Progressive Education – Didactic Challenges

Sonja Kovačević
University of Split, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Department of Teacher Education

Abstract

Ever since they were established, schools and the teaching they entail have always been burdened by their progressive role. Progressive reformers were preoccupied with a pedagogical interpretation of the Paedocentric concept of education and the teaching methodology and methodological operationalization of the so-called child-centred method. The premise of pedagogical Progressivism was that education is based on the fact that the best way for people, as social beings, to learn and acquire knowledge is by engaging in real life activities. Processes of acquiring new knowledge occur with increasing frequency outside the formerly known didactic organizational scheme. If schools do not adapt quickly, they are bound to lose this race. Does progress, in the sense of teaching improvement, presume innovations in the educational technology, the teaching organization, or would progress in pedagogy mean something completely different today? As soon as we pose the question of quality, we raise questions of not only organization of the educational process but also the meaning and manner of learning and teaching in the era in which everything is relative, when all values fluctuate and everything becomes mutable and impermanent because of the influence of technology, media and virtual reality.

Key words: *didactics; organisational models; progressive education; teaching.*

Introduction

Ever since schools and teaching as its most organized form of work were established, they had always been burdened by their progressive role, whereby the term progressive denotes an (accelerated) advancement and development of students. Progress denotes "advancement, forward motion, towards a more perfect condition, change for the

better, transition to a higher development level, improvement, development" (Klajić, 1974, p. 1068). The term "progressive" originally signified new social and political ideas in mid and late 19th century, the epochal changes of direction in social development and spirit of the time caused by the completely different image of the world transformed by industrialization and urbanization across the globe. In addition, on the one hand, the term progressive represented a dominant alternative to the traditional conservative attitude towards social and economic change, and on the other, a radical socialist and anarchist perspective on social development. It was articulated by all political parties as the middle way between conservatism and liberalism of the early 20th century.

> The Progressives demanded social freedoms, voting rights for minorities and women, foundation of Workers' Unions as an aspect of political freedom, passage of laws defining weekly working hours and value of minimum wage. The Progressives were strongly opposed to economic freedoms, i.e. the economic policy the country was based on since the end of the American Civil War, which was supported by both the Republicans and Conservatives…. (Kangavari, 2017, p. 191)

They represented interests of the ordinary people, taxpayers, consumers, workers, citizens and parents.

As a political movement, progressivism referred to reformist ideas on broad-spectrum social issues: workers' rights, abolition of child labour, establishment of community centres (settlement houses – author's note), introduction of social work and centres for protection of children and the underprivileged - in poor districts, improvement of living conditions in urban areas, political corruption, electoral system, democratic control of government, social justice, monopoly, reform of traditional education and other issues. Adherents of Progressivism understood society to be a flexible market economy with a developed social services sector and achievement of social justice. In the liberal tradition, they considered freedom to be the basic principle – economic, intellectual and cultural openness, society in which individuals and families advance based on their own expectations and hard work, and not based on family status or circumstances (Cremin, 1961; Weiss, De Falco, & Weiss, 2005).

Because education is deeply rooted in culture and society, progressive education and pedagogy inherited other traditional reformist ideas, i.e. progressive education is part of comprehensive social reform ideas about strengthening civic participation in democratic decision-making processes. In the context of other pedagogic ideas, progressive education was a reaction to the traditional mechanics in the educational philosophy of American Herbartianism (Cruikshank, 1998). According to Iorio and Yeager (2011), the term progressive was introduced during the curriculum debate in order to emphasize the difference between the new 20th century and traditional 19th century education which prepared the upper-class youth for university. As an educational idea founded on the actual experience, democracy and orientation towards the future, progressive education was initiated in different social circles –

the academic community, parents, teachers, school administrations, teachers and parents' unions and reformist scientists. We should say that this was not a coherent view on education, but on different progressive ideas: the progressive, child-centred education, the Progressive education movement understood in terms of Taylorism (measuring achievements and efficiency of education), socio-cultural progressivism and intellectual reconstructionism, etc.

Principles of Progressivism in Education

The Progressive education movement was created in the US in late 19th and early 20th century under the name of progressive education. It represented efforts at reforming the American education system, which later transcended boundaries of the culture it originated in and spread to Europe. In an attempt to consider the child holistically, educational efforts turned towards the physical, emotional and intellectual. The Britannica Concise Encyclopaedia states that "Progressive education" was a movement that took form in the United States during the late 19th century as a reaction to the narrowness and formalism of traditional education. One of its main objectives was to educate the "whole child". Therefore, the curriculum was directed at developing creative and manual arts, and children were encouraged towards experimentation and independent thinking. Progressive education denotes a broad deviation from traditional education and authoritarian procedures of classroom learning, as well as the reorganization of the new school curriculum.

This phenomenon has a broad-spectrum of meanings and comprises changes in classroom activity, changes in the social curriculum, professional education, the role of school and attitude towards students. The basic principle of progressive education is that children learn best from personal experience connected to vital interests. Education is understood as a continued reconstruction of personal experience through activities managed directly by the child.

In the course of the 20th century, terms progressive education, progressivist pedagogy or progressivist educational philosophy etc., were used to describe pedagogic ideas and ideologies, programmes and educational practices that were intended to reform schools and aspired for schools to become efficient social institutions that actively contributed to the democratization of society and fostered expansion of democratic processes. As pluralistic and plural, it comprised the phenomenon of industrial training, agricultural and social education as well as new and improved teaching techniques developed by educational theoreticians. The Progressives emphasised the need for education to perpetually reconstruct life experiences based on activities directly managed by children while accepting and recognizing individual differences.

Development of new and different attitudes towards students, and consequently reorganization of the teaching practice – primarily in formalized procedures, were basic postulates that promoted progressive education. Progressive pedagogy was based on an optimistic view of human nature and had faith in its developmental forces and inclination for learning as an integral part of life. Progressive "schools" disposed

of uniformity of the traditional educational process (Progressive Education, The Electronic Encyclopaedia of Chicago, 2004).

Children who attend progressive schools study in an informal setting. These schools begin with the spontaneous interests of children and adapt its school programme to the authentic interests of each child. In terms of the political affiliation of curriculum in public schools, which were attempting to achieve these pedagogical ideas, they were the foundation of work in free and alternative schools. J. Dewey's educational theory, as well as the entire Progressive education movement, originated in ideas of many prominent pedagogues such as Feltre, Campanella, Komensky, Pestalozzi, Rousseau and F. Froebel (Klapan, 1992).

Friedrich Froebel was a German educator and founder of the kindergarten. His ideas dealing with the development of the whole child (a physical, intellectual and emotional being), and encouraging the child's natural growth through activities and play, were inherited by Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi and John Dewey. Specifically, Froebel believed that children should spend part of their days playing games so that they could naturally develop their intellectual and creative potentials. Froebel was the author of the garden metaphor (education as cultivation, growing) – cultivating children to grow towards maturity. These two pedagogues had a large influence on John Dewey's ideas about children and learning in the process of work (Klapan, 1992; Shapiro, 1983).

Speaking about Froebel's contribution, Dewey mentions the most important principles:

1. The primary business of school is to train children in cooperative and mutually helpful living; to foster in them the consciousness of mutual interdependence; and to help them practically in making the adjustments that will carry this spirit into overt deeds.

2. The primary root of all educative activity is in the instinctive and impulsive activities of the child, and not in the presentation and application of external material, whether through the ideas of other students or through the senses. Numerous spontaneous activities of children - games, mimic efforts, even the apparently meaningless motions, previously ignored or even condemned as bad – are suitable for educational use. Moreover, these activities are the cornerstones of the educational method.

3. With time, these individual tendencies are reorganized and activities become more practiced as the child performs them in cooperative living, together with other students. On the children's plane, these activities recreate the typical doings and occupations of the society in large into which the child is finally to go forth; and it is through production and creative use that valuable knowledge is secured and clinched (Dewey, 1915).

Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi was the founder of modern elementary education connected to work (learning by hand, head and heart). He emphasized individuality and wholeness of each child and considered that the teacher's role was to foster

individuality, not only to instil facts in children. He insisted on the right of all individuals to education (Mušanović, 2001). To him, education meant the development of natural potentials that exist as latent possibilities in each person. These potentials are developed through individual and social processes. The influence of his pedagogy was reflected in Dewey's views on the social-reconstructionist purpose of education according to which a morally, socially, emotionally and intellectually developed person contributes to the development of society at large. He also adopted key ideas of the famous Pestalozzi Method: child-centred education; natural learning based on children's experiences, on what a child is able to see, hear and touch; learning through active observation by doing things, trial and error by analysing what has been done, induction or inference of general conclusions from concrete activities; learning during early education on the basis of concrete experiences and not from books; drawing general conclusions by dividing the subject matter into its constituent elements and basic structures. By adopting the Pestalozzi didactic teaching method that uses objects from the student's environment, for Dewey, learning begins when a teacher selects the subject that the child knows well, in order to guide the child towards new knowledge.

Maria Montessori developed the system founded on the presumption of relevance and contextualization of education whereby people acquire knowledge in areas of life they plan to work as adults. What makes Montessori close to Dewey's pedagogy is the fact that this system views the child as one who learns through personal activity in well-prepared stimulating learning environments. The Montessori system is based on an indirect method of work that uses the advantages of natural learning, self-motivation and affinity of children to self-develop their own abilities. By emphasising learning instead of teaching, Montessori moves the centre of didactic thinking to the creation of stimulating learning environments that inspire curiosity in children and encourage them to learn by playing. When it comes to social relationships in a group, she accepts the family model so children of different ages learn and work together (Bašić, 2011).

Kovačević (2007) writes that Dewey's contribution to the development of progressivism was the foundation of the University of Chicago Laboratory School in 1896 where he developed the new project-method – groups of students working on one central project (project method) connected to their own personal interests. Thematic subjects were formulated and organized as important parts of the central project, by dividing the work. *The project-method* was originally a product of the progressive movement, even though history of the project-method reaches far into the past.[1]

---

[1] As a pedagogical term, project was first mentioned in Italy in relation to academic competitions to create architectural projects as hypothetical tasks, modelled on real architectural competitions. Hence the original Italian name "progetti." These projects were intended to be exercises in imagination, but they were not intended to be built. The competitions were organized at the Accademia di San Luca in Rome, marking the first appearance of these projects in an educational context. It is interesting that projects had not originally been part of the educational programme of that institution, and competitions were open to every young architect who wanted to try their hand at project design. See: Marconi, Cipriani, & Valeriani (1974).

Progressive reformers were preoccupied with the pedagogical interpretation of the Paedocentric concept of education and the methodological and teaching methodology operationalization of the so-called child-centred method. This method demanded that the teacher positions each child into the centre of the educational process by formulating teaching activities in accordance with students' interests. The project-method was defined as a deliberate and purposeful activity undertaken in order to solve a problem set by the project. Educational effects are achieved during such work so the working activity cannot be disorganized, but has to be completely pedagogically conceived. This method is considered a tool by which students develop independence and responsibility, and practice social and democratic modes of behaviour.

S. H. Robinson introduced the project method that connected theory and practice into professional education. He thought that the student must first be a craftsman (mechanic) and only after that a theoretician (engineer). He required students to execute projects as complete acts of creation, which involved not only drafting the project on the drawing board but actually constructing it in the workshop. Robinson wanted to achieve two purposes; enable students to become practical engineers and democratic citizens who believed in the dignity of labour (Knoll, 1997).

Dewey advocated learning by doing, i.e. experiential learning. We could also describe it as active learning. During one such process the child learns by engaging in different practical activities, i.e. through play. By engaging in these activities, the child acquires lifelong knowledge and skills, as opposed to learning by memorizing factual knowledge that he remembers only for a short period of time (Dewey, 1916).

Generally speaking, progressivist pedagogues considered traditional schools to be too rigid, formal and detached from real life. That is why they were inclined towards an informal learning space and a natural relationship between student and teacher. Development of the child's personality is central in their didactic concepts and their motto was to teach the child, not the subject. The premise of pedagogic Progressivism was that education is based on the fact that the best way for people, as social beings, to learn and acquire knowledge is by engaging in real life activities. Therefore, if we were to define the teaching process as one that is organized for the purpose of transferring and acquiring knowledge, and in light of contemporary social and technological relationships, we have to change our contextual perspective, precisely because today these processes can, and do, also occur outside of institutions and yet in a completely organized manner. As such, previously known organizational teaching rules start to diminish. We are getting further removed from the 45-minute period, classroom organization and standard teaching or educational technology. Processes taking place around us on a daily basis demand rapid change and adaptation, which is something our schools do not seem to be well disposed towards, or perhaps are simply not adequately prepared for (Dewey, 1916). Specifically, we cannot deny the fact that procedures of acquiring new knowledge take place outside the previously known organizational scheme more often and with increasing frequency. If schools do not adapt quickly, they are bound to lose this race.

> Information technology introduced new forms of communication that intensified cooperation between people and organizations. However, with better interaction came greater probability for new conflicts. In other words, information technology intensified the question of the relationship between the organization and its environment. The information age brought about a new structure – the network – a more elastic and adaptable social structure than those before, but also less stable. Efficiency of the contemporary organization depends on its ability to adapt to change, which is exactly why organizations are flexible, unstable and fragile. What is needed is the transformation of an individual and competitive model of organization into a model of cooperation and partnership. (Giljević, 2015, p. 214)

Predictability of society and its outcomes ceased to exist both in education and social relations. Unpredictable outcomes create chaotic images of the projected future and existential insecurity; the uncertainty of outcomes brings into question all that we plan to do and are doing now. Outcomes predicted in today's ongoing educational process could very well become unnecessary and unusable by the end of that process. Consequently, the quality of the teaching process is called into question and messages sent by the school lose credibility. There is a rise in discontinuity in student experience, both inside and outside of school. Hence, it is important to recognize the importance of free time as the central theme in daily life and activities in which children and young people participate during their free time (Badrić, Prskalo, & Matijević, 2015). Knowledge acquired in school and in life situations becomes more and more separate. It is possible to overcome this gap with the continuous education of future teachers in implementing free time activities in their teaching (Prskalo, 2015).

> Children find it increasingly difficult to establish a meaningful link between what they are taught in schools and life's problems. Even students with solid academic results find it difficult to apply lessons learned to solving real life problems. It would be right to conclude that the way in which students are taught is not well suited to meet the needs of living in the modern world. These are only some of the reasons to be dissatisfied with educational results and why the Constructivist theory has become ever more prominent among the educational scientific community in the last few decades of this century. It developed new perspectives on the nature of the learning process, the curriculum theory and the theoretical foundation of the teaching process. The Constructivist didactic credo states it is more important how students learn than how teachers teach. This change throws new light on the didactic theory and requires its thorough reconstruction from the standpoint of revision of the terms knowledge, learning and teaching. (Barbir & Nejašmić, 2004, p. 98)

Recently, constructivist teaching and learning of teacher education students was in the focus of several research studies (Batarelo Kokić, Nevin, & Malian, 2013; Batarelo

Kokić, & Rukavina, 2017; Bognar, Gajger, & Ivić, 2016; Topolovčan, Matijević, & Dumančić, 2016). These studies raise an important question of exposure of future teachers to new technologies and rich constructivist environments.

Topolovčan, Matijević, and Dumančić (2016) researched predictors of constructivist teaching including sociodemographic characteristics of students and teachers, along with computer self-efficacy, attitudes towards new media and the frequency of using new media in instruction. The study results revealed that the greatest variance of constructivist teaching can be explained by the attitude towards new media and computer self-efficacy rather than the use of new media in instruction. Facilitation of constructivist multidimensional teaching and learning was in the centre of the action research conducted by Batarelo Kokić, Nevin, and Malian (2013). The researchers analysed online special education course for future teachers. In the course structure, special focus was given to different types of online teaching activities such as: course discussion, individual papers, individual on-site observations and group work. Bognar, Gajger, and Ivić (2016) also researched possible ways of organising constructivist e-learning in teacher education. The authors analysed online discussions as potential constructivist environment and recognized large variation in the quality of student reflections that indicate possible difficulties in knowledge construction. In the content analysis study, Batarelo Kokić and Rukavina (2017) attempted to determine the potential triggers that help to initiate and shape meaningful online discussions in teacher education. The researchers analysed levels of knowledge construction in two consecutive online discussions, focusing on the topic of online educational materials. These discussions were part of the graduate level hybrid course for teacher education students. When comparing two discussion threads, it was noticeable that under the second discussion teacher education students reached higher levels of knowledge and negotiated meaning/knowledge construction more frequently.

By asking the question of quality, we inevitably encroach upon issues of organizing the teaching process that we need to approach from the aspect of the systemic theory. The term organization comprises different divisions of tasks, allocation of tasks to the executors, coordination of task execution and evaluation of results. Models of the teaching organization represent ways in which organizational elements are conceived and associated in order to accomplish the established goals. These models are intellectual constructs, abstractions of reality that reduce reality's wealth of facts to just a few key elements of the teaching activity.

Traditional school has accepted bureaucratic organization from other social institutions of industrial society as the only organizational model in the field of social activity. Bureaucratic organization legitimated the rightness of its conduct with unquestionable authority. Basic characteristics of the bureaucratic organizational model are encapsulation, inelasticity, inflexibility, hierarchical structure, formalized relations, professional power, reluctance to change, etc. As opposed to the traditional school, the concept of the progressive school moves away from the rigid and inflexible

organization because it is focused on change, and the very essence of change is that it cannot be known in advance. The progressive school tries to achieve goals set by the particular social community and it therefore attempts to develop a self-affirming organization that can handle all demands placed before it.

In that sense, some of the contemporary organizational approaches and their implications for didactic practice can certainly contribute to the development of progressive schools. A conceptual organization emerging as *Flourishing Chaos* is one of the newest organizational concepts (Accardi & Heyde, 2012). This concept assumes that environmental changes are so fast and unpredictable that operational strategies based on proactive behaviour cannot absorb the pace of those changes. Organizations must be proactive. Only those organizations formed by autonomous sub-organizations, who draw information and energy for progress and development from the chaotic environment, can function on the basis of this concept. In organizations of flourishing chaos, innovations are constant, and unpredictability and chaos represent an opportunity for quick and superior development rather than difficulties or problems (Jušić, 1994). The most important implication of this organizational theory relates to positions of student and teacher in the educational process, where they appear as partners working together, co-creators and active participants. The only possible way to understand the world around us is to connect it to the process of learning or experiential learning, i.e. education. Therefore, the only way for a person to contend with the environment is to incorporate one's life into the educational process, i.e. to gain experience through the learning process that will make them become a contributing member of the community. We believe that precisely this perspective on social relationships corresponds with novel ideas about the nature of the teaching process and school's role in society. To summarize, we can conclude that it is useful to apply findings of organizational theories to developing the new role of school in order to change the existing model of the educational organization.

Contemporary Education and New Progressive Inquiry

It would be irresponsible in this day and age, to say the least, to insist on retaining more than a 300-year-old organizational premise. We are not talking about the legitimacy of schools as institutions that still have the exclusive right to verify knowledge and competence, but about the essential reason for the existence of schools and teaching as a process.

Today, what would be considered progressive ideas or manners in which to improve the teaching practice in an age of so many technological and IT innovations? Does progress, in the sense of improvement in teaching, presume innovations in the educational technology, the teaching organization or would progress in pedagogy mean something completely different? The 21st century poses many challenges, from industrial production to complex social relationships. The educational process is certainly one such complex social relationship that needs to be prepared and be able to

respond to all future challenges. Our position is that theoretical but also very practical considerations about progressive didactic methods in the teaching process need to be moved from the area of educational technology into the realm of quality. It would be a mistake to consider progress in the didactic and organizational sense through the prism of e-learning or hybrid learning, regardless of the degree to which such an approach seems revolutionary to some individuals. Specifically, progress understood in this manner positions the question of *HOW?* in the forefront, and does not move away from the didactic triangle defined 300 years ago. Regardless of the fact that modern communication technologies are used in teaching organization, just like in the classical teaching organization, it still depends on the knowledge, abilities and motivation of teachers and students, with the addition of the service provider in the content part.

It sounds almost unreal that the current school practice mostly considers using IT technologies or social networks in the daily creation of the educational process as innovative didactic ideas and methods. The result of these attitudes is that didactic theory and practice focus on the question of *HOW*. By posing this question, we continue to circle around technical spheres, i.e. spheres of operationally very reduced understanding of progress and improvement in the educational process.

By moving to the question of *WHY*, we begin to ask those key questions that are much more difficult to answer, such as the question of quality. In the times we live today, when identity is dispersed and referential points of both family and school life are gone, the question of *WHY* becomes ever more important. Simply, it is the framework for postmodern understanding of the world, but also for the teaching process that can no longer be viewed as an isolated part of existence, no matter how much school walls insulate it from the rest of the world. As soon as we pose the question of quality, we raise questions of not only organization of the teaching process but also the meaning and manner of learning and teaching in the era in which everything is relative, when all values fluctuate and when, because of the influence of technology, media and virtual reality, everything becomes mutable and impermanent.

Immutability, instability and variability become new values and as such give an illusion of freedom and total individualization of people. This illusion places very serious demands onto the organization and quality of the educational process in which one acquires knowledge, because today, knowledge can be acquired anywhere!

What is the nature of such knowledge, how late is the school itself (regardless of form) with structuring, presentation and transfer?

What can knowledge structured in such a manner in school programmes be used for when it is years or even decades late from the onset?

Did the structure of knowledge change?

Did the purpose of knowledge change?

Who is going to answer questions about "what kind of knowledge"? *(This is particularly interesting currently when we are discussing the educational system reforms.)*

According to Blossing, Imsen, and Moos (2014), the latest school reforms in Nordic European countries lead towards reduction of progressive ideas for the benefit of

basic skills, outcomes, national standards and tests, streaming and competition. The test-based conception of educational quality is in the opposition to proactive progressivism. The increase in individualization is leading towards reduction in curriculum variation and decline in the use of complex forms of educational work and pedagogic communication. Darling-Hammond (1994) writes about alternative assessment methods and emphasizes that school reform strategies use assessment reform as a lever for external control of schools. These strategies are unlikely to be successful and the assessments equitable due to distrust that is shown towards teachers and the fact that teachers are not involved in the reform processes.

> As opposed to the Republic of Croatia with its National Curriculum Framework, as well as the Plan and Programme that proscribes subjects and the number of lessons for each subject in the annual school work plan, the situation in the United States of America (USA) is significantly different. Namely, there is not a single national curriculum, and the ratio of subjects and teaching content largely depends on the local government. It would be almost impossible to speak about the American curriculum except in some general sense. (Matijević & Rajić, 2015, p. 644)

To discuss progress in the school context minimally, never use the available information technology, or even worse, introduce information technology as a mandatory subject as late as the 5th grade, means that we are trailing far behind those processes, reality and progress in general, or we do not completely understand the context that we are living in. At the level of didactic theory, this indicates lack of understanding of the teaching processes in which *teaching, education and learning diverge* completely.

Inevitably, all organizational forms of human activity change under the pressure of technological progress, and even more in terms of lifestyles and types of communication. Therefore, education is no longer defined merely as an acquisition of knowledge but as a lifestyle and learning, as the process that starts with the absorption of facts, goes through transformation and ends in concrete changes in living conditions.

> In the sphere of accelerated social changes, and in opposition to traditional education that was based on the unquestionable educational authority, working on the principle of "listen – memorize – repeat" that tried to preserve the existing reality, modern education is looking to the future. In the world in which knowledge becomes outdated daily, excessive memory is counterproductive. A person is no longer expected to diligently memorize a multitude of "facts" but he/she has to have an ability to research, constantly learn and create. This presupposes capacity for critical thinking. Therefore, there is no place for unquestionable authority any more. Democracy is more suitable to the world of accelerated change than an authoritarian society, individuality instead of collectivist conscience. (Polić, 2006, p. 20)

"This is why many true experts and intelligent members of society admit they find it difficult to absorb actual floods of new ideas – even in narrow scientific areas" (Toffler, 1975, p. 127). Today, ideas of progressive education are linked to basic views of development, influence and responsibilities of civil society, different racial, class, ethnic and other divisions, especially in the context of open discussion of postmodern pedagogy (Kovačević, 2007). The speed of change affects not only educational but also many other teaching and existential levels, and the referential point of education is taken over by other factors, networks, technologies, etc. Therefore, didactics is left with the question and challenge of whether it can, by using today's standard methods, respond to limitations in its practice when everything has already moved to the "future" level.

The current age of uncertainty projects an uncertain future as well as unforeseeable risks. The question is, even now, what is true reality? We are almost unable to distinguish true reality from reality, i.e. virtual reality has become more real than reality itself. What will the future that is yet to come be like?

References

Accardi, L., & Heyde, C. C. (Eds.). (2012). *Probability towards 2000* (Vol. 128). Berlin: Springer Science & Business Media.

Badrić, M., Prskalo, I., & Matijević, M. (2015). Primary school pupils' free time activities. *Croatian Journal of Education: Hrvatski časopis za odgoj i obrazovanje, 17*(2), 299-331. https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v17i2.1630

Barbir, J., & Nejašmić, S. (2004). Prevencija zlouporabe droga kao pedagoško-didaktički problem. *Život i škola, 50*(12), 92-102.

Bašić, S. (2011). Modernost pedagoške koncepcije Marije Montessori. *Pedagogijska istraživanja, 8*(2), 205 – 21.

Batarelo Kokić, I., Nevin, A., & Malian, I. (2013). Collaborative online course development: facilitation of multi-dimensional teaching and learning. *Croatian Journal of Education: Hrvatski časopis za odgoj i obrazovanje*, *15*(2), 491-519.

Batarelo Kokić, I., & Rukavina, S. (2017). Learning from Digital Video Cases: How Future Teachers Perceive the Use of Open Source Tools and Open Educational Resources. *Knowledge Cultures*, *5*(5), 115-130. https://doi.org/10.22381/KC5520177

Blossing, U., Imsen, G., & Moos, L. (2014). Progressive education and new governance in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. In U. Blossing, G. Imsen, & L. Moos (Eds.), *The Nordic education model* (pp. 133-154). Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7125-3_8

Bognar, B., Gajger, V., & Ivić, V. (2016). Constructivist e-learning in higher education. *Croatian Journal of Education: Hrvatski časopis za odgoj i obrazovanje*, *18*(Sp. Ed. 1), 31-46. https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v18i1.1475

Cremin, L. A. (1961). *The transformation of school.* New York: Random House.

Cruikshank, K. (1998). The prelude to education as an academic discipline: American Herbartianism and the emergence of a science of pedagogy. *Paedagogica Historica*, *34*(sup1), 99-120. https://doi.org/10.1080/00309230.1998.11434879

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Performance-based assessment and educational equity. *Harvard Educational Review*, *64*(1), 5-31. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.64.1.j57n353226536276

Dewey, J. (1915). *The School and Society.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education.* New York: Macmillan.

Giljević, T. (2015). Okolina upravne organizacije. *Pravni vjesnik, 31*(3-4), 213-236.

Iorio, S. H., & Yeager, M. E. (2011). *School reform: Past, present and future.* Manuscript submitted for publication, College of Education, Wichita State University, Wichita, KS, Retrieved from http://webs.wichita.edu/depttools/depttoolsmemberfiles/COEdDEAN/School_Reform_Past_Present_and_Future.pdf

Jušić, B. (1994). Samoorganiziranje u suvremenoj teoriji organizacije. *Revija za sociologiju, 25*(1-2), 51-61.

Kangavari, R. K. (2017). Metodologija razumjevanja socijalnih pokreta s akcentom na pokrete Zauzmimo Wall Street i Tea party. *Znakovi vremena, 20*(76/77), 183-208.

Klaić, B. (1974). *Veliki rječnik stranih riječi.* Zagreb: Zora.

Klapan, A. (1992). Pogledi Jana Amosa Komenskega na disciplinu v šoli. *Sodobna pedagogika,* 9-10, 439-496.

Knoll, M. (1997). The Project Method: Its Vocational Education Origin and International Development. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 34*(3), 1-12.

Kovačević, S. (2007). *Struktura progresivističke pedagogije učitelja osnovne škole (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).* Rijeka: Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci.

Marconi, P., Cipriani, A., & Valeriani, E. (1974). *I disegni di architecttura dell'Archivio storico dell'Accademia di San Luca.* Roma: De Luca Editore.

Matijević, M., & Rajić, V. (2015). Metodologije kurikulumskih promjena: nekad i danas. In S. Opić, & M. Matijević (Eds.), *Researching Paradigms of Childhood and Education: 4th Symposium: School for Net-generation: Internal Reform of Primary and Secondary School Education* (pp. 635-654). Opatija: UFZG.

Mušanović, M. (2001). *Pedagogija profesionalnog obrazovanja.* Rijeka: Graftrade.

Polić, M. (2006). *Činjenice i vrijednosti.* Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo.

Prskalo, I. (2015). Kinesiology of Free Time. *Croatian Journal of Education: Hrvatski časopis za odgoj i obrazovanje, 17*(Sp. Ed. 1), 219-228. https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v17i0.1520

Shapiro, M. S. (1983). *Child's garden: the kindergarten movement from Froebel to Dewey.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Sikavica, P. (2011). *Organizacija.* Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Toffler, A. (1975). *Šok budućnosti.* Rijeka: Otokar Keršovani.

Topolovčan, T., Matijević, M., & Dumančić, M. (2016). Some Predictors of Constructivist Teaching in Elementary Education. *Croatian Journal of Education: Hrvatski časopis za odgoj i obrazovanje*, *18*(Sp. Ed. 1), 193-212. https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v18i0.2217

Weiss, S. G., DeFalco, A. A., & Weiss, E. M. (2005). Progressive=Permissive? Not According to John Dewey… Subjects Matter!. *Essays in Education*, *14*(1), 1-21.

x x x: (2001-04). Progressive education. *The Columbia Encyclopedia, 6th ed.* New York: Columbia University Press. Retrieved from www.bartleby.com/65/

Sonja Kovačević
University of Split, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Department of Teacher Education
Poljička cesta 35, 1000 Split, Croatia
sonja@ffst.hr

Progresivno obrazovanje – izazovi didaktici

Sažetak

Od nastanka škole i postojanja nastave u njoj postoji svojevrsno opterećenje o njezinoj progresivnoj ulozi. Progresivistički su reformatori bili zaokupljeni pedagoškom interpretacijom pedocentrističke koncepcije obrazovanja i metodološke i metodičke operacionalizacije tzv. metode usmjerene na dijete. Pedagoški progresivizam polazio je od toga da se obrazovanje temelji na činjenici da ljudi kao društvena bića najbolje uče i usvajaju znanja stvarnim životnim aktivnostima. Procesi usvajanja novih znanja sve češće se događaju upravo izvan do sada poznate didaktičke organizacijske sheme i ako ne pristane na brzo prilagođavanje, škola će izgubiti tu utrku. Podrazumijeva li napreadk u smislu unapređenja nastave novine u nastavno-obrazovnoj tehnologiji ili u nastavnoj organizaciji, ili je progres u pedagogiji danas nešto potpuno drugo? U trenutku kada postavimo pitanje kvalitete, otvorili smo pitanja ne samo organizacije nastavnog procesa već i smisla i načina učenja i poučavanja u eri u kojoj sve vrijednosti variraju i zbog utjecaja tehnologije, medija i virtualnosti sve postaje promjenjivo i nestalno.

Ključne riječi: *didaktika; nastava; organizacijski modeli; progresivno obrazovanje.*

Uvod

Od nastanka škole i postojanja nastave kao najorganiziranjeg oblika rada, u njoj postoji svojevrsno opterećenje o njezinoj progresivnoj ulozi pri čemu se pojmom progresivno označava (ubrzano) napredovanje i razvoj učenika. Progres znači „napredak, pokret prema naprijed, prema savršenijem stanju, promjena nabolje, prijelaz na viši stupanj razvitka, poboljšanje, razvijanje" (Klajić, 1974, str. 1068). Termin „progresivno" izvorno označava nove socijalne i političke ideje sredine i kraja 19. stoljeća, epohalne promjene smjera društvenog razvoja, promjenu duha vremena izazvanu sveobuhvatnom promjenom slike svijeta uslijed industrijalizacije i urbanizacije u međunarodnim okvirima. Isto tako, progresivno, s jedne strane, označava dominantnu alternativu tradicionalnom konzervativnom stavu o socijalnim i ekonomskim promjenama, a s druge radikalnim socijalističkim i anarhističkim pogledima na društveni razvoj. Politički se artikulirao u svim strankama kao srednji put između konzervativizma i liberalizma s početka 20. stoljeća.

Progresivisti su zahtijevali društvene slobode, pravo glasa za manjine i žene, uspostavu Unije radnika kao jedan vid političke slobode, donošenje zakona kojim

bi se ustanovilo tjedno radno vrijeme i minimalna vrijednost nadnice. Progresivisti su se žestoko suprotstavljali ekonomskim slobodama, tj. onome na čemu se temeljila ekonomska politika zemlje od vremena prestanka unutrašnjeg američkog rata i što su podržavali republikanci i konzervativci... (Kangavari, 2017, str. 191)

Oni predstavljaju interese običnih ljudi, poreznih obveznika, potrošača, zaposlenika, građana i roditelja.

> Progresivizam se kao politički pokret odnosi na reformističke ideje u širokom spektru društvenih pitanja: radničkih prava, zabrane dječjeg rada, osnivanja komunalnih centara (settlement houses op. a.), u siromašnim četvrtima – uvođenje socijalnog rada i službe radi zaštite djece i deprivilegiranih, poboljšavanje uvjeta života u urbanim sredinama, političke korupcije, izbornog sustava, demokratske kontrole vlasti, socijalne pravde, monopola, reforme tradicionalnog obrazovanja i drugim pitanjima. Njegove pristaše društvo shvaćaju kao fleksibilnu tržišnu ekonomiju s razvijenim sektorom socijalnih usluga i ostvarivanjem društvene pravde. U liberalnoj tradiciji osnovnim načelom smatraju slobodu – gospodarsku, intelektualnu i kulturnu otvorenost, društvo u kojemu pojedinci i obitelji napreduju na osnovi vlastitih očekivanja i marljivim radom, a ne na osnovi obiteljskog položaja i okolnosti (Cremin, 1961; Weiss, De Falco i Weiss, 2005).

S obzirom na duboku ukorijenjenost obrazovanja u kulturu i društvo progresivno obrazovanje i pedagogija baštine tradiciju drugih reformističkih ideja, odnosno progresivno je obrazovanje dio ukupnih društvenih reformskih ideja o jačanju sudjelovanja javnosti u demokratskom odlučivanju. U kontekstu drugih pedagoških ideja, progresivno obrazovanje reakcija je na tradicionalni mehanicizam obrazovne filozofije američkog herbartizma (Cruikshank, 1998). Prema Iorio i Yeageru (2011) termin progresivno uveden je u sklopu rasprave o *curriculumu* s ciljem da se istakne razlika između novog obrazovanja 20. i tradicionalnog obrazovanja 19. stoljeća koje je mlade više klase pripremalo za sveučilište. Kao ideja o obrazovanju utemeljenom na aktualnom iskustvu, demokratičnosti i usmjerenosti na budućnost, progresivno obrazovanje pokrenuli su različiti društveni krugovi – akademska zajednica, roditelji, učitelji, školske uprave, zajednice učitelja i roditelja, kao i reformistički znanstvenici. Možemo reći da nije riječ o koherentnom pogledu na obrazovanje, već o različitim progresivističkim idejama: progresivno, na dijete usredotočeno obrazovanje, progresivistički pokret tejlorostički shvaćenog obrazovanja (mjerenje postignuća i uspješnost obrazovanja), socio-kulturni progresivizam i intelektualni rekonstruktivizam i dr.

Zasade progresivizma u obrazovanju

Progresivistički obrazovni pokret nastao je u SAD potkraj 19. i početkom 20. stoljeća pod nazivom progresivno obrazovanje, a označava reformske napore u razvoju američkog školstva. Poslije prelazi okvire kulture u kojoj je nastao pa se širi u Europi.

Nastojeći sagledavati dijete cjelovito, obrazovna su se nastojanja okrenula prema tjelesnom, emocionalnom i intelektualnom. Prema Britannica Concise Encyclopedia pod pojmom „Progressive education" navodi se pokret koji je nastao u SAD-u potkraj 19. stoljeća kao reakcija na ograničenost i formalizam tradicionalnog obrazovanja. Jedan od glavnih ciljeva bio je obrazovati "cijelo dijete". Dakle, *curriculum* je usmjeren na razvijanje kreativnih i ručnih vještina, kao i poticanje djece na eksperimentiranje i neovisno mišljenje. Progresivno obrazovanje označava širi otklon od tradicionalnog obrazovanja i autoritarnih procedura razrednog učenja, kao i reorganizaciju *curriculuma* nove škole.

Taj fenomen ima širi spektar značenja i obuhvaća promjene razrednog postupanja, promjene socijalnog *curriculuma*, profesionalno obrazovanje i ulogu škole, kao i stajališta prema učenicima. Temelj progresivnog obrazovanja jest kako djeca najbolje uče iz osobnog iskustva povezanog s vitalnim interesima. Obrazovanje se shvaća kao kontinuirana rekonstrukcija osobnog iskustva aktivnostima kojima dijete neposredno upravlja.

Tijekom 20. stoljeća termini progresivno obrazovanje, progresivistička pedagogija ili progresivistička odgojno-obrazovna filozofija i sl. služili su za označavanje pedagoških ideja i ideologija, programa i odgojno-obrazovnih praksi koje su sadržavale nakanu reformiranja škole, težnju da od škole stvore učinkovitu društvenu instituciju koja aktivno pridonosi razvoju demokratizacije društva, koja potiče razvoj demokratskih procesa. Kao pluralističan i pluralan fenomen obuhvaća industrijsku izobrazbu, poljoprivredno i socijalno obrazovanje, kao i nove poboljšane tehnike poučavanja koje su razvijali teoretičari obrazovanja. Progresivisti naglašavaju da obrazovanje mora biti neprestana rekonstrukcija životnih iskustava osnivanih na aktivnostima kojima djeca neposredno upravljaju, uz uvažavanje i prepoznavanje individualnih razlika.

Razvijanje novih i drugačijih stavova prema učenicima, a samim tim i reorganizacija nastavne prakse – poglavito u formaliziranim procedurama – osnovni su postulati koje promiče progresivno obrazovanje. Progresivistička pedagogija zasnovana je na optimističkom pogledu na ljudsku prirodu i polaže vjeru u njegove razvojne snage i nagnuće učenju kao sastavnom dijelu života. Njezine „škole" otklanjaju uniformizam tradicionalnog procesa obrazovanja (Progressive Education, The Electronic Encyclopedia of Chicago, 2004).

Djeca koja pohađaju progresivne škole uče u neformalnoj okolini. Te škole polaze od spontanih interesa djece i prilagođavaju školski program autentičnim interesima svakog djeteta. S obzirom na političku obojenost kurikula u javnim školama, a u kojima se nastojala ostvariti ideje te pedagogije, bile su podloga rada u slobodnim i alternativnim školama. Teorija obrazovanja J. Deweya, kao i čitav pokret progresivnog obrazovanja, ima izvorište u idejama brojnih prominentnih pedagoga kao što su Feltre, Campanella, Komensky, Pestalozzi, Rousseau i F. Froebel (Klapan, 1992).

 Friedrich Froebel, njemački odgajatelj, začetnik je ideje dječjih vrtića. Njegove ideje baštinili su Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi i John Dewey, a tiču se razvoja djeteta

kao jedinstvene cjeline (tjelesno, umno i osjećajno biće), na poticanje prirodnog rasta djeteta putem aktivnosti i igre. Naime, Froebel je vjerovao da djeca dio dana trebaju provesti igrajući se kako bi prirodno razvila intelektualne i kreativne potencijale. Froebel je autor metafore vrta (odgoj kao kultiviranje, uzgajanje) – kultiviranja rasta djece prema zrelosti. Ta dvojica pedagoga imala su velik utjecaj na shvaćanja Johna Deweya o djetetu i učenja u procesu rada (Klapan, 1992; Shapiro, 1983).

Govoreći o Froebelovu doprinosu, Dewey navodi najvažnije spoznaje:

1. Osnovna je zadaća škole poučavati djecu suradnji i zajedničkom životu; poticati ih na svjesnu suradnju; praktično im pomagati u prilagođavanju i njegovanju toga duha u javnom djelovanju.

2. Primarni izvor svih obrazovnih aktivnosti su instinktivne i impulzivne aktivnosti djeteta, a ne aktivnosti do kojih dolazi reakcijom na okolinu, ideje drugih učenika ili opažanja; brojne spontane aktivnosti djece – igre, mimika, prividno besmisleni pokreti, prethodno ignorirani ili čak obeshrabrivani kao loši – podobni su za obrazovne svrhe; štoviše, te aktivnosti osnova su obrazovne metode.

3. Te se individualne tendencije s vremenom reorganiziraju i aktivnosti postaju uvježbanije pa ih dijete izvodi u socijalnom prostoru, usklađeno s drugim učenicima. Tim se aktivnostima na dječjoj razini šire ponavljaju tipični radovi i zanimanja u društvu, prema kojemu dijete konačno napreduje; stvaranjem i kreativnom upotrebom vrijednog znanja koje je učvršćeno i dostignuto (Dewey 1915).

Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi postavio je temelje suvremene osnovne škole povezane s radom (odgoj ruke, glave i srca), ističe individualnost i cjelovitost svakog djeteta te je zadaća učitelja da u djetetu razvijaju individualnost, a ne da mu samo usađuju činjenice. Naglašavao je i pravo svih ljudi na obrazovanje (Mušanović, 2001). On pod odgojem podrazumijeva razvoj prirodnih potencijala koji kao latentne mogućnosti postoje u svakom čovjeku. Navedeni se potencijali razvijaju individualnim i socijalnim procesima. Njegov pedagoški utjecaj na Deweya uočava se u stavovima o socijalno-rekonstruktivističkoj svrsi obrazovanja po kojoj moralno, socijalno, emocionalno i intelektualno razvijena osoba pridonosi razvoju cjelovitog društva. On prihvaća i ključne ideje glasovite Pestalozzijeve metode: usmjerenost odgoja na dijete; prirodno učenje – učenje na temelju dječjih iskustava, onoga što dijete može vidjeti, čuti i dodirnuti; učenje tijekom aktivnosti promatranja, izvođenja radnji, pokušajima i pogreškama, analize učinjenog..., indukcija – izvođenje uopćavanja iz konkretnih aktivnosti; učenje u ranom odgoju na osnovi konkretnih iskustava, a ne knjiga; sadržaje svoditi na sastavne elemente i osnovne strukture iz kojih se izvode uopćavanja. Prihvaćajući Pestalozzijevu didaktičku metodu poučavanja s pomoću predmeta u okolini učenika, za Deweya učenje počinje tako što učitelj odabire predmet koji dijete dobro poznaje s ciljem da pokrene dijete prema novim spoznajama.

Maria Montessori razvija sustav koji se temelji na relevantnosti i kontekstualnosti obrazovanja prema kojima ljudi stječu znanja u područjima života u kojima će

djelovati kao odrasle osobe. Taj sustav polazi od činjenice da dijete uči vlastitom aktivnošću u dobro uređenim odgojno-poticajnim sredinama, po čemu je Montessori bliska pedagogiji Deweya. Montessori sustav temelji se na indirektnoj metodi rada koja se koristi prednostima prirodnog učenja, samomotivacije i sklonosti djece samorazvijanju vlastitih sposobnosti. Stavljajući naglasak na učenje umjesto na poučavanje, Montessori središte didaktičkih promišljanja skreće na oblikovanje poticajnih odgojnih okolina koje pobuđuju radoznalost djece i potiču ih na učenje igrom. U socijalnim odnosima skupine ona prihvaća obiteljski model, pa djeca različite dobi uče i rade zajedno (Bašić, 2011).

Kovačević (2007) navodi da je Dewey pridonio razvoju progresivizma 1896. godine osnivanjem Laboratorijske škole Sveučilištu u Chicagu u kojoj je razvio novu, projektnu metodu – rad skupina učenika na centralnom projektu (projektna metoda) povezanom s njihovim osobnim interesima. Podjelom rada teme su sadržajno oblikovane i organizirane kao važni dijelovi centralnog projekta. *Projektna metoda* izvorni je proizvod progresivnog pokreta iako njezina povijest seže u daleku prošlost.[1] Progresivistički su reformatori bili zaokupljeni pedagoškom interpretacijom pedocentristučke koncepcije obrazovanja i metodološke i metodičke operacionalizacije tzv. metode usmjerene na dijete. Ta metoda zahtijeva od učitelja da svako dijete stavi u središte obrazovnog procesa tako što će oblikovati obrazovne aktivnosti u skladu s učenikovim interesima. Projektna metoda označava namjerno i svrhovito djelovanje radi rješavanja nekog projektom zadanog problema. Tijekom takvog rada postižu se obrazovni efekti pa radna aktivnost ne smije biti neorganizirana, nego sveobuhvatno pedagoški osmišljena. Tom metodom učenici razvijaju neovisnost i odgovornost, iskušavaju socijalne i demokratske modele ponašanja. S. H. Robinson u profesionalno obrazovanje uvodi projektnu metodu kao metodu povezivanja teorije i prakse. Od učenika je najprije tražio da budu praktičari (mehaničari), a potom teoretičari (inženjeri). Od studenta zahtijeva da ostvari projekt kao cjelovit akt kreacije, dakle ne samo nacrtima na papiru nego konstrukcijom i izradom projekta u radionici. Robinson time želi ostvariti dva cilja: da studenti postanu praktični inženjeri i demokratični građani koji će cijeniti radništvo (Knoll, 1997).

Dewey se zalagao za učenje radom, odnosno iskustvenim učenjem. Takvo učenje mogli bismo nazvati i aktivnim učenjem. U jednom takvom procesu dijete uči putem različitih praktičnih radnji, odnosno putem igre. Zahvaljujući takvim aktivnostima ono usvaja znanja i vještine za cijeli život, za razliku od učenja gdje se usvaja činjenično znanje koje samo kratkotrajno ostaje u pamćenju (Dewey, 1916). Općenito uzevši,

---

[1] Projekt se kao pedagoški pojam prvi put spominje u Italiji u vezi s akademskim natjecanjem u izradi arhitektonskih projekata prema hipotetičkim zadacima, rađenih po uzoru na stvarne arhitektonske natječaje. Otuda i izvorni talijanski naziv «progetti». Namjena je tih projekata bila vježba imaginacije, a nisu bili namijenjeni stvarnoj realizaciji. Natjecanja su organizirana na Accademia di San Luca u Rimu i tada se prvi put projekti spominju u obrazovnom kontekstu. Zanimljivo je da projekti izvorno nisu bili dio obrazovnog programa te ustanove, nego je natječaj bio otvoren i za sve mlade arhitekte koji su se htjeli okušati u projektiranju. Vidi: Marconi, Cipriani, Valeriani (1974).

progresivistički pedagozi misle da su tradicionalne škole previše krute, formalne i odvojene od stvarnoga života. Zato su skloni neformalnom prostoru za učenje i prirodnim odnosima učenika i učitelja. Razvoj osobnosti djeteta postavljaju u središte svojih didaktičkih koncepcija motom – poučavaj dijete, a ne predmet. Pedagoški progresivizam polazio je od toga da se obrazovanje temelji na činjenici da ljudi kao društvena bića najbolje uče i usvajaju znanja stvarnim životnim aktivnostima. Stoga ako nastavni proces definiramo kao proces koji je organiziran radi prenošenja i usvajanja znanja, u svjetlu današnjih i društvenih i tehnoloških odnosa nužno je promijeniti kontekstualni pogled. Upravo zbog toga što se ti procesi danas mogu, i odvijaju se i izvaninstitucijski, a opet posve organizirano. Na taj način počinju se gubiti organizacijska pravila nastave kakvu smo do sada poznavali. Sve se više udaljavamo od 45-minutnog sata, razredne organizacije i ustaljene nastavne ili obrazovne tehnologije. Procesi koji se svakodnevno oko nas odvijaju zahtijevaju brze promjene i prilagođavanja, čemu ipak, čini se, naše škole nisu baš previše sklone ili samo nisu dovoljno pripremljene (Dewey, 1916). Naime, ne može se pobiti činjenica da se procesi usvajanja novih znanja sve više i sve češće događaju upravo izvan do sada poznate organizacijske sheme, i ako ne pristane na brzo prilagođavanje, škola će izgubiti tu utrku.

> Informacijska tehnologija, uvođenjem novih oblika komuniciranja, intenzivirala je suradnju među ljudima i organizacijama, ali veća interakcija donosi i brojne mogućnosti za nove sukobe. Drugim riječima, informacijska tehnologija intenzivirala je pitanje odnosa organizacije s okolinom. U informatičkom društvu pojavljuje se nova struktura – mreža – koja je mnogo elastičnija i prilagodljivija društvena struktura od onih prijašnjih, ali i manje stabilna. Učinkovitost suvremene organizacije ovisi o sposobnosti njezine prilagodbe promjenama, zbog čega su i organizacije fleksibilne, labave i krhke. Potrebna je promjena individualnog i kompetitivnog modela organizacije u model suradnje i partnerstva (Giljević, 2015, str. 214).

U takvom okruženju nestalo je predvidljivosti društva, i ishoda, kako u obrazovanja tako i u društvenim odnosima. Nepredvidljivost ishoda stvara kaotičnu sliku projicirane budućnosti, nesigurnost egzistencije; neizvjesnost ishoda dovodi pod znak pitanja sve ono što ćemo činiti ili činimo sad. Ishodi danas predviđeni u aktualnom školovanju do kraja školovanja vrlo lako mogu biti nepotrebni i neupotrebljivi. Sve to za posljedicu ima sumnju u kvalitetu nastavnog procesa i gubljenje vjerodostojnosti poruka koje škola šalje. Uočljiv je diskontinuitet školskog i izvanškolskog iskustva učenika. Stoga je važno prepoznati važnost slobodnog vremena kao središnje teme u svakodnevnom životu te aktivnosti u kojima djeca i mladi sudjeluju u slobodno vrijeme (Badrić, Prskalo i Matijević, 2015). Znanja stečena u školi i u životnim situacijama postaju sve više razdvojene cjeline. Navedeni jaz je moguće nadvladati kontinuiranim obrazovanjem budućih nastavnika za uključivanje aktivnosti slobodnog vremena u poučavanje (Prskalo, 2015).

Djeca sve teže uspostavljaju smislenu vezu između onog što ih uče u školi i životnih problema. Čak i učenici koji postižu solidne školske ocjene, imaju teškoće u primjeni znanja u rješavanju realnih životnih problema. S pravom se zaključuje da način na koji učenici uče nije primjeren životnim potrebama suvremenog svijeta. To su samo neki od razloga nezadovoljstva rezultatima školovanja zbog kojih konstruktivistička teorija posljednjih desetljeća ovog stoljeća izaziva sve veću pozornost znanstvenika u području obrazovanja. Ona razvija nove poglede kako na prirodu procesa učenja, na teoriju curriculuma tako i na teorijsko utemeljenje nastavnog procesa. Konstruktivistički didaktički kredo glasi – to kako učenici uče, važnije je od toga kako učitelj poučava. Ta promjena baca novo svjetlo na didaktičku teoriju i zahtijeva njezinu temeljitu rekonstrukciju s motrišta revizije pojmova znanja, učenja, poučavanja (Barbir i Nejašmić, 2004, str. 98).

U novije vrijeme konstruktivistička nastava i učenje studenata nastavničkog studija našli su se u fokusu nekoliko istraživanja (Batarelo Kokić, Nevin i Malian, 2013; Batarelo Kokić, i Rukavina, 2017; Bognar, Gajger i Ivić, 2016; Topolovčan, Matijević i Dumančić, 2016). Ta istraživanja postavljaju važno pitanje izloženosti budućih učitelja novim tehnologijama i bogatim konstruktivističkim okruženjima.

Topolovčan, Matijević i Dumančić (2016) istraživali su predviđanja konstruktivističkog podučavanja uključujući sociodemografske karakteristike učenika i učitelja, računalnu samoefikasnost, odnos prema novim medijima i učestalost upotrebe novih medija u nastavi. Rezultati istraživanja pokazalisu da se najveća razlika u konstruktivističkoj nastavi može objasniti odnosom prema novim medijima i računalnoj samoefikasnosti radije nego upotrebom novih medija u podučavanju. Omogućavanje konstruktivističke multidimenzionalne nastave i učenja u središtu je pažnje istraživanja koje su proveli Batarelo Kokić, Nevin i Malian (2013). Istraživači su analizirali *online* kolegij iz područja specijalnog obrazovanja za buduće učitelje. U strukturi kolegija posebna se pažnja poklanja različitim tipovima *online* nastavnih aktivnosti kao što su: rasprava, individualni radovi, individualno promatranje na licu mjesta i grupni rad. Također, Bognar, Gajger i Ivić (2016) istražili su načine organiziranja konstruktivističkog e-podučavanje u obrazovanju učitelja. Autori su analizirali *online* rasprave kao potencijalno konstruktivističko okruženje te su uočili velike razlike u kvaliteti razmišljanja učenika koje ukazuju na moguće poteškoće u konstrukciji znanja. Uz primjenu istraživačkog pristupa analize sadržaja, Batarelo Kokić i Rukavina (2017) pokušali su utvrditi potencijalne okidače koji započinju i oblikuju suvisle *online* rasprave u obrazovanju nastavnika. Istraživači su analizirali razine konstrukcije znanja u dvije uzastopne *online* rasprave fokusirajući se na temu *online* obrazovnih materijala. Te su rasprave bile dio diplomskog hibridnog kolegija za studente nastavničkog studija. Kada su uspoređena dva smjera rasprave, utvrđeno je da su u drugoj raspravi studenti nastavničkog studija dosegli višu razinu znanja i češće pregovarali o značenju/ konstrukciji znanja.

Postavljajući pitanje kvalitete, nužno se zadire u pitanja organizacije nastavnog procesa i neizostavno ga je promatrati s aspekta teorije sustava. Pojam organizacije uključuje različite raspodjele zadataka, dodjeljivanje zadataka izvršiteljima, koordinaciju izvođenja zadataka i evaluaciju ostvarivanja. Modeli organizacije nastave načini su na koji se koncipiraju i asociraju elementi organizacije da bi se dostigli postavljeni ciljevi. Modeli su misaoni konstrukti, apstrakcije realnosti koje bogatstvo činjenica realnosti reduciraju samo na neke, ključne elemente nastavne djelatnosti.

Tradicionalna škola preuzela je od drugih društvenih institucija industrijskog društva birokratsku organizaciju kao jedini organizacijski model polja društvenog djelovanja. Ispravnost postupanja birokratska organizacija legitimira neupitnim autoritetom. Zatvorenost, neelastičnost, nefleksibilnost, hijerarhijska struktura, formalizacija odnosa, moć struke, tromost u promjenama i sl. osnovne su odlike modela birokratske organizacije. Za razliku od tradicionalne škole progresivna se škola koncepcijski odmiče od krute i nepromjenjive organizacije jer je usmjerena na promjene, a sam sadržaj promjena nije unaprijed poznat. Progresivna škola nastoji doseći ciljeve postavljene u određenoj društvenoj zajednici pa stoga teži razvoju samoformirajuće organizacije koje se može nositi s pred nju postavljenim zahtjevima.

U tom smislu neki od suvremenih organizacijskih pristupa i njihove implikacije u didaktičkoj praksi zasigurno doprinose razvoju progresivnih škola. *Cvjetajući kaos* javlja se kao jedan od novijih organizacijskih koncepata (Accardi i Heyde, 2012). Taj koncept polazi od pretpostavke da su promjene u okolini izrazito brze i nepredvidljive, te da strategije djelovanja utemeljene na proaktivnom djelovanju te promjene ne mogu apsorbirati. Organizacije nužno moraju djelovati proaktivno. Samo organizacije ustrojene od autonomnih podorganizacija koje iz kaotične okoline crpe informacije i energiju za razvoj i djelovanje, mogu funkcionirati po tom konceptu. U organizaciji cvjetajućeg kaosa inovacije su konstanta, a neizvjesnost i kaotičnost prilika za brz i kvalitetan razvoj, a ne teškoće i probleme (Jušić, 1994). Najvažnija implikacija te teorije organizacije tiče se upravo položaja učenika i nastavnika u nastavnom procesu, gdje se oni pojavljuju kao partneri u poslu, sukreatori i aktivni sudionici. Jedini način da uopće razumijemo svijet oko sebe jest da ga povežemo s procesom učenja radom ili iskustvenim učenjem, odnosno obrazovanjem. Dakle jedini način da se osoba snađe u okolini jest da život uklopi u proces obrazovanja, odnosno da procesom učenja stekne iskustva kojima će postati član zajednice koji pridonosi razvoju te zajednice. Držimo da upravo takvo sagledavanje socijalnih odnosa odgovara novim pogledima na prirodu nastavnih procesa i uloge škole u društvu. Može se zaključiti da je primjena spoznaja teorije organizacija u razvoju nove uloge škole korisna za promjenu postojećeg modela nastavne organizacije.

Suvremena nastava i nova progresivistička propitivanja

Inzistirati na zadržavanju organizacijskih postavki koje su stare više od 300 godina, u današnje bi vrijeme u najmanju ruku neodgovorno. Ne govorimo ovdje o legitimnosti

škole kao institucije koja još uvije zadržava ekskluzivno pravo verificiranja znanja i kompetencija, već o onom esencijalnom razlogu postojanja škole i nastave kao procesa.

Šta je to što bismo u današnje doba niza tehnoloških i informatičkih novina mogli smatrati progresivnim idejama ili načinima kojima bi se nastavna praksa mogla unaprijediti? Podrazumijeva li progres u smislu unapređenja nastave novine u nastavno-obrazovnoj tehnologiji, u nastavnoj organizaciji ili je progres u pedagogiji danas nešto potpuno drugo?

Počevši od industrijske proizvodnje do kompleksnih društvenih odnosa, 21. stoljeće postavlja niz izazova. Takvim kompleksnim društvenim odnosima svakako pripada i nastavno-obrazovni proces, koji se nužno mora pripremiti i osposobiti kako bi odgovorio na sve dolazeće izazove. Mišljenja smo da se teorijska, ali i vrlo praktična promišljanja o naprednim didaktičkim metodama u nastavnom procesu, moraju nužno izmaknuti iz područja nastavno-obrazovne tehnologije u područje kvalitete. Pogrešno bi bilo progres u didaktičkom i organizacijskom smislu promatrati kroz prizmu e-učenja ili hibridnog učenja, bez obzira na to koliko se takav pristup pojedincima činio revolucionaran. Naime na takav način poiman progres ponovno u prvi plan postavlja pitanje *KAKO?* i ne odmiče se od prije 300 godina definiranog didaktičkog trokuta. Bez obzira na to što se u organizaciji nastave koriste suvremene komunikacijske tehnologije, one jednako kao i klasična nastavna organizacija ovise o znanju, sposobnostima i motiviranosti učitelja i učenika, s dodatkom da se u dijelu koji se odnosi na sadržaj pojavljuje i pružatelj usluga.

Gotovo nestvarno zvuči spoznaja da se u današnjoj školskoj praksi pod naprednim didaktičkim idejama i metodama uglavnom podrazumijeva uporaba informatičkih tehnologija ili društvenih mreža u svakodnevnom kreiranju nastavnog procesa. Rezultat takvih stavova stavlja pitanje *KAKO?* u fokus didaktičkoj teoriji i praksi. Postavljajući pitanje *KAKO?*, neprestano se vrtimo u sferama tehnike, u sferama operativnog poprilično reduciranog poimanja progresa i unapređivanja nastavno-obrazovnog procesa.

Prelazeći na pitanje *ZAŠTO?*, otvaramo ona ključna pitanja, pitanja kvalitete, na koja je mnogo teže naći odgovore. U vremenu u kojem živimo, u kojem dolazi do raspršenosti identiteta i nestajanja referentnih točki, kako obiteljskog tako i školskog života, pitanje *ZAŠTO?* dobiva sve više na važnosti, ono je naprosto okvir postmodernističkog poimanja svijeta, ali samim tim i nastavnog procesa koji više nije moguće promatrati kao izolirani dio postojanja, ma koliko škola u kojoj se provodi bila odvojena zidovima od ostatka svijeta. U trenutku kada postavimo pitanje kvalitete, otvorili smo pitanja ne samo organizacije nastavnog procesa već i smisla i načina učenja i poučavanja u eri u kojoj je sve relativno, u kojoj sve vrijednosti variraju i zbog utjecaja tehnologije, medija i virtualnosti sve postaje promjenjivo i nestalno.

Nestalnost, nestabilnost, varijabilnost, pojavljuju se kao nove vrijednosti i kao takve daju privid slobode i potpune individualizacije pojedinca. Taj privid stavlja vrlo ozbiljne zahtjeve pred organizaciju i kvalitetu nastavnog procesa u kojem se stječe znanje, jer danas se znanje stječe svugdje!

Kakva je priroda takvog znanja, koliko sama škola (bez obzira na oblik) kasni sa strukturiranjem, prezentacijom i transferom?

Čemu danas uopće može služiti na takav način u školskim programima strukturirano znanje koje u startu kasni godinama ili desetljećima?

Je li se promijenila struktura znanja?

Je li se promijenila svrha znanja?

Tko će odgovoriti na pitanja „koja su to znanja"? (*Posebno je ovo zanimljivo u vremenu u kojem se govori o reformama obrazovnog sustava!*)

Prema Blossing, Imsen i Moosu (2014) najnovije reforme u sjevernoeuropskim zemljama vode u smjeru redukcije progresivnih ideja u korist razvoja osnovnih vještina, ishoda, nacionalnih standarda i testova, usmjeravanja i natjecanja. Koncept obrazovne kvalitete koji se temelji na testiranju suprotan je proaktivnom progresivizmu. Porast individualizacije vodi prema redukciji različitih kurikula i opadanju uporabe kompleksnih oblika obrazovnog rada i pedagoške komunikacije. Darling-Hammond (1994) navodi alternativne metode ocjenjivanja i naglašava da bi se strategije reforme školstva trebale koristiti reformom ocjenjivanja kao polugom za vanjsku kontrola škola. Te strategije nemaju puno šansi za uspjeh i malo je vjerojatno da će ocjenjivanje biti pravično zbog postojećeg nepovjerenja prema učiteljima i činjenici da učitelji nisu uključeni u procese reforme.

> Za razliku od Republike Hrvatske koja ima Nacionalni okvirni kurikulum, kao i Plan i program koji propisuju nastavne predmete i broj sati za svaki od njih u godišnjem planu rada škole, situacija u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama (SAD-u) bitno je različita. Naime, jedinstveni nacionalni kurikul ne postoji i nastavni predmeti, nastavni sadržaji i njihov omjer uvelike ovise o lokalnoj upravi. Gotovo je nemoguće govoriti o američkom kurikulu, osim u nekom općem obliku (Matijević i Rajić, 2015, str. 644).

Govoriti o progresu unutar škole, a pri tome se minimalno ili nikako koristiti dostupnom informatičkom tehnologijom ili, još gore, tek u dobi od 5. razreda osnovne škole uvoditi informatiku kao obvezni predmet u nastavi, ne znači ništa drugo nego daleko zaostajati za procesima, zbiljom i progresom uopće ili, pak, potpuno nerazumijevanje konteksta u kojem živimo. S razine didaktičke teorije to ukazuje na nerazumijevanje procesa koji se odvijaju u nastavi, gdje se potpuno *razilaze nastava, obrazovanje i učenje*.

Svi organizacijski oblici ljudskog djelovanja nužno se mijenjaju pod pritiskom tehnološkog napretka, a još više s obzirom na stilove življenja i komuniciranja. Stoga se ni obrazovanje ne definira kao puko usvajanje znanja, već kao stil egzistiranja, a učenje proces od usvojenih činjenica preko transformacije do konkretne primjene u životnim okolnostima.

U sferi brzih društvenih promjena, za razliku od tradicionalnog odgoja koji se temeljio na neupitnosti odgojnog autoriteta i koji je po načelu „slušaj – pamti – ponovi" bio usmjeren održavanju postojeće stvarnosti, suvremeni je odgoj okrenut

budućnosti. U svijetu u kojem znanja zastarijevaju dnevno, pretjerano pamćenje postaje kontraproduktivno. Od pojedinca se ne očekuje postojano pamćenje mnoštva „činjenica", već sposobnost istraživanja, neprestanog učenja i stvaralaštva. To, pak, pretpostavlja sposobnost kritičkog mišljenja. Stoga za neupitne autoritete više nema mjesta. Svijetu brzih promjena umjesto autoritarnog društva primjerenija je demokracija, a umjesto kolektivističke svijesti osobnost (Polić, 2006, str. 20).

„Zato mnogi pravi stručnjaci i inteligentni članovi društva priznaju da imaju poteškoća u svladavanju prave poplave novih spoznaja – čak i na vrlo uskim područjima znanosti." (Toffler, 1975, str. 127). Danas su ideje o progresivnom obrazovanju povezane s osnovnim pogledima na razvoj, utjecaj i odgovornosti civilnog društva, različitih rasnih, staleških, etničkih i drugih podjela, posebno u kontekstu otvorene rasprave o postmodernoj pedagogiji (Kovačević, 2007). Brzina promjena utječe ne samo na obrazovnu već i na nizu drugih nastavnih i egzistencijalnih razina, a referentnu točku odgoja i obrazovanja preuzimaju drugi čimbenici, mreže, tehnologija i drugo. Didaktici dakle ostaje pitanje i izazov, može li danas standardnim pristupima odgovoriti na ograničenja u svojoj praksi kada je sve već na razini „budućnosti".

Neizvjesna sadašnjost projicira i neizvjesnu budućnost, a time i nepredvidive rizike.

Postavlja se pitanje, već danas, što je istinska stvarnost? Gotovo da nismo u stanju razaznati istinsku stvarnost od stvarnosti, odnosno, virtualna stvarnost postaje stvarnija od stvarnosti. Kakva li je tek budućnost koja predstoji?