

UDK: 371.3:371.12  
Izvorni znanstveni rad  
Primljeno: 15. siječnja 2013.

## **TEACHING AND LESSON DESIGN FROM PRIMARY AND SECONDARY TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVE**

dr. sc. **Vesna Buljubašić Kuzmanović**, associate professor  
**Ana Petrović**, student

**Abstract:** The variety of didactic methods and approaches to teaching, which can stimulate and unlock learning potential, is recognised as influence of pluralist teaching. Pluralism in teaching is determined by various methods which can improve the quality of learning and make teaching more active, interesting, of high-quality and complete.

The authors of this paper wanted to examine which teaching strategies are employed by primary and secondary school teachers. Furthermore, they also investigated to what extent teaching really is pluralistic, i.e. whether teachers use multiple sources of knowledge and teaching aids in their classrooms.

The results show that problem and programmed teaching, topic-based and integrative teaching, project, computer-assisted teaching and field work are least frequently used in everyday lessons. Motivation, creativity and educational influences are significantly in decline, not only in secondary but also in higher classes of primary school. According to teachers' assessments, multiple-source and pluralistic teaching approaches are only sometimes used.

Research and development of learning and teaching methods are considered to be an important component of a modern school, which aims to direct learning towards students and their needs. In conclusion the authors point out the need for greater freedom of choice and decision making for teachers.

**Keywords:** school, primary school teacher, secondary school teacher, strategies, methods, procedures, didactic pluralism.

### **Different approaches to instruction and lesson design**

Examining and developing learning and teaching methods has become an important determining factor of a contemporary school which tries to adapt teaching to students and their needs and turn learning into an active process which is continuously being evaluated and self-evaluated. Teaching strategies, methods and procedures are the foundations of the learning process which respect individuality and differences of each student (Walsch, 2002).

Accordingly, this chapter presents different approaches to lesson design and contributes to a better understanding of the teaching process complexity, but it also offers some guidelines for practical activities regarding different teaching methods which help develop competence and make teaching more interesting, complete and of high-quality (Meyer, 2005).

Competences essential for a good quality organisation of teaching are developed by practicing and they permeate the entire design of teaching (teaching each subject acknowledging general and specific / special didactics) in all stages of lifelong learning. Teaching humanities and social sciences subjects is regarded as an interdisciplinary science. Being interdisciplinary refers to an extensive knowledge and a thorough study of a certain phenomenon from the perspective of a certain science and all educational sciences as a contribution to teaching and organisation skills (Matijević & Radovanović, 2011). In this context teaching strategies, methods and procedures are an integral part of the educational process and its plurality acknowledging specificities in alternative schools and different classifications of teaching strategies, methods and procedures since it is necessary to differentiate between these terms. Namely, methods are a part of strategies and procedures are a part of methods.

Bognar and Matijević (2002) differentiate between strategies of upbringing (existence, socialisation and individualisation) and educational strategies (teaching and learning; practicing and creation; experience and expression). The word method originates from the word *meta* which means a target, centre and the word *hodos* meaning a way, procedure, motion (Jelavić, 1995). A method is defined as a procedure which teachers and students use to achieve aims with the help of a certain learning content (Pranjić, 2005). An aim is what one wants to achieve by learning and teaching (Meyer, 2002), and the content is directed at fulfilling the aims (individual and social level). The aim, tasks and content are closely connected to methods (Meyer, 2005) as well as to teaching and learning outcomes. Methods can also be defined as procedures and forms which teachers and students use to develop natural and social reality at school (Meyer, 2002), i.e. methods are a type of communication. Methods which do not take into consideration teachers and students' needs are doomed to failure (Glasser, 1994). Teaching and learning are the foundations of didactic activity of students and teachers (Meyer, 2002). They do not stop existing when a lesson or a school day ends, but they represent a lifelong process (Jensen, 2003).

Marzano et al. (2006) discuss learning strategies which affect students' achievements. They differentiate between teacher- and student-oriented strategies and put them in the context of conducting a research in teaching. Considering all this, we can conclude that multiple sources (different and multi-layered approaches to designing a lesson) and pluralism of teaching are

features of a contemporary school, i.e. didactic pluralism of teaching has become more widespread. In order to examine the quality of lesson design from teachers' perspective (primary and secondary schools), precisely pluralism of teaching and learning and its growth and development, the teachers participating in this research were asked to assess how often they use 48 teaching strategies, methods and procedures. To make it more coherent, we made maps referring to lesson design (types of classroom interaction and team work), teaching procedures, types of (self-directed) learning and teaching and students' contribution, creativity of teaching and motivation for learning, educational strategies and evaluation techniques and approaches.

Teacher-fronted instruction, individual, pair, group and team work are types of classroom interaction, namely they represent organisational forms of teacher-student and student-student relationships in the process of learning and teaching (Pranjić, 2005). Teacher-fronted instruction is a structured and planned method whose aim is to inform learners about a certain topic (Mattes, 2007). A teacher plays the main role in knowledge transfer. Teacher-fronted instruction is a type of teaching occurring on the level of "one-way communication" (Terhart, 2001, p. 36).

Individual work refers to students working independently. A teacher is not a person who directly guides them. A disadvantage of this type of work is the lack of social relationships during learning (Pranjić, 2005). Individual work is often used when revising, practicing, collecting or applying knowledge and it reminds students of an exam situation (Mattes, 2007).

Individualisation is a form of teaching which is adapted to students' needs. It is completely tailored to each student (Terhart, 2001). This method takes into consideration student's needs, interests and abilities (Pranjić, 2005).

In pair work two students work together on an assignment. Students are active, they cooperate and communicate. This type of work serves as good preparation for group and team work (Mattes, 2007).

In group work a class is divided into smaller learning groups so that each group works on an assignment (the same or a different one), and afterwards the results are presented to the whole class. A teacher does not play a key role (Terhart, 2001). It is essential for groups to be well-organised. An ideal number of students is three to six per group. This type of work is suitable for research or discussions (Mattes, 2007). Group work encourages students to cooperate, communicate and be tolerant (Pranjić, 2005). Moreover, when learning together, students satisfy the need for belonging (Glasser, 1994).

Teams function best in six- to eight-week periods. There should be no more than seven members in a team. When creating a team, one should appoint a leader, set goals, establish good relationships among team members, present results publicly and create a relaxed atmosphere (Jensen, 2003). Team work

prevents monotony (Bognar & Matijević, 2002, p. 257) and contributes to interaction-communication pattern of school and its micro-structure.

Different approaches to lessons design can also be represented through learner-centred teaching, i.e. a lesson adapted to students' needs taking consideration of new students and teachers' roles in the educational process. Creating teaching scenarios in a certain teaching process is based on the characteristics of new generations and new ways of communication, accelerated and variable surroundings, technological advances and environmental dimensions of healthy living and growing up. Within this context there are numerous possibilities of developing and creating the teaching process as a partnership based on maximum involvement of all participants and mutual cooperation.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **Aim and problems**

The research studies instruction and lesson design from primary and secondary school teachers' perspective. The aim is to examine which teaching strategies, methods and procedures teachers use most and least, i.e. to establish to what extent didactic pluralism is present in teaching. Special attention has been given to: types of class interaction and team work, teaching procedures, types of (self-directed) learning and teaching, students' contribution to teaching, fostering creativity and motivation for learning, educational strategies and evaluation techniques and approaches.

On the basis of this aim the following research problems were defined:

- to examine the frequency of teaching strategies, methods and procedures
- to examine differences in teachers' assessment of the frequency of certain strategies, methods and procedures
- to examine teachers' self-evaluation of teaching pluralism / multiple resources
- to examine how teachers grade (1 – 5) and evaluate the quality of their own teaching and difficulties they come across in their work

The hypothesis of the research is: lower primary school teachers more frequently use a variety of teaching methods in comparison to higher primary and secondary school teachers and didactic pluralism of teaching is still not widespread in teaching.

Independent variables refer to the type of school (primary, secondary), gender and work place: lower primary, higher primary and secondary school teacher and map of strategies, methods and procedures (48 in total).

Dependent variables refer to the frequency of using certain teaching strategies, methods and procedures, the assessment of teaching pluralism and quality of own teaching regarding instruction and lessons design.

The chapter attempts to make a theoretical and practical contribution to studies on contemporary teaching at all levels, namely to raise awareness of the importance of pedagogical, didactic and teaching pluralism in educational processes which provide students with multiple resources and variety (freedom of choice and decision making), active learning and sharing own experience, encourage students to think and work independently by using adequate learning strategies, problem solving and planning of learning.

### **Sample, instrument and procedure**

The research was carried out on a sample of 150 teachers, 50 of which are lower primary teachers, 50 higher primary and 50 secondary school teachers. To ensure anonymity the names of schools are not published.

The questionnaire consists of two parts. The first part contains a five-point Likert scale regarding the frequency of use of 48 teaching strategies, methods and procedures (1 – almost never, 2 – sometimes, 3 – often, 4 – almost always) classified in 6 categories or subscales referring to: types of interaction and team work (items 1 – 6); teaching procedures (7 – 16); types of learning and teaching and students' contribution to teaching (17 – 28); fostering creativity and motivation for learning (29 – 36); educational strategies (37 – 43); and evaluation techniques and approaches (44 – 48). Lesson planning map contains 48 strategies, methods and procedures and is based on the relevant didactics works ((Bognar & Matijević, 2002; Jensen, 2003; Terhart, 2001; Mattes, 2007) and our own experience. Additionally, when drawing up the first part of the questionnaire, especially the part discussing the results, we consulted the recent literature on teaching and learning developed in student-teacher cooperation, i.e. learner-centred teaching (Matijević & Radovanović, 2011).

The second part of the questionnaire consists of three questions. The first question refers to self-evaluation of multiple resources and pluralism of own teaching, namely the teachers were asked to assess which teaching strategies, methods and procedures dominate in their teaching, pluralism of their teaching (no, it is not pluralistic; I am not sure; yes, it is pluralistic). The second question examined self-evaluation of the quality of teaching from 1 – 5 (excellent – 5, very good – 4, good – 3, sufficient – 2, insufficient – 1). The third question, open-ended, referred to pedagogical and didactic design of teaching, namely the teachers were asked to identify problems they encounter in their work.

The research was carried out in six primary schools (in Donji Miholjac, Osijek, Podravski Podgajci, Vinkovci) and two secondary schools (Donji Miholjac, Osijek) in February 2010. After obtaining consent, the questionnaires were distributed to all the teachers who had one week to complete them. Although the questionnaire was anonymous, some teachers decided not to participate stating that they have been working for a long time and they preferred their younger colleagues to take part. Statistical methods and procedures used for data collection refer to descriptive statistics and analysis of variance and the Kruskal-Wallis test. The interpretation and discussion are accompanied by quantitative and qualitative analyses and comparisons.

### Results and discussion

Table 1 shows how teachers assess lessons design based on four main types of classroom interaction: teacher-fronted instruction, group, pair and individual work including individualised and team work which give us a better insight into whole-class and group teaching (groups and teams).

Types of classroom interaction and team work	Lower primary		Higher primary		Secondary school	
	AS	SD	AS	SD	AS	SD
1) Teacher-fronted	2.56	0.577	2.52	0.789	2.76	0.687
2) Individual work	2.88	0.520	2.82	0.629	2.54	0.734
3) Individualisation	2.86	0.639	2.88	0.689	2.38	0.779
4) Pair work	2.76	0.476	2.68	0.653	2.36	0.693
5) Group work	2.70	0.463	2.40	0.670	2.64	0.598
6) Team work	2.46	0.579	2.28	0.729	2.12	0.773
ANOVA (Kruskal Walllis test), H=3.48; p=0.1755; df=2						

Table 1. The frequency of types of classroom interaction and team work in lower primary (N=50), higher primary (N=50) and secondary schools (N=50)

Teacher-fronted instruction is still a very common type of work in primary schools and is dominant in secondary schools. Individual work is often present in primary schools, while higher primary teachers prefer group work and lower primary teachers individual work. Individualisation, whose function is to adapt teachers' requirements to interests and abilities of each student, is the most frequent in lower primary school, whereas it is almost completely neglected by secondary school teachers. These findings are best supported by the item about team work which is only occasionally present. However, team

work and cooperation represent the foundations of contemporary teaching. On the other hand, various teaching procedures included in this research indicate that doing experiments, as an important part of contemporary teaching, is extremely rare compared to all other procedures, which suggests that teaching should be more directed at research and practical activities. In other words, it should provide students with a possibility to check their hypotheses, the connections between learning and life, theory and practice. Namely, the results indicate that the most common teaching procedures in primary school include working on a text, conversation, doing written exercises, drawing and writing, while in secondary schools teachers prefer conversations, discussions and writing. Workshops, as a type of classroom interaction, communication and cooperation, are only sometimes organised in these schools, less frequently in secondary schools and a bit more often in lower primary schools (table 2).

Teaching procedures	Lower primary		Higher primary		Secondary school	
	AS	SD	AS	SD	AS	SD
7) Working on a text	3.30	0.580	2.86	1.050	2.52	0.953
8) Written exercises - handout	3.24	0.625	2.56	0.837	2.06	0.935
9) Writing	3.58	0.609	2.98	0.914	2.74	0.803
10) Drawing	3.16	0.584	2.42	0.835	1.82	0.825
11) Workshop	2.28	0.881	1.92	0.724	1.78	0.910
12) Conversation	3.24	0.744	3.52	0.580	3.14	0.808
13) Discussion	2.74	0.876	2.86	0.857	3.02	0.742
14) Using images and visualisation	3.14	0.756	2.08	0.751	2.76	0.916
15) Experiment	2.06	0.740	1.90	0.886	1.38	0.697
16) Practical work	2.52	0.789	2.56	0.837	2.02	0.892
ANOVA (Kruskal-Wallis test), H= 5.82; p=0.0545; df=2						

Table 2. The frequency of using various teaching procedures in lower primary (N=50), higher primary (N=50) and secondary schools (N=50)

Types of learning and teaching determine characteristics of instruction to a great extent. An important characteristic of contemporary instruction is reflected in learning how to learn, self-directed learning and students' contribution to learning and teaching. Table 3 indicates the frequency of these contemporary types of learning.

Types of learning, teaching and students' contribution	Lower primary		Higher primary		Secondary school	
	AS	SD	AS	SD	AS	SD
17) Learning how to learn	2.40	0.808	2.44	0.861	2.00	0.639
18) Cooperative learning	2.60	0.728	2.38	0.602	2.08	0.601
19) Experiential learning	2.54	0.579	2.46	0.706	2.18	0.747
20) Integrative and topic-based learning	2.42	0.642	2.20	0.670	2.06	0.682
21) Problem-solving teaching	2.36	0.631	2.56	0.733	2.32	0.741
22) Programmed teaching	2.00	0.571	2.12	0.824	1.76	0.797
23) Project work	2.14	0.452	2.08	0.566	1.64	0.631
24) Research	2.36	0.525	2.08	0.751	1.58	0.702
25) Field work	2.30	0.505	1.80	0.670	1.60	0.728
26) Computer- and internet-assisted t.	1.86	0.670	1.84	0.889	2.08	0.922
27) Students' seminars	1.62	0.602	1.90	0.707	2.04	0.670
28) Students' presentations	1.78	0.648	2.34	0.659	2.36	0.663
ANOVA (Kruskal-Wallis test), $H= 4.99$ ; $p= 0.0825$ ; $df=2$						

Table 3. The frequency of different types of learning in lower primary ( $N=50$ ), higher primary ( $N=50$ ) and secondary schools ( $N=50$ )

On average the teachers occasionally use all mentioned types of learning and teaching. Lower primary teachers more often use cooperative learning and to some extent experiential learning, while higher primary and secondary school teachers more frequently use problem-solving teaching and students' contribution to learning (presentations). It is alarming that research, project, field work and programmed teaching are not present at all or only in a small percentage, especially in secondary schools. The percentages of computer- and internet-assisted learning, as well as learning how to learn are also not very satisfying, especially in secondary schools. Generally speaking, contemporary types of learning, teaching and students' contribution are not frequently employed by the teachers, especially the ones working with older students (higher primary and secondary school). Subsequently, we examined the common procedures regarding creativity in teaching and motivation for learning.

Creativity has numerous definitions depending on different authors. Ozimec (1987) defines creativity as creating something new, different, i.e. solving problems in our own way or discovering unknown. Similar definitions are offered by foreign authors who wonder why it is difficult to be creative (Kaufman & Bear, 2002) and emphasise generalities and specificities of



creativity (Lumbart & Guignard, 2002) or state that every individual has a creative potential (Runco, 2002). Similarly, motivating students for learning “encompasses everything (externally or internally) that stimulates learning, directs it, determines its intensity, duration and quality” (Marentič-Požarnik, 2000, p. 184). Table 4 indicates to what extent the abovementioned aspirations are a part of the teaching process.

Techniques related to creativity in teaching and motivation for learning	Lower primary		Higher primary		Secondary school	
	AS	SD	AS	SD	AS	SD
29) Brain storming	2.64	0.663	2.32	0.844	1.88	0.746
30) Mind maps	2.90	0.647	2.10	0.840	2.00	0.756
31) Games and simulations	3.12	0.660	2.22	0.680	1.90	0.789
32) Laughter and humour	3.30	0.647	3.04	0.856	2.64	0.875
33) Music	3.12	0.627	1.84	0.912	1.66	0.772
34) Creativity and creation	3.12	0.627	2.60	0.670	2.18	0.629
35) Various learning styles	2.66	0.717	2.74	0.664	2.26	0.723
36) Motivation for work and learning	3.16	0.765	3.38	0.602	2.92	0.695
ANOVA (Kruskal-Wallis test), $H=10.04$ ; $p=0.0066$ ; $df=2$						

Table 4. The frequency of using creative techniques and motivation for learning in lower primary ( $N=50$ ), higher primary ( $N=50$ ) and secondary schools ( $N=50$ )

According to the teachers, the most common technique for fostering creativity is laughter and humour. On average lower primary school teachers apply creative techniques more frequently than higher primary and secondary school teachers. This especially refers to using music, brain storming and games and simulations. Higher primary school teachers also neglect music as well as mind maps and their usage declines even more in secondary school. We can thus conclude that creativity and creation in teaching along with motivation for learning are more characteristic of primary school teachers (more of lower primary) than secondary school teachers, which is confirmed by the analysis of variance indicating that the differences between the groups are statistically significant,  $H=10.04$ ;  $p=0.0066$ .

Laughter and humour, as shown in Table 4, is the most representative technique, which is quite encouraging and optimistic.

Table 5 indicates the importance of educational techniques and good relationships with others.

Educational techniques	Lower primary		Higher primary		Secondary school	
	AS	SD	AS	SD	AS	SD
37) Promoting concentration	3.04	0.727	3.04	0.669	2.70	0.789
38) Promoting communication	3.40	0.571	3.24	0.625	3.04	0.755
39) Promoting cooperation	3.28	0.671	3.34	0.658	3.08	0.695
40) Promoting affirmation	2.96	0.637	3.16	0.618	2.84	0.738
41) Promoting social skills	2.90	0.707	3.00	0.808	2.54	0.761
42) Promoting healthy way of living	3.52	0.544	3.06	0.935	2.68	0.913
43) Promoting non-violent conflict resolution	3.52	0.580	3.48	0.544	3.00	0.881
ANOVA (Kruskal-Wallis test), H= 7.42; p=0.0245; df=2						

Table 5. The frequency of using educational techniques in lower primary (N=50), higher primary (N=50) and secondary schools (N=50)

Even though it is believed that nowadays the educational function of school is going through a crisis, the teachers put the greatest emphasis on these characteristics of contemporary teaching. In other words, they implement all of the abovementioned techniques, especially in higher primary grades when students' growth and development is most intensive (from late childhood and puberty to adolescence). The analysis of variance shows that the differences between the primary and secondary school teachers regarding educational techniques are significant, H=7.42; p=0.0245. These results indicate that there is a great need for employing different educational techniques and adequate procedures within a certain group, i.e. individual and social development (personalisation and socialisation).

Evaluation and self-evaluation are an integral part of learning. The research attempted to obtain teachers' assessment of whether testing and simple knowledge reproduction are being changed with new evaluation trends listed in table 6.

Evaluation techniques and procedures	Lower primary		Higher primary		Secondary school	
	AS	SD	AS	SD	AS	SD
44) Evaluation of learning aims and outcomes	2.76	0.797	2.90	0.707	2.46	0.706
45) Students' self-evaluation	2.4	0.706	2.58	0.758	2.40	0.782

	6					
46) Peer evaluation	2.4 0	0.670	2.50	0.789	2.12	0.660
47) Interconnection of learning and evaluation	2.8 6	0.860	2.94	0.652	2.50	0.735
48) Interconnection of learning and life	3.4 0	0.700	3.42	0.609	3.04	0.807
ANOVA (Kruskal-Wallis test), $H= 3.13$ ; $p=0.2091$ , $df=2$						

Table 6. The frequency of using evaluation techniques and procedures in lower primary (N=50), higher primary (N=50) and secondary schools (N=50)

The teachers put the greatest emphasis on the interconnection of learning and life, namely they use this evaluation context in teaching. The interconnection of learning and evaluation, as an important part of contemporary teaching, is very common in primary schools and also more and more frequent in secondary schools. Other techniques and approaches are only sometimes used with the tendency of more present evaluation of learning aims and outcomes, especially in primary school, while self-evaluation and peer evaluation are very rare.

Since all these comparisons are only approximate indicators of the frequency of certain strategies and teaching methods, without considering specificities of each subject (although we tried to include similar profiles of teachers), we asked the teachers to carry out self-evaluation of how various their teaching is (different approaches to lessons design), which teaching strategies, methods and procedures are dominant, and how pluralistic their teaching is (no, it is not pluralistic; I am not sure; yes, it is pluralistic). Additionally, the teachers evaluated the quality of their own instruction and lesson design with grades from 1 to 5 (excellent – 5, very good – 4, good – 3, sufficient – 2, insufficient – 1). The results are shown in Table 7.

Evaluation of pluralism	Lower primary		Higher primary		Secondary school	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
No, it is not pluralistic	0	0	4	8	3	6
I am not sure	18	36	19	38	28	56
Yes, it is pluralistic	32	64	27	54	19	38
<b>Evaluation of quality of teaching</b>						
Excellent	4	8	5	10	8	16
Very good	46	92	30	60	29	58
Good	0	0	15	30	13	26

Sufficient	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insufficient	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Table 7. Self-evaluation of multiple sources, pluralism and quality of teaching, N=150*

Overall, almost a half (43.3 %) of all 150 teachers are not sure whether their teaching is pluralistic and multiple-source (various, multi-layered approaches to designing lessons). If we add to this number 4.66 % of the teachers who say that their teaching does not contain the described characteristics, it is evident that more attention should be paid to didactic and teaching pluralism in schools.

17 teachers (11.3 %) gave an excellent grade to their own teaching, 105 (70 %) said it was very good and 28 (18.7 %) good. However, we should point out that lower primary school teachers rated their own teaching with higher grades, while other teachers (higher primary and secondary) were a lot more critical of their own teaching.

Finally, in the last part of the questionnaire the teachers were asked to name problems related to pedagogical and didactic design of their teaching (open-ended). Unfortunately, one third of all the teachers did not mention any problems, whereas the other participants' answers can be divided into the following categories: organisational problems, a large number of students per class/group and a too extensive curriculum. Secondary school teachers (as well as higher primary teachers) also say that another problem is teaching mixed-ability groups. We are familiar with all these responses since teachers have already emphasised these problems in previous similar studies. It is obvious that it is crucial to introduce innovations and making improvements should be a continuous process, which requires greater effort. It should also be emphasised that pluralistic teaching and learning are directed towards sensible and not mechanical learning and towards practical instead of verbal learning. This is a process of active building / construction and cumulative integrating of knowledge which should be reflected in teaching as a self-directed, aim-oriented and cooperative process.

## **Conclusion**

Instruction and lesson design from teachers' perspective is a vital component of a contemporary school, teaching and learning. The variety of didactic and instructional forms of teaching improves the quality of teaching and makes it more active, interesting and complete.

The results indicate that problem and programmed teaching, topic-based and integrative teaching, project work, computer-assisted learning and field

work are very rarely implemented, while teacher-fronted instruction is still very common. Team work is only sometimes present and experiment, as an important part of contemporary teaching, is least performed in comparison to all other methods.

Quantitative and qualitative analysis of frequency of teaching strategies, methods and procedures leads to the conclusion that didactic and teaching pluralism is only sometimes present in higher primary and secondary schools, and it is a bit more widespread in lower primary schools. Also, lower primary school teachers, compared to higher primary and secondary teachers, rate their own teaching with higher grades.

Theoretical and practical findings of this research point to a greater need for pluralistic teaching at all levels (primary and secondary schools), greater freedom of choice and decision making, sharing own experience, independent thinking and work by using adequate learning strategies for creative problem solving and developmental processes within lifelong learning and partnership in schools, families and communities.

### References:

1. Bognar, L. & Matijević, M. (2002). *Didaktika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
2. Glasser, W. (1994). *Kvalitetna škola: škola bez prisile*. Zagreb: Educa.
3. Jelavić, F. (1995). *Didaktičke osnove nastave*. Jastrebarsko: Naklada Slap.
4. Jensen, E. (2003). *Super – nastava: nastavne strategije za kvalitetnu školu i uspješno učenje*. Zagreb: Educa.
5. Kaufman, C. J., & Bear, J. (2002). Hawking's Haiku, Madonna's Math: Why Is It Hard to Be Creative in Every Room of the House. In R. J. Stenberg, E. L. Grigorenko, J. L. Singer (Eds.), *Creativity - From Potential to Realization* (pp. 3-21). Washington. DC: American Psychological Association. Available at <http://www.scribd.com/doc/51023358/Creativity-From-Potential-to-Realization>
6. Lubart, T., & Guignard, J.-H. (2002). The Generality - Specificity of Creativity: A Multivariate Approach, In R. J. Stenberg, E. L. Grigorenko, J. L. Singer (Eds.), *Creativity - From Potential to Realization* (pp. 43-57). Washington. DC: American Psychological Association. Available at <http://www.scribd.com/doc/51023358/Creativity-From-Potential-to-Realization>
7. Marentič Požarnik, B. (2000). *Psihologija učenja in pouka*. Ljubljana: DZS.
8. Mattes, W. (2007). *Nastavne metode -75 kompaktnih pregleda za nastavnike i učenike*. Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak.
9. Matijević, M., & Radovanović, D. (2011). *Nastava usmjerena na učenika*. Zagreb: Školske novine.
10. Meyer, H. (2002). *Didaktika razredne kvake*. Zagreb: Educa.
11. Meyer, H. (2005). *Što je dobra nastava?*. Zagreb: Erudita.
12. Ozimec, S. (1987). *Odgovornost: Kako prepoznati i poticati dječju kreativnost*. Varaždin: Društvo "Naša djeca".

13. Pranjić, M. (2005). *Didaktika*. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga.
14. Runco, A. M. (2002). *Everyone has Creative Potential*. In R. J. Sternberg, E. L. Grigorenko, J. L. Singer (Eds.), *Creativity - From Potential to Realization* (pp. 21-31). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Available at <http://www.scribd.com/doc/51023358/Creativity-From-Potential-to-Realization>
15. Terhart, E. (2001). *Metode poučavanja i učenja*. Zagreb: Educa
16. Walsch, B. (2002). *Kurikulum za 1.razred osnovne škole*. Zagreb: Udruga Korak po korak.

### Metodičko oblikovanje nastave iz perspektive učitelja i nastavnika

**Sažetak:** Raznolikost didaktičkih i metodičkih oblika nastave, koji mogu potaknuti i osloboditi potencijale učenja, prepoznaju se kao metodički pluralistički utjecaji. Metodička pluralnost s obzirom na vrste i stilove učenja određena je različitim metodama koje potiču kvalitetu učenja i nastavu čine aktivnom, zanimljivom, kvalitetnom i cjelovitom.

U ovom se poglavlju izlažu rezultati istraživanja kojemu je cilj bio ispitati kojima se nastavnim strategijama, metodama i postupcima (od ponuđenih 48, mapiranih u 6 kategorija), ispitani učitelji i nastavnici (N=150) najviše, a kojima najmanje koriste, odnosno rasvijetliti višeizvornost i pluralnost nastave unutar osnovne i srednje škole.

U statističkoj obradi rezultata uporabljene su standardne metode deskriptivne statistike, a za testiranje statističke značajnosti razlika među uzorcima učitelja razredne i predmetne nastave te nastavnika srednje škole primijenjen je Kruskal-Wallisov test, neparametrijski ekvivalent analizi varijance za nezavisne uzorke. Rezultati su pokazali da problemsko i programirano poučavanje, tematsko i integrativno učenje, projektna, računalna i izvanučionička nastava zauzimaju najniže rangove primjene. Motiviranost, kreativnost i odgojni utjecaji u srednjoj školi, ali i višim razredima osnovne škole značajno opadaju, a glazbeni izričaji gotovo su zanemareni. Višeizvornost i pluralnost nastave, prema procjenama učitelja i nastavnika, samo je ponekad zastupljena.

Ispitivanje i razvoj metoda učenja i poučavanja pokazuje se kao važna odrednica suvremene škole koja teži nastavu usmjeriti prema učeniku i njegovim potrebama. Teorijski i praktični nalazi ovog istraživanja upućuju na potrebu višeizvornosti i pluralnosti suvremene nastave na svim razinama, veću mogućnost izbora i odlučivanja, iznošenja vlastitoga iskustva, samostalnoga razmišljanja i djelovanja uporabom optimalnih strategija odgoja i obrazovanja, kreativnoga rješavanja problema, što ne prestaje nakon nastavnoga sata ili školskoga dana, već predstavlja cjeloživotni proces.

**Ključne riječi:** škola, učitelj, nastavnik, strategije, metode, postupci, metodički pluralizam.

## **Methodische Unterrichtsgestaltung aus der Sicht der Grundschullehrer**

**Zusammenfassung:** Die Vielfältigkeiten der didaktischen und methodischen Unterrichtsformen, die das Lernpotenzial fördern und entfesseln können, werden als methodische und pluralistische Einflüsse erkannt. Die methodische Pluralität ist bezüglich der Lernstile und Lernarten durch eine Vielzahl von Methoden bestimmt, die die Lernqualität fördern und den Unterricht aktiver, interessanter, hochwertiger und vollständiger machen.

In dieser Studie werden die Ergebnisse der Untersuchung präsentiert, mit der erforscht werden sollte, welche Unterrichtsstrategien, Methoden und Verfahren (von 48 angebotenen, in sechs Kategorien eingeteilt) die befragten Lehrer (N = 150) am meisten und welche am wenigsten einsetzen, bzw. es sollte die Vielfältigkeit der Quellen und die Pluralität des Unterrichts in Grund- und Mittelschulen verdeutlicht werden.

Bei der statistischen Analyse der Ergebnisse wurden Standardverfahren der deskriptiven Statistik verwendet, und für die Prüfung der statistischen Signifikanz der Unterschiede zwischen Grundschul- und Mittelschullehrern wurde der Kruskal-Wallis-Test angewendet, ein parameterfreier Äquivalent der Varianzanalyse für unabhängige Stichproben.

Die Ergebnisse zeigten, dass problemorientierter und programmierter Unterricht, thematisches und integratives Lernen, Projektunterricht, computerisierter und außerschulischer Unterricht am seltensten angewendet werden. Motivation, Kreativität und pädagogische Einflüsse in der Mittelschule, aber auch in den höheren Grundschulklassen, sind deutlich zurückgegangen, und der musikalische Ausdruck wird fast ignoriert. Die Vielfältigkeit der Quellen und die Pluralität des Unterrichts ist nach Schätzungen von Grundschullehrern nur manchmal vertreten.

Die Prüfung und Entwicklung von Lehr- und Lernmethoden zeigt sich als eine wichtige Determinante der modernen Schule, die sich nach einem schülerorientierten Unterricht und den Bedürfnissen der Schüler richtet. Die theoretischen und praktischen Ergebnisse dieser Studie weisen auf die Notwendigkeit der Vielfältigkeit der Quellen und der Pluralität des Unterrichts auf allen Ebenen hin, eine größere Auswahl- und Entscheidungsmöglichkeit, Präsentation der eigenen Erfahrungen, selbstständiges Denken und Handeln mit Hilfe der optimalen Bildungsstrategien, kreative Problemlösung, was nicht nach einer Lektion oder einem Schultag aufhört, sondern einen lebenslangen Prozess repräsentiert.

**Schlüsselbegriffe:** Schule, Grundschullehrer, Strategien, Methoden, Verfahren, methodische Pluralität.