

Received: 13.10.2015.
UDK: 378.091.33-043.5
Reviewed paper

INTERACTIVE TEACHING AS INNOVATION IN QUALITY OF DIDACTICAL METHODOLOGICAL ORGANIZATION OF ACADEMIC TEACHING

Nedim Ćirić

*University of Travnik, The Faculty for Education, The Department for Pedagogy
Ive Andrića 70; 75 000, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina
nedimcivic@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

Discussions on quality of university teaching are numerous and under the public eye. At contemporary market conditions where responsibility and evaluation of academic institutions is accentuated there is a need for innovations of methodical organizations of teaching work for the purpose of development and promotion of quality of academic teaching and higher education. The accent is on pleasure and requirements of students, competencies of teachers and labor market expectation as well as the community. The purpose of this paper is to present characteristics of interactive teaching in relation to quality of academic teaching and establish whether university teaching through interactive learning and teaching emphasizes cooperative and partner relations through position and role of students and teachers. In terms of methodology, the method applied is one of meta-analysis for research studies that dealt with studying of characteristics of academic teaching (innovations in learning and teaching, project-co-relation approach realized through connecting of teaching contents and differences in teaching organization, and the like) based on which it could be said that problems of contemporary researches in the area of academic didactics mainly encompassed micro organizational structure of teaching work. Analytic-descriptive method was used with the procedure for content analysis. The basis was the assumption that didactical methodical structure of teaching work according to the model of interactive teaching contributes to creation of co operational and partner relations through positions and role of students and teachers which is reflected to higher quality of academic education. The results of this research indicated that interactive teaching with suitable methodical-didactical structure of organization of teaching work contributes to development of cooperative relations that were neglected in the concept of traditional paradigm of academic education which contributes to quality of academic

teaching as well as to quality of higher education overall.

Keywords: *interactive teaching, quality of teaching, methods and forms of teaching work; academic teaching; high education.*

INTRODUCTION

The development of contemporary society is continually followed by continual development and progress in the field of technology which highly influences many segments of social activities of human work. More and more professions demands continual progress and professional education of individuals in order to be included into contemporary flows of social activities and institutionally formal education is especially prominent. Life in the twenty-first century demands from individuals to be included into the process of life-long education that is conditioned by abilities and readiness of a separate person to continually study and upgrade knowledge and abilities, develops skills and acquires new competencies. Increase of quality of high education represents an imperative in development of contemporary “studying” society. It means that it is expected from an individual to be constantly open to the process of collective studying and professional education and to be ready for different forms of cooperation in order to integrate readily into the process of life-long education regardless of when and where. Regarding this, it could be said that the final goal of high education is to qualify an individual for more active contribution to personal development and development of the community, development of cooperative relations, and competencies for team and group work regardless of professional occupation in their future.

Mikanović (2010) emphasizes that tendency towards quality university education opens the requirement of innovation of university teaching itself. The purpose of innovation is to accomplish higher outcomes of studying which is one of the key aspects of high education. When it comes to outcomes of learning and teaching within university teaching regardless of the academic field or area of education outcomes and measures are indicated through knowledge acquirement, development of abilities and skills and development of competencies. In that sense, innovation of university courses in which teaching and academic processes are collocated with different learning and teaching forms should be based on the new criteria of education quality directed towards individual and society requirements and it is based on active involvement and interactivity of its participants.

Concerning the goals of the Bologna concept of high education, innovation should provide such effect as it is emphasized by Đukić (2010, p. 136) that “misconceptions and confusions which make the existing high education system ineffective, inefficient and non-economical”. Therefore, high necessity of re-conceptualization of “society of knowledge” into the “society that is learning” is emphasized and at the same time re-conceptualization of high education from mere “serving facts through presenting and teaching” into “active and interactive participation of students in learning by discovering,

creation, innovation, production and earning". This creates innovative institutions of high education directed towards requirements of students, teachers and the society as a whole. In that sense, the purpose of this paper is to present characteristics of interactive classes in relation to quality of academic teaching and establish whether university teaching through interactive learning and teaching accentuates cooperative and partnership relationships through position and role of students and teachers.

INTERACTIVE CLASSES AND QUALITY OF ACADEMIC TEACHING

Since the quality of academic classes depends on didactical-methodical reach of its organization interactive classes are imperative of contemporary academic education. Unlike interactive classes, traditional university teaching is based on traditional paradigm of learning. It is based on forms of teaching in which each activity of students comes down to a minimum of self-actualization of an individual in the process. Such concepts of organization of teaching work in academic education highly contribute to passivity of students, disinterest for participation that finally influences badly to outcomes of quality of learning. Ćatić and Ćatić (2009) emphasize that classical teaching contributes to passivity of the learners placing them into situation of "limited activity" which means that in the process of learning only a few of activities are initiated (memorizing, reproduction, and so on) and other activities are suppressed (cooperation, agreeing, problem solving). Therefore, it could be said that classical teaching neglects inclination for learners that their own activity contribute to creation of situations in which they would be able to learn.

Active and interactive classes are based on contemporary models, strategies and styles of learning in which quality of interpersonal relations of university teachers, assistants and students are deepened. The character of such teaching practice is based on contemporary paradigm of learning and teaching in which all participants learn from each other. According to Omerović (2016) the basic attribute and meaning of interactive classes are expressed so that interactive classes are scientifically based and systematically organized educational work dedicated to attendees of a particular age, differential degree of education at the established conception of teaching plan and program in which methods of interactive learning are dominantly applied. Interactive classes are based on defined goals and they are characterized, among other things, by a huge number of various teaching activities and methods.

Ćatić and Ćatić (2009) emphasize that it is the most important to understand significant characteristics of active classes from the aspect of position of those individuals for whom classes were organized for. Therefore, it is necessary to pay attention of personal participation (work) of attendees of a certain degree of education, their work, expressing of initiative, individual strength and readiness to accept changes that occur. In that way in the process of learning more relaxed atmosphere is created in which tensions disappear and positive emotions strengthen and they become powerful initiator of new activities.

According to Popović (2007) classes are based on interpersonal cooperative relations

and it helps overcome many weaknesses of traditional classes. Therefore, interaction directly develops competencies that the system of traditional classes barely supports. In that sense, the main purpose of the interactive method is transferring action from teachers, joint learning, and joint work on learning goals, processing of content, application of the learned content and evaluation of the process. Application of the interactive learning model influences the level of motivation, cooperation is developed and responsibility assumed. Harmonizing of attitudes are learned, mutual action, tolerance, modern communication and dialog culture by using of media and different sources of knowledge. Ćatić and Ćatić (2009) emphasize that the methods of interactive learning are those in which learning in social interaction dominates. Such methods are: methods of team learning, mosaic method, study together method, method of group project, structural approach, cooperative map concepts, cooperative lecture notes, problem learning in problem classes, other traditional and contemporary methods that support co-education and social interaction in the process of learning which are targeted to students.

Numerous researches show that at levels of primary, secondary and high education in teaching practice, verbal and reproductive types of teaching are on the lowest level of efficiency. The necessity that teaching process based on learning and teaching there is a justifiably accentuated requirement for didactical and methodical structuring through active involvement of all participants. The research conducted in Great Britain by the "society for audio-visual research" (according to Ciryacou, 1994, - the pyramid of experience in educational process) showed that an individual memorizes 10% of what is read, 20% of what is heard, 30% of what is seen, 50% of what is seen and heard, 80% of what is said, and 90% of what is said and done at the same time. The stated research results show that the effect of learning is much larger if participants of teaching process are actively involved in participation through interaction with each other. In accomplishing the professional role of university teacher it is necessary to possess professional scientific knowledge but also quality skills and developed pedagogical and methodical competencies for work in teaching process. In interactive classes university teacher is the leader who creates suitable socio-emotional climate and academic and pedagogical atmosphere in order to accomplish goals of interactive learning and justify purpose and functionality of high education. Methodical organization of joint learning and teaching at the level of high education classes has the purpose to pedagogically lead and monitor university teachers by which the sense of mutual interaction, i.e. intentionality of education in acquiring of knowledge, development of abilities and skills and in creation of competencies in interactive classes.

In the context of didactical-methodical structure of high education it should be emphasized that the model of interactive teaching does not discard completely the traditional model of organization of teaching work but it represents particular innovation in the context of methodical concept of organization of teaching work with students. This innovation is included through combination of interactive learning in different teaching systems such as exemplary, team, problem solving, etc. classes and its purpose is to make the process of learning easier and more efficient. Contemporary methodology of teaching work in academic education in relation to requirements of students demands

meticulous respecting of didactical principle of conscious activities of students. In consistency of following of didactical principle of conscious activities of students in the process of interactive teaching work, interests and motivation of students as key factors in the process of learning have to be continuously recognized by university teachers.

Based on consistency of following of didactical principle of conscious activity of students university teachers and associates get the role of leaders, monitoring roles and guides in educational interests in the process of interactive learning and teaching. University teachers can successfully control motivation of students according to recognized interests by suitable methodological procedures and adequate didactical-methodical structure of teaching process. Related to this, the contribution of interactive teaching in total quality of teaching work of academic classes is reflected through development of mutual partnership, collegial and cooperative relationships with the purpose of development of responsible and recognizable professional individual who will initiate changes by their skills and competencies in self-development as well as the society as the whole.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

In methodological sense the method of Meta analysis was applied for research studies that dealt with studying of contemporary characteristics of academic classes. The analytical-descriptive method was used during research as well as the procedure for content analysis. The basis was the assumption that didactical-methodical structure of teaching work by the model of interactive teaching contributes to creation of cooperative and partnership relations through position and role of students and teachers which is reflected to higher quality of high education. The basic research was done by Google Scholar, Online platform for Taylor and Francis Group content, Web of Science, Research Gate browser in electronic data bases Taylor & Francis, Routledge, CRC Press, Psychology Press, Garland Science, Focal Press, Hrčak, Blackwell Synergy, DOAJ and Master FILE Premier. Papers published in printed journals "Didactic Roadmaps" and "Our School" were reviewed as well as available journals of scientific conferences papers. Research of data bases was conducted in August 2015 and it was base on thorough analysis of briefs of published works that contained the following key words: *university courses; high education; position of students and teachers in classes; methods of teaching work; forms of teaching work; interaction during classes, interactive methods of learning; active and interactive classes, models of interactive learning; strategies of interactive learning; methods of interactive learning, forms of work in interactive classes, grading techniques, quality of classes*. Papers published in Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian and English languages were reviewed. The procedure of content analysis was used for separation and classification of articles. Content-related criterion for classification of works was compatibility of works with subject of this research. Total of 21 published papers satisfied content-related criteria for the requirements of this paper from the aspect of interactive classes and quality of academic teaching. For more complete and quality theoretical elaboration of this paper

6 of the published papers satisfied the content-related criteria. Papers that meet the following criteria for analysis of content: papers published in the period from Jan 2006 to Aug 2015 and which refer to interactive classes and quality of academic classes, papers with research results presented in quantitative and qualitative methods with interviewees found among students and/or university teachers and associates. In the content-related analysis for theoretical elaboration of problems research, papers with content based on the aspect of interaction and interactive methods of teaching work, quality of courses, goals and tendencies of high education and the Bologna Concept and declaration of high education were considered and they do not represent empirical researches. Relevant course materials for explaining and elaboration or problems of interactive classes and quality of academic classes were used.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Table 1. Systematic overview of studies

Author and year	Research results
Collier, G.K. (2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • five classical methods of learning of students: lectures; discussion method; practical work in laboratories, studios, etc.; • individualizing of learning techniques and computer methods • deviations from the usual practice with special accent on techniques in smaller groups
Đorđević, V. (2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pair work learning (cooperative learning in pairs student-student) • group learning (cooperative learning in groups of students) • cooperative learning teacher-student (pair work, group work, class work)
Popović, A. (2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • offers higher movement liberty and various models of individual work and creation by students • transferring of action from teachers to students • joint work on goals of learning and processing of content • interactive method influences to higher level of motivation in classes, develops cooperation and stimulates responsibility of students
Teresa B. K. Tsien (2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • joint process of learning, students participate in planning and realization of project activities during classes • higher control over individual learning at students • participation model of learning develops cooperation, stimulates to development of values, skills and understanding of civil responsibility and preparation for life

Peko, A. at alumni (2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • presence of various forms and degrees of activity in class • students request more active participation in teaching process through research and flexible approach and noticing of values of critical approach and self-criticism as well as adaptability to new situations and differences
Grahovac-Pražić, V., Vrcić Mataija, S. (2008).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • project-co-relation approach realized through relation of teaching contents and diversity of organization of classes • leaves concept of class-subject organization of teaching work and introduces innovative learning and teaching approaches
Močinić, S. (2008).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • respecting of students as subject of learning • methods of work are seminars, consultations, practices and discussions • it influences positively to re-organization of high education courses
Krampus, V. (2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students are subjects of classes • motivation moves them, and it comes from students' • methods, techniques and forms of work are various, used in accordance to possibilities, prior knowledge and skills of students, • teaching aids are various
Knežević, S. and Kovačević, B. (2011).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focus of interactive learning is on cognitive, emotional, social and work-action competencies • results of experimental research of influences of interactive learning to development of competencies in literature classes indicate that effects of interactive learning are expressed through higher degree of development of cognitive, emotional, social and work-action competences of students
Cigan, V. i Šlogar, H. (2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in interactive teaching, teacher – guide who guides the teaching process, directs students • teaching process is directed to student and is based at the analysis of their requirements and community, contributes to adoption of communication and entrepreneurship competences • active methods in studying contribute to qualifying of students for life-long learning as basis for increase of competition at the market and entrepreneurship in general
Maksimović, A i Stančić, M. (2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teaching methods dominate • there is not enough orientation to individualization of classes • there is cooperation with colleagues at choice of methods as well as conscious on significance of pedagogical-psychological-methodical knowledge for adequate choice of methods of work in classes
Močinić, S. (2012).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dominant method of oral presentation but with frequent usage of discussion • contributes to gradual re-organization of academic classes
Mirković, M. (2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • project classes increase students' activities • project learning increases active participation of students • teacher organizer, manager, mentor, instructor and associate • students become organizers and implementers of classes

<p>Čirić, N. (2013).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the most dominant method of oral presentation • frequently in use and conversational method • dynamics in process of contemporary university teaching
<p>Planas, A. et al. (2013)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • student participates in the process of university management • offers proposal for easier students' engagement in functioning of university • changes should not refer to improvement of methods in which students are informed on the methods of participation but also to influence to the university structure of participation process, role of teaching staff
<p>Čirić, N. (2014).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the most dominant is written grading • grading by tests, quizzes, essays, and similar • a few teachers use oral verification of knowledge • problems of lack of time are emphasized and huge number of students for oral verification of knowledge
<p>Bognar, B., Bungić, M. (2014).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students actively participate in evaluation • observations and proposals of students can initiate teachers to promote all stages of teaching process • evaluation as mutual activity of students and teachers
<p>Brkić, S. (2014)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • active participation is performed in interactive classes with a lot of various methods • interactive teaching methods increase efficiency of teaching in relation to lectures
<p>Richardson, S. & Radloff, A. (2014)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quality of learning of university education focused to teaching plans and programs and less to interaction student – teacher • frequent interaction with those who teach lead to higher level of engagement of students and their pleasure and lower degree of expenditures • teaching staff has insight into learning of students offering them possibility for better channeling of classes
<p>Boyd, MP.i Markarian, WC. (2015)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dialogue method initiates conversations and functions of cognitive activities • larger support in the classroom and animates ideas from students that contribute to learning process • functions of conversations are important for success of dialogue in teaching and learning
<p>Angelique De Hei, M. et. al. (2015)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cooperative learning contributes to team work • contributes to higher motivation and outcomes • higher orientation of students towards activities than teacher

Table 2. Systematic overview of criteria of teaching quality

Author and year	Research results or theoretical assumptions
Kovač, V. And others (1998).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • seeing quality of academic classes through making educational goals of students easier • quality classes enables: stimulation of interests, clarity, honesty, preparedness, enthusiasm, friendly relations, readiness to help and openness to other opinions, • seven principles of successful classes at faculties are: initiation of contacts between teachers and students; developing of reciprocity and cooperation between students; usage of techniques of active learning; giving immediate feedback information
Vlahović, B. (2001).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for quality and reform it is necessary to have innovations of program, different curriculums based on which students can develop intellectual and other abilities, cherish rational, humanistic, creative approach to scientific, technical and artistic contents, initiative and adaptability
Van Damme, D. (2003).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • various meanings of quality depending on: understanding of interests of various component parts or participants of the high education system (demands for quality are dictated scientific area/labor market/society/government/students), references such as inputs, processes, outputs, mission, goals, etc., characteristics and marks of the academic community that is worth researching and historical period in development of high education
Meyer, H. (2005).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 criteria of validity of classes: clear classes structure, high participation of real learning time, motivational atmosphere for learning, clarity of content, establishing of sense for communication, differences of methods, individual motivation, intelligent practice, clarity of expected achievements, prepared environment
Mencer, I. (2010).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high education as an important factor of economic and social development as well as the assumption of social cohesion and justice • for high education the interested parties are: employers, students, parents and public management at all levels

DISCUSSION

During recent years the question of quality of high education is more and more prominent. The quality of high education classes is positioned highly in range of priorities for promotion of educational system. The quality, according to Juran and Gryna (1999, p. 3) is “the pleasure of users”. Ivošević and others (2006) define quality as “continual process that ensures completion of agreed standards”. The agreed standards should ensure that each academic institution, in which the quality is ensured, has the potential of accomplishing of high quality of contents and results through assets and processes by which

the institution guarantees a certain standard. The quality of classes is multidimensional, multilevel and dynamic concept that refers to didactical-methodical assumption of the model, educational goals and learning outcomes. Ensuring and developing of quality of high education are parallel process within the continual monitoring and analysis process in order to adapt teaching process to circumstances in which it runs and in accordance to requirements and abilities of its participants.

Evaluation of teaching process is an important part of the professional practice of every teacher. Teachers evaluate teaching process in order to identify how successful they were in accomplishing of their own professional practice, which are their weak and strong sides and how successful they were in comparison to their colleague teachers (Hounsell, 2003). In relation to quality of teaching process, necessity to analyze high education is multipurpose. The tendency is to define mutual components and criteria variables that affect the most to the quality of classes. Academic institutions are honorable bearers of creation of educational activities. They have the responsibility towards students, employees, parents of the students, authorized institutions, employers and community. Measuring perceptions of students it is possible to reliably and validly manage the quality of classes. Functioning of the system of internal evaluation of quality of classes gives good assumptions for continual promotion of education quality and makes the university the center of development. For management of institutions of academic education it provides rich source of data on perception of students on education, their requirements and desires. Data are collected quickly and with low expenses and they offer detailed insight into analysis of complex factors related to pleasure of students (Sutić and associates, 2012).

The official goals of Bologna Declaration (according to Đukić, 2010) that are related to the reform of the high education system and they refer to establishing of the system comparable and comprehensible academic vocations, adoption of three-stage (cycle) system of studying, acceptance of the European scoring system (ECTS) and one semester courses in order to overcome obstacles to free movement of students and teachers, i.e., in order to make studies more efficient and in order to promote cooperation amongst academic institutions and associations in the sense of achievement and maintaining of academic education quality.

Related to this, the significant quality of academic classes is interaction itself and interactive classes. They motivate establishment of cooperation and cooperative relations at the level of classes as well as at the level of the high education organization system. It means that learning and teaching is conditioned by communication. Pedagogical communication has the purpose to accomplish the influence to motivation of all processes that contribute to successful development of personality of an individual. The goals and task of the class process influences the nature and communication quality. Success of classes depends on quality of communication. Teaching communication should provide symmetry, i.e., equal involvement of all participants in communication. The tendency of interactive classes is to place the student in the role of the subject of the class. It requires higher involvement and participation of students through personal engagement in realization as well in planning and evaluation of classes. It indicates that interactive learning by its character is mutual process of learning and teaching and motivates students

and teachers to critical thinking, creativity, independence, competencies, individuality, and so on. From the position of communication in symmetric communication the position of students and teachers is equal and as such it makes academic atmosphere and climate for better work easier. Osmić (2001) states that dominance of teachers is reflected in verbal presentation of contents, giving orders, criticism of behavior, defense of personal experience, giving information and opinions, asking questions, acceptance or refusal of opinions, attitudes and ideas which represents traditional paradigm of academic classes.

Concerning the nature of communication relations between professors and students there are differences between styles of work of teachers in teaching practice. They can be democratic, cooperative, authoritative and authoritarian. According to Suzić (2003), authoritative teachers comparing cooperative teachers create less desirable emotional climate, contribute less to motivation, lead classes to unadjusted cognitive styles of the learners which reflect in lower academic achievement. Powerful teachers (authoritative style) accept and stimulate submissive behavior through expression of their superiority while flexible (democratic style) teachers offer chances, they are friendly, they take in consideration needs and interests and they take over coordinator role. When it comes to opposing of these two basic styles of management it should be pointed out that they are connected to two different concept of education that has its historical order. Authoritarian style is traditional classes “heritage” (or, as it is sometimes called, teacher centered class) in which efficient management demands submission to strict rules. According to Stantrock (2006) the contemporary concept of student oriented class demands completely different approach – orientation to students’ needs, cherishing relations and creation of conditions for development of self-regulation at students. Interactive class and interactive methods of learning and teaching understand innovations for the purpose of alleviation of the learning process and creation of cooperative relations between students and teachers.

According to Ćatic and Ćatic (2009) active class is outlined on natural tendency of research of the world around by personal activity and it is realized by providing motivation of various activities in different aspects of learning in the teaching process. Popović (2007) emphasizes that interactive class offers higher liberties of movement and more diverse models of individual work and creation. Brkic (2014) emphasizes that active learning is performed during interactive class with succession of various methods and that interactive teaching methods increase class performance in relation to lecture. On the other hand, Richardson and Radloff (2014) emphasize that the quality of learning in university education is focused to teaching plans and programs and it is weaker during student-teacher interaction. They emphasize that frequent interactions with teachers lead to higher level of student engagement and pleasure and lower rates of expenditures and teaching staff has the insight into learning of students offering them possibility for better directing of classes.

Theresa (2007) emphasizes that interactive class encompasses mutual process of learning, students participate in planning and realization of project activities during classes and the complete process of interactive learning is reflected in higher control over personal students’ learning. Interactive classes represent participative model of learning that develops cooperation, motivates development of values, skills and understanding in

civil responsibility and preparation for life. Cigan and Šlogar (2012) explain the position and role of teachers in interactive classes in which teacher – guide manages the teaching process, directs students, and the teaching process is student centered and is based on the analysis of their needs and community and contributes to adoption of communication and entrepreneur competencies. They emphasize that active methods of teaching contribute to qualification of students for life-long learning as basis for increase of competition at the market and entrepreneurship in general. Differences between traditional model of classes and interactive classes could be shown as it follows:

Table 3. Differences in traditional and interactive model of classes

Traditional classes model	Interactive classes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher is the center • Learning is transferring of knowledge • Studying is equal for all • Learning as individual activity • Uniform types of activities • Limited number of teaching methods • Goals in relation to teacher • Teacher is instructor • Verification of the learned (summative evaluation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student is the center • Learning is active construction of knowledge • Different styles of learning and individual differences in learning capabilities • Cooperative learning • Different types of activities • Huge number of teaching methods • Goal in relation to attendee, teaching process and problems • Teacher is facilitator • Evaluation is formative

Therefore, interactive class is the class in which the methods of interactive learning are applied, i.e., methods that stimulate cooperation. Ciric (2014) emphasizes that majority of didactic practitioners (Filipović, 1980; Poljak, 1984; Stevanović, 1998; Vilotijević, 2001; Tomić, Osmić, 2008) as the most comprehensive offer the classification of teaching methods to “*dialogical, monologue, textual, demonstration, graphic works, laboratory works and methods of practice works*”. Out of previously stated methods, for interactive classes all except monologue methods are applicable if the teacher is capable of adapting the class method with goals and methods of interactive learning. For interactive classes, forms of teaching work are important. Vilotijević (2001, p. 169) emphasizes “the contemporary didactics accepted classification of forms of teaching work according to sociological criterion to *frontal, group, pair work, individual and individualizing*. The forms of organization of teaching work in interactive class have the purpose to stimulate mutual work and cooperation relationships in order for teaching activities to be realized, educational goals accomplished and effects of learning achieved. The stated forms of teaching work, each of them with methodical modification and adjustment to interactive learning can be equally useful to achievement of educational goals and successful learning effects. Besides methods and forms of teaching work, *strategies of learning* are important that refer to activities and actions that students use in order to make knowledge

acquisition easier, i.e. specific actions that students take for the purpose of easier, faster, more interesting and more efficient learning. It is expected from the student to achieve the quality of knowledge that would provide solving of general but also professionally specific problems.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION

Reform of high education in Bosnia and Herzegovina initiated series of changes in the sense of organization of academic teaching and actualized methods of approach to studying, demands, perceptions of studies, expected outcomes and competencies which represent guidelines of quality of academic teaching. In this research, the central question was interactive class and its contribution to development of quality of academic classes.

The results that were acquired by analytic descriptive method and content analysis indicate that the main characteristics of interactive teaching are *exchange of experience, knowledge and attitudes between students, between students and teachers through interactive learning and teaching, relation of teaching content with experience and styles of learning and cooperation and partnership through equality, respect and tolerance*, guidelines of quality of academic classes. In interactive class, the choice of adequate teaching method depends on methodical competence of teachers in its usage as well as of the nature of teaching contents.

The results show that interactive teaching stimulates creation of cooperative relations and contributes to dynamics of teaching process, motivates self-activity and initiative, active participation in students' involvement. The accent is on development of interpersonal relations between students and teachers which affects the change of the teachers and students' role in interactive classes. The teacher becomes coordinator, guide and supervisor over the teaching process, directs interaction in class and lets student be bearers of realization of teaching activities. The purpose interactive class is to ease the process of learning and help students in accomplishing of tasks given. For the choice of the appropriate method in interactive class it is necessary to know advantages and shortcomings of various teaching methods and consider the following: *Does the method respond to the set goal and does it lead to development of skills, knowledge and abilities? Does it provide including different styles of learning? How long does it take how much space and material does it take for application of the method? Which degree of prior knowledge and skills does it require for a certain teaching method? Does the method correspond to the style of teacher's style of teaching and style of learning of students? **Does it require activity of students?** It is expected from students in interactive classes to *increase personal responsibility in accomplishing educational goals, increased necessity for personal organization and self-motivation and increase of expected results regarding quantity and quality of adopted knowledge, development of skills and development of competencies.**

Based on all of the stated above it could be concluded that interactive class with suitable methodical-didactical structure of organization of teaching work contributes to development of cooperative relations that were neglected by the traditional high

education paradigm which contributes to quality of academic classes as well as quality of high education overall.

REFERENCES

1. Angelique De Hei, M. S., Strijbos, J.W., Sjoer, E., Admiraal, W. (2015). Collaborative learning in higher education: lecturers' practices and beliefs. *Research Papers in Education*, 2: 232-247.
2. Bongar, B., Bungić, M. (2014). Mogućnosti evaluacije visokoškolske nastave. *Život i škola*, 31: 139-159.
3. Boyd, MP. i Markarian, WC. (2015). Dialogic Teaching and Dialogic Stance: Moving beyond Interactional Form. *Research in the Teaching Of English*, 3: 272-296.
4. Brkić, S. (2014). Interaktivne metode u nastavi fizike. *Suvremena pitanja*, 17: 68-81.
5. Cigan, V., Šlogar, H. (2012). Istraživanje stavova studenata o metodama poučavanja na visokim čilištima u cilju razvoja poduzetničke kompetencije. *Učenje za poduzetništvo*, 1: 179 - 190.
6. Collier, G.K. (2006). Teaching Methods in Higher Education: The Changing Scene, with Special Reference to Small-group Work. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 1: 3-27.
7. Ćatić, R., Ćatić, A. (2009). *Strategije učenja i poučavanja*. Zenica: Pedagoški fakultet u Zenici.
8. Čirić, N. (2014). Forms, methods and techniques of evaluation, inspection, evaluation and assessment of students' achievement in contemporary university teaching. Zbornik međunarodnog naučno-stručnog skupa „Kulturni identitet u digitalnom dobu“ (str. 1001-1009). Zenica: Pedagoški fakultet.
9. Čirić, N. (2014). Selection and Use of Teaching Aids and Technologies in Contemporary University Courses. *Metodički obzori*, 20: 14 - 25.
10. Đorđević, V. (2007). Integrativni modeli nastave (Integrativna nastava, Projektna nastava i Interaktivna nastava). *Obrazovna Tehnologija*, 4: 76 - 97.
11. Đukić, M. (2010). Nova paradigma univerzitetske nastave kao izraz pedagoške reforme visokog obrazovanja. *Sociološka luča*, 4: 135-145.
12. Grahovac-Pražić, V., Vrcić- Mataija, S. (2008). Projektno-korelacijska nastava na učiteljskom studiju. *Metodika*, 17: 287-295.
13. Hounsell, D. (2003). The evaluation of teaching. U : Fry i sur. (2003) *A handbook for teaching & learning in higher education*. Second edition, London: Kogan page.
14. Ivošević, V. and associates (2006). *Priručnik za profesore i studente, Vodič kroz osiguranje kvalitete u visokom školstvu*. Zagreb: Agram Naklada.
15. Juran, J.M., Gryna, F.M. (1999). *Planiranje i analiza kvalitete*. Zagreb: Matte.
16. Kiryacu, Ch. (1994). *Temeljna nastavna umijeća*. Zagreb: Eduka.
17. Knežević, S., Kovačević, B. (2011). Interaktivno učenje i kompetencije učenika u nastavi književnosti. *Metodički obzori*, 13: 83 - 92.
18. Kovač, V. and associates (1998). Kriteriji uspješne visokoškolske nastave. *Časopis za*

- pedagogijsku teoriju i praksu, 139.*
19. Krampus, V. (2009). Poslovni Hrvatski jezik i interaktivna nastava na Veleučilištu VERN. *Metodika, 18*: 92-96.
 20. Maksimović, A., Stančić, M. (2012). Nastavne metode iz perspektive nastavnika. *Metodički obzori, 7*: 69 - 82.
 21. Mencer, I. (2010). Upravljanje kvalitetom na hrvatskim sveučilištima u nastojanjima uključivanja u europski prostor visokog obrazovanja, Zbornik radova 11. međunarodnog Simpozija o kvaliteti Kvaliteta, konkurentnost i održivost. Zagreb: INTER-ING.
 22. Meyer, H. (2005). *Što je dobra nastava*, Zagreb: Erudita.
 23. Mikanović, R. B. (2010). Humanističko-razvojne paradigme univerzitetskog obrazovanja. U: Humanizacija univerziteta - Problemi i perspektive. Zbornik radova (str. 52-65). Banja Luka: Filozofski fakultet.
 24. Mirković, M. (2009). Nastava usmjerena na učenika. Digitalni časopis za obrazovne stručnjake „Pogled kroz prozor“ br. 40.
 25. Močinić, S. (2008). Implications of the Bologna process: student's position in the educational process. International Conference on Comparative Education and Teacher Training (str. 156-160), Sofia: Bureau for Educational Services .
 26. Močinić, S. (2012). Active teaching strategies in higher education. *Metodički obzori, 7*: 97-105.
 27. Omerović, M. (2016). *Metodika nastavnog rada - pedagoška moć odlučivanja*. Tuzla: Off Set
 28. Osmić, I. (2001). *Komunikacije i interakcije u nastavnom procesu*. Gračanica: Grin.
 29. Peko, A., Mlinarević, M., Buljubašić – Kuzmanović, V. (2008). Potreba unaprjeđivanja sveučilišne nastave. *Odgojne znanosti, 1*: 195-208.
 30. Planas, A. and associates (2013). Student participation in university governance: the opinions of professors and students. *Studies in Higher Education, 4*: 571-583. London:
 31. Popović, A. (2007). Interaktivno učenje – inovativni način rada u nastavi. *Obrazovna tehnologija, 4*: 55-75.
 32. Richardson, S., Radloff, A. (2014). Allies in learning: critical insights into the importance of staff–student interactions in university education. *Teaching in Higher Education, 6*: 603-615.
 33. Santrock, J.W. (2006). *Educational psychology –classroom update: preparing for PRAXIS and practice*. Boston: Mc Graw Hill
 34. Sutić, I. (2012). Kvaliteta i društvena odgovornost, Zbornik radova 13. Međunarodnog simpozija o kvaliteti. (str. 331-345). Zagreb: Hrvatsko društvo menadžera kvalitete.
 35. Suzić, N. (2003). *Osobine nastavnika i odnos učenika prema nastavi*. Banja Luka: Teacher Training Centre.
 36. Teresa B. K. Tsien (2007). A Participative Learning and Teaching Model: The Partnership of Students and Teachers in Practice Teaching. *Social Work Education, 4*: 348-358.
 37. Van Damme, D. (2003). Outlooks for the international higher education community

in the global knowledge society, in: UNESCO ed., First global forum on international quality assurance, accreditation and the recognition of qualifications in higher education. Paris: Proceedings.

38. Vlahović, B. (2001). *Putevi inovacija u obrazovanju*. Beograd: Stručna knjiga i Eduka.