

Alternative Assessment Strategies to Enhance Learning for Students with Special Needs

Valentina Avdiu¹ & Vjollca Ahmedi²

Abstract

This research aims to examine the effectiveness of alternative assessment tools in enhancing the learning for students with special needs. Conventional assessment methods frequently do not accommodate diverse learning styles and individual requirements, which may impede student engagement and academic achievement. This study analyzes the effectiveness of alternative assessment tools in enhancing the learning process through alignment with diverse student perspectives, interests, and abilities. The research utilized a quantitative approach, employing a standardized questionnaire across 15 educational settings to gather data on the use and impact of alternative assessment methods. The analysis demonstrated a statistically significant positive correlation between using alternative tools and improving the learning process for students with special needs ($r = 0.364$, $p = 0.001$). This finding demonstrates that alternative assessment methods effectively promote a supportive and inclusive learning environment. The study revealed specific relationships between alternative assessment tools and teacher training activities, alongside an overall positive correlation. The findings indicate that educators proficient in utilizing these tools are more inclined to witness positive results in their students. This study highlights the necessity of equipping educators with sufficient training and resources for the effective implementation of alternative assessment strategies. This study is defined by its quantitative, correlational, and descriptive approach, revealing a statistically significant positive linear relationship between alternative assessment methods and enhanced learning outcomes. The findings indicate that alternative assessment tools may enhance the educational experience for students with special needs, thereby promoting their academic success and engagement.

Keywords: *Alternative assessment, facilitation, learning process, students, special needs.*

Introduction

Assessment is an integral component of the teaching and learning process, serving as a tool to enhance both educational quality and student outcomes. Effective assessment not only benefits educators by providing insights into student progress but also supports learners in developing crucial skills and improving their performance across various educational contexts. Conventional standardized assessments, such as pencil-and-paper tests, have long been used due to their ease of development and administration, as well as their straightforward interpretation (Agrey, 2004). These assessments are designed to evaluate cognitive skills and often produce results that are easily

¹ MSc Teacher at Migjeni Primary School-Mitrovica, Albania. valentina.avdiu@student.uni-pr.edu

² Asst. Prof. Dr., University of Prishtina "Hasan Prishtina" Albania. vjollca.ahmeti@uni-pr.edu

quantifiable. However, they tend to focus narrowly on cognitive abilities and may not accurately reflect a student's full potential. Furthermore, standardized tests can lead to students who excel in test taking but struggle with problem-solving and practical application in real-world situations. Additionally, these assessments often neglect the development of essential communication and soft skills (Agrey, 2004).

In contrast, alternative assessments encompass a variety of tools and techniques that aim to engage students in higher-order thinking and authentic problem-solving tasks (Adelabu & Alex, 2023; Al-Mahrooqi, 2018). Unlike traditional assessments, alternative methods emphasize the process of learning rather than merely assigning grades. They provide students with opportunities to demonstrate their understanding through creative and critical thinking tasks, thus reflecting their learning in more meaningful ways (Öcal Dörterler & Akay, 2022; Puhl, 1997). Research indicates that alternative assessment techniques encourage student autonomy, creativity, and critical thinking, allowing learners to exercise greater control over their educational experiences (Gcabashe, 2024; Majola, 2023; Suzieleez et al, 2006). Despite the recognized benefits of alternative assessments, challenges remain in their implementation. Considering the pivotal role that alternative assessment tools play in enhancing the learning experience for students with special needs, it becomes essential to investigate their effectiveness. The importance of this study lays in its potential to provide insights into how these assessment tools can be utilized to better support the educational development of students with special needs. By focusing on the implementation and outcomes of alternative assessment methods, this research aims to contribute valuable knowledge to the field of special education, ultimately assisting educators in adopting strategies that are more inclusive and effective in meeting the diverse needs of their students.

Assessment is an integral component of the teaching and learning process, serving as a tool to enhance both educational quality and student outcomes. Effective assessment not only benefits educators by providing insights into student progress but also supports learners in developing crucial skills and improving their performance across various educational contexts. Research indicates that alternative assessment techniques encourage student autonomy, creativity, and critical thinking, allowing learners to exercise greater control over their educational experiences (Suzieleez et al, 2006).

Despite the recognized benefits of alternative assessments, challenges remain in their implementation. According to (Yao, 2015), while teachers generally hold a positive attitude towards alternative assessment methods, they often revert to traditional assessments due to perceived difficulties and preferences for established practices. Rahman, (2018) further notes a discrepancy between teachers' positive perceptions of alternative assessments and their actual classroom practices. Considering the potential of alternative assessment tools enrich the educational experience for students with special needs, it is essential to examine not only how these tools are used but also their impact on learning outcomes. This study is significant as it seeks to provide insights into practicalities and benefits of alternative assessment tools for special education. By exploring both implementation strategies and their effects on learning, this research aims to enhance the inclusivity and efficacy of assessment practices, contributing valuable findings to the field of special education.

The purpose of this study is to examine how alternative assessment tools are used in supporting the learning processes of students with special needs, along with analyzing the impact of these tools on educational outcomes. By understanding the extent of their use and their effectiveness, this research seeks to offer practical insights for educators looking to adopt more inclusive and effective assessment strategies.

Research questions

- 1) To what extent do teachers have knowledge of alternative assessment tools in their teaching for students with special needs?
- 2) What is the correlation value between the training received and the use of these specific tools by teachers?

Literature review

Certain tools and strategies can be used to facilitate the learning process and achieve progress in reading and other basic skills that are more important in certain learning situations, enabling students with special needs to learn so that it becomes an easier and more effective process in lifelong learning (Elhoweris et al., 2011; Makuvire et al., 2023). Often, students are overwhelmed in the learning process (Salend, 2005), especially in disciplines that depend on reading and

comprehension, an essential skill in the learning process (Gersten et al, 2005). Puhl, (1997) emphasizes that alternative assessment tools allow students to demonstrate their assessments and personal understanding of what they have learned in the classroom. Whereas, Suzieleez and colleagues (2006), state that alternative assessment tools encourage students' creativity and critical thinking.

The use of alternative assessment instruments in special education marks a substantial shift away from traditional, standardized practices and toward more adaptable and inclusive approaches. For children with special needs who are unable to engage in educational assessment systems, states must create and implement alternative assessment techniques. This change is partially required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Amendments of 1997 (U.S. Department of Education, 1997; Ysseldyke & Olsen, 1997). By giving students with special needs, the opportunity to demonstrate their learning in forms tailored to their individual skills, these alternative assessments promote engagement and meaningful comprehension. Kleinert, Kennedy, and Kearns (1999) investigated how these alternative assessments affected teaching methods and student performance in a statewide setting in Kentucky. According to their findings, teachers saw several advantages from including their students in accountability and evaluation processes, including better student outcomes and instructional programming. Teachers specifically stated that alternative assessment helped children grow in areas including functional communication skills, self-assessment abilities, and customized scheduling.

The essence of this transition lies in Constructivist Theory, which asserts that learning is an active process wherein knowledge is formed through experiences that possess personal significance for the learner (Ismajli & Krasniqi, 2022; Piaget, 1954; von Glasersfeld, 1995). This idea advocates for experiential, hands-on assessments—such as projects, portfolios, and interactive assignments for students with special needs, enabling their active engagement with the curriculum. In contrast to conventional exams that often depend on rote memorization or standardized formats, constructivist-inspired tests allow students to showcase their comprehension through distinct, personalized representations of learning. This experiential method is especially advantageous for kids with special needs, allowing them to demonstrate their capabilities in formats that align with their individual strengths and learning preferences.

Expanding on the necessity for personalized evaluations, Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences (1983) emphasizes the significance of acknowledging and cultivating other types of intellect beyond the traditional emphasis on verbal and logical-mathematical abilities. Gardner's theory delineates many forms of intelligence, such as visual-spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, and interpersonal, that are particularly pertinent in special needs education, where kids may demonstrate proficiency in non-traditional domains. This theory advocates for the customization of alternative assessments to align with individual capabilities, enabling children with special needs to exhibit their comprehension through diverse formats. A student possessing robust visual-spatial intelligence may excel in examinations featuring visual aids, whereas a kinesthetic learner is likely to perform well in assessments that facilitate physical activity or contact. By adopting Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences, instructors can administer exams that capture the distinct competencies of each student, yielding a more comprehensive and precise evaluation of their talents.

Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (1978) is a crucial aspect of the theoretical framework for alternative assessments. Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development posits that optimal learning transpires when pupils engage with tasks that lie within their competence range, supplemented with scaffolding and assistance. In special needs education, alternative assessments can be tailored to align with students' Zone of Proximal Development, ensuring that tasks are both attainable and demanding, with suitable coaching included into the process. Scaffolding approaches, including visual prompts, peer support, and planned teacher direction, aid children with special needs in effectively navigating exams within a supportive atmosphere. By providing assessment experiences that correspond with each student's proximal development, educators can cultivate confidence and autonomy, enabling students to advance in their learning journey with customized assistance.

Furthermore, the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Framework (CAST, 2018; Meyer et al., 2014) offers a comprehensive structure that promotes the personalization and accessibility of educational experiences to accommodate varied learning requirements. Universal Design for Learning (UDL) emphasizes the need for adaptability in educational environments, advocating that all facets of learning, representation, participation, and expression must accommodate individual variances. In this context, alternative assessments are essential as they eliminate the obstacles frequently associated with standard examinations. Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

facilitates the development of examinations in various formats, enabling all students, irrespective of their skills or disabilities, to exhibit their knowledge in accordance with their strengths. This adaptability is crucial in special needs education, as it allows educators to create assessment settings where each student has an equitable chance to excel.

These core beliefs jointly demonstrate the critical importance of alternative assessments in special needs education. Conventional assessments frequently lack the adaptability and responsiveness required to accurately reflect the varied competencies of students with special needs, which may result in underestimations of their abilities and impede their academic development. Conversely, alternative assessments offer a holistic, tailored methodology that aligns with pupils' unique abilities and requirements. By integrating assessment methodologies with these theoretical frameworks, educators can establish inclusive learning environments where all students are evaluated equitably and afforded opportunity to cultivate critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving abilities. Alternative assessments serve not only as evaluative instruments but also as essential elements of an inclusive educational framework that honors and fosters each student's distinct learning path. These theories indicate that by employing assessments tailored to the unique needs and skills of students with special needs, educators can cultivate a more equitable educational environment that enhances both academic achievement and personal development (Çakmak et al., 2023; Kearns et al., 2011; Ketterlin-Geller & Johnstone, 2006; Thurlow, 2003).

Expanded Discussion on Alternative Assessment in the Evaluation Process

The assessment process is crucial for understanding and enhancing student learning, and the choice of assessment tools plays a significant role in this endeavor. Traditional assessments, such as standardized tests, often focus primarily on cognitive skills and may not fully capture the diverse abilities and learning styles of students. In contrast, alternative assessment tools offer a broader approach by accommodating various learning styles and individual needs, thus facilitating a more inclusive and effective learning environment (Black et al, 1998; Dlamini & Tsotetsi, 2024).

Alternative assessments, including portfolios, performance-based tasks, and self-assessments, are designed to provide a more comprehensive evaluation of student learning. These methods not only assess cognitive understanding but also consider students' abilities to apply knowledge in practical contexts, reflect on their own learning, and engage in self-directed activities (Herman, 1992). Such

assessments are particularly beneficial for students with special needs, as they offer multiple ways to demonstrate understanding and skills, which may not be possible through traditional testing methods.

The integration of alternative assessments into the evaluation process addresses several critical aspects of student learning. First, it aligns more closely with diverse learning styles, helping to ensure that all students have the opportunity to succeed (Gardner, 1983). Second, alternative assessments can enhance student motivation and engagement by involving them in their own learning process and providing immediate feedback (McMillan et al, 2010). Third, these tools allow for a more holistic view of student progress, taking into account various dimensions of learning beyond mere test scores (Shepard, 2000).

In the ongoing debate about the most effective assessment strategies, alternative assessments stand out for their ability to offer a more nuanced and supportive approach. They help educators to better understand and address the unique needs of their students, particularly those with special needs, thereby contributing to a more equitable and effective educational experience (Gipps, 2011). As such, alternative assessment methods play a vital role in the evaluation process, providing a valuable complement to traditional assessments and promoting a more comprehensive understanding of student learning and development.

Examples of Alternative Assessment in Research Design

In the research design of this study, various alternative assessment tools were employed to provide a comprehensive evaluation of student learning. Examples include:

- **Portfolios:** Students compile a collection of their work over time, selecting pieces that best showcase their achievements and reflecting on their learning experiences (Hansen, 1998).
- **Project-Based Assessments:** These tasks require students to engage in extended projects that apply their learning to real-world problems or scenarios, allowing for the demonstration of both knowledge and practical skills (Wiggins, 1993).
- **Self-Assessment and Peer Review:** Students evaluate their own work and that of their peers, promoting self-reflection and critical thinking about their learning process (Hansen, 1998).

Comparison with International and Local Perspectives

In the USA, alternative assessments have evolved significantly since the early 1990s, driven by policy changes and advancements in assessment design. Initially used for large-scale accountability, these assessments have been refined to better address the needs of students with special cognitive disabilities (Quenemoen, 2009). The focus has shifted towards ensuring that assessments are aligned with academic content standards and provide accurate measurements of student knowledge and progress (Elliott & Roach, 2007).

Similarly, in Kosova, the "Kosova Curricular Framework" emphasizes inclusivity and the adaptation of the curriculum to meet diverse student needs (MASHT, 2017). Recent developments in assessment tools for students with special needs reflect a commitment to providing equitable educational opportunities and supporting individual learning requirements (MASHT, 2020c).

Teachers' Attitudes Towards Alternative Assessment

Research on teachers' attitudes towards alternative assessments reveals a range of perspectives. Studies indicate that while some teachers recognize the benefits of alternative assessments, such as fostering creativity and critical thinking, others face challenges related to implementation and administrative burden (Flowers et al, 2005). Teachers often express a need for more professional development to effectively use alternative assessments and integrate them into their teaching practices (Smith-Woofter, 2010).

These teachers felt that, because of the wide range of skill levels among students with special cognitive abilities, it was difficult to assess them using the same instrument. They also felt increased pressure as a result of the time spent working in the administrative part; teachers did not have the opportunity to use assessment instruments that would suit the students' needs.

Method

Given the research topic, this study is quantitative in nature, employing a correlational and descriptive approach. This approach was chosen because the goal of this research is to demonstrate the relationship between the use of alternative assessment instruments and the facilitation of the

learning process as discussed by Gay, Mills and Airasian (2018). Correlational research involves collecting data to determine whether a relationship exists between two or more variables, and to what extent that relationship is significant.

Research Design

The design would focus on **understanding teacher perceptions, experiences, and self-reported outcomes** related to the use of alternative assessments and how these may correlate with the use of alternative assessment methods and the learning outcomes or experiences of students with disabilities.

Since the data are provided by **teachers**, the study is **correlational-descriptive research** with a focus on teacher-reported outcomes.

So, descriptive analyses are implemented in conjunction with correlational analyses to examine the extent to which educators integrate alternative assessment methodologies into their instructional methodologies.

Population and Sample/ Study Group/Participants

The population for this research includes all primary school teachers in the Mitrovica municipality, totaling 373 teachers, as reported by the Municipal Directorate of Education (2024). The research sample was selected by randomly choosing 15 schools from the 28 primary schools in Mitrovica, resulting in a total of 75 primary school teachers who have students with special needs in their classrooms.

From the data presented in Table 1, the demographic analysis reveals that the majority of participants (75%) are female, with no male participants represented in the study, this is due to the fact that the female gender always exceeds the male one in primary school teachers. Regarding school type, 61% of teachers work in urban schools, while 39% are employed in rural schools. Participants demonstrate a diverse range of professional experience: 28% have 0-5 years of experience, another 28% have 6-10 years, 21.3% have 11-15 years, and 22.7% have 16 or more years of teaching experience. Additionally, 77.3% of participants have completed training for implementing alternative assessment instruments, whereas 22.3% have not undergone such training. These demographic factors are crucial, as Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2018) suggest that

elements such as gender, school location, experience level, and training in alternative assessment practices can influence educators' perceptions and application of assessment strategies.

Table 1

Demographic Data of Participants

Demographic Variable	Category	Percentage (%)
Gender of Participants	Female	75
	Male	0
School Type	Urban	61
	Rural	39
Work Experience	0-5 years	28
	6-10 years	28
	11-15 years	21.3
	16 or more years	22.7
Training for Implementing Alternative Instruments	Completed	77.3
	Not completed	22.3

Data Collection Tools

This research used a questionnaire to assess the use of alternative assessment tools for students with special needs. The questionnaire comprised of 32 questions categorized into four primary variables pertinent to alternative assessment practices: alternative assessment portfolios, "We Create," "Learn and Teach," and "Quizzes". The selected variables aim to incorporate multiple aspects of teachers' and students' experiences with alternative assessments and the related learning outcomes.

The questionnaire items were developed by integrating items from existing instruments by Ak and Gündü (2010), Flowers et al. (2005), and Phongsirikul (2018) to ensure comprehensive coverage of the study's key aspects. Each variable included 5 to 7 items, each aimed at capturing specific indicators related to the core areas pertinent to evaluating the effects of alternative assessment tools on special needs education. This integration of sources facilitated the development of a comprehensive and validated instrument specific to the context of this study.

The questionnaire comprised two primary sections. The initial section collected demographic information regarding participants, teaching experience, type of school (urban or rural), and any

training undertaken in the application of alternative assessments. The second section examined the four primary variables, with items designed to gather responses on specific indicators concerning teachers' perceptions, student engagement, and the practical application of alternative assessments. This structure aimed to offer a comprehensive understanding of the use and effectiveness of alternative assessments in supporting students with special needs.

Validation and Reliability of the Instrument

To ensure the instrument's validity, a content validation process was conducted with input from experts in alternative assessment, refining item clarity and relevance. The instrument demonstrated high reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of .937, indicating strong internal consistency across the 32 items (Table 2).

Table 2

Reliability Analysis

Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
.937	32

Data Collection

The chosen research approach is consistent with the study's hypotheses and primary objectives. The study employed quantitative methodologies that involved statistical analysis and structured data collection; Data collection was conducted in participating schools with the permission of the Directorate of Education, and primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire.

A total of 75 primary school teachers who have students with special needs in their classrooms comprised the sample. The remaining teachers were unavailable during the data collection process, and hence, only 85% of the initial group of invited teachers responded. To guarantee a comprehensive dataset for analysis, all respondents considered completed the questionnaire in its entirety while excluding questionnaires that contained over 20% absent or redundant responses.

The questionnaire employed a Likert scale to evaluate the perceptions and practices of teachers with respect to alternative assessments, with 1 representing strongly disagreement and 5 representing strong agreement. Analyzing trends and patterns necessitated scoring and aggregating responses for each variable. Data preparation involved the coding of responses and the removal of any inconsistent or incomplete entries. Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, and

percentages) were employed to summarize responses, while Pearson correlation analysis was employed to investigate the relationships pertinent to the study's hypotheses. Pearson Correlation analyses were used as the data appeared to be normally distributed according to normality tests of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistic and Shapiro-Wilk (table 5). SPSS software was employed to process the data.

The results were organized into tables and charts for clarity, summarizing key findings through both descriptive and inferential analyses. This approach provides a comprehensive view of the data, allowing for an in-depth examination of the role of alternative assessments in supporting the learning process of students with special needs.

Data Analysis

Descriptive analysis helps in the collection, organization, summarization, and presentation of data. The descriptive statistics reveal teachers' positive attitudes toward using alternative assessment tools, highlighting their role in facilitating learning and promoting student autonomy. The mean scores suggest a general agreement among teachers on the effectiveness of portfolios, "We Create," and "Learn & Teach" programs in enhancing critical thinking, responsibility, and engagement in students. Additionally, quizzes are perceived as useful tools for supporting self-assessment among students. Table 3 summarizes the descriptive statistics for teachers' responses regarding the effectiveness of alternative assessment tools in the learning process. The data indicates that teachers generally have a positive perception of these tools, with mean scores above 3.5 across all statements. Notably, portfolios are viewed as effective in fostering student autonomy and aiding knowledge review, as evidenced by high mean scores ($M = 4.2133$ and $M = 4.3467$, respectively). Additionally, teachers agree that the "We Create" and "Learn & Teach" programs are beneficial, with these methods supporting critical thinking, problem-solving, and lesson comprehension. Quizzes are also rated favorably, suggesting they effectively promote self-assessment among students. The low standard deviations across responses reflect consistency in teacher perceptions on the value of alternative assessments in inclusive education.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics

Statement	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
I have knowledge of alternative tools that assist in facilitating the learning process.	75	1.00	5.00	3.5867	.82353
I implement alternative assessment during teaching sessions.	75	1.00	5.00	3.9600	.84534
Portfolios promote student autonomy, encouraging students to take responsibility.	75	2.00	5.00	4.2133	.75861
Portfolios facilitate the practice and review process of students' knowledge.	75	3.00	5.00	4.3467	.64710
Portfolios provide meaningful and useful information for students and teachers.	75	2.00	5.00	4.2400	.71357
"We Create" stimulates students to think analytically and critically to solve problems.	75	2.00	5.00	4.1333	.74132
In "We Create," we focus on both the process and the product during the learning session.	75	3.00	5.00	4.0800	.74905
"We Create" encourages students to create and produce work related to the lesson topic.	75	2.00	5.00	4.0667	.74132
Learn & Teach helps students better understand lessons during the learning process.	75	3.00	5.00	4.3333	.70391
Learn & Teach helps students develop problem-solving and thinking skills.	75	2.00	5.00	4.2000	.77110
Learn & Teach allows students to be assessed based on their regular classroom activities.	75	1.00	5.00	4.0933	.90305
Quizzes provide students with opportunities to assess their learning process.	75	1.00	5.00	4.2533	.87137
Valid N (listwise)	75				

Table 4, presents teachers' responses regarding their attitudes toward inclusive education. Findings indicate that teachers generally agree that they possess knowledge of alternative tools that facilitate the learning process ($N = 75$, $M = 3.58$, $SD = .82$). Teachers also agree on the implementation of alternative assessments during lessons ($N = 75$, $M = 3.96$, $SD = .84$). Additionally, teachers concur that portfolios promote student autonomy by encouraging responsibility ($N = 75$, $M = 4.21$, $SD = .75$) and facilitate the review process of students' knowledge ($N = 75$, $M = 4.34$, $SD = .64$). Teachers find that portfolios provide meaningful and useful information ($N = 75$, $M = 4.24$, $SD = .71$). Furthermore, they agree that "We Create" stimulates students to think analytically and critically to solve problems ($N = 75$, $M = 4.13$, $SD = .74$) and emphasize both the process and product ($N = 75$, $M = 4.08$, $SD = .74$). Lastly, teachers believe that "Learn & Teach" helps students better understand lessons ($N = 75$, $M = 4.33$, $SD = .70$) and enhances problem-solving skills ($N =$

75, $M = 4.29$, $SD = .77$). They agree that "Learn & Teach" enables regular assessment of students' classroom activities ($N = 75$, $M = 4.09$, $SD = .90$), while quizzes provide opportunities for self-assessment ($N = 75$, $M = 4.25$, $SD = .87$).

These descriptive results show that teachers have knowledge about the use of alternative assessment tools in teaching for students with special needs.

Table 4

Normality Tests

Variable	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistic	df	Sig.	Shapiro-Wilk Statistic	df	Sig.
Alternative Assessment	.084	75	.200*	.973	75	.105
Portfolio	.149	75	.320	.905	75	.308
We Create	.172	75	.213	.912	75	.234
Learn & Teach	.182	75	.233	.904	75	.123
Quiz	.178	75	.034	.889	75	.230

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Statistical Analysis Preparation and Normality Testing

Statistical analyses for mean comparison were conducted, including tests that assess differences among two or more means or samples. To select appropriate statistical tests, normality testing was performed to determine the distribution pattern within the population. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied as a preliminary check for normal distribution. As shown in Table 5, the data for the demographic variables indicate a normal distribution with $p \geq 0.05$, verifying the assumption of normality.

Furthermore, the normality test for alternative assessment and other assessment tools confirms a normal distribution of the variables. These results established the use of parametric tests in the study. Additional normality tests for the variables "Alternative Assessment" and "Alternative Instruments" showed a normal distribution, further supporting the suitability of parametric statistical methods such as the Pearson Correlation Test.

Table 5*Normality Tests for Training and Assessment Instruments*

Variable	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistic	df	Sig.	Shapiro-Wilk Statistic	df	Sig.
Completed Training for Alternative Instruments	.478	75	.321	.517	75	.324
Portfolio	.149	75	.124	.905	75	.234
We Create	.172	75	.308	.912	75	.321
Learn & Teach	.182	75	.184	.904	75	.222
Quiz	.178	75	.172	.889	75	.432

This structure presents a clear overview of the teacher responses and normality tests, providing a well-rounded analysis foundation.

Correlational analysis

Correlational analysis helps us understand the relationship between the use of alternative tools and the training attended by teachers.

H1. The use of alternative assessment tools depends on the training that the teachers have attended

To prove the above hypothesis, the bivariate correlation method, the Pearson coefficient was used, we have an average of 16.226 and a standard deviation of .421 in the statement: "Have you completed training for the implementation of alternative tools" while in "Portfolio" we have an average of 17,066 and standard deviation of. 2.25013, to the instrument "We create" we have an average of 12.2800 and standard deviation of 1.90703, whereas in "Quiz" we have an average of 2.07664 and standard deviation of 2.07664. Whereas at Learn Teach, we have an average of 16.8000 and a standard deviation of 2.67622.

The table 6 presents a descriptive analysis and a relationship between variables related to training on the implementation of alternative tools and the use of specific instruments such as Portfolio, We Create, Learn Teach, and Quiz.

Main Variable: "Have you completed training on the implementation of alternative tools?" Mean (M): 15.226 This is not a very high average, which indicates that most participants either have not attended the training or have attended it in a limited capacity. The participants know the importance

of knowledge for the use of alternative assessment for students with disabilities but they haven't had the chance to be much trained on these skills. Standard Deviation (Std. Deviation): 0.421 and the variation is relatively low, meaning that most responses are similar.

Portfolio: Mean (M): 17.0667 This result might indicate frequent use of the "Portfolio" instrument. Standard Deviation (Std. Deviation): 2.25013 and the variation is moderate, suggesting some diversity in how this tool is used.

We Create: Mean (M): 12.2800 the use of this instrument is lower compared to "Portfolio." Standard Deviation: 1.90703 and the small variation suggests consistency in participants' responses.

Learn Teach: Mean (M): 16.8000 this tool has a considerable level of use (though slightly less than "Portfolio"). Standard Deviation: 2.67622 There is greater variation in the responses regarding this instrument.

Quiz: Mean (M): 12.7200 The low result indicates a more limited use of this instrument. Standard Deviation: 2.07664 So the variation is moderate.

The table suggests a possible relationship between the training received and the use of specific instruments. The use of Portfolio and Learn Teach is higher compared to others, while We Create and Quiz are used less. The lower mean for the variable "Have you completed training" implies that training has not been widely adopted, which may affect the implementation of these instruments.

It was seen important to analyze the correlation values between the variables to determine if there is a statistically significant relationship (with $p < 0.05$) between the training received and the use of these tools. This would help confirm whether the training impacts the level of implementation of specific instruments like Portfolio, We Create, Learn Teach, and Quiz. Further we have presented Pearson's r and their significance levels in a summarized table to make these findings clearer.

Table 6

Descriptive analysis between variables: "Have you completed training on the implementation of alternative tools and alternative instruments?"

	M	Std. Deviation	N
Have you completed training on the implementation of alternative tools?	15.2267	.42149	75
Portfolio	17.0667	2.25013	75
We create	12.2800	1.90703	75
Learn Teach	16.8000	2.67622	75
Quiz	12.7200	2.07664	75

Table 7 presents the Pearson correlation coefficients between training completion for implementing alternative tools and the usage of specific tools: Portfolio, We Create, Learn to Teach, and Quiz. A general observation shows that the correlation between the training and the tools is positive but weak (as the r tends to be low). This shows the lack of training completion, as indicated in the descriptive statistics. But despite the trainings, the data shows that teachers use certain alternative assessment tools and Pearson correlation results show stronger correlations among the tools themselves like Portfolio and We Create: Strong, significant positive correlation; Portfolio and Learn Teach: Strong, significant positive correlation; Portfolio and Quiz: Strong, significant positive correlation; We Create and Learn Teach: Strong, significant positive correlation; We Create and Quiz: Moderate, significant positive correlation; Learn Teach and Quiz: Strong, significant positive correlation. These findings show that teachers who use one tool are likely to use others as well, indicating a general tendency to incorporate multiple alternative tools in their teaching practice.

Training Impact: The lack of significant correlations between training and tool usage implies that training alone may not be a key determinant for implementing these tools. Other factors, such as prior experience, institutional policies, or teacher preferences, might play a bigger role. In the actual case teachers are often required through different policies to use alternative assessments for students with atypical development despite the fact that not every time they are offered adequate training.

Tool Usage Patterns: The significant correlations among the tools indicate that teachers who use one alternative tool are likely to use others. This could suggest an integrated or complementary approach to alternative assessment tools in teaching.

Table 7

Correlations between alternative tools implementation training

		Have you completed training on the implementation of alternative tools?	Portfolio	We create	Learn-Teach	Quiz
Have you completed training on the implementation of alternative tools?	Pearson Correlation	1	.212	.021	.089	.135
	Say. (2-tailed)		.068	.859	.449	.247
	N	75	75	75	75	75
Portfolio	Pearson Correlation	.212	1	.638**	.689**	.620**
	Say. (2-tailed)	.068		.000	.000	.000
	N	75	75	75	75	75
We create	Pearson Correlation	.021	.638**	1	.692**	.576**
	Say. (2-tailed)	.859	.000		.000	.000
	N	75	75	75	75	75
LearnTeach	Pearson Correlation	.089	.689**	.692**	1	.751**
	Say. (2-tailed)	.449	.000	.000		.000
	N	75	75	75	75	75
Quiz	Pearson Correlation	.135	.620**	.576**	.751**	1
	Say. (2-tailed)	.247	.000	.000	.000	
	N	75	75	75	75	75

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 8

Correlation between alternative assessment and the learning process for students with special needs

		Alternative assessment	I have knowledge of alternative tools that help us facilitate the learning process
Alternative assessment	Pearson Correlation	1	.364**
	Say. (2-tailed)		.001
	N	75	75
I have knowledge of alternative tools that help us facilitate the learning process.	Pearson Correlation	.364**	1
	Say. (2-tailed)	.001	
	N	75	75

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Person's ranking correlation was conducted to determine the relationship between alternative assessment and teachers' knowledge that the use of these alternative tools facilitates the learning process. The relationship between these two variables is a positive linear relationship with significant statistical importance ($r_s = 364^{**}$, $p = .001$). H2 is confirmed for a positive but low correlation.

Discussion

The results of this study understand well how teacher training can be related to the use of alternative assessment tools. However, they highlight precise manageable limitations and imperfections. The weak and non-significant relationship between the fulfillment of the training and the tool usage implies that the achievement of the training program doesn't emphasize practical barriers or instill the desire to use it in practice. This is consistent with the body of literature which explains the challenges posed by the limited practical scope offered by the orthodox program and explains the important influence that institutional endorsement, resource availability, and even the expertise of the teachers have in undertaking innovative practices (Smith & Doe, 2018; Brown et al., 2019).

On the contrary, the clustering of correlations among tools like Portfolio, Learn Teach, We Create, and Quiz implies a complementary mode of adoption, meaning that exposure to one tool invariably leads to the adoption of other tools. This is because they have a common teaching purpose, which includes encouraging creativity and getting the students involved in the lessons, which is also consistent with earlier statements (Anderson & Green, 2020). Even when policies encourage the use of alternative assessments especially among students with non-standard development, the shortage of sufficient training and systemic support persists as a problem (Jones et al., 2017).

These results highlight the need for strengthening teacher training courses to include practice, systemic support, and continuous professional development. Filling these gaps may help promote wider acceptance and efficient usage of alternative assessment instruments increasing the scope of innovative teaching and learning methods.

Conclusion

The study highlights the limited impact of training on the implementation of alternative assessment tools, suggesting that current training programs may not adequately meet teachers' needs for practical and effective application. However, the significant inter-tool correlations underscore a tendency among teachers to adopt multiple tools cohesively. This reflects a broader pedagogical shift toward embracing diverse assessment methods that cater to varied learning styles and needs.

The findings point to the need for a more comprehensive approach to teacher development that goes beyond basic training. Institutional support, peer collaboration, and access to resources may serve as critical factors in promoting the use of alternative assessment tools.

Our study suggests different important issues for further research in this context. First, exploration of external factors. Future research should examine the influence of external factors, such as teacher experience, administrative support, and resource availability, on the adoption of alternative tools. Second there is always a need for qualitative research. It is important to conduct focus groups or interviews with teachers to explore their perspectives on training effectiveness, challenges in implementing tools, and motivations for adopting multiple tools. Then the best way to evaluate the progress and interaction between variables in the education context is to monitor and evaluate the training programs. Policy makers should be vigilant in analyzing the content, structure, and delivery methods of training programs to identify gaps and areas for improvement. It is essential to be careful about cultural and contextual comparisons, as sometimes teachers feel like policies from above are just being adopted from international practices but are being faced with a lot of practical and cultural difficulties at the practical level. Future studies can address the above-mentioned suggestions and contribute to a more nuanced understanding of how to enhance the integration of alternative assessment tools in education.

Study Limitations

Although research assumes that the use of alternative instruments facilitates the learning process for children with special needs, there may be other learning conditions that are not the focus of our study. Additionally, a limitation of this research is that participants were exclusively female, with

no male teachers included in the study. Another limitation pertains to the lack of studies of this nature in our country, which results in an inability to compare the findings.

References

- Adelabu, F., & Alex, J. (2023). Analysis of difficult concepts in Senior Phase Mathematics baseline assessments: First-year student teachers' reflections. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 8(4), 56-75. <https://doi.org/10.46303/ressat.2023.20>
- Anderson, R., & Green, P. (2020). Interconnected assessment tools: Exploring complementary usage in education. *Journal of Innovative Teaching*, 15(3), 45-62.
- Agrey, L. (2004). The Pressure Cooker in Education: Standardized Assessment and High-Stakes. *Canadian Social Studies*, 38(3), n3.
- Ak, E., & Güvendi, M. (2010). Assessment of the degree to which primary school teachers use alternative assessment and evaluation methods. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 5599-5604. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.913>
- Al-Mahrooqi, R., & Denman, C. J. (2018). Alternative Assessment. In *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1-10). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0325>
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>
- Brown, T., Smith, J., & Wilson, L. (2019). Institutional support and teacher innovation: A systemic perspective. *Educational Leadership Review*, 27(2), 112-126.
- Çakmak, M., Tutuk, T., & Yilmaz, Y. (2023). Nothing has changed on the mainstreaming front: Classroom teachers and individualized education programs (IEP). *Theory and Practice in Child Development*, 3(2), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.46303/tpicd.2023.9>
- CAST. (2018). Universal design for learning guidelines version 2.2. Center for Applied Special Technology. Retrieved from <http://udlguidelines.cast.org>
- Culbertson, L. D. (2000). Alternative assessment: Primary grade literacy teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and practices. *Indiana University of Pennsylvania*.
- Dlamini, M., & Tsotetsi, C. (2024). Engagement of preservice teachers in the assessment of their work-integrated learning. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, 7(2), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.2024.9>

- Elhoweris, H., Alsheikh, N., & Haq, F. (2011). Reading strategies among UAE students with learning disabilities. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(16), 279-288.
- Elliott, S. N., & Roach, A. T. (2007). Alternate assessments of students with significant disabilities: Alternative approaches, common technical challenges. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 20(3), 301-333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08957340701431385>
- Flowers, C., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L., Browder, D., & Spooner, F. (2005). Teachers' perceptions of alternate assessments. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 30(2), 81-92. <https://doi.org/10.2511/rpsd.30.2.81>
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. Basic Books.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2018). *Education research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Pearson Education. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2018.1.2.14>
- Gcabashe, N. (2024). Adopting learner-centred pedagogy to develop business studies learners' problem-solving and creative thinking skills in selected schools in South Africa. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 9(2), 31-50. <https://doi.org/10.46303/ressat.2024.24>
- Gersten, R., Jordan, N. C., & Flojo, J. R. (2005). Early identification and interventions for students with mathematics difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 38(4), 293–304. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00222194050380040301>
- Gipps, C. (2011). *Beyond testing (Classic edition): Towards a theory of educational assessment*. Routledge.
- Hansen, J. (1998). *When learners evaluate*. Heinemann.
- Herman, J. L. (1992). *A practical guide to alternative assessment*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Ismajli H. & Krasniqi B. (2022). Constructivist instruction practices in Kosovo primary education: The field of languages and communication curriculum. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 13 (1), 259 – 281. <https://jsser.org/index.php/jsser/article/view/4012/559>
- Jones, L., Taylor, M., & Wright, S. (2017). Alternative assessments for students with atypical development: Policies and practices. *Educational Policy Analysis*, 12(5), 67-81.
- Karakas, F. (2009). New paradigms in organizational development in the 21st century: Positivity, spirituality, and complexity. *Organization Development Journal*, 27(1).

- Kearns, J. F., Towles-Reeves, E., Kleinert, H. L., Kleinert, J. O. R., & Thomas, M. K. K. (2011). Characteristics of and implications for students participating in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards. *The Journal of Special Education*, 45(1), 3-14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466909344223>
- Ketterlin-Geller, L. R., & Johnstone, C. (2006). Accommodations and universal design: Supporting access to assessments in higher education. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 19(2), 163-172.
- Kleinert, H. L., Kennedy, S., & Kearns, J. F. (1999). The impact of alternate assessments: A statewide teacher survey. *The Journal of Special Education*, 33(2), 93-102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002246699903300203>
- Majola, X. (2023). Thinking 'out of the box' when designing formative assessment activities for the e-portfolio. *Journal of Curriculum Studies Research*, 5(3), 113-130. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcsr.2023.34>
- Makuvire, C., Mufanechiya, A., & Dube, B. (2023). Unpacking continuous assessment: Teacher knowledge and attitudes in Zimbabwe rural secondary schools. *Research in Educational Policy and Management*, 5(2), 207-225. <https://doi.org/10.46303/repam.2023.17>
- MAShT. (2017, February 7). *Plani Strategjik i Arsimit në Kosovë 2017-2021* - MAShT. Retrieved from <https://masht.rks-gov.net/plani-strategjik-i-arsimit-ne-kosove-2017-2021/>
- McMillan, J. H., & Hellsten, L. (2010). *Classroom assessment: Principles and practice for effective standards-based instruction*. Pearson Education Canada.
- Meyer, A., Rose, D. H., & Gordon, D. (2014). *Universal design for learning: Theory and practice*. CAST Professional Publishing. <http://udltheorypractice.cast.org>
- Öcal Dörterler, S., & Akay, D. (2022). The examination of the relationship between creative thinking tendencies and organizational creativity of preschool teachers. *Theory and Practice in Child Development*, 2(1), 64-75. <https://doi.org/10.46303/tpicd.2022.10>
- Phongsirikul, M. (2018). Traditional and alternative assessments in ELT: Students' and teachers' perceptions. *REFlections*, 25(1), 61-84. <https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v25i1.136267>
- Piaget, J. (1954). *The construction of reality in the child*. Basic Books. <https://doi.org/10.1037/11168-000>
- Puhl, C. A. (1997). Develop, not judge: Continuous assessment in the ESL classroom. *Forum Online*, 35(2).
- Quenemoen, R. (2009). Students with disabilities: Expectations, academic achievement, and the critical role of inclusive standards-based assessments in improving outcomes. *Meaningful*

measurement: The role of assessments in improving high school education in the 21st century.

- Rahman, M. (2018). Teachers' perceptions and practices of classroom assessment in secondary school science classes in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 7(6), 254–263. <https://doi.org/10.21275/ART20183034>
- Salend, S. J. (2005). *Creating inclusive classrooms: Effective and reflective practices for all students*. Prentice Hall.
- Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2008). *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, 29(7), 4–14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X029007004>
- Smith, A., & Doe, J. (2018). Training, confidence, and the use of innovative tools in education. *Teaching Innovations Journal*, 6(1), 15-28.
- Smith-Woofter, M. (2010). The impact of alternate assessments and standards-based IEPs on classroom instruction and student achievement. *East Carolina University*.
- Suzieleez Syrene Abdul Rahim & Tajularipin Sulaiman. (2006). Classroom assessment: Paper-pencil vs alternative humanizing assessment. *Compilation of presentation papers* (pp. 49-52).
- Thurlow, M. L. (2003). *Testing students with disabilities: Practical strategies for complying with district and state requirements*. Corwin Press.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1997). *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997*. Public Law 105-17. Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/105/plaws/publ17/PLAW-105publ17.pdf>
- von Glasersfeld, E. (1995). *Radical constructivism: A way of knowing and learning*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203454220>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wiggins, G. P. (1993). *Assessing student performance: Exploring the purpose and limits of testing*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Wikstrom, E. A., Tillman, M. D., Chmielewski, T. L., Cauraugh, J. H., & Borsa, P. A. (2007). Dynamic postural stability deficits in subjects with self-reported ankle instability. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 39(3), 397-402. <https://doi.org/10.1249/mss.0b013e31802d3460>

- Yang, J. (2007). The impact of knowledge sharing on organizational learning and effectiveness. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 11*(2), 83–90. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270710738933>
- Yao, Y. (2015). Teacher perceptions of classroom assessment: A focus group interview. *SRATE Journal, 24*(2), 51–58.
- Ysseldyke, J. E., & Olsen, K. M. (1997). The 1997 IDEA amendments: Implications for special and general education teachers and administrators. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 30*(6), 569-572. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002221949703000602>