THE TEACHER OF THE FUTURE WE WANT

Danijela Milošević
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš, Serbia, danijelamilosevic1993@gmail.com
Gorana Đorić
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš, Serbia, gorana.djoric@filfak.ni.ac.rs

Abstract: Comparative analyzes of educational systems indicate that a teacher is one of the most important factors in improving the education system. The greatest challenges of the modern era faced by teachers are: increasing student's antisocial behavior, inadequate cooperation with school community actors, parents and other educational institutions, the absence of greater autonomy in curriculum innovation, and technological development in educational system. That is why modern teachers are expected to adopt new roles and competences. When talking about a teacher of the future, it is most often meant to teach learners for and in the context of the digital age. No less important emphasis is on the capacity of future teachers who, besides cognitive development, develop theirs and students' emotional, social and working competences. Emotional and social education of teachers is an imperative of contemporary school. Freedom of emotional expression of students' represents an optimal pedagogical contribution to emotional development, and the development of social competences influences the regulation of social relations in the class. Therefore, it is necessary to apply the democratic style of teacher management based on mutual trust and respect. Such an approach is based on the authority of values and encourages interaction, autonomy and mutual compromise. A teacher who tends to implement such a humanistic approach makes it possible to create an incentive environment that is subordinate to the interests, needs and opportunities of the child, which the school of the future should be based on. How much teachers are willing to respond to some of the challenges of the modern age? How far are we from achieving that teachers promote values based on the humanistic conception? How much are these values consistent with the needs of the pupil's themselves? Our study is an attempt to answer these questions. In this social and theoretical context, this study examines: 1) the extent to which teachers are oriented towards the implementation of the humanistic conception in education, and 2) how students' perceive the real and ideal roles and characteristics of teachers. These two analyzes are compared and we use a quantitative and qualitative approach. For the analysis of teacher orientation, we used the scale of assessment of the pedagogical climate in the school (ISC-S). The scale contains 44 items grouped into nine categories, which measure: teacher's support for students, clarity and consistency in the application of rules, student's dedication, orientation to achievement; disciplinary rigor, students's involvement in decision-making, teaching innovation, negative and positive peer interaction and cultural pluralism. The scale was filled by 30 teachers from a primary school in Niš. The results suggest that teachers who teach natural and social-humanistic subjects, as well as teachers with different years of service, differ in their degree of focus on humanistic education. The student's perceptions of teacher roles were measured through the focus of a group interview on three topics: the personality of the teacher, the role and influence on pupil's behavior and the ideal teacher. In the focus group interview, 12 students of the seventh and eighth grades of the same elementary school participated. The basic results of focus groups with pupils indicate the similarity of pupils in understanding the role and personality of teachers and the difference between sexes in perceiving the ideal teacher. Based on the results, we conclude that it is necessary to develop the competencies of teachers regarding the management of contemporary educational processes, independent and cooperative research of their own practice. It is necessary to create a mutual climate of trust, support and encourage the ethical behavior of students, all for the purpose of better mutual relations and the future we want.
Keywords: teacher and students, characteristics and roles of teachers, teacher's competence, humanistic approach of teachers, teacher's training.

INTRODUCTION

The teacher of the future faces at least two challenges: (1) How to teach the students the knowledge and the skills necessary to adjust to and succeed in the world changed technologically, structurally, culturally and with thoroughly transformed ways of communication. (2) How to convey this knowledge to the students who are different in many ways themselves, changed by the new environment in which they grew up (different styles of bringing up the children in transformed family forms, with the new relation and expectations from teachers and the school). A teacher how wishes to respond to these challenges not just by teaching students how to adjust to the new circumstances of academic and work life, but to also cultivate students capacity to influence and modify the circumstances of their life in accordance with the socially promoted values, faces yet another challenge: 3) How to

empower students to create *the future they want*. A possible answer to these challenges has been encompassed by the concept of humanistic pedagogy which is formulated in order to enable students to develop their human potential to its maximum. In short, this pedagogy nourishes free personality development, in a climate of trust, facilitating students' understanding of problem situations, through autonomous choice of ones action (Đorđević, 2006:131-176). Humanistic pedagogy embraces the following principles: (1) students learn most efficiently if they need the knowledge and are motivated to study; (2) the quality of knowledge is more important than its quantity; (3) self-assessment is the most meaningful approach to learning outcomes' assessment; (4) a students learns most efficiently in an encouraging environment; and (5) experience of learning is as important as are the learning outcomes (Mikanović, 2015:230). Numerous studies suggest that humanistic pedagogy relays on teachers who understand students' problems and create accepting and friendly climate in class. Such teachers encourage students and enable their personality development. (Đorđević, 2002; Assor, Kaplan & Roth, 2002). Thus, quality of teaching as well as students attitudes towards learning, depend on teachers characteristics, abilities, their own motivation and other physiological factors (Dunđerović et al., 2009; Suzia, 2003; Laketa, 2009). Teacher of the future has to embrace multitude of roles – a planer, organizer, executive, practitioner, motivator and evaluator (Mikanović, 2015). Furthermore, a good teacher – student relation diminishes the likelihood of antisocial behavior of students (Marzano & Marzano, 2003 & Santrock, 2006). So that some authors emphasize communication as the key factor of class management (Korać, 2010 & Gordon, 2011).

In this paper we present the results of a research focusing on to kinds of question: (1) To what extent are principles of humanistic pedagogy really implemented in schools, according to teacher's perception of it? (2) What characteristics of teachers are most desirable from the student's perspective? Which are the dominant roles teachers play and should play according to the students, and what are the limits of their influence, in students view? By comparing the results on these two interconnected analyses, we can establish (3) to what extent teachers and students support or obstruct each other in implementing the principles of humanistic pedagogy and achieve the education for the future we want.

The research has been conducted in one of the most respectable elementary schools in Niš, in Serbia, in 2018. The first question has been addressed by measuring the attitudes of 30 teachers towards pedagogic climate in the school, using the Inventory of School Climate-Student scale (ISC–S). The ISC was originally developed by Brand et al. (2003, p. 575) to measure the social climate of elementary school students. In our application the scale is used and interpreted as indicative of perceived extent of enactment of the humanistic pedagogy, by the teachers. The participation in the survey was on volontary bases and the most of the teachers took part. The tachers differed by sex, subject area of teaching and the length of work experience in school. In addition to the more general question of teachers attitudes towards shcool climate, we have also addressed the question if the teachers perceptions of the school climate differs by the subject area and the work experience lenght.

The question of student's preferences has been addressed through a focus group interview with 12 students from the same school (5 boys and 7 girls, 6 students from each 7. and 8. grade, 10 students with excellent grades (A) and 2 students with good grades (B)). The students were selected on the first come, first served bases, taking into consideration the balance of girls and boys (one could assume that the part in the focus groups took the most interested and motivated students). Interview lasted for 90 minutes. The structure of the interview will be presented in the next part of the paper.

In the rest of the paper we will firstly present the results of the focus group interview, and then the results of the teachers' attitude measurements. In the conclusion, the results are summarized and interpreted in line with the theorizing and researching in the field of humanistic pedagogy, with the assessment of its prominence in Serbian contest.

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW WITH STUDENTS

Through the semi-structured focus group interview, a student's perceptions of teacher roles were measured, which involved discussion on three topics: the personality, roles and influence of teachers on student behavior. Students expressed their preferences in three ways: (1) By verbally answering questions: What qualities do you recognize as the most important for the teaching role? What kind of teacher should be a model for you? (2) By choosing the most important qualities for the teaching profession from the list offered (compiled on the basis of theory). (3). By drawing an ideal teacher and discussing how to present it. The second topic was launched to find out which roles students recognize as being most important for the teaching profession and contained questions: List the roles of teachers? In your opinion, what is the most important role a teacher has in school? The third theme opened a discussion on the possibility of teachers' influence on student behavior through the following question: What is the impact of a teacher on your behavior? Students' responses and their interaction made it possible to ask a number of

questions relevant to our research, and some of them concerned the educational impact and respect of the teaching profession.

The focus group interview was realized in one of the most respected elementary schools in Nis in Serbia. We will only present the key answers within the described topics.

1. Personality of the teacher

Within this topic, students were asked to use the ranking techniques to select the most important characteristics of teachers, and then present the ideal teacher with the drawing technique. The qualities that the students emphasize independently refer to the *expertise* ("... to explain a lesson clearly, to make everything understandable"), *general culture* ("... be cultural and literate, that he can talk to us normally"), *capacity to stimulate and support* ("... that there is perseverance, desire and will to teach us") and for *understanding the students* ("... be reasonable that if we do not learn something, understand it and do not ask us."). From the qualities they were offered (*a good pedagogue, showing understanding to a student, clearly expounding and interpreting material, a good teacher, equal to all students, just in evaluation, possessing a sense of humor, encouraging the student to work and encouraging it, taking care about appearance, maintain order and discipline,* according to Ivić and associates., 2001 and Suzić, 2005), the students selected the 5 most important ones in their opinion, among which they repeat the *expertise*: clearly expounding and interpreting material ("Well, for example, teachers who just go in for a lesson and do not ask if something is clear to you, and if we say that we do not understand, they say: 'Look at home!' "); *a good lecturer* ("He clearly expounds and interprets the material, because, for example, we have a history teacher who is very good in teaching a lesson and we can only repeat it once at home, because we already know everything. For example, once when he told a lesson, I did not even read it at home at all, I remembered everything and got 'A' the next time. He's a very good lecturer. He's good to pass the lesson and make sense of humor and then always makes us laugh so we never get bored.") and *understanding students* ("Because most teachers do not matter if I have five tests in other subjects or whether I have to answering"). Via this technique, students recognize the *fairness* and *equal treatment* of students ("There are some teachers who like a few students, and the others a little less, so they are not just in the evaluation.", "A teacher of geography, for example. She likes a girl - Nina, and when she answering, teacher does not listen at all, or doing everything, she says one sentence and gets an 'A', and the other girl who answers, learns the whole lesson and knows everything, but teacher gives her 'C', and only because that girl is silent and withdrawn in class. "); ("Because there are teachers who prefer one student more, and less the other, and then they give better grades to the first one, respect him more in the class, they give him less to work than others or expose him."). The answers of the students did not differ in terms of sex and success in school, and the expectations of all regarding the characteristics of teachers were the same.

In the drawing technique, which is applied as an alternative way in examining students about the characteristics of teachers, we notice differences in relation to students' sex. The girls have mapped the same characteristics as in the previous activity and presented a teacher who is *expert, just, shows understanding and rewards students* ("An interesting way to teach children a lesson? I will give to all of them the same task to be fair. Later I will reward them."). Unlike them, boys see an ideal teacher as an *open, entertaining* (with a sense of humor) and one *maintaining order and discipline* in the classroom ("... a teacher who is not very old-fashioned, but maintains discipline at classes and has a sense of humor."). Girls reiterated that their interest in learning from teachers' approach.

2. Teacher roles

The pupils identified the following teaching roles: "The pedagogue, psychologist, lecturer, he prepares at home for a class (planner), the organizer, he evaluates our tests and ourselves as persons (evaluator)". As the most important one they emphasize, the role of "motivator" ("I think that a teacher should get to know students and to know who will be motivated by a good or a bad grade. If the teacher handles all of that, then he can be a teacher whom the students like, and from whom they can learn something."; "Teachers have many ways to motivate students, they can do it by imagination, by introducing changes in a class, by grade"). As important factors influencing their motivation for work, students emphasized creativity and innovation. On the other hand, they pointed that they are not satisfied with the teachers' responsiveness. The results indicate a lack of care for students' problems and response to situations when something happens ("I think most teachers do not want to interfere with our problems. That only do the class teacher. They sometimes try to show us that something we should not do, for example - violence, and the others rarely, when something happens. The same is true for pedagogues, psychologists and sociologists."). There were no differences in answers regarding gender and students' success.

3. The influence of a teacher on students' behavior

The attitudes of students about the influence of teachers vary with dependence on closeness and trust. The intensity of the influence will depend on: (1) the personality of the student ("It depends from one to another. It also depends

on a student's attitude and character, and whether he wants to change it and whether he wants to hear a teacher at all."); and (2) the personality of a teacher ("In order for a teacher to have an influence on me he should be a mature person, to know what he is doing, and when I see that he does not advise me well, I will not listen to him."). All students have the greatest trust in a family and then in a class teacher ("We, at school, are learning how to behave and what qualities we need, but I think that it is most important to learn it at home."; "Behavioral influence only exists within class teachers, but realistically most at home. ").

When it comes to students' attitudes about the appreciation of the profession of teachers, due to complexity of the work, students do not see themselves in that role ("A teacher, when you look at all, has many obligations in a school and out of it, he must endure all those children who are in puberty, sometimes he understands them, and sometimes does not. Out of school he has to look at the tests, creates them, prepare a lesson for the next class, and always is burdened."; "My mom is a professor and I've seen all the sides of the job. She writes planes, solves children's problems at school, she has to go to the meetings and sessions."). It is evident that students consider the teaching profession as multidimensional and, given their personal requirements, they do not have a desire to direct their aspirations to activities that involve the fulfillment of a multitude of tasks.

PERCEIVED SCHOOL CLIMATE BY THE TEACHERS

The teacher's attitudes towards humanistic approach to education were assessed by the Scale of perceived school climate (ISC). The scale contains 44 items divided into nine categories measuring: 1. Teachers support for students (reliability coefficient $\alpha = 0,76$), 2. Clarity in enforcing rules and support for students ($\alpha = 0,74$), 3. Students commitment and achievement orientation (teachers perception) ($\alpha = 0,81$), 4. Negative students interaction (teachers perception) ($\alpha = 0,73$), 5. Positive students interaction (teachers perception) ($\alpha = 0,70$), 6. Disciplinary harshness ($\alpha = 0,67$), 7. Students' participation in decision making (teachers perception) ($\alpha = 0,70$), 8. Teaching innovation, and 9. Support to cultural pluralism ($\alpha = 0,68$). Statements composing measures of the nine categories could be supported on a scale from 1 - never, to 5 - always (except for the category 9 where the strongest support has the value of 4).

In Table 1 we present the average scores on items measuring these categories for teachers of Humanities and Sciences.

Table 1. Average score on the scale of perceived school climate (ISC) by the subject area - Humanities (H) and Sciences (S). Presented are significan differences at the level p<0,05 for 4 df

	Statements	Subject	N	Mean	SD	t
1.	Teachers go out of their way to help students.	H/S	14/16	4,00/4,68	0,96/0,47	2,53
	If students want to talk about something teachers will find time to do it.	H/S	14/16	4,00/4,50	0,78/0,51	2,08
2.	Students are given clear instructions about how to do their work in classes.	H/S	14/16	4,07/4,75	0,73/0,44	3,11
	Teachers make a point of sticking to the rules in classes.	H/S	14/16	4,00/4,93	1,10/0,25	3,09
4.	Students in this school have trouble getting along with each other.	H/S	14/16	2,92/2,43	0,73/0,51	2,15
	Students in this school are mean to each other	H/S	14/16	3,21/2,62	0,69/0,61	2,44
	In classes, students find it hard to get along with each other.	H/S	14/16	2,71/2,18	0,72/0,40	2,49
	Students in this school feel students are too mean to them.	H/S	14/16	2,85/2,12	0,94/0,61	2,53
5.	Students enjoy doing things with each other in school activities.	H/S	14/16	3,00/3,68	0,67/0,47	3.23
	Students in this school get to know each other really well.	H/S	14/16	3,57/4,06	0,75/0,44	2,13
6.	Students get in trouble for breaking small rules.	H/S	14/16	2,00/1,37	1,03/0,61	2,03
7.	Students in this school have a say in how things work.	H/S	14/16	3,85/4,43	1,02/0,51	1,99

8.	New and different ways of teaching are tried in classes.	H/S	14/16	3,35/4,06	0,63/0,57	3,20
	New ideas are tried out here.	H/S	14/16	3,50/4,25	0,85/0,68	2,67
9.	Students of many different races and cultures are chosen to participate in important school activities.	H/S	14/16	3,21/3,81	0,80/0,40	2,63
	You work with students of different races and cultures in a school activity	H/S	14/16	3,42/4,00	0,64/0.00	3,30

The results of measuring teachers' attitudes towards school climate suggest that the strongest perceived support is for clarity of instructions and the rules governing the teaching process, as well as for the teachers support of students. The lowest scores are recorded for the perceived disciplinary harshness. Significant differences between the teachers teaching Humanities and Sciences suggest that the Humanities teachers are more critical in their perception of the extent of teachers' support for students, clarity of instructions, students' participation in decision making, teachers' innovation and the support for cultural pluralism, than are Sciences teachers. In other words, average Humanities teachers' perception indicates that there could be some improvement in these areas of teaching. Humanities teachers have lower scores than Sciences teachers for the perceived positive peer interaction and higher scores for the perceived negative peer interaction in school, indicating their higher sensitivity for undesirable interactions. On the other hand, Humanities teachers seem to be more in favor of lower disciplinary harshness than are Sciences teachers.

By difference to teachers' subject area which seem to differentiate teachers' attitudes, work experience of teachers matters in just two measured categories of attitudes: students' commitment in class and the disciplinary harshness (Table 2). Teachers with longest work experience (more than 21 year) seem to perceive the students as less committed to classes than the teachers with fewer years of work experience. They are also inclined to assess the disciplinary harshness in school as almost nonexistent. The teachers with the least work experience (how are also the youngest) perceive the disciplinary rules to be harsher than do the teachers with more than 10 years of work experience.

Table 2. Average score on the scale of perceived school climate (ISC) by the work experience of teachers (in years). Presented are significant differences at the level p<0,05 for 8 df

	Statements	Work experience	N	Mean	SD	F
3.	Students try hard to get the best grades they can.	>10/11-21/>21	8/14/8	3,75/4,07/3,37	0,46/0,61/0,51	4,05
	Students put a lot of energy into what they do here.	>10/11-21/>21	8/14/8	3,37/3,64/2,87	0,51/0,49/0,35	8,72
6.	The rules in this school are too strict.	>10/11-21/>21	8/14/8	2,37/1,57/1,50	0,91/0,64/0,53	4,12
	It is easy for a student to get kicked out of class in this school.	>10/11-21/>21	8/14/8	2,50/1,64/1,25	1,06/0,63/0,46	4,76
	Students get in trouble for breaking small rules.	>10/11-21/>21	8/14/8	2,50/1,28/1,50	1,19/0,46/0,53	3,73
	If students are acting up in class they have been harshly punished.	>10/11-21/>21	8/14/8	2,62/1,35/1,87	0,91/0,63/0,35	6,52

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We have started with claiming that the challenges of the teacher of the future (as we want) could be best met by implementation of the principles of humanistic pedagogy in schools. In this paper we have analyzed if students prefer the teachers with characteristics enabling them to introduce these principles in schools. We have found that they do: the preferences are on the side of a teacher as a motivator, the one who, in addition to his expertise, is fair, supportive and understands students. The power of influence is, however, placed in family and only secondarily in teachers, and only in those teachers who are „mature" and really care, and those are perceived by students to be rare. In another piece of analysis, we have addressed the teachers' perception of how school climate is close to what would be expected from the one driven by the humanistic principles. We found that the teachers perceive themselves

as very supportive of students, and instructive of the rules of in class behavior. In a lesser degree (but still quite high) they perceive themselves as innovative, supportive of student's participation in decision making and of cultural pluralism. More critical of themselves, in that respect, are teachers teaching Humanities than the ones teaching Sciences. This most probably expresses their more developed sensitivity to the issues of humanistic pedagogy. Humanities' teachers are also more sensitive to the lack of active promotion of the students' positive interaction, and to the lack of student's capacity to work with each other in a friendly atmosphere. Teachers work experience has not been a good predictor of their perception of the school climate. The only difference found in that respect is that the teachers with many years of experience notice the lack of student's commitment to learning more than the rest of the teachers. They also assess the discipline harshness in the school as almost not existent (by difference from the teachers with less work experience).

Taken together, these findings suggest that underdeveloped teachers' social and emotional competences hinder dipper communication with the students. The most obvious problems are teachers' criticism and moralizing, lack of understanding for students, as well as inaccessibility and just occasional responsiveness. The consequences are the lack of discipline, frequent conflicts, students' resistance, bad grades. The majority of teachers do not meet students' preferences, so the students generalize this perception an loose motivation for learning in general. I order to improve the teacher – student relationship it is necessary to nourish fuller implementation of humanistic approach to education.

On the other hand, we can also claim with Radišić (2012) that teachers position in contemporary education system in Serbian context is unsatisfactory – low participation in decision making, vague and constantly changing regulation, as well as inadequate preparation for expansion of complex teachers' roles. Thus, teachers too should be supported in order to be able to embrace the values `of humanistic pedagogy and better prepare for their demanding role of the teachers for the future (as we want it).

REFERENCES

Assor, A., Kaplan, H. & G. Roth (2002). Choice is Good, but Relevance is Excellent: Autonomy-enhancing and Suppressing Teacher Behaviours Predicting Students Engagement in Schoolwork. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72, 261-278.

Brand, S, Felner, R. Shim, M. Seitsinger, A., & Dumas T. (2003). Middle school improvement and reform: Development and validation of a school – level assessment of climate, cultural pluralism, and school safety, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(3), 570-588.

Dunđerović, R., Radovanović, I., & Levi, S. (2009). *Upravljanje razredom – psihološki i pedagoški aspekti upravljačke funkcije nastavnika* (*Class Management - Psychological and Pedagogical Aspects of the Management Function of Teachers)*. Beograd: Učiteljski fakultet.

Đorđević, J. (2002): *Svojstva nastavnika i procenjivanje njihovog rada* (*Teacher properties and assessment of their work*). Vršac: Viša škola za obrazovanje vaspitača.

Đorđević, J. (2006). Ciljevi obrazovanja i vaspitanja i moralne vrednosti (Objective of education and moral values) U N. Potkonjak (Ur.) *Zbornik radova naučnog skupa: Osnovna polazišta obrazovanja u Srbiji* (str. 131-176). Beograd: Filozofski fakultet, Srpska akademija obrazovanja.

Gordon, T. (2011). *Origins of the Gordon model.* Gordon Training International. Retrieved 2018 from http://www.gordontraining.com/thomas-gordon/origins-of-the-gordonmodel/

Ivić, I., Pešikan, A., & Antić, S. (2001). Aktivno učenje (Active learning). *Priručnik za primenu metoda aktivnog učenja/nastave*. Beograd: Institut za psihologiju.

Laketa, N. (2009). Škola danas i tendencije njenog razvoja (School today and the tendencies of its development). U N. Potkonjak (Ur.) *Zbornik radova sa naučnog skupa: Buduća škola* (str. 111-142). Beograd: Srpska akademija obrazovanja.

Korać, I. (2010). Nastavnik – efikasan vođa odeljenja (Teacher - an effective leader of the class). *Nastava i vaspitanje*, 59(1), 145-155.

Marzano, R.J. & Marzano, J.S. (2003). The key to classroom management. *Educational leadership*, 61(1), 6-13.

Mikanović, B. (2015): Humanističko vaspitanje i emancipacija ličnosti (Humanistic education and emancipation of personality). U B. Dimitrijević (Ur.) *Humanistički ideali obrazovanja, vaspitanja i psihologije* (str. 223-235). Niš: Filozofski fakultet.

Radišić, N. (2012). Umesto zaključka: kompetencije nastavnika za sprovođenje promena i unapređivanje sistema obrazovanja (Instead of conclusion: teachers' competencies for implementing changes and improving the education system). U N. Pantić i J. Č. Marković (Ur.), *Nastavnici u Srbiji: stavovi o profesiji i o reformama u obrazovanju.* (str.74-89). Beograd: Centar za obrazovne politike.

Santrock, J.W. (2006). *Educational psychology – classroom update: preparing for PRAXIS and practice*. Boston: Mc Graw Hill.

Suzić. N. (2003). *Osobine nastavnika i odnos učenika prema nastavi* (*Teacher characteristics and student attitudes toward teaching*). Banja Luka: Teacher Training Centre.

Suzić, N. (2005). *Pedagogija XXI veka* (*Pedagogy of the XXI century*). Banja Luka: TT-centar.