

**HUMANISTIC TEACHING STRATEGIES IN PRIMARY  
SCHOOLS IN CENTRAL SLOVAKIA:  
EMPIRICAL COMPARISON  
OF TRADITIONAL AND NON-TRADITIONAL INSTRUCTION**

*Beata Kosová*

Faculty of Education, Matej Bel University, Banská Bystrica

**Theoretical Issues of Humanistic Education**

The notion of **humanization of education** is frequently used in the Slovak professional literature. However, it is interpreted in a number of ways. According to the most general definition, humanization is transformation of a unified conception of education (teaching of everybody in the same way, aiming at same objectives and using same methods for all pupils) to a conception aiming at genuine individual development of personality of every pupil in view of his potentials and abilities. The aim is to educate an individual so that he will be an independent person. Frequently, a single quality of humanization is emphasized: making conditions of education humanistic by adopting them to needs and developmental stages of the child. In other words, it means a specific kind of approaching the child. Another requirement is less frequently quoted: creation of such means of education that constantly activate personal growth of the child in order that he can fully constitute and experience life.

**Humanistic education** is characterized by manifesting respect to the child, by accepting his values as man who, as such, is worth attention and dignity without taking into consideration of his current state, low knowledge, or inadequacies. This education gives to the child all rights and duties that belong to a personality, with the exception of those which would harm child's development. This education refuses everything that would humiliate the child in the eyes of other people and himself, or everything that could slow down child's personal growth (e.g., lack of developmental stimuli, adoption of a self-damaging self-conception, overestimation of some features of child's personality, concentration on rote learning and the like).

Search for outcomes and explanations of humanistic education can be dated back throughout the whole education in the 20th century - from Progressive Education to current educational theories. In this paper, we shall refer only to those humanistic ideas that are linked to the substance of the humanistic problems or their identification.

Humanistic psychologists, represented mainly by A.H. Maslow and C. Rogers, have been interested mostly in self-actualization and self-accomplishment of man. The two authors advocated the development of man based on revealing and activating his inner potentials, chiefly through experience. "A change [caused by education] can take place only if relationship is experienced" (C. Rogers, 1993). This relationship must allow a pupil to find a potential in himself for personal growth. Rogers considers it to be important in education to "transfer acting according to expectations of others to acting according to man's own expectations based on his experiences, based on personal meaningfulness" (Rogers, 1993). In other words, education should provide space for self-growth.

A team of American educators and psychologists led by B. S. Bloom has developed a taxonomy of educational objectives comprising cognitive, affective and psycho-motor domains, which are interrelated. In the cognitive domain, the lowest category is knowledge. The highest category is evaluation. Affective objectives are hierarchized from receiving (attending) phenomena to acting according to one's own value complex (B. S. Bloom, 1972). Objectives such as attitudes and abilities are superior to knowledge.

In his theory of humanistic teaching, A. W. Combs emphasized freedom, value, dignity and integrity of people. Significant qualities of this teaching are:

1. It accepts needs and interests of pupils.
2. It facilitates and develops self-actualization of pupils.
3. It teaches practical abilities needed for life.
4. It personalizes educational decisions.
5. It accepts priority of human feelings.
6. It creates stimulating teaching climate
7. It develops genuine interest in other people and respect in values of others (Š. Švec, 1993, p. 3). In this teaching, child is respected and developed as a unique personality who determines his own growth.

S. A. Amonashvili lists the following top principles of elementary instruction:

1. The principle of free options which are meaningful for the child.
2. The principle of instruction being concentrated on promoting development of the child, as far as the limits of his developmental potentials allow, whereby pupil's learning is based on cooperation.
3. The principle of joy of life, so that learning becomes a meaningful component of life (S. A. Amonashvili, 1986, p. 50-60). The so-called Pedagogy of Cooperation, whose representative is this author, grew out from similar conditions that prevail in Slovak schools. Important quality of this education is that it does not only respects needs of the child and adopts instruction to them, but it also views his future development and assigns demanding tasks to him.

Z. Helus (1982), the Czech author, made it clear that personality development can take place only if self-development is achieved. Self-development is most strongly affected by inner dispositions which are induced to the child from outside, and they can either activate or slow down child's development. He warned about a self-damaging self-concept of a child as well as a self-concept of an underachiever.

Š. Švec, the Slovak author, identifies the following key features of humanistic teaching: emotionalization of teaching, transfer of teacher's enthusiasm to pupils, respecting uniqueness of pupils, promotion of self-confidence and self-awareness, tolerance to other views, preference of positive evaluation of pupils, moral socialization of pupils in the spirit of general human values and creation of favourable socio-emotional climate (Š. Švec, 1993; p. 2-15).

This overview of some approaches to humanistic education shows that, in spite of varying formulations or generality of features and elements, all authors join in orientation on children and their development - not only on the present but also on the future development, that is **orientation on development of children's personality**. In this educational conception priority is given to potentials and abilities of children rather than to normative requirements of the society that must be fulfilled by all individuals in the same manner. An orientation on the development of personality of children requires to follow these principles and their educational consequences in theory and practice (B. Kosová, 1994, p. 16-17):

Key Principles	Educational Consequences
1. Uniqueness as a goal and condition of education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- personalization of educational decisions,</li> <li>- individualization of educational decisions,</li> <li>- acceptance of needs, interests and experiences of pupils,</li> <li>- tolerance of inter-individual differences and opinions.</li> </ul>
2. Self-development of pupil as a goal and condition of education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- promotion of positive relationship of pupil to himself,</li> <li>- active participation of pupil in all stages of education,</li> <li>- development of self-appreciation and self-regulation,</li> <li>- meaningful motivation and stimulating learning climate that supports independent and active strategies,</li> <li>- promotion of independence and developmental-activation dispositions,</li> <li>- promotion of curiosity and creativity.</li> </ul>
3. Development of all-round personality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- balanced development of cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains,</li> <li>- use of all learning sources,</li> <li>- use of all senses.</li> </ul>
4. Priority of relationships in life of man; - priority to attitudes and abilities as goals of education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- moral socialization aimed at humanistic values,</li> <li>- meaningful development of practical life abilities,</li> <li>- emphasis on ability development rather than on achievement,</li> </ul>

Key Principles	Educational Consequences
- emphasis on experiences in education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- emphasis on creativity development rather than on development of memory.</li> <li>- emotionalization of education,</li> <li>- positive learning climate, no hampering mechanisms,</li> <li>- development of positive inter-personal relationships,</li> <li>- positive feedback,</li> <li>- learning by experiencing.</li> </ul>

To humanize schools means acknowledging of these four principles. These principles set the direction and content of changes in relationship of the teacher to pupils as well as direction and content of teaching. Implementation of these principles at school manifests itself in new formulation of aims of education, in new proportion of content of education, in preference of active methods of instruction and management of instruction.

### **Requirements for changes in the teacher and obstacles in adopting these changes**

It is clear that the key element in implementing humanization of teaching at school is the teacher. Humanization rests on changes in her attitudes to education of children and on acquiring abilities needed for transformation of the character of education. In Slovakia, this means predominantly a reform inside the school, including changes in educational and instructional strategies. **Changes in attitudes** of teachers to education and children should rest on development of pupils personality and on a different concept of teaching, following the above described principles. What is additionally needed is willingness of teachers to change themselves and their relationships to children, and change their educational beliefs.

Change in attitudes is closely linked to **changes in abilities** of teachers. These changes concern abilities needed in management of instruction. Primarily, non-cognitive abilities of teachers should be developed. Activity methods should be acquired and non-directive teaching style should be learned by the teacher. Studies of efficiency of non-cognitive educational programmes for pre-service teachers indicated that improvement in students inter-personal abilities resulted in certain improvement in behaviour of pupils, and in changes in pupils behaviour, attitudes and achievement (Š. Švec, 1993, p. 302).

There may occur some **obstacles** and restrictions during adoption of changes in teachers attitudes. A great part of these obstacles is of a subjective character, e.g.:

- changes will bring more demanding work for the teacher rather than for pupils;
- teachers may be reluctant to get rid of routine methods they used;
- teachers may be unwilling to accept changes because of fear of new and unknown things;

- teachers may be socially threatened by changes: when teachers are dismissed due to decrease of classes at school it is mainly innovative teachers who are affected since they are uncomfortable for headpersons because they constantly attack the traditional school system;
- character and temperament of some teachers will not allow them to overcome the authoritarian manner of teaching or their distrust in children;
- if changes are adopted, they do not result directly in overall positive results; some pupils will achieve better results earlier, some will achieve later - this may cause doubt about their teaching in some teachers who were accustomed to compare pupils achievement with a traditional standard.

Some obstacles are caused by the character of the system in which the teacher works, and they are of objective rather than subjective character:

- teachers are inadequately prepared to adopt changes due to bad pre-service training; some teachers are even inappropriate for the teaching profession (the selection of teacher candidates is inadequate and some inappropriate candidates, e.g., aggressive persons, are accepted);
- the changes cause loss of powers within the system and beyond it. Some authorities hamper adoption of changes by strengthening control over innovative teachers, who become victims of criticism; on the other hand, authorities do not affect teachers who do not introduce any changes;
- lack of funds and materials (inability to opt from a variety of textbooks and teaching aids) may, in part, restrict the process of humanization;

Many of these obstacles can be, however, overcome especially if the humanistic tendencies be more significantly supported by school authorities, educational science and parents.

### **Attitudes of Slovak teachers to humanization of education: Empirical comparison of traditional and non-traditional instruction**

In May 1993 we have conducted a questionnaire survey of primary school teachers from districts of Banská Bystrica, Zvolen and Prievidza. The aim was to identify views and attitudes of teachers toward humanization of the school. The specific aims of the survey were to identify:

- how teachers view humanization of the school,
- whether or not they are willing to adapt their instruction to be humanistic,
- whether or not they make use of possibilities for humanization of instruction under traditional conditions of schools,
- whether or not there are differences in opinions and attitudes between teachers who teach in a traditional way and those who teach in a non-traditional way.

The sample consisted of 317 teachers. Out of them 91.9 % were women. 97.5 % of teacher had the required qualification. 65 % teachers taught at urban schools and 35 % taught at rural schools. As it is typical for Slovak primary schools, 1/3 of teachers were over 50 years old. As many as 48.5 % of teachers had teaching experience exceeding 20 years.

The sample consisted of two groups of teachers: 43 teachers taught in non-traditional classes within pilot programmes that were permitted by district school administration offices or school headpersons. For instance, in these classes instruction was organized in "blocks" rather than in traditional individual lessons, curriculum was modified, scheduling was flexible, subject matter was integrated according to topics, LEGO Dacta teaching materials were used, drama education was employed, teaching by playing was used, or "epochal" teaching adopted from Waldorf school was implemented. This group will be referred to as "Group A". The group was composed from teachers from all age groups. Group B consisted of 274 teachers who taught in a traditional way.

Though the two groups differed in number, the sizes reflect the proportion of traditional/non-traditional teaching at Slovak schools.

We hypothesized that teachers will have different opinions on humanization of schools and that they will not have a clear theoretical knowledge on the personalized approach to pupils. Furthermore, we anticipated that even if they wish to adopt changes in schools aiming at humanization, they expect that these changes will be introduced upon their superiors' order. Also we anticipated that teachers do not make use of all positive possibilities that are available at traditional schools. We expected that teachers in non-traditional teaching programmes will allow more freedom and independence for pupils in class, and that younger teachers will be more willing to adopt changes in instruction than older ones.

The first part of the questionnaire contained questions on theoretical aspects of humanization, on the personalized approach to pupils, on partner-like relationship of the teacher and pupils, and on goals of instruction. The second part of the questionnaire contained questions concerning practical implementation of humanistic principles in instruction.

We shall present partial findings that are statistically significant at 0.01 level (cf. G. Heinz - C. Ebner 1967).

As many as 62.4 % of teachers (Group B) said that they did not make any changes aiming at humanization of instruction. One respondent wrote that she had had taught in a humanistic way already in the past so that there was nothing to be changed in her instruction. Other teachers listed changes in teacher-pupil relationship, changes in teaching methods, changes in classroom environment, and their reliance on pupils interest as key qualities of humanistic instruction. Unfortunately, only one respondent stated that the most significant change should be a personality change in the teacher.

There were substantial differences between the two groups in answering questions on theoretical aspects of humanization. As many as 32.8 % of teachers claimed that the most significant feature of humanization of education was to respect needs, interests and abilities of children. As many as 30.6 % of, mainly older, teachers stated a positive teacher-pupil relationship. It can be summed up that the majority of teachers opted for "a closer approach" to the child. On the other hand, only 19.5 % of teachers stated that the entire process and content of instruction should be targeted at the development of the personality of the pupil (that is, on individual development of every child).

Only 1/3 of teachers answered that the responsibility for humanization of education rests on the teacher herself and that every teacher could implement

humanization elements in her class immediately. The largest group of teachers, 37.2 %, thought that teaching conditions (size of classrooms, number of pupils in class) are important prerequisites for implementing humanization. Since these prerequisites are not favourable, they claimed that it was very difficult to start humanizing the instruction. This answer was opted for mostly by older teachers as well as by teachers from Group B, and by urban teachers who had mostly great number of pupils in class. Frequently, they also had a double shaft instruction (morning classes and afternoon classes). These opinions were anticipated. However, one can hardly acknowledge them since the basic feature of humanization are changes that depend on the teacher herself.

Further questions concerned teacher-pupil relationship and its effect on pupil s achievement. As many as 59.3 % of respondents think that partnership between the teacher and the pupil could exist in the entire schooling, whereas 32.2 % thought that this partnership was possible only in lower primary grades. Also, 34.7 % of teachers claimed that the effect of teacher-pupil relationship on pupil s achievement was significant; 60.25 % of teacher said that this effect was considerable. If almost all teachers claim great importance of positive teacher-pupil relationship, in theory they should agree that during the four years of primary education they would do something which is more demanding for them but, at the same time, it is more natural and probably also more beneficial for children. However, 54 % of respondents refused this option while listing three reasons. The first group of answers consisted of teachers claiming that this was too demanding for them, that children make them tired and the that they were unable to specialize in a specific aspect of instruction. Another group of answers claimed that the child must get accustomed to a new teacher in grades 3 and 4, which helps the child in transition to upper primary grades, where every subject is taught by a different teacher. The last group, which was the smallest one in number, expressed its distrust in the teacher who could badly manage a class during four primary grades, and they refused to have a stronger emotional relationship to pupils. The percentage of those respondents who refused to manage the whole class during the four grades was increasing with the age of respondents ( $r = 0.255$ ).

If the child is to become a personality and a partner to the teacher, the teacher should enable him to manifest himself as a personality. The teacher should give him rights which belong to a partner. It was surprising to find out that exactly 3/4 of respondents did not admit any direct participation of the child in the development of the content of instruction. However, there were differences between Group A and Group B. In Group A this was refused by 37.2 % of teachers, in Group B by as many as 81 % of respondents. The percentage was increasing with age ( $r = 0.384$ ). These teachers did not even admit that children would propose one topic a week which they would like to learn about. So, on one hand, teachers are in favour of establishing the instruction on interests of pupil, on the other hand, they are not willing to accept spontaneous interests of pupils. They consider it to be a threat to their powers. It is also possible that they consider a spontaneous interest of pupils to be a disturbing element in instruction. They failed to realize that children s interests have important power in increasing motivation of children to learn.

Also, teachers were asked whether or not they would like to teach an "open instruction", i.e., an instruction in which pupils would be given a certain number of

tasks in the beginning of lesson which they would work out independently in any order and in their own pace. Experiences from some countries indicated that such a learning was possible as early as in grade 1. Children learned independently and actively. In our sample, 76 % of respondents refused such a mode of instruction. They even refused to teach temporarily in this manner. In Group A this was refused by a half of teachers, in Group B by 80 % of teachers. They justified their refusal by distrust in children's independent learning. Also, they claimed that pupils would misuse the opportunity of learning independently and they stated that teachers would lose a close contact with children. It seems that teachers could not even imagine their role in this mode of instruction. As it is known, it is this mode of instruction that allows the teacher to take an individual approach to slow pupils, assist them if needed, communicate with the child, have a direct contact with him, i.e., to know him better.

Other questions were answered more favourably. As many as 55.5 % of respondents acknowledged the right of the pupil to evaluate the teacher - at least from time to time. In Group A this was admitted by 76.7 % of respondents. Almost half of them wanted to allow this as frequently as possible; 63.7 % of teachers allow noise and free movement of pupils in the classroom during the instruction. In both cases, the greatest number of negative answers were obtained from older teachers.

An important finding concerned humanistic changes teachers would like to implement; 48.9 % of teachers expressed satisfaction with the way they teach; they only required some organizational and resource improvements; 35 % of respondents required changes in instruction itself - especially in the content and methods of instruction; 15.5 % required a completely new conception and organization of instruction in lower primary grades. Group A teachers were more critical. They required especially changes both in educational matters and in conception of instruction. When asked to list three most urgent changes, these answers were provided (further on ordered according to number of options):

1. 196 options: adaptation of such teaching content which, according to 83.6 % of teachers, did not correspond to developmental characteristics of pupils. They claimed that content of the instruction was overloaded, it made pupils less active, it was too demanding, it was non-creative and formulations were complex.

2. 183 options: change in instructional methods and strategies.

The first and the second most required changes do not concern organization or resource matters.

3. To empower teachers with rights to decide about content and organization of instruction (177 options);

4. To allow more freedom in schools (124 options); 5. Changes in teacher-pupil relationships (116 options);

6. Changes in organization of instruction (63 options);

7. New objectives and priorities in education (40 options);

8. Changes in teacher beliefs (31 options).

As it is obvious, three out of the first four changes, as rated by respondents, may be implemented by school authorities only. The fourth one - change of instructional methods - could be done by teachers themselves. However, as we said earlier, more than half of the respondents failed to do this.



Teachers view the changes pragmatically. This can be documented by low rating (7th position) of changes in instructional objectives at the primary level of schools. However, all other changes are determined by solution of the former one. If we want to implement thoroughly the personalized model of education as well as to implement humanistic education then we had to change the order of importance of educational objectives. The most important should be development of attitudes and values of pupils (i.e., positive relationship to the school, willingness to learn and development of self-concept, followed by abilities - e.g., independent and efficient learning, ability to start positive inter-personal relationships) and only then to learn certain amount of knowledge, which, however, children would locate themselves rather than being provided by teachers. Respondents' task was to rate objectives according to degree of importance on a scale from 1 (the most important) to 8 (the least important). They rated provision of basic knowledge about nature and society, about the mother tongue and mathematics as the most important (the word "provision" was used intentionally in the questionnaire). 317 teachers rated this objective 1, 158 teachers rated it 2, and 108 teachers rated it 3. According to respondents, the second most important objective was to learn independent and efficient ways of learning. The third most important objective was to increase willingness to learn by children. This third objective was opted mostly by teachers from Group A. However, some teachers from this group rated this objective the least important. The fourth most important option was to develop ability of establishing positive interpersonal relationships. The fifth option was taken by objective to develop self-confidence of pupils. The sixth, seventh and eighth positions were taken by aesthetic education, education for work and physical education objectives. It seems that in Slovakia a broader discussion on new objectives and priorities in primary level education should be organized because this is closely linked with changes in teachers' attitudes to the substance of education.

The findings of the questionnaire survey were compared with observation of instruction in which elements of humanistic education were identified. The modified observation system of Š. Švec (1993, p. 3) was used to observe 18 lessons taught by 9 teachers who taught a traditional mode of instruction and by 9 teachers who taught non-traditional mode of instruction.

Ten observation categories were used: emotionalization of instruction, teacher's enthusiasm and its transfer to pupils, promotion of independent learning of pupils, acceptance of uniqueness of pupils by the teacher, creativity development, fostering self-awareness and self-confidence of pupils, tolerance, cooperation and pro-social behaviour, positive feedback, and classroom atmosphere.

Each category was subdivided into subcategories that were coded (*See Tab. 1*).

The observation supported many findings of the questionnaire survey. The group of non-traditional teachers had a larger frequency of elements of humanistic education. For instance, the following constant characteristics were used: smile of the teacher, free movement of pupils in class, nice way of addressing pupils, teacher's enthusiasm, etc. The group of traditional teachers demonstrated a variety of the above categories, e.g., caressing, allowing manifestation of feelings, appreciation of an independent learning strategy, creativity development, restraining of prejudices, appreciation of help to slow pupils, enabling self-evaluation, allowing pupils to express opinions, etc. While the

frequency of elements of humanistic education in instruction among teachers in the non-traditional group was nearly equal, in the group of traditional teachers there were considerable differences among teachers.

*Tab. 1 Identification of elements of humanistic education*

Observed categories	Non-traditional teaching			Traditional teaching	
	Number of elements	Totals	Average for a lesson	Totals	Average for a lesson
Constant, repeated characteristics	8	71	9	46	5,1
Individual elements of humanistic education	59	217	30,4	142	15,8

From this it can be concluded that non-traditional teachers were more humanistically oriented. Though they used a variety of instructional conceptions, generally they manifested in a greater degree:

- a visible effort to take a kind and understanding attitude to children, an effort to create positive emotional relationship between them and children - which was demonstrated both in verbal and non-verbal communication, an effort to pay attention to every child, an interest in personal problems of the child, and frequent encouragement of children;
- considerable effort to permit more freedom to pupils; teachers emphasized that children should be more independent - this was manifested by free movement in class, by individual pace of learning, by selection of assignments according to pupil s interest, by teaching some topics that pupils were interested in, by acceptance of initiative of pupils and by their own contribution to instruction;
- an effort to teach more subject matter than required by prescribed curriculum, though using ways of teaching that were easier and more amusing than the traditional ones, using play-like and non-traditional methods, smaller use of traditional textbooks, teaching of social skills, development of creative thinking and imagination, learning to concentrate, and to relax, etc. This, in turn, increased motivation of pupils.

It can be summed up from these findings that our expectations and anticipations were met. Teachers considered humanization of education primarily as creating a positive relationship to children, or respecting needs and interests of children. In lesser degree they linked humanization of instruction to personalization and personality development of every child. This, in turn, was reflected in their conceptions of objectives of education or in granting children some rights that are owned by a personality. Though in answering theoretical questions they agreed to respect the child

as a personality, they did not allow the child to participate in creation of the subject matter or a in a freer way of instruction based on individual pace of learning.

Though teachers suggested important changes in instruction, they claimed that these changes should be introduced by school authorities. In a lesser degree they wished to adopt a completely new conception of instruction. They explicitly required new methods of instruction, however, they themselves did not implement them. This verifies the hypothesis that teachers did not make use of those possibilities for humanization of instruction that are available at traditional schools. Also, they did not rate important change in their opinions and attitudes. Only 1/3 of respondents considered the teacher, that is themselves, responsible for process of humanization.

Answers of teachers in the non-traditional group, as compared to the traditional group, contained significantly more elements of humanistic education, e.g., willingness to allow more freedom and independence of pupils, a share of pupils in decisions about subject matter, an individual pace of learning, or free movement of pupils in the classroom. As found out in our observation, in their classes they used more frequently elements of humanistic education. With increasing age of teachers less willingness to adopt changes and innovations appeared in their questionnaire answers.

Generally, it was determined that teachers were inadequately familiar with theoretical conceptions of humanistic education. In answering questions aimed at theoretical aspects there were no differences between the two groups of teachers. The humanistic conception was less frequently used at schools and if so, it was used only partially.

Due to this inadequacies, educational theoreticians in Slovakia should develop theoretical issues of humanistic education and make them available to teachers. Also new teachers manuals are very urgent. Primary school teachers should be inspired by findings of this study, be more critical on their own opinions and practices and find ways of improving their instruction. This is because the process of humanization of education lies in their own hands.

## Literature

- AMONASHVILLI, Sh. A. : V shkolu s shesti let. Moscow 1986.
- BLOOM, B. S.: Taxonomie von Lenzielen ins kognitiven Bereich. Weinheim 1972.
- HAINZ, G. - EBNER. C.: Grundlagen der Statistik für Psychologen, Pädagogen und Soziologen. Berlin 1967.
- HELUS, Z.: Pojetí žáka a perspektivy osobnosti (Concept of pupil and perspectives of person). Praha, SPN 1992.
- KOSOVIÁ, B.: Humanistický prístup vo výchove a vzdelávaní na 1. stupni ZŠ (Humanistic approach to education at the first level of basic school). PhDr Thesis. Bratislava, FiFUK 1994.
- KOSOVIÁ, B.: Základné otázky humanizácie výchovy a vzdelávania a postoje učiteľov k nej (Basic problems of humanization of education and teachers aptitudes). In: Acta Universitatis Mattaei Belii. Banská Bystrica 1994, No.1, p.17-23.
- ROGERS, C.: On Becoming a Person. Boston 1961.
- ŠVEC, Š.: Humanistická orientácia v učiteľskom povolání a vzdelávaní (Humanistic orientation in teachers profession and training). Alma mater, Vol.3, 1993, No.5, p.299-305.

ŠVEC, Š.: Konceptia humanistickej orientovanej výučby (Conception of humanistically oriented teaching). Pedagogická revue, Vol. 45, 1993, No. 1-2, p. 2-15.

### Resumé

#### HUMANISTICKÉ PRÍSTUPY NA STREDOSLOVENSKÝCH ZÁKLADNÝCH ŠKOLÁCH: EMPIRICKÉ POROVNANIE TRADIČNEJ A NETRADIČNEJ VÝUČBY

*Beáta Kosová*

Humanizácia výchovy a vzdelávania predstavuje premenu unifikovanej koncepcie výchovy a vzdelávania všetkých rovnako na koncepciu založenú na skutočnom individuálnom rozvoji osobnosti každého žiaka. Humanistický prístup znamená vo vedeckometodologickom zmysle orientáciu na žiaka pri uplatnení takých princípov, ako je jedinečnosť, sebarozvoj žiaka ako cieľ a podmienka výchovy, celostnosť rozvoja jeho osobnosti a priorita vzťahovej dimenzie v každodennom živote človeka, ktorá vo výchove spočíva v prioritě postojov a schopností ako cieľov výchovy a v dôraze na prežívanie vo výchovno-vzdelávacom procese. Rozhodujúcou podmienkou procesu humanizácie školy je zmena učiteľa, najmä v oblasti jeho postojov k výchove a k dieťaťu a v posilnení jeho nonkognitívnych kompetencií. Naráza však na prekážky predovšetkým subjektívneho charakteru. Výsledky výskumu poukazujú na nejasnosť chápania teoretických problémov humanizácie výchovy a vzdelávania zo strany učiteľov 1. stupňa ZŠ na Slovensku a na nevyužívanie ani tých možností zmien, ktoré im umožňujú súčasné podmienky.