUAGE TEACHING

The need to individualize modern education process by respecting students' abilities and interests imposes an obligation to bring innovation to teaching methodology, both regarding the process of teaching, and the monitoring and assessment techniques. There is an increasing number of studies worldwide that show “a positive correlation between formative evaluation and student performance (Araceli Ruiz-Primo & Furtak, 2006; Black, Harrison, Lee, Marshall, & Wiliam, 2004; Dunn & Mulvenon, 2009, cited from: Djelic et al. 2016, 130). Positive experiences in many countries involving descriptive evaluation in the early grades of primary school but also in some latter ones, prove that it is truly effective and valuable, which further means it should be used in the second, third and fourth primary school grades in our country as well, especially in Serbian language lessons.

The artistic value of literary, as well as of language learning content requires the students to be able to express what they have experienced in a qualitative manner. Therefore, in addition to the numerical grade, descriptive evaluation is also necessary to properly assess the sensory experience of the young readers, to evaluate their aesthetic taste, the depth of emotional experience, creative ability and other important personality traits that cannot be clearly identified when using numerical evaluation, even though they are included in it.

Insufficient reading activity observed in primary school students in Serbia can be improved through various school and extracurricular activities that involve reading, because such activities help the children to acquire different experiences and develop attitudes towards reading (Mullis et al., 2009), which is actually the learning goal and objective of this subject that, among other things, implies the following: “... developing a feeling for authentic aesthetic values in literature... – developing the need for a book, and the ability to independently use it as a source of knowledge; - getting used to using the library independently; – gradual and systematic training of students to experience and evaluate theater and film performances; – introducing oneself with, developing, preserving and respecting one’s own national and cultural identity through Serbian literature, theater and film, as well as other artistic achievements; ... – encouraging, engaging in and evaluating students' extracurricular activities (literary, linguistic, recitation, drama, journalistic optional school activities, etc.)... (Guidelines on the Curriculum for the First and Second Grade of Primary School, “The Official Gazette of the RS - Education Gazette”, No. 10/2004, 20/2004, 1/2005, 3/2006, 15/2006, 2/2008, 2/2010, 7/2010, 3/2011 – amended guidelines, 7/2011 – amended guidelines, 1/2013, 4/2013, 14/2013, 5/2014, 11/2014, 11/2016, 6/2017 and 12/2018).

Summative evaluation, where learning results are expressed by numbers, and where a numerical symbol is the general indicator of the value of the knowledge acquired, there is no possibility to express other elements of student performance such as ability, interest, innovation, fluency, etc. This does not provide a complete and detailed image of students' commitment.

Contrary to summative, the formative evaluation uses a descriptive grade and it includes "motivation and praise for what the student is doing well, suggestions or advice to improve, information on adequacy or inadequacy, and advice on how to improve the weaknesses" (Jovanović, 2017). Formative evaluation is especially suitable for the evaluation of students' Serbian language knowledge because it entails the following:

1. overall and detailed knowledge of students' personality,
2. continuous and systematic monitoring of their progress, supported by timely feedback that motivates them to make new efforts,
3. analytic approach by segmenting the subject that students are being graded for, and by choosing multiple school performance /achievement indicators,
4. individualized learning, which ensures the possibility of self-actualization in students.

By combining summative and formative evaluation, where formative descriptive assessment should be used in teaching Serbian, teacher would have to change the students' role in the classroom, making them active participants. Over time, student assumes some responsibility for their further development and advancement. In this way, the teacher interacts with students more often, creating an opportunity for them to speak about themselves, their qualities, performance, positive and negative personality traits, which is important for self-assessment, but also for the development of speaking skills. Although the Guidelines require continuous monitoring of students' development and performance through formative and summative evaluation, where the final grade should be the result of oral and written assessment, as well as of students' practical work, with respect for their individuality in order to motivate them to have a positive image of themselves, the real-life experience and the current teaching practice shows a completely different picture.

5. RESEARCH METHOD

Since we are aware of the importance of a well-organized primary school students monitoring, assessment and evaluation process, both for building a positive attitude towards the book and learning, and for the importance of feedback for students to create a positive image about themselves, we wanted to hear from the students about this issue.

The subject of this research was to obtain the opinions of fourth grade primary school students on how teachers monitor, assess, and evaluate their commitment to Serbian language lessons. The goal of the research was to determine how the teacher conducts monitoring, assessment and evaluation of student knowledge in Serbian language and literature.

The research tasks were to investigate:

- how often the teacher announced that they would be evaluated,
- what contents of the Serbian language lessons teachers evaluate most often,
- how the teachers conduct monitoring, assessment and evaluation,
- how much the students are allowed to self-evaluate their own answers, and
- how the grade they get affects their future commitment to studying.

Based on the research goals and tasks set, the research hypotheses are:

1. Given the age of the survey participants, it is expected that the teacher would always preannounce the assessment and evaluation;
2. It is assumed that in addition to grammar and spelling rules, the teacher would equally value knowledge of literature as well as students' linguistic skills;
3. Given the specifics of this course and the importance of conscious activity of students of the aforementioned age when it comes to language, it is assumed that the teacher would use different evaluation methods;
4. The teacher is expected to encourage self-criticism and allow the students to assess and evaluate their own responses;
5. It is assumed that the grade significantly affects the students of the abovementioned age with regard to these learning contents, and it can be a strong motive (if the grade is high), but also inhibit their further progress (if the grade is negative).

The survey was conducted in the 2018/2019 school year. The questionnaire contained ten closed-ended questions. The sample included 50 randomly selected participants. This cannot be considered an extensive research given the number of participants, but we believe that the data obtained can be an impetus to take this important segment of teaching more seriously. The results below are shown in a table expressed as a percentage.

6. RESEARCH RESULTS – ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

When asked how often the teacher announced that they would be evaluated in order for the students to prepare themselves, 28% of the participants (14 of them) said that the teacher did it always, 48% (24) said the teacher only did it sometimes, and 14% said never (12) (Table 1). Considering the percentage of those teachers who announce the evaluation occasionally, and those who do not do it at all (62%), it is evident that the majority of students believe that the teacher does not properly inform them about the intention to verify their knowledge, believing that linguistic and speaking activities are specific to this subject, which is a sufficient indicator to the students that their activity and manner of expression are constantly evaluated and that no special pre-announcement is required. This may be justified in the fourth, possibly third grade, but not in the first and second, when we know that those students are only developing an awareness of the importance of using the standard language forms, especially when the students attend a school in the part of the country where a regional dialect is used.

Table 1 How often does the teacher announce evaluation to students?

	Frequency	Percentages
Always	14	28%
Only sometimes	24	48%
Never	12	14%

The majority of students believe their Serbian language teachers most often assess grammar knowledge - 56% of them (28), 26% of them (15) claim that their teachers mostly assess reading and reciting, and the least number of students say the teacher primarily assesses retelling, speaking and describing - 18% of the students (9) (Table 2). Such observations are the reflection of the actual situation in schools, because grammar, reading

and reciting seem to be more easily measurable to teachers in terms of material available to them, whether those are books for individualized instruction, or guidelines for reciting and expressive reading. That is why, most often, students' writing skills are evaluated based on grammar tests, and the evaluation of speaking skills is based on accuracy and expressiveness in reading and reciting.

Table 2 Serbian language teachers most often assess

	Frequency	Percentages
Retelling, speaking and describing	9	18%
Reading and reciting	15	26%
Grammar knowledge	28	56%

Moreover, 56% of the participants (28) claim that the teacher always gives feedback on their performance as well as the grade, 20% of the participants (10) say that the teacher does this sometimes, while almost 24% of the participants (12) claim that the teachers almost never tells them what their grade is (Table 3). When it comes to evaluation transparency, teachers are bound to adhere to this by law, and most of them respect it. However, the percentage of those students who only sometimes receive feedback on the grade or never receive it (44%) is the biggest shortcoming of the teaching process, given that the grade, either descriptive or numerical, is a significant motivation to students for future activities.

Table 3 Teacher provides students with feedback in evaluation class

	Frequency	Percentages
Always	28	56%
Sometimes	10	20%
Almost never	12	24%

In addition to feedback on student success or lack of success in a subject in the form of a specific grade, it is very important to provide students with feedback in the form of praise, advice or criticism, as well as recommendations. The results show that 40% of the participants (20) state that besides the grade, the teacher most often gives them a praise. Furthermore, 32% of survey participants (16) state that after every oral examination that is not satisfactory, the teacher gives them advice, while 28% (14) state that the grade is accompanied by negative criticism (Table 4). It has long been acknowledged that the positive expectations and motivation by teachers are directly related to student performance (Rosental and Jacobson, 1970), which should certainly be kept in mind when working with students in modern schools because nothing succeeds like success. Negative criticism should be avoided whenever possible.

Table 4 In addition to grade, teacher usually provides students also with

	Frequency	Percentages
Praise	20	40%
Advice	16	32%
Negative criticism	14	28%

Given the responsibility of teachers to involve the students in the evaluation and assessment process in order to develop self-criticism in them, as well as the need for self-monitoring, one of the survey questions was how often the students were able to express their opinion on the answer they had provided and propose a grade themselves. So, 46% of them (23) point out that only sometimes they get the opportunity for self-evaluation with a request to justify the grade, 34% (17) always do so, while 40% of participants (20) have never had the opportunity to do so (Table 5). A large percentage of the students surveyed do not believe that they can be actively involved in the process of evaluating their own work, and thus cannot develop their own responsibility for further progress, which is certainly another disadvantage of the modern teaching process.

Table 5 Teacher involves students in the evaluation process

	Frequency	Percentages
Always	17	34%
Only sometimes	23	46%
Never	20	40%

When it comes to the evaluation methods, given the fact how specific language and literature are, we were interested in the methods teachers most frequently use to evaluate students' progress: verbally, in writing or by combining different techniques, since linguistic and speaking skills are equally important, as well as students' reading interests, love for native language, need for art, sensory sensitivity and other positive personality traits.

Table 6 The most common evaluation methods are

	Frequency	Percentages
Oral examination	12	24%
Written tests	20	40%
The combination of these two evaluation methods	18	36%

The results (Table 6) obtained show that the largest number of participants, that is, 40% of them (20) say that the teacher evaluates them in writing (using a test, practice sheet, transcribing, dictation, written assignment). In the opinion of 36% of them (18) the teacher uses both evaluation methods, while 24% (12) point out that the teacher most frequently uses oral examination. Certainly, the diversity and specifics of the learning content, as well as the aforementioned Guidelines on assessment, impose the need and obligation on the teacher to thoroughly evaluate student engagement, as indicated by the learning outcomes. As for the skills the students should master in these lessons, those are as follows: "to correctly pronounce letters; to adhere to the linguistic norms in speech; to read the literary text expressively and to recite the memorized text expressively as well; to recount the text without compression or with compression; to be able to talk about an actual or fictional event, in the first or third person, following the original chronology or in retrospect; to be able to verbally inform someone about something and describe something (to make an expository and descriptive text verbally); to be able to participate in discussion; to be able to formulate his or her opinion and express it publicly; and to possess communication skills (self-expression skills, as well as listening skills and respect for others' opinions)" (Guidelines on General Performance Standards - Education Standards for the Completion of Primary Education, The Official Gazette of the RS - Education Gazette, No. 5/2010).

Therefore, when evaluating students' school achievement, other aspects should be taken into account in addition to knowledge, such as their interests, book loving, commitment to homework, how prepared for the lesson they are, classroom activity, manner of presentation, collaboration with others, quality of interaction, as well as interest in cultural and art content, and the motivation to use the knowledge acquired. Thus, the largest number of participants, 56% of them (28) believe that the teacher values their love of books and reading, homework completion, how prepared for the lesson they are, and how active they are in the classroom. A slightly smaller percentage of the participants - 30% of them (15) think that the teacher takes into account students' speaking skills, as well as the grammatical mistakes they make, while only 14% of them (7) think that their collaboration and team spirit are important to their teachers, as well as their willingness to help their peers to understand the literary text, grammatical and spelling rules and successfully use them in practice (Table 7).

Table 7 In addition to student knowledge, teacher also assesses the following characteristics

	Frequency	Percentages
Love of books and reading, homework completion, activity in class	28	56%
Students' speaking skills	15	30%
Collaboration and team spirit	7	14%

As for the influence of a specific grade on students' personality and further engagement, the greatest motivation in the opinion of 44% (22) of the participants is teacher's praise, for 30% of them (15) it is criticism - if justified, 18% of them (9) see the praise from their parents as significant motivation, and only 8% of the participants (4) are motivated by peer praise (Table 8). Therefore, the fourth grade students are most motivated by teacher praise, but are also willing to accept criticism if it is in place, as well as to respond to the praise from parents. They are least motivated by their peers' opinion, which proves that there is no developed collaboration and team spirit.

Table 8 In addition to grade, the greatest motivation for students' further engagement is

	Frequency	Percentages
Teacher's praise	22	44%
Criticism from teacher	15	30%
Peer praise	4	8%
Praise from parents	9	18%

Good teacher evaluation and high grades are important to the students, because these make them more motivated to read and work more at home, as confirmed by 56% of them (28). Moreover, 34% (17) of them find good grades important for the satisfaction of their parents, and 26% of the participants (13) think that a good grade gives them better status among their peers (Table 9). All in all, higher grades are still a strong motivation for students, they are proof to their parents that they are committed, but also a type of validation among the classmates, which each teacher should keep in mind.

Table 9 Good teacher evaluation and high grades motivate students to

	Frequency	Percentages
Read and work more at home	28	56%
Have better status among their peers	13	26%
Make their parents happy and satisfied	17	34%

Praise and kind words that formative assessment begins with, along with continuous monitoring of the achievement of individual goals and timely feedback, are strong motivation for students to create a positive self-image. Students become aware of their strengths, understand what, how and why they learn, assume an active role in the classroom and embrace some responsibility.

We did not expect to hear that the highest percentage of students, that is, 46% of them (23) see the poor grade and negative criticism from the teacher as a challenge to show that they do not deserve it or that they simply were not adequately prepared for that particular evaluation. We assume that these participants are the ones who are high achievers. However, if we take into account the devaluation of knowledge in modern schools, and since grade is its indicator, it is then no surprise that 28% (14) of the participants do not see the grade as something significant and it means nothing to them, as they have stated; while 26% (15) of them are aware of its negative consequences for their self-esteem, because negative criticism from the teacher or poor grades cause them to doubt their abilities (Table 10).

Table 10 Students see the poor grade and negative criticism from the teacher as

	Frequency	Percentages
A challenge	23	46%
Do not see the grade as something significant	14	28%
Are aware of its negative consequences	15	26%

The percentage of those who are affected emotionally by a poor or negative evaluation is not low at all, given that it also leads to a loss of intrinsic motivation and a decrease in student engagement first in this subject and then in school in general. One student felt the need to openly express her dissatisfaction with her teacher evaluation methods since the teacher was constantly “punishing” her by giving her a lower grade than she thought she deserved. She added that the teacher had some favorite students, who she gave excellent grades to regardless of their performance, which supports the subjective evaluation by teachers, which we have already mentioned as a big shortcoming of the teaching process in Serbia.

7. INSTEAD OF A CONCLUSION

Student monitoring, and especially evaluation, as part of the student assessment process and the process of self-evaluation of teaching has a dual role. One role relates to the students, because the goal is to encourage their development, and the other role relates to the teaching process as “the central process in an effective school” (Wiliam, 2013: 15). We were interested in student monitoring and evaluation as a form of encouraging student development, but also an important segment in building a positive self-image of students. Student evaluation is the central concept of docimology, but it should also be seriously considered within the methodology of specific teaching subjects.

Lately, there has been an increasing effort, both by educators and methodologists, to help teachers overcome a number of issues related to this important segment of teaching. Starting from the Serbian language learning objectives in the younger grades of primary school, as well as from the learning content specifics and individualization of modern teaching process, the process of monitoring and evaluation of student performance should (in addition to reading and writing skills, the knowledge of functional concepts of language and literature, as well as the linguistic and speaking skills) also include the students' interest in oral and written language, their love for books and reading, their interest in cultural events, their desire to participate in teaching and extracurricular activities, etc. In order to achieve this, it is necessary to apply various methods and techniques of continuous monitoring, thorough evaluation, as well as simultaneous use of formative and summative assessment. This is also indicated by the results of a survey conducted among the fourth-grade primary school students who said that:

- most teachers only sometimes announce the evaluation,
- teachers most frequently evaluate grammar, reading and reciting skills,
- teachers always provide feedback to justify the grade they gave to a student,
- the grade is most often accompanied by praise from the teacher, advice and criticism,
- students only occasionally have the opportunity to evaluate their own performance and propose the grade they believe they deserve,
- students are most frequently evaluated in writing or verbally,
- most teachers value students' reading interests and engagement outside the classroom,
- their best motivation is the praise from their teacher, then their criticism, and only lastly their parents' support,
- they see low grades as a challenge to prove themselves, although in some cases, such grades affect their confidence, future performance and a positive self-image.

Positive experiences from other countries regarding student evaluation, poor performance of primary school students' from Serbia at international student assessments, as well as the opinions of the fourth grade students indicate that there is no serious approach to this important issue of modern education, both from the teachers' point of view (including a systematic and thorough student performance monitoring along with student participation), as well as from the perspective of the scientific public, as there need to exist specific techniques and procedures that would provide a proper overview of the learning results, in all segments of the development of students' personality, by primarily using formative assessment, which should not be overshadowed by summative assessment as previously was the case, especially when it comes to Serbian language lessons.

REFERENCES

- Vilotijević, M. (1995). *Evaluacija didaktičke efikasnosti nastavnog časa [The Evaluation of the Didactic Efficiency of the Teaching Process]*, Belgrade: KURO.
- Vilotijević, M. (1992). *Vrednovanje pedagoškog rada škole [The Evaluation of School Education Efforts]*. Belgrade: Naučna knjiga.
- Vilotijević, M., Vilotijević, N. (2016). *Modeli razvijajuće nastave I [The Models of Developmental Education 1]*, Belgrade: Teacher Education Faculty.
- Dejić, M., Milenković, V. (2016). Standardi postignuća učenika u funkciji efikasne diferencirane nastave matematike [Student Performance Standards for the Effective Differentiated Mathematics Teaching]. *Inovacije u nastavi [Innovation in Teaching Journal]*. 2016/2. 15–24. doi: 10.5937/inovacije1602015D, available at: http://www.inovacijeunastavi.rs/wp-content/uploads/Inovacije2-16/02_Dejić.pdf

- Djelić, J., Maričić, S., Špijunović, K. (2016). Formativna ocena u početnoj nastavi matematike [Formative Assessment in Early Mathematics Teaching]. *Zbornik Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja [Journal of Educational Research Institute]*. (1), 127–146.
- Jovanović, M. (2017). *Opisno ocenjivanje u teoriji i praksi [Descriptive Assessment in Theory and Practice]*. Niš: Faculty of Philosophy.
- Kyriacou, C. (2001). *Temeljna nastavna umijeća [Essential Teaching Skills]*. Zagreb: EDUCA.
- Looney, J. (2011). Integrating Formative and Summative Assessment: Progress Toward a Seamless System? OECD Education Working Papers. No. 58. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved September 17, 2017. from: [www:http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5kghx3kbl743-en](http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5kghx3kbl743-en).
- Matijević, M. (2004). *Ocenjivanje u osnovnoj školi [Evaluation in Primary School]*. Zagreb: Tipeks.
- Mullis, V. S. I., Martin, O. M., Kennedy, M. A., Trong, L. K., and Sainsbury, M. (2009). PIRLS 2011 Assessment Framework. TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Lynch School of Education, Boston College.
- Pavlović-Babić, Baucal, (2013). *Podrži me, inspiriši me, PISA 2012 u Srbiji: prvi rezultati [Support me, inspire me, PISA 2012 in Serbia: first results]*, available at http://pisa.rs/old/images/stories/pdf/PISA_2013_Srbija_prvi_rezultati.pdf
- Pedagoška enciklopedija [Pedagogical Encyclopedia]*
- Pravilnik o nastavnom planu i programu za prvi i drugi razred osnovnog obrazovanja i vaspitanja [Guidelines on the Curriculum for the First and Second Grade of Primary School]*, ("The Official Gazette of the RS - Education Gazette" No. 10/2004, 20/2004, 1/2005, 3/2006, 15/2006, 2/2008, 2/2010, 7/2010, 3/2011 – dr. pravilnik, 7/2011 – amended guidelines, 1/2013, 4/2013, 14/2013, 5/2014, 11/2014, 11/2016, 6/2017 and 12/2018).
- Pravilnik o opštim standardima postignuća – obrazovni standardi za kraj osnovnog obrazovanja [Guidelines on General Performance Standards - Education Standards for the Completion of Primary Education]*, The Official Gazette of the RS - Education Gazette" No. 5/2010.
- Pravilnik o ocenjivanju učenika u osnovnom obrazovanju i vaspitanju [Guidelines on Primary School Student Evaluation]*, "The Official Gazette of the RS", No. 34 from May 17, 2019. Available at <https://www.pravno-informacioni-sistem.rs/SlGlasnikPortal/eli/rep/sgrs/ministarstva/pravilnik/2019/34/10/reg>
- Purić, D. (2012). *Zbirka zadataka iz srpskog jezika za treći razred osnovne škole [Collection of Serbian Language Assignments for the Third Grade of Primary School]*. Požega: Epoha.
- Stojanović, B., Cvetanović, Z. (2014). Mišljenje učitelja o opštim standardima postignuća za napredni nivo u nastavi srpskog jezika [Teachers Opinion on General Performance Standards for the Serbian Language Advanced Level]. *Inovacije u nastavi [Innovation in Teaching Journal]*. Belgrade: Teacher Education Faculty. 1/2014. 55–64. doi:10.5937/inovacije1401055S, available at: <http://www.inovacijeunastavi.rs/sr/27-1-5/>
- William, D. (2013). Assessment: The bridge between teaching and learning. *Voices from the Middle*, 21(2), 15–20.

PRAĆENJE I OCENJIVANJE U NASTAVI SRPSKOG JEZIKA

Značaj nastave srpskog jezika za razvoj i vaspitanje učenika mlađih razreda osnovne škole nameće odgovoran odnos učitelja kako prema postavljenim ciljevima i zadacima nastave i sadržajima kojima će ih realizovati, tako posebno prema aktivnostima učenika koje na pravi način treba vrednovati. Postavljeni ciljevi nastave srpskog jezika i definisani krajnji ishodi obrazovanja zahtevaju pažljivo osmišljene aktivnosti kojima će se razviti neophodna jezička i govorna kompetentnost učenika, ali i stalno pratiti i vrednovati ukupno angažovanje kako na času, tako i van njega. Iskustva u svetu pokazuju da se rezultati nastave uopšte, a posebno nastave jezika, sagledavaju osim kroz stečena znanja i kroz ponašanje učenika, njegovu jezičku i govornu kompetentnost, neposrednu interakciju sa drugima, individualne osobine, ispoljena interesovanja, što sve nameće potrebu za istovremenim formativnim i sumativnim ocenjivanjem tokom čitave osnovne škole kako bi se postignuća sagledala na sveobuhvatan i objektivna način. Nasuprot tome, ocenjivanje u Srbiji je uglavnom brojčano, osim u prvom razredu osnovne škole gde je opisno. Rad, između ostalog, donosi i saznanja o tome kako učenici četvrtog razreda osnovne škole opažaju odnos učitelja prema ocenjivanju, koje sadržaje nastave srpskog jezika najčešće ocenjuje, o povratnoj informaciji koju (ne)daje i značaju koji joj (ne)pridaje, kao i "slici" koju na osnovu procene i izrečene ocene učitelja učenici grade o sebi.

Ključne reči: *nastava srpskog jezika, učenici, praćenje, vrednovanje, ocena, razvoj*