Croatian Journal of Education
Vol.21; Sp.Ed.No.1/2019, pages: 167-180
Original research paper
Paper submitted: 9th November 2018
Paper accepted: 10th July 2019
https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v21i0.3432

Open Classes and Participation in Decision-Making in Class

Monika Mithans and Milena Ivanuš Grmek
University of Maribor, Faculty of Education

Abstract

The article focuses on the problem of students involved in the education process. The study comprised students aged 10-11, 13-14 and 16-17. The total number comprises 322 students attending schools in Austria and 458 students from Slovenia. The data were collected with a questionnaire and processed on the level of descriptive and inferential statistics.

We determined that student participation in practice has not fully developed yet. The students who are attending schools in Austria detected more opportunities to participate in the decision-making process than their peers in Slovenia. The majority of the students wish to participate. We also determined a statistically significant positive impact of open class on student participation. The students who see their classes as open detect more opportunities to participate in the decision-making process.

Key words: *open classes; Slovene and Austrian students; student participation.*

Introduction

In a modern school, the teacher is expected to motivate students and create conditions for active learning, with the students taking part in all stages of the education process (Javornik Krečič, 2003). Modern schools differ from the traditional ones with respect to the level of democracy. At the same time modern pedagogical processes are based on a democratic climate and relationships at the level of the school and in class (Kovač Šebart & Krek, 2007).

Participation is understood as the goal of general education (e.g. Reith, 2007) since the school, as a national and social institution, plays an important role in the development of democratic values of its future citizens (see Bergel Pogačnik, 2016).

The notion of student participation in our case represents active student participation in planning, implementation and evaluation of school work (Kovač,

Resman, & Rajkovič, 2008, 2010), and it provides new opportunities for quality school work (Kovač, 2008; Kovač et al., 2010).

Positive Impact of Student Participation

School is a place where children encounter a democratic way of life and learn democracy directly through their experience (see Pereira, Mouraz, & Figueiredo, 2014). Participation is the key to independent learning. In the long run, inclusion of students results in greater motivation for learning and better learning outcomes (Reith, 2007), which is why participation is a requirement for successful education (Bergel Pogačnik, 2016; Bundesjugendkuratorium, 2009). Positive impacts of participation on school work outcomes and personal traits are also emphasized by Eder (1998). He is convinced that children exposed to democratic education, giving them opportunity for more frequent participation in decision-making process, develop personal characteristics such as openness, activity, self-confidence and independence, while they also face new challenges with more self-confidence and curiosity (e.g. Kirby, Lanyon, Cronin, & Sinclair, 2003). Additionally, participation prepares young people for active engagement in social life and helps them develop organizational skills and respond to social change rapidly (Baumkirher, Bakovnik, Beočanin, & Džidič, 2011; Pereira et al., 2014). Participation also has a positive effect on school life and the learning process. Various studies on school climate and quality have proven that student satisfaction with school and the quality of school work improve if they encounter various opportunities for participation at school and can be regarded as serious discussion partners (see Baacke & Brücher, 1982; Grundmann et al., 1998; Kötters, Schmid, & Ziegler, 2001; Kovač, 2008; Pereira et al., 2014). Participating students feel better in class and at school; they enjoy going to school more and experience less frustration than their peers. They also discover things they like at school more frequently and are thus more motivated (Baacke & Brücher, 1982; Kötters, et al., 2001; Kovač, 2008). Hart (1992) emphasizes that youth participation must increase with age and maturity, as well as expand from the private to public sphere, because this enables young people to find their position in society and develop their competences in a responsible way.

Modern Classes that Enable Student Participation

An important function of school today is mainly independent and active learning (see Pribićević, Miljanović, Odadžić, Mandić, & Županec, 2017). Two-way communication is important, which challenges the teacher and students' activities. At the same time, it allows them to express their own thoughts and ideas (Ivanuš Grmek et al., 2009). It also contributes to active inclusion of students in class, as well as facilitates their participation in the decision- making process.

The sustainability of primary and secondary school knowledge is poor, which also applies to the situation in the institutes of higher education (Pelc, 2008). Pelc (2008, p. 7) sees the reasons for this situation mainly in the teaching methods which are based

on reproduction of what is heard and read. Therefore, he believes that classes should be organized in such a way that would allow students to attain knowledge thorough their own activities since knowledge acquired in such a manner is more sustainable and useful.

The demand for an active and independent acquisition of knowledge is mainly met by modern teaching strategies where the common denominator is open class (Strmčnik, 2003). Borsum et al. (1982) understand it as a type of class where the course and results are not predetermined since it anticipates that both teachers and students will participate in the decision-making process when determining the objectives, themes, methods and implementation of the learning process. These strategies (Cencič et al., 2008, p. 10) change the student from a "passive listener into an active designer of one's own learning process".

Study results (see Fatke & Schneider, 2005; Grundmann et al., 1998; Grundmann & Kramer, 2001; Kovač, 2008) indicate that opportunities for student participation in decision-making are still very limited in practice.

Research Goals

These results are part of an extensive study where the main objective was to establish how students and teachers perceive the opportunities for participation and its influence on student motivation, as well as the class climate (see Mithans, 2017).

This article will provide answers to the following research questions:

- How does the open class method influence student participation?
- What are the areas where students already see an opportunity to participate; where would they like to participate more in decision-making?

In this framework, differences between Slovene and Austrian students will be analyzed.

Methodology

Research Sample

The research sample is represented by students aged 10-11, 13-14 and 16-17, who attend Slovenian urban, suburban and rural schools bordering with Austria and schools in Austrian federated states Styria and Carinthia, that share their southern border with Slovenia, and where the Slovenian national minority lives.

The sample includes 780 students, with 458 (58.7%) attending schools in Slovenia and 322 (41.3%) in Austria. The student sample is a non-random purposive sample which inferential statistics defines as a simple sample from a hypothetical population.

Description of Research Instruments

A student questionnaire was prepared for the purpose of the research. It helped us obtain the students' opinions on the possibility of participating in the decision-making process and on their wishes to participate in the educational process. The student questionnaire included five thematic segments with closed-ended questions.

The introductory segment of the questions pertains to information on the researched sample of students (gender, country and year of education). The second segment of the questionnaire, which included a 5-point descriptive rating scale (very frequently, frequently, rarely, very rarely, never) tells us how often students encounter the open class teaching method. The third section tells us how students assess their ability to participate in the decision-making process at their school and classes. The fourth section is represented by a 5-point descriptive scale (completely true, true, neither, false, completely false) that indicates the way students participate in the creation of school climate and how familiar they are with the ability to participate in the decision-making process. The fifth section tells us which fields already allow students to participate in the decision-making process and where else they want to participate.

Validity of the questionnaire was ensured with taking into account all previous studies, experiment reviews and probing use. The *reliability* was confirmed by the calculated Cronbach alpha coefficient ($\alpha = 0.832$). Its *objectivity* was ensured with detailed instructions and evaluation of answers without subjective judgement.

The data were analyzed with the help of the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software on the level of descriptive and inferential statistics. It was anticipated that the open class influences students' ability to participate in the decision-making process. Regression analysis was used to determine the impact of the open class assessment on the students' ability to participate in the decision-making process during class assessment. The χ^2-test was used to analyze the difference between Slovene and Austrian students.

Results and Discussion

Active forms of learning are much more attractive to students since they allow them to acquire knowledge through their own experience, and help them to adjust and prepare for lifelong learning process. Open class teaching strategies allow this kind of knowledge acquisition (see Blažič et al., 2003). We were interested in how often the open class strategies appear in practice and what kind of impact they have on student participation in the decision-making process in class.

That is why the questionnaire for students included 26 statements that make up the open class variable. The students assessed them on a five-point scale ranging from "very frequently" (5) to "never" (1).

The basic statistical values of the open class variable are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Basic descriptive statistic of the total open class results

	MIN	MAX	$\bar{\chi}$	s	KA	KS
Open Class	22.00	88.00	49.990	11.148	0.344	0.171

The results distribution is quite symmetrical (KA = 0.344) and normal (KS = 0.171). Therefore, these are predominantly average results or average level of class openness.

Nevertheless, the variability level is slightly higher (KV% = 22.3%). The existing practice is very diverse in this aspect. On the one hand, we have the students who do not perceive the class as open or are detecting only a few characteristics of open class. On the other hand, we have students who are detecting more characteristics of open class.

The impact of the open class on student participation is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

The results of the regression analysis of the open class' influence on participation

β	p	R^2
0.443	0.000	0.196

Results reveal a statistically significant (ß = 0.443; p = 0.000) impact of the open classes on students' participation. Students who find their classes open perceive several opportunities to participate in the decision-making process. The value R^2 (0.196) reveals that nearly 20% of participation depends on open classes; this indicates a big impact (Cohen, 1988).

Results confirm the positive impact of the open classes on students' possibility of participation and offer information on preconditions of successful involvement of students in the education process.

We were interested in how students perceive the possibility to participate in the decision-making process and how much they want to participate when it comes to didactic, methodology and content formation of the class, as well as with testing and knowledge assessment. The students assessed the items on a three level scale – "I can participate in the decision-making process at my school". (3); "I cannot participate in the decision-making process at my school, but I want to". (2) and "I cannot participate in the decision-making process at my school nor do I want to". (1). The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

χ^2 - test results for students' statements about participation opportunities and preferences in decision-making process on the class topics, teaching methodology and knowledge assessment

		Students from Slovenia		*Students from Austria*		*TOTAL*		*χ^2 – test results*
Statement		*f*	*f%*	*f*	*f%*	*f*	*f%*	
Choosing seminar paper topics	*I can participate* in my school.	239	52.2	203	63.0	442	56.7	*= 10.876 P = 0.004*
	I *cannot* participate in decision-making in my school, but I *want to.*	150	32.8	90	28.0	240	30.8	
	I *can* neither participate in decision-making in my school *nor do I want to.*	69	15.1	29	9.0	98	12.6	

		Students from Slovenia		Students from Austria		TOTAL		χ^2 – test results
Statement		*f*	*f%*	*f*	*f%*	*f*	*f%*	
Setting the seating arrangement	*I can participate* in my school.	167	36.5	204	63.4	371	47.6	= 61.557 P = 0.000
	I *cannot* participate in decision-making in my school, but I *want to.*	185	40.4	92	28.6	277	35.5	
	I *can* neither participate in decision-making in my school *nor do I want to.*	106	23.1	26	8.1	132	16.9	
Setting oral exam dates	*I can participate* in my school.	187	40.8	169	52.5	356	45.6	= 12.373 P = 0.002
	I *cannot* participate in decision-making in my school, but I *want to.*	178	38.9	111	34.5	289	37.1	
	I *can* neither participate in decision-making in my school *nor do I want to.*	93	20.3	42	13.0	135	17.3	
Setting written exam dates	*I can participate* in my school.	167	36.5	147	45.7	314	40.3	= 6.709 P = 0.035
	I *cannot* participate in decision-making in my school, but I *want to.*	191	41.7	117	36.3	308	39.5	
	I *can* neither participate in decision-making in my school *nor do I want to.*	100	21.8	58	18	158	20.3	
Decisions about make-up exams	*I can participate* in my school.	143	31.2	159	49.4	302	38.7	= 39.519 P = 0.000
	I *cannot* participate in decision-making in my school, but I *want to.*	214	46.7	137	42.5	351	45.0	
	I *can* neither participate in decision-making in my school *nor do I want to.*	101	22.1	26	8.1	127	16.3	
Decisions about work methods in class (individual, with friends in a group, etc.)	*I can participate* in my school.	125	27.3	123	38.2	248	31.8	= 17.832 P = 0.000
	I *cannot* participate in decision-making in my school, but I *want to.*	235	51.3	162	50.3	397	50.9	
	I *can* neither participate in decision-making in my school *nor do I want to.*	98	21.4	37	11.5	135	17.3	

		Students from Slovenia		Students from Austria		TOTAL		χ^2 – test results
Statement		*f*	*f%*	*f*	*f%*	*f*	*f%*	
Decisions about type of exam (written, oral etc.)	*I can participate* in my school.	101	22.1	99	30.7	200	25.6	= 8.707 P = 0.033
	I *cannot* participate in decision-making in my school, but I *want to*.	233	50.9	153	47.5	386	49.5	
	I *can* neither participate in decision-making in my school *nor do I want to*.	123	26.9	70	21.7	193	24.7	
Decisions about exam topics	*I can participate* in my school	75	16.4	117	36.3	192	24.6	= 43. 955 P=0.000
	I *cannot* participate in decision-making in my school, but I *want to*.	253	55.2	151	46.9	404	51.8	
	I *can* neither participate in decision-making in my school *nor do I want to*.	130	28.4	54	16.8	184	23.6	
Which aids/ media I want to use in class (textbook, books, computer, internet, TV)	*I can participate* in my school.	91	19.9	84	26.1	175	22.4	= 6.794 P = 0.033
	I *cannot* participate in decision-making in my school, but I *want to*.	252	55.0	178	55.3	430	55.1	
	I *can* neither participate in decision-making in my school *nor do I want to*.	115	25.1	60	18.6	175	22.4	
Setting classroom rules	*I can participate* in my school.	94	20.5	81	25.2	175	22.4	= 24. 837 P = 0.000
	I *cannot* participate in decision-making in my school, but I *want to*.	204	44.5	181	56.2	385	49.4	
	I *can* neither participate in decision-making in my school *nor do I want to*.	160	34.9	60	18.6	220	28.2	
Decisions about the amount of homework	*I can participate* in my school.	76	16.6	67	20.8	143	18.3	= 13.497 P = 0.001
	I *cannot* participate in decision-making in my school, but I *want to*.	275	60.0	213	66.1	488	62.6	
	I *can* neither participate in decision-making in my school *nor do I want to*.	107	23.4	42	13.0	149	19.1	

		Students from Slovenia		Students from Austria		TOTAL		χ^2 – test results
Statement		*f*	*f%*	*f*	*f%*	*f*	*f%*	
Decisions about grading criteria	*I can participate* in my school.	61	13.3	52	16.1	113	14.5	= 5.448 P = 0.066
	I *cannot* participate in decision-making in my school, but I *want to.*	241	52.6	185	57.5	426	54.6	
	I *can* neither participate in decision-making in my school *nor do I want to.*	156	34.1	85	26.4	241	30.9	
Decisions about what will be taught in class	*I can participate* in my school.	55	12	50	15.5	105	13.5	= 20.094 P = 0.000
	I *cannot* participate in decision-making in my school, but I *want to.*	225	49.1	196	60.9	421	54.0	
	I *can* neither participate in decision-making in my school *nor do I want to.*	178	38.9	76	23.6	254	32.6	

Students said that teachers allowed them to participate mainly by choosing topics for their seminar papers, where 56.7% of the respondents reported participation. In addition, 47.6% reported they can participate on the seating arrangement; 45.6% on choosing oral exams and knowledge assessment dates, and 40.3% on choosing written exams and knowledge assessment dates. There were 38.7% of the students who reported having an impact on the ways of making up for bad grades; 31.8% can participate in decision-making process about individual or group work; 25.6% about knowledge assessment and grading methods; 24.6% about the knowledge assessment and grading topics. Regarding the choice of aids and media to be used in class, 22.4% of students had the chance to have a say in that, and the same percentage of students were able to participate in decision-making process about classroom rules. Students saw few opportunities for participation regarding the amount of homework (18.3%). Students rarely participate in decision-making process about the grading criteria since only 14.5% had had such an opportunity. Even fewer opportunities for participation were available with regard to the choice of topics taught in class, with only 13.5% of students reporting such opportunities.

Students without opportunities to participate in decision-making process would mostly prefer participation. Thus, 62.6% would opt for participation in decision-making process with regard to the amount of homework. More than half would like to participate in knowledge assessment, the choice of aids and media used in class, defining knowledge assessment criteria, choice of class topics, knowledge assessment and grading topics, and in making decisions about individual or group work. Just

under one half (49.5%) would participate in decision-making process about knowledge assessment and grading methods, and 49.4% about classroom rules. There were 45.0% of the students who would choose to participate in decision-making process about ways of making up for bad grades; 39.5% about the written exam and knowledge assessment dates; 37.1% in setting oral exams and knowledge assessment dates; 35.5% in defining the seating arrangement and 30.8% in choosing seminar paper topics.

There were also a few students who would not want to participate in decision-making process. The highest percentage, 32.6% of students, do not wish to participate in decision-making process about class topics; 30.9% in defining the grading criteria; 28.2% in setting classroom rules; 24.7% in defining knowledge assessment and grading methods; 23.6% in defining knowledge assessment and grading topics; 2.4% in the choice of the preferred aids or media and 20.3% in setting written exam dates. Fewer than 20% of students would opt for participation with regard to other statements.

The frequencies show that students from our study see fewer opportunities for participation in decision-making process in comparison with students from other similar studies (see Fatke & Schneider, 2005; Grundmann et al., 1998; Grundmann & Kramer, 2001; Kurth-Buchholz, 2011). Fatke and Schneider (2005) found that 76.4% of students participated in decision-making about the seating arrangement (47.6% in our study); 51.0% of students participated in decision-making process about the choice of topics (13.5% in our study); 50.9% of students could participate in setting classroom rules (22.4% in our study). Students from this study also perceived more opportunities (49.0%) for setting written exam dates (40.3% in our study).

The - χ^2test results show a statistically significant difference between students in Slovenia and Austria in the perception of opportunities to participate and the desire to do so in all statements in the research area, with the exception of the statement regarding the definition of knowledge assessment criteria.

Students attending schools in Austria are ahead in terms of all the given opportunities for participation in decision-making process regarding the design of classes. It should also be emphasized that students from Slovenian schools are less interested in participation than their peers in Austria.

In our opinion, students in Slovenia show such willingness to participate because they have lacked sufficient opportunities for participation in decision-making process, which is why they never developed the skills needed for it (e.g., Baacke & Brücher, 1982).

The literature mentions that students do not wish to participate. Therefore, Reichenbach (2006) states that many students do not feel the need to participate in decision-making process. Our study proved the opposite since there are more students opting for participation in decision-making in all defined areas than the ones who do not feel the need to participate.

Conclusion

The theoretical starting points and the results from previous studies offer evidence of numerous advantages of student participation. The obtained results show

a disconcerting fact that, despite the advantages, the participation is still limited in the teaching practice. More than 50% of the respondents can participate in the decision-making process only when selecting essay topics, while less than half of the respondents can participate in the decision-making process in other fields included in the research.

Below are a number of guidelines to help increase student participation with the purpose of creating circumstances that allow a more active inclusion of the students in the educational process.

Due to the significant impact of the open classes on student participation, one of the ways of encouraging student participation in the learning process is *a more frequent use of modern teaching strategies or open classes* in the education process, since the analysis proved that almost 20% of student participation depends on it. The teachers can encourage active participation by *including the students in various projects,* where the students can decide on every level of implementation while the teacher only acts as a mentor.

Since numerous authors (Kurth-Buchholz, 2011; Reith, 2007) state that student participation largely depends on the teachers, their readiness and proficiency for allowing participation presents numerous unexplored options. If we want student participation to become a standard practice in teaching, we need to provide *quality and continuous education for the teachers.* They are the ones who should encourage students to participate in class, but it is essential that they understand participation themselves, which does not include only the theory. They need a deeper understanding of the concepts and teaching methods that facilitate a more successful inclusion of students. It is only with in-depth knowledge in this field they will gain the confidence in their own knowledge and capabilities necessary for student participation. With this kind of training, they will be able to create opportunities for students to participate in the decision-making process and establish conditions for the development of participation competences. At the same time, they will also feel qualified enough to shoulder the burden of responsibility brought by student participation.

A more active inclusion of students could be encouraged by including more *optional activities* in the syllabus that the teacher can select together with the students. More optional activities would enable students to participate actively in determining the content introduced in class, one that would interest them. Introduction of new optional activities in the syllabus would provide students with the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process when planning classes, and bring the subject matter closer to their interests, which would have a positive impact on their participation in the subject.

The ability to participate is learned mainly through direct experience and by implementation of activities. It is important that children start to *learn or train in this field in the kindergarten.* Teachers can include them in equipping the playrooms,

furnishing, arranging the play corners, selection of toys, etc.

Our research does not give clear answers on the factors which would encourage participation in the everyday education process. Nevertheless, it provides a number of options that help us think about the possibilities of strengthening them.

References

Baacke, D., & Brücher, B. (1982). *Mitbestimmen in der Schule: Grundlagen und Perspektiven der Partizipation [Participation in school: bases and perspectives of cooperation]*. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz.

Baumkirher, T., Bakovnik, N., Beočanin, T., & Džidič, S. (2011). *Participacija mladih: programski dokument Mladinskega sveta Slovenije [Participation of young people: program document of the Youth Council of Slovenia]*. Ljubljana: Mladinski svet Slovenije. Retrieved from www.mss.si/datoteke/dokumenti/participacija_mladih_web.pdf

Bergel Pogačnik, J. (2016). *Model spreminjanja kakovosti odnosov z medsebojnim sodelovanjem učencev, učiteljev in staršev [Model for Monitoring the Quality of Relationships with Mutual Cooperation of Students, Teachers and Parents]* (Master's thesis). Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani, Pedagoška fakulteta.

Borsum, W., Posern, H. G., & Schittko, K. (1982). *Einführung in die Didaktik: didaktische Modelle, Grundprobleme, Praxishilfen [Introduction to Didactics: Didactics Models, Basic Models, Practical Strategies]*. München: Urban & Schwarzenberg.

Bundesjugendkuratorium (2009). *Partizipation von Kindern und Jugendlichen - Zwischen Anspruch und Wirklichkeit [Participation of Children and Adolescents - Between Aspiration and Reality]*. Retrieved from https://www.bundesjugendkuratorium.de/assets/pdf/press/bjk_2009_2_stellungnahme_partizipation.pdf

Cencič, M., Cotič, M., & Medved Udovič, V. (2008). Pouk v družbi znanja [Lessons and Knowledge]. In V. Medved Udovič, M. Cotič, & M. Cencič (Eds.), *Sodobne strategije učenja in poučevanja [Modern Learning and Teaching Strategies]* (pp. 8-15). Koper: Pedagoška fakulteta.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Academic Press.

Eder, F. (1998). *Schule und Demokratie: Untersuchungen zum Stand der demokratischen Alltagskultur an Schulen [School and democracy: research on the daily democratic culture in schools]*. Innsbruck: Studien Verlag.

Fatke, R., & Schneider, H. (2005). *Kinder- und Jugendpartizipation in Deutschland. Daten, Fakten, Perspektiven [Participation of children and adolescents in Germany. Data, facts and perspectives]*. Güteffatkersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung. Retrieved from http://www.jungbewegt.de/fileadmin/media/jungbewegt/Downloads/Beteiligung_junger_Menschen_in_Kommunen/Kurzbericht_Druckversion_3._Auflage_heruntergerechnet.pdf

Grundmann, G, Kötters, C., & Krüger, H. H. (1998). Partizipationsmöglichkeiten an Schulen in Sachsen-Anhalt. Ergebnisse aus einer repräsentativen Befragung von SchülerInnen und LehrerInnen [online] [Participation in decision-making in schools in Sachsen-Anhalt. The results of the representative survey amongst students and teachers]. *Diskurse zu Schule und Bildung*, Werkstatthefte des ZSL, Heft 13. Halle: Zentrum für Schulforschung und Fragen der Lehrerbildung. Retrieved from http://wcms.uzi.uni-halle.de/download.php?down=590&elem=236860

Grundmann, G., & Kramer, R. T. (2001). Partizipation als schulische Dimension – Demokratische Reformhoffnungen zwischen schulischen Gestaltungsmöglichkeiten und strukturellen Brechungen [Participation as a school dimension – democratic possibilities of reforms between opportunities and obstacles]. In J. Böhmer, & R. T. Kramer (Eds.), *Partizipation in der Schule: Theoretische Perspektiven und empirische Analysen (Studien zur Schul- und Bildungsforschung) [Participation in schools: Theoretical perspectives and empirical analyses]* (pp. 59-92). Opladen: Leske + Budrich Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-322-94982-0_6

Ivanuš Grmek, M., Čagran, B., & Sadek, L. (2009). *Eksperimentalna študija primera pri pouku spoznavanja okolja [Experimental Case Study in Science Classes].* Ljubljana: Pedagoški inštitut.

Javornik Krečič, M. (2003). Aktivnosti srednješolcev pri obravnavi nove učne snovi [Secondary school students' activities in dealing with new learning material]. Je aktivnost dijakov pri pouku v skladu s sodobnimi didaktičnimi koncepti? [Is student activity in class in line with modern teaching concepts?]. *Vzgoja in izobraževanje, 34* (6), 20-25.

Kirby, P., Lanyon, C., Cronin, K., & Sinclair, R. (2003). Building a Culture of Participation: Involving children and young people in policy, service planning, delivery and evaluation. Nottingham: Department for Education and Skills. Retrieved from https://www.education.gov.uk/publications//eOrderingDownload/DfES-0827-2003.pdf.pdf

Kötters, C., Schmidt, R., & Ziegler, C. (2001). Partizipation im Unterricht – Zur Differenz von Erfahrung und Ideal partizipativer Verhältnisse im Unterricht und deren Verarbeitung [Class Participation - On the Differences Between the Experiences and the Ideals of Participatory Relationships]. In J. Böhmer, & R. T. Kramer (Eds.), *Partizipation in der Schule: Theoretische Perspektiven und empirische Analysen (Studien zur Schul- und Bildungsforschung) [Participation in schools: Theoretical perspectives and empirical analyses]* (pp. 93-122). Opladen: Leske + Budrich Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-322-94982-0_7

Kovač, T. (2008). V*pliv participacije učencev na kakovost vzgojno-izobraževalnega dela šole [The influence of pupils' participation on the quality of schools' educational work]* (Doctoral dissertation). Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani: Filozofska fakulteta.

Kovač Šebart, M., & Krek, J. (2007). Ali je šoli imanentno da lahko deluje samo nedemokratično? Demokratičnost v šoli, avtonomija subjekta in zakon [Is it given that school can function only undemocratically?]. *Sodobna pedagogika, 58*(Special edition), 30-55.

Kovač, T., Resman, M., & Rajkovič, V. (2008). Kriteriji ocenjevanja kakovosti šol na podlagi ekspertnega modela. Moč participacije učencev [Criteria for assessing the quality of schools on the basis of an expert model. The power of pupil participation]. *Sodobna pedagogika, 59* (2), 180-201. Retrieved from https://www.dlib.si/details/URN:NBN:SI:DOC-S40Q5BB7

Kovač, T., Resman, M., & Rajkovič, V. (2010). The model for evaluating the influence of student participation on school quality. *Napredak: časopis za pedagogijsku teoriju i praksu, 151* (3-4). 335-349. Retrieved from http://hrcak.srce.hr/file/122984

Kurth-Buchholz, E. (2011). *Schülermitbestimmung aus Sicht von Schülern und Lehrern: Eine vergleichende Untersuchung an Gymnasien in Brandenburg und Nordrhein-Westfalen [Student participation from the students and teachers' viewpoint: a comparative study between schools in Brandenburg and North Rhine-Westphalia].* Münster: Waxmann Verlag.

Lansdown, G. (2001). *Promoting Children's Participation in Democratic Decision-making*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre. Retrieved from http://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/insight6.pdf

Mithans, M. (2017). *Participacija učencev pri pouku in na šoli [Student Participation During Class and at School]* (Doctoral dissertation). Maribor: Univerza v Mariboru, Pedagoška fakulteta.

Pereira, F., Mouraz, A., & Figueiredo, C. (2014). Student Participation in School Life: The "Student Voice" and Mitigated Democracy. *Croatian Journal of Education, 16*(4), 935-975. https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v16i4.742

Pribićević, T., Miljanović, T., Odadžić, V., Mandić, D., & Županec, V. (2017). The Efficiency of Interactive Computer-Assisted Biology Teaching in Grammar Schools. *Croatian Journal of Education, 19*(3), 803-839.

Reith, S. (2007). *Warum Partizipation in der Schule? [Why participation in school?].* Retrieved from http://ganztag-blk.de/ganztags-box/cms/upload/soz_komp/pdf/2.11.4_Partizipation_in_der_Schule.pdf

Schmidt, R. (2001). Partizipation in Schule und Unterricht *[Participation in school and classes]. Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, *44*, 24-30. Retrieved from http://www.bpb.de/system/files/pdf/2PSIIH.pdf

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillion, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic Knowledge, Attitudes and Engagement Among Lower-secondary School Students in 38 Countries.* Amsterdam: IEA. Retrieved from http://www.iea.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/Electronic_versions/ICCS_2009_International_Report.pdf

Strmčnik, F. (2003). Didaktične paradigme, koncepti in strategije [Didactic Paradigms, Concepts and Strategies]. *Sodobna pedagogika, 54* (1), 80–92.

Monika Mithans
University of Maribor, Faculty of Education
Koroška cesta 160, 2000 Maribor, Slovenia
monika.mithans1@um.si

Milena Ivanuš Grmek
University of Maribor, Faculty of Education
Koroška cesta 160, 2000 Maribor, Slovenia
milena.grmek@um.si

Otvorena nastava i sudjelovanje u donošenju odluka u razredu

Sažetak

Rad se fokusira na problem inkluzije učenika u procesu obrazovanja. U studiji su sudjelovali učenici starosti 10-11, 13-14 i 16-17 godina. Od toga 322 učenika pohađaju škole u Austriji, a 458 u Sloveniji. Za prikupljanje podataka koji su obrađeni na razini deskriptivne i inferencijalne statistike koristio se upitnik.

Utvrdili smo da učeničko sudjelovanje u praksi još nije dovoljno razvijeno. Učenici koji pohađaju škole u Austriji uočili su više prilika za sudjelovanje u procesu donošenja odluka od svojih vršnjaka u Sloveniji. Većina učenika želi sudjelovati. Također smo utvrdili statistički značajan učinak otvorene nastave na učeničku participaciju. Učenici koji nastavu percipiraju kao otvorenu primjećuju više prilika za sudjelovanje u procesu donošenja odluka.

Ključne riječi*: slovenski i austrijski učenici; otvorena nastava; sudjelovanje učenika.*