

# Evaluations of Learners, Teachers and School Management Boards with Regard to the Indicators of Contemporary Teacher Competences

Daria Tot

Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb

## Abstract

*The paper presents the results of the study into the opinions that learners, teachers, and school management have about the indicators of contemporary teacher competences. The study included 876 participants, lower/higher grade teachers, primary school management boards and learners. The adults considered establishing a nice relationship between teachers and learners/other school employees as the most important measurable indicator. The learners ranked teacher competences focused on learner needs very high (the first, second, and third important). Factor analysis was used for classifying 23 indicators of contemporary teacher competences into three groups, taking into account evaluations by both learners and adults. Statistically significant differences were found in their opinions. The results of the study have their application value because they indicate the recommendation of permanent expansion with regard to professional competences due to the new roles of teachers in contemporary teaching.*

**Key words:** *teaching profession; teaching skills*

## Introduction

The importance of a competent teacher is reflected in the quality of his/her educational activities regarding the support of child development. The teacher is no more seen as a person responsible for knowledge transfer. This role has changed, from being less informative to being more formative (Sherin, 2007). He/she is expected to stimulate the development of learners' abilities, to teach them how to

learn, to prepare them for acquiring the intercultural and multicultural competences. Different commissions (e.g. Joint Report by the European Council and the European Commission on Progress towards Education and Training 2010)<sup>1</sup> have concluded that the teacher is a key person in developing educational systems, conducting reforms, and preparing learners for the world citizenship.

The activities of teachers are analysed according to three interrelated roles they have in the school environment; that of an officer, an expert, and a man (Resman, 1990). Consequently, it is possible to discuss his/her competences, as well. The general competence results from the role of the teacher viewed as an expert, while the pedagogical competence refers to the view of the teacher as a pedagogical expert (Shulman, 1986). The hierarchical competence reflects the teacher as an officer. None of them can be excluded, but the priority should be given to the first two competences – general and pedagogical (Dann, 1989; Day, 1999; Dillabough, 1999). They both regard the development of teacher abilities and skills needed for solving certain problems in the class, then teacher training for the improvement of programmes and achievement of his/her own professional aims, and motivation for permanent learning that is important not only for his/her professional development, but also for the avoidance of routine and exhaustion.

Nickel (see in Pšunder, 1994) considers the teacher competences throughout his/her direct, democratic, and interpersonal relation with the learner. She developed the transactional model of general, pedagogical, and hierarchical competences. Starting from this, Pšunder (1994) conducted a study into the teacher favourable characteristics. She revealed that learners wanted the teacher who would be 'the master of the trade', continuously having access to professional training after his/her initial education. They wanted the autonomous teacher who trusted pupils. It is, thus, the teacher general and pedagogical competence, based on his/her personality and knowledge. The teacher hierarchical competence is reflected in his/her legal authority. It does not stem from his/her personality and real knowledge, but it is given to him/her due to the fact that he/she has become the teacher – has been educated to be the teacher (knowledge is just implied then). The legal authority changes, in direct educational activities, through interweaving the teacher personality, knowledge, and personal style into the active authority. Kyriacou (1995) thinks that teaching skills are of great significance to the teacher. They include special types of knowledge (with regard to subject, learners, curriculum, teaching methods, etc.), decision-making (on how to obtain the expected pedagogical results in the easiest way - before, during, and after classes), teacher actions and behaviours aimed at motivating learners to learn. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has rejected the premise according to which particular content knowledge is crucial in quality teaching, and emphasised that research had shown that teachers who had been theoretically and practically taught on how to teach in the course

---

<sup>1</sup> Education and Training 2010 – The Success of the Lisbon Strategy Hinges on Urgent Reforms, (J.I.R.)  
Joint Temporary Report accepted by the European Council and the European Commission on 26<sup>th</sup> Feb, 2004, p. 28

of their studies significantly outperformed their age peers who had not received such education when studying (even more than 70% in mathematics).

The teacher competences, except for formal knowledge and skills, should be valued according to the quality of changes regarding the learners. What is also important is the relation of the learner to the teacher. The teacher should know how to activate the learner potentials. A large part of the activities refers to the teacher's professional competences and the results of his/her professional engagement. Previously responsible for the transmission of teaching contents, he/she is now becoming the creator of teaching and learning curricula, in charge of the accomplishment of goals during the teaching process he/she designs.

Bauman Knight (2002) thinks that the teacher credibility model, which includes ability, trust, and dynamics, is an excellent way of comprehensibly acquiring the needed competences. The above-mentioned model can better explain why learners have positive or negative opinions about their teachers. It is then important that teachers really understand the opinions of their learners to be able to correct their own behaviours and, taking a long-term view, the behaviours of learners will also change as a result of improved learning. The concept presented in this study is well-chosen when teaching and learning situations are analysed. Learners are always in a situation to assess 'the values' of their teacher(s). His/her values or credibility are tested every day.

The realistic (pragmatic) understanding of teaching is not the reason to turn the teacher professionalism into a personal secret. The teacher competences can be learnt. Professionalism in this job is based on the professional-personal developmental process. The teacher competences are acquired through studying, and developed within the experiential professional field (Korthagen, 2004; Boschhuizen et al., 2005). Besides, competences are not acquired 'now and for good'. They do not appear in the form of sudden quantum jump. They gradually develop from particular pre-degrees and forms towards their highest individual achievement. The speed at which stages are reached differs from teacher to teacher. The same can be said about the range and depth of competences. Yet, all teachers should reach minimal standards. And what standards are significant to learners and teachers, and also to school management? What is the level of favourable competences that replace the traditional professional functions of teachers with the contemporary ones? We found these questions to be useful in the current study, the aim of which was to determine how three interrelated categories of participants (learners, teachers, school management) evaluated the teacher competences and their importance.

## **Problems of the Study**

To examine the opinions of teachers, learners and school management regarding the important indicators of contemporary teacher competences.

To examine potential differences in the opinions of lower/higher grade teachers and school management regarding the importance of indicators of contemporary teacher competences.

## Method

### *Participants*

The study included 876 participants, 564 primary school (lower and higher grade) teachers and school management boards<sup>2</sup>, and 312 eighth graders. The study was conducted in 43 primary schools in the County of Primorje-Gorski kotar, the County of Istria, and the County of Lika-Senj.

### *Instruments and Procedure*

A special 23-item questionnaire was constructed for this study, regarding the indicators of contemporary teacher competences. Learners, teachers, and school management boards had the same items (statements) in terms of their contents. However, taking into account the age of learners and their ability to evaluate some teacher competences, the learners were given 20 items<sup>3</sup> linguistically adapted for them. Each item included answers on the Likert-type scale, from 1=value to be neglected, to 5 = extremely large value. The total result in case of particular factors was achieved on the basis of item means and theoretically ranged from 1 to 5.

The factor analysis (teachers and school management boards *versus* learners) was used for determining and selecting the indicators of contemporary teacher competences. Variance analysis was applied for determining the differences in giving significance to particular indicators and the obtained factors of teacher competences between teachers and school management boards.

## Results and Discussion

### *Contemporary Teacher Competences Evaluated by Teachers and School Management*

Lower and higher grade teachers as well as principals and their professional associates considered the following indicators of contemporary teacher competences as the most important ones (Table 1): *established nice relationship with learners and other school employees; respect for general ethic and spiritual values, and respect for differences and competence and skill of communication and expression.*

In order to determine the factor structure of indicators, evaluated by teachers and school management boards, a factor analysis of the main components was needed (with Varimax rotation on 23 indicators). Using Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test of adequacy, it was determined that data obtained from teachers and school management board were appropriate for factorisation (KMO teachers and school management board= 0.953). According to Guttman-Kaiser criterion, the factors having a characteristic root above 1 were retained.

---

<sup>2</sup> The term *school management board* refers to principals and their professional associates in schools.

<sup>3</sup> All 20 indicators are in accordance with the indicators evaluated by teachers and school management boards.

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics for contemporary teacher competence indicators, evaluated by teachers and school management

Indicators of contemporary teacher competences	M	SD
Established nice relationship with learners and other school employees	4.59	0.588
Respect for general ethic and spiritual values, and respect for differences	4.55	0.583
Competence and skill of communication and expression	4.51	0.597
Competence for analysing and successful learner problem solving	4.48	0.591
Competence for logical, critical, and creative thinking (and making decisions)	4.47	0.614
Competence for quality observation, evaluation, and assessment of learner achievements and learning process	4.46	0.587
Success in identifying learner talents and other values	4.45	0.601
Competence and motivation for permanent improvement of teaching/learning quality	4.45	0.601
Awareness of needed permanent professional training and professional development	4.43	0.602
Skill of making critical judgements and improving one's own professional activity	4.43	0.599
Competence for preparing learners for lifelong education *	4.42	0.671
Sensitivity to troubles, problems, fears, and learner expectations, empathy	4.40	0.647
Skill of active communication, successful cooperation with learner parents	4.39	0.619
Competence for identifying learners exposed to risky factors (behavioural problems, developmental problems, etc.) and help in their solving	4.38	0.634
High level of professional and pedagogical-psychological competence	4.37	0.636
Awareness of needed permanent expansion of modern functional knowledge and skill	4.34	0.620
Competence for identifying learners with special needs and working with them*	4.25	0.708
Competence for expressing, recognising, and detecting emotions	4.18	0.674
Competence and motivation for team work	4.17	0.672
Competence for skilful use of modern ICTs in teaching	4.14	0.639
Competence for using humour in teaching	4.05	0.731
Competence for conducting action and other operative research	3.98	0.660
High level of organisational and administrative knowledge and skills *	3.88	0.682

The results of explanatory factor analysis showed that three factors jointly explained 56.56% of the variance in the case of contemporary teacher competence indicators. The largest percentage was explained by the first factor, which was 45.60% before rotation, i.e. 21.04 % after rotation.

After rotation (7 iterations), all indicators of contemporary teacher competences were classified into 3 factors (Table 2). In the first factor, nine indicators were grouped regarding *social competence and competence for detecting learner needs, abilities, and*

skills. The range of burden factor of indicators in the first factor was 0.755 and 0.454. Nine indicators of the second factor *competence for the quality of programmes and teaching, as well as learner and teacher lifelong education* have contribution coefficients from 0.760 to 0.421. The third factor included five indicators related to *competence for critical and creative communication aimed at learner and teacher development*. Their burden factor ranged from 0.754 to 0.463. Cronbach alpha was satisfactory.

The results were in accordance with teacher positioning in terms of contemporary teacher competence indicators, as their orientation to social competences and learner needs, abilities, and skills was evident. Due to the increasing requirements for teacher lifelong education, it was expected that teachers and school management boards would be more orientated to considerations preferring the development of awareness of one's own professional training and advancement. The existence of professional development culture is related to teacher responsibility for developing and improving practice and providing mutual information about new perspectives (Kerr, 2000). However, it might have been affected by inadequate, discouraging, contemporary settings (social and school), not adapted to learner and teacher needs; the settings in which teachers conduct their professional activities and acquire their professional knowledge (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005).

**Table 2.** Factor structure of indicators of contemporary teacher competences evaluated by teachers and school management boards: factor burden and Cronbach alpha coefficients

Indicators of contemporary teacher competences	Components			α
	1	2	3	
<b>Factor 1: Social competence and competence for detecting learner needs, abilities, and skills</b>				<b>0.891</b>
<i>Sensitivity to troubles, problems, fears, and learner expectations, empathy</i>	0.775			
<i>Competence for identifying learners exposed to risky factors (behavioural problems, developmental problems, etc.) and help in their solving</i>	0.755			
<i>Competence for expressing, recognising, and detecting emotions</i>	0.706			
<i>Skill of active communication, successful cooperation with learner parents</i>	0.660			
<i>Success in identifying learner talents, and other values</i>	0.647			
<i>Established nice relationship with learners and other school employees</i>	0.637			
<i>Competence for identifying learners with special needs and working with them</i>	<b>0.607</b>	0.466		
<i>Competence for using humour in teaching</i>	<b>0.461</b>	0.309		
<i>Respect for general ethic and spiritual values, and respect for differences</i>	0.454		4.36	
<b>Factor 2: Competence for quality of programmes and teaching, and learners' and teachers' lifelong education</b>				<b>0.882</b>
<i>Awareness of needed permanent professional training and professional development</i>		0.760		
<i>Competence and motivation for team work</i>		0.756		
<i>Awareness of needed permanent expansion of modern functional knowledge and skills</i>		0.710		
<i>Competence and motivation for permanent improvement of teaching/learning quality</i>	0.314	<b>0.648</b>	0.333	
<i>High level of organisational and administrative knowledge and skills</i>		0.581		

High level of professional and pedagogical-psychological competence		<b>0.532</b>	0.478	
Competence for conducting action and other operative research		<b>0.511</b>	0.355	
Competence for preparing learners for lifelong education	0.472	0.477		
Competence for skilful use of modern ICTs in teaching		<b>0.421</b>	0.401	
<b>Factor 3: Competence for critical and creative communication aimed at learner and teacher development</b>				<b>0.836</b>
Competence and skill of communication and expression			0.754	
Competence for logical, critical, and creative thinking (and making conclusions)			0.729	
Skill of making critical judgements and improving one's own professional activity		0.344	<b>0.679</b>	
Competence for analysing and successful learner problem solving	0.360		0.657	
Competence for quality observation, evaluation, and assessment of learner achievements and learning process	0.404	0.369	<b>0.463</b>	

### *Contemporary Teacher Competences Evaluated by Learners*

Learners reserved the first five ranks for those indicators that determined the teacher as somebody who: respected all learners regardless of their differences; justly evaluated and assessed learner activities and achievements in the teaching process; successfully detected learners with learning problems and worked with them; successfully communicated with learners, parents, and other persons; recognised and successfully solved learner problems (succeeded in teaching the learner how to learn in an easier and better manner). It is clear that learners emphasised justice and those teacher competences which enabled them some help with learning and problem solving. The orientation of learners to their own teaching and learning needs is understandable, but it should be also taken into account that learners can classify the strong and weak points of teachers quite objectively (Duke & Stiggins, 1986). Both learners and teachers, as expected, ranked high teacher competence for quality observation, evaluation, and assessment of learner achievements and learning process. However, it is interesting and indicative that teachers and learners saw bringing teacher humour and good mood in classes differently. Learners ranked this indicator relatively high (7<sup>th</sup>), while teachers saw it almost at the end of the scale of contemporary teacher competences. Following such considerations, there is an increasing number of requirements among practitioners and researchers for the quality of teaching helped by good mood and humour, which can finally contribute to better learning and teaching (e.g. Matijević, 1994; Dickhäuser, 2002).

Using Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test of adequacy, it was determined that data obtained from learners were appropriate for factorisation ( $KMO_{learners} = 0.935$ ). According to Guttman-Kaiser criterion, the retained factors had a characteristic root above 1.

The results of the explanatory factor analysis showed that three factors jointly explained 56.90% of the variance with regard to the indicators of contemporary teacher competences. The largest percentage explained the first factor from 43.75% before rotation, and 23.38% after rotation.

In order to determine the factor structure of indicators, evaluated by learners, the factor analysis of the main components was needed (with Varimax rotation on 20 indicators).

**Table 3.** Descriptive statistics of indicators of contemporary teacher competences, evaluated by learners

Teacher is good and professional when:	M	SD
<i>s/he respects all learners regardless of their differences</i>	4.59	0.914
<i>s/he justly evaluates and assesses learner activities and achievements in teaching</i>	4.52	0.875
<i>s/he successfully detects learners with learning problems and works with them</i>	4.47	0.91
<i>s/he successfully communicates with learners, parents, and other persons</i>	4.43	0.826
<i>s/he recognises learner problems and solves them with success</i>	4.41	0.899
<i>s/he succeeds in teaching learners how to learn easier and better</i>	4.41	0.954
<i>s/he has a nice relationship with learners and other school employees</i>	4.4	0.895
<i>s/he brings humour and good mood in teaching</i>	4.33	0.978
<i>s/he has empathy for learners and learners can ask him/her for help</i>	4.3	0.974
<i>s/he makes good judgements and improvements in his/her teaching</i>	4.29	0.858
<i>s/he detects learner talents with success</i>	4.29	0.976
<i>s/he can recognise learners with behavioural problems and help them</i>	4.27	0.944
<i>s/he thinks and concludes logically, critically, and creatively</i>	4.26	0.924
<i>s/he studies and introduces efficient and interesting teaching methods</i>	4.26	0.989
<i>s/he understands that s/he also needs to upgrade his/her knowledge all the time, and adapt to changes and adapt to</i>	4.26	0.939
<i>s/he constantly improves his/her teaching quality - learning in teaching process</i>	4.23	0.955
<i>s/he understands different worries, problems, fears, and expectations of learners</i>	4.21	0.978
<i>s/he cooperates with other teachers in his/her work</i>	3.97	1.017
<i>s/he uses computer and other modern teaching devices</i>	3.66	1.14
<i>s/he successfully communicates with learners, parents, and other persons</i>	3.56	1.277

After rotation (10 iterations) almost all indicators evaluated by learners (indicators of good and professional teacher) were classified into three factors (Table 4). Item *uses computer and other contemporary devices in teaching* was not taken into account because of its low burden factor (0.358) and its inadequacy in terms of the third factor contents, so the factor analysis was repeated without this item. The first factor included the indicators that were related, in terms of their contents, to *positive features of teacher personality and care and support given to learners in their development*. The burden factor indicators ranged from 0.743 to 0.400. The second factor indicators *permanent improvement of teaching quality and individual professional development* have the contribution coefficient ranging from 0.743 to 0.589. The third factor included the indicators regarding successful cooperation and communication with all subjects in the process of teaching and learning. Their burden factor ranged from 0.683 to 0.470. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients confirmed high internal consistency for each factor.

**Table 4.** Factor structure of indicators of contemporary teacher competences evaluated by learners: factor burden and Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient

Indicators of good and professional teacher	Components			$\alpha$
	1	2	3	
<b>Factor 1: Positive features of teacher personality, and permanent care and support given to learners in their development</b>				<b>0.902</b>
s/he justly evaluates and assesses learner activities and achievements in teaching process	0.743	0.324		
s/he brings humour and good mood in teaching	0.704			
s/he has empathy for learners and they can ask him/her for help	0.699		0.322	
s/he has a nice relationship with learners and other school employees	0.669		0.308	
s/he succeeds in teaching learners how to easier and better learn	0.625	0.421		
s/he can recognise learners with behavioural problems and help them	0.607		0.499	
s/he respects all learners regardless of their differences	0.584	0.485		
s/he successfully detects learners with learning problems and works with them	0.581	0.528		
s/he understands different worries, problems, fears, and expectations of learners	0.575		0.533	
s/he recognises learner problems and solves them with success	0.400		0.301	
<b>Factor 2: Permanent improvement of teaching quality, and teacher professional development</b>				<b>0.818</b>
s/he thinks and concludes logically, critically, and creatively		0.743		
s/he permanently improves teaching/learning quality		0.705	0.316	
s/he studies and introduces efficient and interesting teaching methods	0.424	0.672		
s/he justly makes good judgements and improvements in his/her teaching		0.597	0.385	
s/he understands that s/he also needs to upgrade his/her teaching		0.589	0.302	
<b>Factor 3: Successful cooperation and communication with all subjects in teaching/learning process</b>				<b>0.710</b>
s/he cooperates with families of learners with success			0.683	
s/he detects learner talents with success	0.365		0.619	
s/he cooperates with other teachers in his/her work		0.384	0.605	
s/he successfully communicates with learners, parents, and other persons		0.402	0.470	

Based on the learners' evaluations, it can be noticed that they preferred those teacher competences under *positive features of teacher personality*, as well as *care and support given to learners in their development*. Learners are self-centred so that they want a teacher who is fair, in good mood, and who can help them learn better and easier; they also expect a warm relationship and social support from the teacher. As they are learners, it is understandable that they are less-oriented to the group of indicators including cooperation with parents and other subjects in the process of education.

New competences and changes in the national curriculum regarding compulsory education (Baranović, 2006) point out the orientation to learner achievements, in other words competences that the learner should acquire after a certain educational stage. Therefore, the contemporary teacher and learner requirements are identical in the field of developing communication skills, autonomous learning ability, social skills (ethical and positive approaches, and responsibility), team work skill, ability to accept changed circumstances, thinking skill, data search and evaluation skills (to know where to find information and how to process it) (Bates, 2004). Evaluating teacher competences, our participants (both learners and adults) were focused on social skills as well as the skills oriented toward learner needs, abilities, and skills.

## Differences in Evaluating the Indicators of Contemporary Teacher Competences

In the process of determining possible differences in the opinions of teachers and school management about the importance of the above-stated indicators (Table 5), statistically significant differences were observed between groups, with the aid of variance analysis and Tukey post hoc test.

It was determined that higher grade teachers gave less importance to factor *social competence and competence for detecting learner needs, abilities, and skills* than lower grade teachers and school management did. It can be clear with regard to the system of teaching in lower grades where the teacher is ‘in the position to spend more time with his learners, get them known better...’ compared to the higher grade teacher who ‘... also teaches in other grades and, thus, frequently feels overburdened by a very large number of learners ... without having so many opportunities, in comparison with the lower grade teacher, to get to know his learners and their family conditions’ (Bratanić, 1993, p. 131). We can similarly consider the orientation of higher grade teachers to their subject (subjects). It can be seen that school management, apart from the awareness of important educational function that lower and higher grade teachers have, gives more importance to factor *competence for programme and teaching quality, and learner and teacher lifelong education* than higher grade teachers.

**Table 5.** Determining differences between teachers and school management boards, and learners with regard to indicators of contemporary teacher competences

Evaluation levels:  
 5 = extremely important; 4 = very important-important; 3= averagely important; 2 = a bit important; 1 = no importance/unimportant

		N	M	sd	F
<b>Factor 1:</b> <i>Social competences and competence for detecting learner needs, abilities and skills</i>	generalist teachers	229	4.43 <sub>2</sub>	0.458	8.842**
	subject teachers	225	4.25 <sub>1,3</sub>	0.504	
	school management	127	4.40 <sub>2</sub>	0.402	
	Total	581	4.36	0.471	

<b>Factor 2:</b> <i>Competence for quality of programmes and teaching, and learners and teacher lifelong education</i>	generalist teachers	229	4.26	0.444	5.416**
	subject teachers	227	4.17 <sub>3</sub>	0.499	
	school management	125	4.34 <sub>2</sub>	0.397	
	Total	581	4.24	0.460	
<b>Factor 3:</b> <i>Competence for critical and creative communication aimed at learner and teacher development</i>	generalist teachers	230	4.47	0.453	2.042
	subject teachers	229	4.43	0.509	
	school management	127	4.53	0.392	
	Total	586	4.47	0.464	

\*\*significant difference  $p < 0.01$

## Conclusion

Although lower and higher grade teachers as well as principals and professional associates ranked a warm relationship between all the subjects in the process of education high, they emphasised the social competences and competence for detecting learner needs, abilities and skills. The advantage in practice belongs to lower grade teachers. Due to the fact that they spend a great amount of time with their learners every day, they can get to know them very well. It is possible that higher grade teachers, due to this, give less importance to the *social competences and competence for detecting learner needs, abilities and skills* factor when compared to lower grade teachers and school management.

As expected, both learners and teachers ranked teacher competence for quality observation, evaluation, and assessment of learner achievements and learning process highly. What is extremely important for the teacher includes his/her teaching skills, special knowledge of the subject he/she teaches, learners, curriculum, teaching methods, etc. because these help him/her make good and timely decisions about how to easily achieve his/her teaching results. These are also teacher actions and behaviours aimed at encouraging learners to learn. Learners as well as adult subjects agree on this. However, bringing humour and good mood into teaching, that can result in contributing to better learning and teaching, is evaluated as more important by learners. It is important that teachers truly understand learners because they will be better able to develop their competences through adjusting their mutual behaviours. In the long-run, learner behaviours will be changed as a result of better learning. Therefore, the results of this research can be used as a solid background for further considerations and making better teaching conclusions with the aim to create the efficient process of teaching and learning, in other words to provide efficient preparation of young people for lifelong learning in the society of knowledge.

## References

- Baranović, B. (2006). *Nacionalni kurikulum za obvezno obrazovanje u Hrvatskoj: različite perspektive*. Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu.
- Bates, T. (2004). *Upravljanje tehnološkim promjenama: Strategije za voditelje visokih učilišta*. Zagreb/Lokve: CARNet/Benja.
- Bauman Knight, A. (2002). *Teacher "Credibility". A tool for diagnosing problems in Teacher/student Relationships*. University of Oklahoma.
- Boschhuizen, R., Alberts, J., & Poortinga, J. (2005). *A Good Practice of reflective Judgement learning? /online/*. Retrieved on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2007 from: [http://www.atee2005.nl/download/papers/14\\_ab.pdf](http://www.atee2005.nl/download/papers/14_ab.pdf)
- Bratanić, M. (1993). *Mikropedagogija: Interakcijsko-komunikacijski aspekt odgoja*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Council of the European Union (2004). *Education and Training 2010 – The Success of the Lisbon Strategy Hinges on Urgent Reforms /on-line/*. Retrieved on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2005 from: [http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/jir\\_council\\_final.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/jir_council_final.pdf)
- Dann, H.D. (1989). Was geht im Kopf des Lehrers vor? *Psychologie in Erziehung und Unterricht*. 36, 2, (pp. 81-90).
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1992). Teaching and knowledge: Policy issues posed by alternate certification for Teachers. In: W. D. Hawley (Ed.) *The Alternative Certification of Teachers*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Day, C. (1999). *Developing teachers, the challenge of lifelong learning*. London, Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
- Dickhäuser, A. (2002). Humor und Unterricht. *Zeitschrift für sinnzentrierte Therapie Beratung Bildung /online/*. Retrieved on 21<sup>st</sup> December 2001 from: <http://www.logotherapie-gesellschaft.de/dickhaeuser.pdf>
- Duke, D.L., & Stiggins, R.J. (1986). *Teacher Evaluation – Five Keys to Growth*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Gee, J. P. (2001). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of research in education*, 25 (pp.99–125). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Korthagen, F. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20 (1), (pp. 77-97).
- Kyriacou, C. (1995). *Temeljna nastavna umijeća*. Zagreb: Educa.
- Matijević, M. (1994). *Humor u nastavi*. Zagreb: Una-MTV.
- Pšunder, M. (1994). *Knjižica za učitelje in starše*. Maribor: Obzorja.
- Resman, M. (1990). Učitelj, vzgojitelj – društvena in strokovna perspektiva. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 41(9/10), (pp. 542-544).
- Tickle, L. (2000). *Teacher induction: The way ahead*. Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Santagata, R., Zannoni, C., & Stigler, W. J. (2007). The role of lesson analysis in pre-service teacher education: An empirical investigation of teacher learning from a virtual video-based field experience. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education* 10, (pp. 123–40)

- Sherin, M. G. (2007). The development of teachers' professional vision in video clubs. In R. Goldman, R. Pea, B. Barron, & S. J. Derry (Eds.) *Video research in the learning sciences*, (pp. 383–96). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher* 15 (pp. 4–14).

---

**Daria Tot**

Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb  
Savska cesta 77, Zagreb, Croatia  
daria.tot@ufzg.hr

# Procjene učenika, učitelja i vodstva škole o indikatorima suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti

---

## Sažetak

*U radu su prikazani rezultati ispitivanja mišljenja učenika, učitelja i vodstva škole o indikatorima suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti. Istraživanje je provedeno na uzorku od 876 ispitanika, učitelja razredne i predmetne nastave, vodstva te učenika osnovnih škola. Odrasli ispitanici najvažnijim mjerljivim indikatorima suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti smatraju izgrađen topao i ljudski odnos prema učenicima i drugim djelatnicima škole. Rangiranjem je utvrđeno da su učenici prva tri mjesta namijenili onim indikatorima učiteljske kompetentnosti koji su usmjereni učeničkim potrebama. Faktorskom su analizom dvadeset tri indikatora suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti razvrstana u tri skupine, kako u učeničkim procjenama tako i u procjenama odraslih ispitanika. Utvrđene su statistički značajne razlike u njihovu mišljenju. Rezultati istraživanja imaju aplikacijsku vrijednost jer upućuju na preporuke za neprestanim nadopunjavanjem profesionalnih učiteljskih kompetencija zbog preuzimanja novih uloga u suvremenom poučavanju.*

**Ključne riječi:** nastavna umijeća; učiteljsko zanimanje

## Uvod

Važnost kompetentnog učitelja ogleda se u kvaliteti učiteljeva odgojno-obrazovnog rada u smislu podrške djetetova razvoja. Na učitelja se više ne gleda kao na osobu koja prenosi znanja. Njegova se uloga mijenja, od informativne prema formativnoj (Sherin, 2007). Od učitelja se očekuje da potiče razvoj učeničkih sposobnosti, da ih uči učiti, da ih osposobljava za interkulturalnu i multikulturalnu kompetentnost. Različita povjerenstva (primjerice Joint Report by the European Council and the European Commission on progress towards Education and Training 2010)<sup>1</sup> zaključuju da je

---

<sup>1</sup> Education and Training 2010 – The Success of the Lisbon Strategy Hinges on Urgent Reforms, (J.I.R.) (Obrazovanje i usavršavanje 2010. – uspjeh Lisabonske strategije vezan je uz hitne promjene). Zajedničko privremeno izvješće koje su Vijeće i Komisija zajednički prihvatili 26. veljače 2004., str. 28.

učitelj ključna osoba u razvoju obrazovnih sustava i primjeni reformi te pripremanju učenika za njihovu ulogu građana svijeta.

Učiteljev rad promatra se kroz tri međusobno povezane uloge, odnosno učitelj se u školi pojavljuje u ulozi službenika, stručnjaka i čovjeka (Resman, 1990). Analogno tim ulogama, može se govoriti i o učiteljevim kompetencijama. Opća kompetencija proizlazi iz uloge učitelja kao stručnjaka, a pedagoška se kompetencija odnosi na učitelja kao pedagoškog stručnjaka (Shulman, 1986). Hijerarhijska je kompetencija odraz učitelja kao službenika. Nijednu nije moguće isključiti, ali ipak prednost valja dati općoj i pedagoškoj kompetenciji (Dann, 1989; Dillabough, 1999; Day, 1999). One se odnose na razvijanje učiteljevih sposobnosti i umijeća za rješavanje određenih situacija u razrednom odjelu, zatim na učiteljevo osposobljavanje za poboljšanje programa i postizanje vlastitih profesionalnih ciljeva, kao i na motiviranje učitelja za trajno (stalno) učenje koje je važno za njegov profesionalni razvoj, ali i za sprečavanje rutine i iscrpljenosti.

Nickel (prema Pšunder, 1994) promatra učiteljevu kompetenciju kroz neposredan, demokratičan i interpersonalan odnos učitelja i učenika. On je izradio transakcijski model učiteljeve opće, pedagoške i hijerarhijske kompetencije. Na toj je podlozi Pšunder (1994) provela istraživanje o poželjnim učiteljevim osobinama. Ono otkriva da učenici žele učitelja koji će biti "majstor" svoje struke, koji se nakon inicijalnog obrazovanja stalno stručno usavršava. Oni hoće samostalnog (autonomnog) učitelja koji vjeruje u učenike. Radi se, dakle, o učiteljevoj općoj i pedagoškoj kompetenciji koja se temelji na učiteljevoj osobnosti i znanju. Učiteljeva hijerarhijska kompetencija ogleda se pak u njegovu pravnom autoritetu. Ona ne proizlazi iz učiteljeve osobnosti i stvarnog znanja, već mu je dana činjenicom da je postao učitelj – školovao se za učiteljsko zanimanje (znanje se tada samo pretpostavlja). Pravni se autoritet u neposrednom odgojno-obrazovnom djelovanju mijenja isprepletanjem učiteljeve osobnosti, znanja i osobnog stila u djelatni autoritet.

Kyriacou (1995) smatra da su za učitelja iznimno važna nastavna umijeća. Njih čine posebna znanja (o nastavnom predmetu, učenicima, kurikulu, nastavnim metodama i dr.), odlučivanje (prije, za vrijeme, poslije nastave o tome kako najlakše postići predviđene pedagoške rezultate), zatim radnje i ponašanje učitelja koje je usmjereno na poticanje učenika da uče.

Nacionalno vijeće za akreditaciju i učiteljsko obrazovanje Sjedinjenih Američkih Država (NCATE – National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) odbacuje tezu da je poznavanje nekog sadržaja ključno da bi se kvalitetno poučavalo. Ističu kako provedena straživanja (Darling-Hammond, 1992;) pokazuju da učitelji koji su tijekom studija teorijski i praktično učili i vježbali **kako poučavati**, značajno nadmašuju svoje vršnjake koji tijekom studija nisu imali organiziranu takvu nastavu (u matematici čak više od 70%).

Kompetentnost učitelja, osim formalnog znanja i umijeća, valja mjeriti i kvalitetom promjena koje se događaju u učeniku. Bitan je i odnos učenika prema učitelju. Učitelj

treba znalački aktivirati učeničke potencijale. Značajan dio aktivnosti odnosi se na učiteljeve profesionalne kompetentnosti, kao i rezultate njegova profesionalnog djelovanja (Darling-Hammond i Bransford, 2005). On od prijenosnika nastavnih sadržaja postaje kreator kurikula nastave i učenja i odgovoran je za ostvarenje ciljeva tijekom nastavnog procesa koji sam koncipira (Santagata, Zannoni i Stigler, 2007; Tickle, 2000). Bauman Knight (2002) zastupa mišljenje da model kredibiliteta učitelja obuhvaća dimenzije: sposobnost, povjerenje i dinamiku, izvrstan način zaokruživanja potrebnih kompetencija. Navedeni model može pomoći u objašnjenju zašto učenici oblikuju pozitivna ili negativna mišljenja o svojim učiteljima. Bitno je pritom da učitelji doista razumiju učenička mišljenja jer će tek tad moći korigirati svoja ponašanja, a dugoročno gledano promijenit će se i ponašanja učenika kao rezultat boljeg učenja. Koncept prikazan u ovom istraživanju služi vrlo dobro kada se analiziraju situacije nastave i učenja. Učenici su uvijek u situaciji ocjenjivanja "vrijednosti" svoga učitelja. Njegova vrijednost ili kredibilitet na kušnji je svakoga dana.

Realistično shvaćanje učiteljskog posla nije razlog da se učiteljska profesionalnost pretvori u osobnu tajnu. Učiteljske se kompetencije mogu naučiti. Profesionalnost u učiteljskom zanimanju temelji se na profesionalno-osobnom razvojnom procesu (Gee, 2001). Učiteljska se kompetencija stječe putem studija i izgrađuje se unutar iskustvenog profesionalnog polja (Korthagen, 2004; Boschhuizen i sur., 2005). Osim toga, kompetencije ne stječu "sada i za svagda". One ne nastaju u obliku naglog kvalitativnog skoka. Postupno se razvijaju od određenih predstupnjeva i oblika prema maksimalnom individualnom postignuću. Brzina ostvarivanja pojedinih stupnjeva različita je od učitelja do učitelja. To isto vrijedi za opseg i dubinu kompetencija. Ipak, svi bi učitelji trebali postići minimalne standarde. A koji su to standardi koji su važni učenicima, učiteljima i vodstvu škole? Koja je to razina poželjne kompetentnosti učitelja koja zamjenjuje tradicionalne profesionalne funkcije učitelja suvremenim? Ta smo pitanja smatrali korisnima u postavljanju cilja ovoga istraživanja koji je bio utvrditi kako tri kategorije (međusobno upućene jedna na drugu) ispitanika: učenika, učitelja i vodstva škole procjenjuju učiteljsku kompetentnost i njezin značaj.

## **Problemi istraživanja**

Ispitati mišljenja učitelja, učenika i vodstva škole o bitnim indikatorima suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti.

Ispitati moguće razlike u mišljenjima učitelja razredne nastave, predmetne nastave i vodstva škole o značaju indikatora suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti.

## **Metode**

### ***Ispitanici***

U istraživanju je sudjelovalo 876 ispitanika osnovnih škola Primorsko-goranske, Istarske i Ličko-senjske županije i to 564 učitelja razredne i predmetne nastave te

vodstva škole<sup>2</sup> i 312 učenika osmog razreda osnovne škole. Ispitivanje je provedeno u 43 osnovne škole Primorsko-goranske, Istarske i Ličko-senjske županije.

### ***Instrumenti i postupak istraživanja***

Za potrebe istraživanja konstruiran je upitnik sastavljen od 23 tvrdnje koje se odnose na indikatore suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti. Učenici, učitelji i vodstvo škole imali su sadržajno jednake tvrdnje. Međutim, uzimajući u obzir učeničku dob i mogućnost procjenjivanja određenih učiteljskih kompetencija, učenicima je ponuđeno 20 za njih jezično prilagođenih tvrdnji.<sup>3</sup> Za svaku tvrdnju ponuđen je odgovor u obliku skale Likertova tipa od 5 stupnjeva s pomoću koje ispitanik pridaje razinu vrijednosti, od 1 = zanemariva vrijednost do 5 = iznimno velika vrijednost. Ukupan rezultat na pojedinim faktorima dobiven je na temelju aritmetičke sredine čestica faktora i teorijski se kreće od 1 do 5.

Za utvrđivanje i izbor indikatora suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti korištena je faktorska analiza (posebno za učitelje i vodstvo škole, posebno za učenike). Analizom varijance utvrđivane su razlike u pripisivanju značajnosti pojedinim indikatorima i dobivenim faktorima učiteljske kompetentnosti između učitelja i vodstva škole.

## **Rezultati i rasprava**

### ***Suvremena učiteljska kompetentnost procjenjivana od učitelja i vodstva škole***

Učitelji razredne i predmetne nastave te ravnatelji i stručni suradnici najvažnijim indikatorima suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti smatraju (Tablica 1): *Izgrađen topao i ljudski odnos prema učenicima i drugim djelatnicima škole; Poštivanje općih moralnih i duhovnih vrijednosti i uvažavanje različitosti te Sposobnost i vještine komuniciranja i izražavanja.*

Tablica 1.

Kako bi se utvrdila faktorska struktura pokazatelja suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti procjenjivane od učitelja i vodstva škole, provedena je faktorska analiza glavnih komponenata s Varimax rotacijom na 23 indikatora. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin testom prikladnosti utvrđeno je da su podaci i učitelja i vodstva škole prikladni za faktorizaciju (KMOučitelji i vodstvo= 0,953). U skladu s Guttman-Kaiserovim kriterijem, zadržani su faktori koji imaju karakterističan korijen veći od jedan.

Rezultati eksplanatorne faktorske analize pokazuju da tri faktora zajedno objašnjavaju 56,56% varijance indikatora suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti. Najveći postotak objašnjava prvi faktor u iznosu od 45,60% prije rotacije, odnosno 21,04 % nakon rotacije.

<sup>2</sup> Pod terminom vodstvo škole podrazumijevaju se ravnatelji i stručni suradnici škola.

<sup>3</sup> Svih 20 indikatora u skladu je s indikatorima procjenjivanim od učitelja i vodstva škole.

Nakon rotacije (7 iteracija) svi indikatori suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti razvrstali su se u 3 faktora (Tablica 2). U prvom faktoru svrstano je devet indikatora koji se sadržajno odnose na *Socijalnu kompetentnost i osposobljenost za otkrivanje učeničkih potreba, sposobnosti i vještina*. Raspon faktorskog opterećenja indikatora u prvom faktoru je između 0,755 i 0,454. Devet indikatora drugog faktora *Osposobljenost za kvalitetu programa i nastave te učeničko i učiteljevo cjeloživotno obrazovanje* imaju koeficijente doprinosa u rasponu od 0,760 do 0,421. U trećem je faktoru pet indikatora vezanih uz *Osposobljenost za kritično i kreativno komuniciranje u cilju učeničkog i učiteljskog razvoja*. Njihov raspon faktorskog opterećenja kreće se od 0,754 do 0,463. Pouzdanost pojedinih faktora indikatora suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti (Cronbach alfa) je zadovoljavajuća.

Ti se rezultati slažu s učiteljskim pozicioniranjem indikatora suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti jer se pokazala njihova usmjerenost socijalnim kompetencijama i učeničkim potrebama, sposobnostima i vještinama. Budući da su zahtjevi za cjeloživotnim obrazovanjem učitelja sve veći, očekivala se veća usmjerenost učitelja i vodstva promišljanjima kojima se preferira razvijanje svijesti o potrebi vlastitog stručnog usavršavanja i profesionalnog razvoja. Postojanje kulture profesionalnog razvoja vezano je uz učiteljevu odgovornost za unapređivanje i razvoj prakse i međusobno informiranje o novim perspektivama (Kerr, 2000). No, moguće je da su na to utjecali neodgovarajući, nepoticajni, suvremenim učeničkim i učiteljskim potrebama neprilagođeni miljei (društveni i školski) u kojima učitelji ostvaruju svoj profesionalni rad i stječu profesionalna znanja (Darling-Hammond i Bransford, 2005).

Tablica 2.

### ***Učeničke procjene suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti***

Prvih pet mjesta učenici su namijenili onim indikatorima suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti koji određuju učitelja kao onoga tko: *poštuje svakog učenika bez obzira na njihove različitosti; pravedno vrednuje i ocjenjuje učenikov rad i postignuća u nastavi; uspješno otkriva i radi s učenicima koji teže svladavaju nastavno gradivo (teže uče); uspješno komunicira s učenicima, roditeljima i drugim osobama; uočava i uspješno rješava učeničke probleme, odnosno uspijeva naučiti učenika kako lakše i uspješnije učiti*. Razvidno je učeničko isticanje pravednosti i onih učiteljskih kompetencija koje mu osiguravaju pomoć u učenju i rješavanju problema. Razumljiva je učenička usmjerenost vlastitim potrebama u nastavi i učenju, no također valja imati u vidu da učenici mogu prilično objektivno poredati dobre i slabe strane učitelja (Duke i Stiggins, 1986). I učenici i učitelji očekivano su relativno visoko pozicionirali učiteljsku kompetentnost za kvalitetno praćenje, provjeravanje, vrednovanje i ocjenjivanje učeničkih postignuća i procesa učenja. No, zanimljivo je i indikativno da učenici i učitelji unošenje učiteljeva humora i vedrine u nastavu procjenjuju različito. Dok tom indikatoru učenici namjenjuju relativno visoko sedmo mjesto, učitelji su ga pozicionirali gotovo na sam kraj ljestice suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti. Na tragu

takvih promišljanja sve su učestaliji zahtjevi praktičara i istraživača usmjerenih prema kvaliteti nastave za unošenje vedrine i humora koji, u konačnici, može doprinijeti kvalitetnijem učenju i poučavanju (primjerice, Matijević, 1994; Dickhäuser, 2002).

Tablica 3.

Kako bi se utvrdila faktorska struktura pokazatelja suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti procjenjivane od učenika, provedena je faktorska analiza glavnih komponenata s Varimax rotacijom na 20 indikatora. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin testom prikladnosti utvrđeno je da su podaci učenika prikladni za faktorizaciju (KMOučenici= 0,935). U skladu s Guttman-Kaiserovim kriterijem zadržani faktori imaju karakterističan korijen veći od jedan.

Rezultati eksplanatorne faktorske analize pokazuju kako tri faktora zajedno objašnjavaju 56,90% varijance indikatora suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti. Najveći postotak objašnjava prvi faktor u iznosu od 43,75% prije, odnosno 23,38% nakon rotacije.

Nakon rotacije (10 iteracija) gotovo svi indikatori suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti procjenjivani od učenika (indikatori dobrog i stručnog učitelja) razvrstali su se u tri faktora (Tablica 4). Jedino čestica *Primjenjuje kompjutor i druga suvremena sredstva u nastavi* je zbog niskog faktorskog opterećenja (0,358) te sadržajne neprimjerenosti za 3. faktor izbačena, pa se iznova provela faktorska analiza bez navedene čestice. U prvi su faktor svrstani indikatori koji se sadržajno odnose na *Pozitivne osobine učiteljeve ličnosti te skrb i potporu učenicima u njihovom razvoju*. Raspon faktorskog opterećenja indikatora u prvom faktoru iznosi od 0,743 do 0,400. Indikatori drugog faktora *Stalno unapređivanje kvalitete rada u nastavi i osobni profesionalni razvoj* imaju koeficijente doprinosa u rasponu od 0,743 do 0,589. U trećem faktoru nalaze se indikatori koji se odnose na *Uspješnu suradnju i komuniciranje sa svim subjektima u procesu nastave i učenja*. Njihov raspon faktorskog opterećenja kreće se od 0,683 do 0,470. Cronbachovim alfa koeficijentima pouzdanosti utvrđene su visoke unutarnje konzistencije za svaki faktor.

Tablica 4.

Prema učeničkim procjenama može se zapaziti preferiranje onih učiteljskih kompetencija koje imaju zajednički nazivnik *Pozitivne osobine učiteljeve ličnosti te stalna skrb i potpora učenicima u njihovom razvoju*. Uz to što su učenici usmjereni na sebe, odnosno žele učitelja koji će biti pravedan, vedar i pomoći im da lakše i uspješnije uče, također od učitelja očekuju toplinu i socijalnu potporu. Budući da se radi o učenicima, razumljivo je što su manje usmjereni grupi indikatora koji obuhvaćaju suradnju s roditeljima i drugim sudionicima odgojno-obrazovnog procesa.

Nove kompetencije i promjene u nacionalnom kurikulumu za obvezno obrazovanje (Baranović, 2006.) naglašavaju učenička postignuća, odnosno kompetencije koje trebaju steći nakon određene obrazovne dionice. Stoga su zahtjevi koji se sve češće stavljaju pred suvremene učitelje i učenike jednaki u području razvijenosti vještina

komuniciranja, sposobnosti za samostalno učenje, društvenosti (etičnosti, pozitivnih stavova i odgovornosti), sposobnosti rada u timu, sposobnosti prilagodbe novim okolnostima, sposobnosti promišljanja, sposobnosti pretraživanja i vrednovanja informacija (znanja o tome gdje pronaći i kako obraditi informacije) (Bates, 2004). Procjenjujući učiteljsku kompetentnost, naši su se ispitanici, i učenici i odrasli, usmjerili socijalnim kompetencijama i onima koje su orijentirane učeničkim potrebama, sposobnostima i vještinama.

### ***Razlike u procjenama indikatora suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti***

Pri utvrđivanju mogućih razlika u mišljenjima učitelja i vodstva škole o značenju indikatora suvremene učiteljske kompetentnosti (Tablica 5), analizom varijance i Tukeyovim post hoc testom utvrđene su statistički značajne razlike među skupinama.

Utvrđeno je da učitelji predmetne nastave pridaju manji značaj faktoru *Socijalne kompetentnosti i osposobljenosti za otkrivanje učeničkih potreba, sposobnosti i vještina* nego učitelji razredne nastave i vodstvo škole. To se može razumjeti s obzirom na sustav razredne nastave u kojem je učitelj „u situaciji da vremenski više boravi sa svojim učenicima, da ih bolje upozna...“ za razliku od predmetnog učitelja koji „... predaje i drugim odjeljenjima, te je često opterećen prevelikom brojem učenika... i nema toliko mogućnosti, kao što je to imao razrednik u razrednoj nastavi, da upozna svoje učenike i njihove obiteljske prilike“ (Bratanić, str. 131). Na tragu toga je i usmjerenost učitelja predmetne nastave na svoj predmet (predmete). Vidljivo je da vodstvo škole, uz svijest o važnosti odgojne funkcije učitelja razredne i učitelja predmetne nastave, faktoru *Osposobljenost za kvalitetu programa i nastave te učeničko i učiteljsko cjeloživotno obrazovanje pridaje veći značaj nego učitelji predmetne nastave.*

Tablica 5.

## **Zaključak**

Iako učitelji razredne i predmetne nastave te ravnatelji i stručni suradnici visoko vrednuju topao i ljudski odnos prema svim sudionicima odgojno-obrazovnog procesa, naglašenijom smatraju socijalnu kompetentnost i osposobljenost za otkrivanje učeničkih potreba, sposobnosti i vještina. U praksi su u tome u prednosti učitelji razredne nastave. Zbog specifičnosti rada, odnosno svakodnevnoga viševremenskog boravljenja (življenja) s učenicima, oni imaju mogućnost kvalitetnije ih upoznati. Moguće je da upravo zato učitelji predmetne nastave pridaju manji značaj faktoru *Socijalne kompetentnosti i osposobljenosti za otkrivanje učeničkih potreba, sposobnosti i vještina* nego učitelji razredne nastave i vodstvo škole.

I učenici i učitelji očekivano su relativno visoko pozicionirali učiteljsku kompetentnost za kvalitetno praćenje, provjeravanje, vrednovanje i ocjenjivanje učeničkih postignuća i procesa učenja. Za učitelja su iznimno važna nastavna umijeća, posebna znanja o nastavnom predmetu, učenicima, kurikulu, nastavnim metodama

i dr. kako bi mogao pravovremeno i kvalitetno donositi odluke o tome kako najlakše postići predviđene pedagoške ishode. To su ujedno radnje i ponašanja učitelja usmjereni na poticanje učenika da uče. U tome se slažu i učenici i odrasli ispitanici. No, unošenje vedrine i humora u nastavu koji, u konačnici, mogu doprinijeti kvalitetnijem učenju i poučavanju, učenici procjenjuju značajnijim. Bitno je da učitelji doista razumiju učenike jer će usklađivanjem svojih ponašanja i jedni i drugi kvalitetnije razvijati svoje kompetencije. Dugoročno gledano promijenit će se ponašanja učenika kao rezultat boljeg učenja. Stoga ishod ovog istraživanja može poslužiti kao solidan predložak učiteljima za daljnje promišljanje i donošenje kvalitetnih didaktičko-metodičkih odluka s ciljem kreiranja djelotvornog procesa nastave i učenja, odnosno učinkovitog pripremanja mladih za cjeloživotno učenje u društvu znanja.