

Assistant Professor Jelena Maksimović

Jelena Petrović, MA

The Faculty of Philosophy

University of Nis

Original scientific paper

UDC: 303.832

=====

DEVELOPMENT OF THE METHODOLOGY OF PEDAGOGY IN SERBIA

Summary: The methodology of pedagogy is one of four constituent elements of pedagogy as a science, thus it is understandable why its development depends on general tendencies in pedagogy. Although the development of the methodology of pedagogy started quite late, until today it has developed enough to allow the use of completely determined techniques in research of its field. The development of the methodology of pedagogy, and pedagogy in general, in our country was under the strong influence of European and global pedagogy during the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century. After World War II, Serbian pedagogy was influenced by Soviet pedagogy and more intensive development of the methodology of pedagogy began later. The study is oriented towards analysis of the historical development of Serbian methodology of pedagogy from the end of the 19th century until the present day. The tasks in the study are: 1) analyze the development of the methodology of pedagogy in the 19th and early 20th century; 2) analyze the development of the methodology of pedagogy since World War II (1944/45 to 1991/92) 3) analyze the state of the methodology of pedagogy in the last decade of the 20th century; 4) analyze the state of the methodology of pedagogy at the beginning of the 21st century. The historical method, an elementary method of historical research, and the analysis of pedagogical documents are used in the study. The study discusses prominent names which have marked the historical development of Serbian methodology of pedagogy, events significant for the further development of Serbian methodology of pedagogy, and textbooks, monographs and journals in that field which have contributed to the constitution of the science of education.

Key words: The history of pedagogy, the methodology of pedagogy, Pedagogical research, Paradigms.

The historical development of the methodology of pedagogy in Serbia followed the European and global pedagogy and was under its strong influence. The prominent Serbian pedagogues of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century (Vojislav Bakić, Ljubomir Protić, Stevan Okanović, Dušan Rajičić, Jovan J. Jovanović, Jovan Miodragović, Sreten Adžić, Miloš Milošević, Vojislav Mladenović), followed and advocated the pedagogical and methodological orientations which dominated European centers in which they had been educated. Until the beginning of the 20th century, the interpretative paradigm, with hermeneutic as its basic research procedure, was dominant in pedagogical research. Researches had not been empirically oriented, which left a strong mark on the methodology of pedagogy. A significant progress in the development of Serbian methodology of pedagogy, as an inevitable follower of the development of pedagogy and its constitution, occurred in the second half of the 20th century. The progress in the development of Methodology of pedagogical research programs at teacher training colleges, pedagogical academies for education of class teachers and at the Faculties of Philosophy, achieved full recognition in the last decade of the 20th century. The entire developmental course of the methodology of pedagogy bears the stamp of general tendencies in pedagogy and its development as the science of education.

Essential personnel and financial, institutional and some other bases had been formed in the first decade of the 21st century, which guaranteed the further development of the methodology of pedagogy as well as pedagogy itself in our country. This observation is based on the following: Today in Serbia there are two pedagogical research institutes (Institute for Educational Research and Institute for Pedagogy and Andragogy at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade), four departments of pedagogy at the faculties of philosophy (in Belgrade, Niš, Novi Sad, Priština, Kosovska Mitrovica), six teachers training faculties (in Belgrade, Subotica, Užice, Jagodina, Prizren-Leposavić i Vranje), the Centre for Pedagogical Research at the Faculty of Philosophy in Niš, as well as several research institutions that deal with the issues of education. Furthermore, in Republika Srpska, there are two departments of pedagogy at the faculties of philosophy (Banja Luka, Eastern Sarajevo-Pale), as well as one Teacher Training Faculty (Bijeljina).

Pedagogical issues are explored by hundreds of expert associates (pedagogues, psychologists, sociologists), and many teacher practitioners also deal with pedagogical research in order to improve their work and contribute to the further development of science. The research in the field of teachers' education was intensified in the second half of the 20th century. This was done by increasing mass education and due to the demands set for the society. The fact is that researchers are related to scientific institutes and universities and they are outside the educational practice which they research. A good example of this is not only institutional division between teaching and scientific research but also the fact that the researchers from academic environment rarely select their own educational practices for their research topic and they rarely apply results of the research to their teaching. Mass educational systems, new division of labor, exaggerated institutionalization contributed to this division between pedagogical theory and its educational practice, between the research of education and research of educational activities, and between researchers and teachers.

It was precisely that idea of a teacher-researcher that became widely accepted in the last twenty years. At a school which is now oriented towards change, teachers can no longer be only the users of research results conducted by professional researchers within academic institutions and research centres. They should become active participants in the process of research. A teacher practitioner is no longer a neutral expert, but an equal participant who tends to cause the desired changes by his or her actions. The position of those on whose behalf research is being conducted also changes. Research practices and methodological competence include not only theoretical methodological knowledge and knowledge of measurements but also full competence to choose and apply appropriate methodological and statistical research data and to represent the results at professional meetings.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE METHODOLOGY OF PEDAGOGY IN THE 19th AND AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 20th CENTURY

Credits for developing pedagogy should go to philosopher Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776-1841). In 1809, he inherited Immanuel Kant's department (1724-1804) at the University of Königsberg. Kant was giving, within his courses, lectures on "practical" philosophical disciplines i.e. lectures on education or pedagogy. Thus Herbart made it possible for ancillary philosophical discipline to gain the status of the main academic scientific discipline by relying on ethics and psychology and using

deduction as the basic methodological method. At the turn of the centuries, Herbart laid the foundation of a new framework of scientific pedagogy by relying on abundant philosophical and pedagogical heritage and experience, developed German philosophy, especially ethics, on psychological accomplishments as well as on the demands and needs of society and education.

Pedagogy as a subject in Serbia was first introduced in the mid-19th century as an elective subject in high school system of teaching and teaching in the Lyceum. It was incorporated among other disciplines at Belgrade Higher School in 1873, as a general subject. Its sustainment during the 19th century was helped by Stevan D. Popović, Milorad Popović Šapčanin and Milan Đ. Miličević, who were translating and publishing books, mostly from German speaking countries. Their work was continued by Jovan Miodragović and Sreten Adžić, German-educated pedagogues and students, who were writing on general methodology and pedagogy, and who, as teachers and administrators of teacher training schools, gave an enormous contribution to the formation of new generations of teachers (Jovanović, 1936).

In the period between the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, prominent Serbian pedagogues also advocated pedagogical and methodological orientations that dominated European centers in which they had been educated. Herbart's pedagogical thought dominated Serbia then, and his most famous followers and disciples were Vojislav Bakić, Ljubomir Protić, Stevan Okanović, Dušan Rajičić, Jovan Đ. Jovanović and others (Bandjur and Potkonjak, 1999; Krulj et al. 2007). Their primary task was to propagate methodological-epistemological orientation of pedagogy thus ignoring the issue of educational empiricism.

The founder of that orientation in Serbia was Vojislav Bakić (1847 – 1929), a student from Jena and one of Herbart's first and most affectionate students and followers. Not only was he Herbart's first but also most engaged follower in Serbia. He was entrusted with the duties of a member and the chairman of the Educational Council of Serbia, a professor and a rector of Belgrade Higher School until 1905 i.e. until Belgrade Higher School was turned into University of Belgrade. Bakić was the first author of books published under the title of *General Pedagogy* (1897), and then *Special Pedagogy* (1921). According to him, pedagogy was the science about the art of education and parenting. General Pedagogy was the science, normative science, and it must "establish standards for man's individual and social development" (Bakić, 1897). Special pedagogy

relied on it and provided further guidelines for teaching practice. Bakić clung to deductivism and, just like his role models, he perceived philosophy as the source of pedagogy: "The one who firstly studies those laws and principles well will find it easier to teach properly, than the one who immediately starts to teach and then, little by little, discovers educational ideas od pedagogical theory through suspicious and dangerous experiments" (Bakić, 1897).

Stevan Okanović (1871-1917) was another Herbart's "orthodox" student who had greatly influenced the work of pedagogical seminar at the University of Belgrade. He studied pedagogy in Jena, just like Bakić. After graduation, he worked in Teachers Training School and as a lecturer at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade. He was stongly advocating Herbart's pedagogical teachings in his published work thus strenghtening resistance to changes through the penetration of education reform movement in Serbia that had largely relied on the results of the experimental program. Ljubomir Protić (1866-1928), studied pedagogy in Jena and Leipzig. He was a professor and the principal of Teachers Training School in Belgrade, an educational supervisor,a clerk and secretary in the Ministry of Education. He spent the largest part of his professional life in civil service in education. He was the strongest opponent to education reform movement in Serbia, who had organized a kind of theoretical showdown with opposers of Herbart's teachings in his four highly polemical books entitled "*Pedagogical Issues*". Although he had earned a degree from European universities, Protić' approach was critical, ironic and sarcastic, and he was resolute in opposing the penetration of the European education innovations into Serbian education. His opposition was not only to general pedagogical issues but it also relied on methodological disagreements. He considered the changes to be scientifically ungrounded, he called them pedagogical innovations and ironically compared them with European trends of dressing according to the latest fashion, "for the latest journal" (Protić, 2008). Protić severely criticized experimental pedagogy: scientific pedagogy "would not allow anyone to wield experimentation that would be detrimental..would not allow just anybody, the invited and uninvited, to experiment thus concealing poor performance and inaction" (Protić, 2008).

There were pedagogues who held more moderate views on pedagogical theoretical generalizations and sources of pedagogical teachings in the late 19th and the early 20th century in Serbia. They were far more tolerant and moderate in accepting and applying Herbart's pedagogical teachings: Dušan Rajičić, Stevan Čuturilo, Pavle Ljotić, Pavle Čubrović and others. In

any case, the influence of Herbart's teachings, through many of his students and followers, was dominant in education of the Serbs. They occupied institutions, educational authorities, including the Serbian Ministry of Education and Educational Council of Serbia, and held the positions of professors of pedagogy in teachers training schools. The number of Herbart's followers must have been reduced in order for some different pedagogical ideas to influence educational system of Serbia.

That would be achieved during first 25 years of the 20th century due to the penetration of new ideas in education, views on children and students in schools, and due to the efforts of pedagogues who had led the reform movement. The advent of that influence was not scientifically studied in Serbia, new ideas and new ways of pedagogical work were obstructed and prevented by the influence of Herbart's followers. That influence was not in the domain of legislation, nor in the domain of administration of education, nor was it so influential as Herbart's theoretical system on the concept and execution of education. That type of interference was often based on authentic pedagogical concepts grounded on Orthodox tradition and ethos of Serbian people.

The representators of anti-Herbart's pedagogy of that time were: Jovan Miodragović, Sreten Adžić, Milan Šević, Miloš Milošević, Paja Radosavljević. They had been educated in Germany, Austria, Switzerland and England and they did not manage to impose the ideas of positivism. Paja Radosavljević, the representator of experimental pedagogy, had not been accepted and, before World War I, he left for the USA where he eventually got educated, he worked and became acknowledged in science.

Jovan Miodragović (1854-1926), was educated at the University of Leipzig, and he had also visited London Paris, and several German cities and pedagogical centers. He was remarkably disciplined and responsible and as a great patriot, he invested all his strength into improving education. During the first decades of his work, he represented himself to the public with a different approach towards teaching and education. His extensive bibliography is made of hundreds of published papers.

He indulged in discussions with Herbart's followers on the theoretical level, challenging their arguments. He published works which had represented an opposite position to the one of Herbart's pedagogical doctrine. He rejected Herbart's teachings as theoretically unfit for the lifestyle and educational customs of the Serbian people. He advocated

what he referred to as “*National Education of the Serbs*” or “*How the Serbian people bring up their offspring*”, which had been published in the work entitled “*National Pedagogy of the Serbs*” (1914). He did not leave any space for Herbart’s or any other systems, movements or experiments, and he fiercely opposed pseudo-theoretical attempts. Miodragović expected pedagogy to be exact and he remarked that he could not have found any accurate, scientific truths among many subjective perspectives (Miodragović, 1914). His work was of great importance in the field of promoting the methodology of scientific research in pedagogy. According to Nedović (1981), Miodragović significantly influenced the expansion of Serbian scientific horizons due to the fact that he had been a disciple of Wilhelm Wundt, one of the greatest researchers of the time. In his reports to the Ministry of Education, even as a student, he wrote about the significance of designing research, especially when it comes to the choice of the topic and methods, setting up hypothesis, creating reports and sorting out the results.

Miodragović understood the process of acquiring knowledge in pedagogy as a transition from theory to practice. He used empirical, as well as historical and descriptive research in his work. He was also the creator of several longitudinal projects, most notably the one that had studied the basics of popular education in Serbia.¹ Unfortunately, due to stiff resistance of Herbart’s followers at the time, Miodragović had not been recognized in this field as he should have been, which was also detrimental to the development of the pedagogy of the Serbs.

It is worth to mention Sreten Adžić (1856-1933), another prominent opponent to Herbart's doctrine. After graduation from Teachers Training School and brief practice in eastern Serbia, he was sent, at his request, to study in Vienna and then in Leipzig. Like Miodragović, he paid for his own scholarship with the property inherited from his parents and he remained for six years to educate himself in Bremen, among other places. Upon his return to the country at the turn of the 19th and 20th century, he was appointed the principal of newly established Teachers Training School in Jagodina, on Miodragović’s suggestion. He prepared teachers of that

¹ J. Miodragović studied the Serbian school with the assistance of 74 national teachers who had agreed to work with him. He studied the process of education in direct pedagogical work. The research lasted from 1888 to 1914, and the result was the book “*National Pedagogy of the Serbs*“. In the documentation of the research there were: the project of the research with a clearly defined goal, the method and time of research, instructions for the field researchers and the instrument of research- questionnaire with 14 questions.

school for teaching career in a very original way. He turned his work in the school into experimental practice that had been accomplished through several projects. The most important were the opening of a boarding school for teachers and the full day care for students in school. As a result, students were given practical work in agricultural, vegetable crops on the school property. That had been planned to perfection and set accordingly to the schedules of students.

Adžić remained famous for his great impact on Serbian pedagogical and cultural public and for being a debater and pedagogue who had had his own pedagogical beliefs and a very active approach towards foreign influences. He adopted from other countries anything which could have been rationally applied to Serbian educational framework. His contribution to the popularization of Schoolwork as reform movement which he had supported with several important works, was noticeable.² His attitudes in the field of the methodology of pedagogy could not be clearly defined since he had paid more attention to pedagogical teleology and pedagogical practice in his works. However, his efforts to carefully record and maintain records on all aspects of educational work and teaching and to use the observations for further improvement, can not remain unnoticed. We could say that, of all Serbian pedagogues, he was the one who had used systematic observations most consistently and honestly. For all those who are interested in improving teaching as well as for pedagogical theorists, he represented the results of his efforts in his relevant works: *Teacher's Notes (1894 and 1924) and Educator's (1909)*.

The third Serbian pedagogue who were standing outside limits of Herbart's doctrine and reform movements, not even considering them as sufficient nor suitable for education of the Serbian people, was Vićentije Rakić (1881-1969). He was one of the most original pedagogues of his time

²He had published in *Schoolmaster* a paper entitled "Schoolwork, School of the Future", which was a friendly-oriented contribution to the Schoolwork. In addition, he published several works dedicated to the Schoolwork (*Arbeit Schule*) and to manual work in the process of teaching. The project of introducing Schoolwork into the practice of Serbian schools was enriched during his semi-annual visit to Sweden, where he had met with the application of Swedish type of this innovation called "Slide". According to his project, courses were organized to train teachers in order for them to accept and organize their schools according to the system of "Schoolwork". Although this had been a step forward from Herbart's doctrine in Serbia, which had undisputedly dominated Serbian schools of that time, the followers of Schoolwork as reform movement were exposed to criticism that they were training teachers to "weave baskets" thus neglecting the intellectual education in schools.

whose work had reached the level of acknowledged pedagogical theory in Germany. His work was an authentic and fresh approach to education and upbringing, very distant from Herbart's preoccupations. "He tried to direct students' education to the direction of the new behavioral theories, to bring to our environment, by creative efforts, the pedagogical views that would have been in close relation to the latest achievements in psychology, biology and other sciences" (Tešić, 1967).

Rakić studied in Leipzig. Upon graduation, he defended his doctoral dissertation *Educating by play and art (Die Erziehung mit Spiel und Kunst)*. That was probably best accepted and the smallest in volume doctoral dissertation in the field of pedagogy by any Serbian author.³ Rakić ended his career as an assistant professor at the University of Belgrade and the founder of pedagogical seminar in 1922. After 24 years of work (in very difficult conditions, as he had stated), after World War II, he was forbidden to give a single lecture because his views were alien to communism as communism was alien to him.

Rakić' concept of education was evolutionary in its nature, and the cooperation with Wilhelm August Lay and Ernst Meumann directed him to experimental pedagogy. Thus, he found pedagogical research in the field of child's soul, its development and teaching. However, he did not specifically address the issue of the methodology of pedagogy.

From the period of Kingdom of Yugoslavia and between two world wars, there were no significant theoretical, epistemological, methodological achievements since there were no scientific research institutions back then nor was there a personnel to engage in the science of education. Methodological achievements of positivistic-empirical orientation were unknown to our scientific pedagogical public and there were no conditions for engagement in theoretical, methodological issues of pedagogy.

Political, scientific and educational environment in Serbia did not provide the conditions for dealing with the theoretical and methodological issues

³ On 44 pages of the text there is the theory that was cited by many prominent European pedagogues and psychologists. Among them are Karl Groos, who cited Rakić in *Die Seele des Kindes (The Soul of a Child)*, Édouard Claparède in *Psychology of the Child (Psychologie de l'enfant)*, and Ernst Meumann, professor at the University of Leipzig, Hermann Ebbinghaus and others. Even the defense of this dissertation was specific since Rakić could not speak because of the committee, comprised of Leipzig professors, Wilhelm Wundt, Ernst Meumann and Mazius, and the dispute between them that had been provoked by the authenticity of the dissertation itself.

of pedagogy. The education in Serbia was not a suitable discipline for projecting scientific pedagogical research that could have potentially reached the level of pedagogical theories. Since educational theories had not been supported at the scientific level, there were too many atheoretical, irregular and without a plan improvisations in pedagogy.

Certain efforts to develop pedagogy in epistemological, methodological sense were made by Serbian representatives of cultural pedagogy, although methodological problems had not been the focus of their interest. They were trying to somehow reconcile the two opposing pedagogical powers: the systematic-deductive, idealistic and the empirical-inductive, naturalistic. Miloš R. Milošević managed to do that by defining pedagogy as the science of spiritual advancement of an individual and of the society, i.e. the science about the culture of man's individual and collective spirit (Milošević, 1911). In this sense, Milošević criticized experimental pedagogy as an act of pure induction, considering that its results had led to the confirmation of an individualistic conception of pedagogy - it was necessary to philosophically observe the entire cultural content in the spiritual development of collective spirit for a full understanding of education and the deriving of general norms and principles. Therefore, in methodological sense, cultural pedagogy must rely on the analysis of inner experience i.e. individual spirit and the analysis of outer experience i.e. collective spirit. The information obtained in this way is subjected to a synthesis that leads to general principles (Dundjerski, 2008).

This group of pedagogues included his younger colleague Vojislav Mladenović, who had made similar efforts even in the post-war period. However, his efforts remained without much response in pedagogical scientific community.

At the very end of World War II (1944/45), the situation became even more unfavorable. The old pedagogical personnel left, pre-war textbooks of pedagogy were dismissed as “bourgeois” and “reactionary”, and of all pedagogues, only was Radovan Teodosić dealing with theoretical pedagogical issues for a brief period of time. In his *Pedagogy* that had been officially approved as a textbook at teachers training faculties in 1957, Teodosić dedicated one chapter to the research methods and he promoted pluralism of methods. He included among the main methods of research in pedagogy: the method of pedagogical observation, the method of pedagogical experiment, the method of pedagogical conversation and the method of studying school educational and general

pedagogical documentation. He dealt with basic principles and stages of pedagogical research in that chapter.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE METHODOLOGY OF PEDAGOGY IN OUR COUNTRY FROM WORLD WAR II (1944/45) TO 1991/92

It is possible to anatomize the development of the methodology of pedagogy in relations to the pace and the concept of changes in the second half of the 20th century. The turning of socialist Yugoslavia in 1944/45 to the Soviet Union as to its role model, marked the development of the methodology of pedagogy. Unilateral philosophical and ideological orientation of Soviet pedagogy made a strong impact on the development of the methodology of pedagogy in Serbia, which had had certain consequences on the development of the science of education.

In this paper, the development of the methodology of pedagogy since World War II (1944/45) is followed according to the periodization of the development of pedagogical science that was created by Nikola Potkonjak. This periodization is marked by dominant and characteristic changes in the field of pedagogical personnel and in pedagogy itself. (Potkonjak, 1994):

- (1) The first developmental period—the period from liberation of the country to The First Congress of Yugoslav Pedagogues (1944/5-1952).
- (2) The second developmental period – the period of the quest for authentic methodological, epistemological basis of Yugoslav socialist pedagogy (1952/3-1963).
- (3) The third developmental period– the constitution of Yugoslav socialist pedagogy (1963-1970).
- (4)) The fourth developmental period– the period of autonomous pedagogy (1970-1986/7).
- (5) The fifth developmental period – the period of the quest for new identity in pedagogy (1986/7-1991/2).

The first developmental period includes the period from the liberation of the country 1944/45 to The First Congress of Yugoslav Pedagogues which was held in Belgrade in 1952. One of the priorities of the new government, after liberation in 1944, was to constitute a new sociological system of education, which implied building the new foundations for pedagogy. The theoretical, methodological achievements of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia were moderate. Therefore, Soviet pedagogy had undisputed monopoly and influence in Yugoslavia of that period. Herbart's pedagogy was dismissed and Soviet Marxist pedagogy was accepted. This pedagogy had

some serious theoretical, methodological insufficiencies which were transferred into our pedagogy - the development of the methodology of pedagogy was then neglected. The entire period was marked by the attitudes of the party and state authorities and, due to domination of deductive over inductive approach, this phase was called the deductive phase. Potkonjak discovered in his research that there had been no pedagogical research institutions, no pedagogical research personnel nor the appropriate methodology. He also discovered that the pedagogical research had been undeveloped and that general pedagogical issues had not been scientifically studied (Potkonjak, 1977; 1994). After the split between USSR and SFRY (the clash with Cominform in 1948), our pedagogy was gradually liberating itself from the chains of Soviet pedagogy and it became crucial for basic social relationships, relationships between an individual and community, for social practices and social development, and for politics. Thus, it became the center for those events. The Constitutional Act of 1953 was especially important since it had implemented a social system in all fields of social activities and it had also contributed to the fundamental reform of the educational system. At The First Congress of Yugoslav Pedagogues in Belgrade in 1952, it was stated that a new “methodological basis” for further studies of pedagogical practice should have been established in order to study pedagogical practice, to connect pedagogical theory with practice and to establish its development on the basis of the practice. Along with these efforts, which had mostly stemmed from academic institutions, the efforts of practitioners to use exactly determined facts instead of subjective impression while solving some didactical and methodological problems, were made. They sought to find instruments of measurements and the precise analysis of the teaching process. The departments of pedagogy at the Faculties of Philosophy were not easily revived, thus the entire development of pedagogy had been in the hands of powerful Ministries. However, in 1951, Nikola Potkonjak, a pedagogue and scientist who would mark his epoch and significantly contribute to the development of pedagogy and the methodology of pedagogy, was appointed assistant professor of General Pedagogy at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade. Having passed through all academic titles, he was appointed full professor of *General Pedagogy* and *The Methodology of Pedagogical Research* in 1973, and a regular member and first president of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (Belgrade) in 2005. His contribution to science is reflected in hundreds of written papers, co-reports and statements in the field of theoretical, epistemological and methodological issues of pedagogy.

The second developmental period is the period of methodological reorientation that started in 1952/53 and lasted for the next ten years, i.e. until the Conference of Yugoslav Pedagogues in Sljemen, near Zagreb in 1969. This showed a real scope of development of the methodology of pedagogy and pedagogical scientific research in Yugoslavia of that time. The methodology of pedagogy was rarely present while the work of pedagogues had been reduced to mere translation of the chapters in certain Soviet textbooks that were dealing with methods in pedagogy.

The argument about scientific paradigms started in this period with the publication of the book- "*The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*", by Thomas Kuhn in 1962. Paradigms are, according to its general meaning given by Kuhn (1974: 165), sets of statements that are universally accepted in a scientific community (scientific community of a certain discipline) and that become the examples or models for exhibiting or solving scientific problems. The interpretative paradigm was being gradually replaced by the empiristic paradigm, and pedagogy freed itself from deductive orientation and accepted the empirical, inductive approach. Thus, the need for studying pedagogical practice and educational empiricism appeared and it resulted in the development of the methodology of pedagogy. That kind of pedagogy required more contemporary methodology that would have investigated conditions in which the educational process took place by applying modern techniques and methods. Precisely this was "methodological reorientation".

Methodological contents in the curricula of teaching training schools had been present since 1953 in Serbia, and people dealing with methodological issues were: Vlado Šmit, Vladimir Mužić, Radisav Ničković, Nikola Potkonjak, Radovan Teodosić, Jovan Djordjević, Milan Bakovljević. This period was marked by the foundation of the only *Institute for Educational Research* whose task had been to deal with and research the issues education. The Institute was founded in 1959, when the Executive Council of the National Assembly of People's Republic of Serbia had passed a Decree on the Establishment of the Institute for Educational Research (Official Gazette of the People's Republic of Serbia no. 54/59). The Institute has had the status of scientific institution since 1961 when the Executive Council adopted the regulation of SR Serbia. Opening of the Institute for Educational Research occurred in the same year when Jovan Djordjević defended his doctoral dissertation *An appendix to experimental research of didactic value of educational film* at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade. In the first decade of the Institute, the most significant works from the field of methodology were being translated and seminars of

pedagogical statistics were being organized in order to train personnel for research in the most efficient manner. The work on publishing technical literature, and the popularization of science was commenced. Programs were mainly focused on the issues of teaching, and empirically-oriented researches of the Institute represented the beginning of the constitution of the empirical methodology of pedagogical research in Serbia. The Institute significantly contributed to theoretical and methodological development of scientific thought in pedagogy, which would be particularly recognized in the 70's and 80's of the 20th century.

In this period, when the methodology of pedagogy was the main subject of interest for scientists and when pedagogical research was successfully conducted, certain insufficiencies appeared: unsolved problems of organizing scientific pedagogical research (only one Institute existed), lack of personnel (few people were engaged in scientific research), as well as many financial troubles.

The third developmental period of pedagogy was called the period of consolidation of Yugoslav socialist pedagogy, and it lasted from 1963 to 1970. In this period, the goal was to strengthen and consolidate Yugoslav pedagogy, as well as to determine its target of research and its methodological course (Potkonjak, 1994; Kundačina, 2004). The social development was taking place during this period and that resulted in more intense democratization in the fields of education since the situation was much more favorable and it provided conditions for further development of pedagogy. This was achieved by relying on the theoretical, methodological heritage from the previous period and on the series of documents and events that provided a base for further development, as well as for the encouragement of the pedagogical research (The Conference of Yugoslav Pedagogues 1963; The Second Congress of Yugoslav Pedagogues, 1965; introducing the courses of *The methodology of Pedagogy* in the curriculum of the studies of pedagogy; publications of pedagogical textbooks, including the methodology of pedagogy). At the Conference of Yugoslav Pedagogues (1963) and at The Second Congress of Yugoslav Pedagogues, (1965), better conditions for scientific research and foundation of pedagogical institutions were requested. In this period greater attention was given to the inductive approach and to constructing an instrument for measuring the practical results. The fact that *Methodology of pedagogical research with statistics* had been a subject at the Department of Pedagogy at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade since 1962, was especially significant for the further development of pedagogy. The first professor of this subject was Prof Dr Nikola Potkonjak (in Zagreb

there was Prof Dr Vladimir Mužić). Vojin Milić in 1965. published textbook *Sociological method* in that time has a great influence on the formation of the methodological thinking in pedagogy. The first complete textbook of the methodology of pedagogy with pedagogical statistics was published in 1968 by Vladimir Mužić, under the title of *Methodology of Pedagogical Research*. Another very important fact for this period was the publication of several reports of educational researches based on new methodology. Nearly all master's and doctoral theses in pedagogy and specialist papers contained the results of empirical pedagogical research.

The fourth developmental period was called the period of autonomous pedagogy and it lasted from 1970 to 1986. Its was characterised by efforts to establish autonomous pedagogy in Yugoslavia, which would differ from all socialist, Marxist, bourgeois, civic and other pedagogies (Potkonjak, 1994; Kundačina; 2004). According to Bandjur and Potkonjak (1999), a new definition of a subject of pedagogy was necessary in Yugoslav pedagogy of this period, and in methodological sense, the efforts were being invested into finding a union between philosophical and scientific, theoretical and empirical, objective and value judgements, deductive and inductive, qualitative and quantitative. Since 1972/73 school year, a five-day working week had been introduced in all primary and secondary schools- that was applied after previous experimental implementation in 1970/71 and 1971/72 school year. There were documents passed by the highest authorities which could have testified to the above mentioned, especially *Resolution of the Federal Assembly on the development of education on self-management basis*(1970) and *Law on Secondary Education* (1974) that demanded overall reform of secondary education. Moreover, the second reform of primary education was conducted in this period, as well as the first detailed reform of secondary education, and two documents were passed: *Primary school- program's structure with general curriculum* (1973) and *Curricula for the preparatory period of secondary education* (1973). In this way, a kind of re- reform of primary education and the first, more radical reform of secondary education were commenced. After 1970, our society decided to change the entire educational system more radically, which created many serious and novel theoretical, epistemological and methodological problems for our pedagogy. These troubles could have been dealt with only by developing scientific research in pedagogy. Thus, many significant research projects were realised in that period and many symposiums and round tables were held at the Institute for Educational Research. The seventies were a milestone in the Institute's program orientation, because the empirical studies had been characterized not only by empirical data, but by the theoretical analysis of

the educational process. The expansion of the program topics from the field of education, along with the research of the educational issues in teaching, was a very significant change. Since then, the study of theoretical or theoretical-empirical character has been handling almost all problems related to fundamental issues of education. In the period of 1975-1980, the Institute started to engage experts from different fields (in addition to pedagogues and psychologists, there were linguists, sociologists, natural science experts and others), in order to completely cover the topics from the program. In 1980, Ljubomir Kocić defended his doctoral dissertation *Experimental Research in the Field of Education*, the first PhD thesis in the field of the methodology of pedagogy.

After foundation of pedagogical academies (1972), certain improvements were achieved in methodological education of class teachers. The contents from pedagogical methodology were studied within academic subject *General Pedagogy*, and special attention was being paid to the preparation of students for studying educational issues in order to improve their own educational work. Students had new textbooks of that period at their disposal and the books were dealing with the methodological issues in pedagogy: *Research in Teaching* (1972) by Tihomir Prodanović and *Methodology of Pedagogical Research and Creativity* (1980) by Djordje Lekić, *Different Methodological Issues in the Research of Moral Education* (1977) by Jovan Djordjević, *Pedagogical Experiments, Characteristics and Possibilities* (1981) by Ljubomir Kocić, *Experimental Pedagogy* (1983) by Ljubomir Kocić.

The study *Theoretical-methodological Issues of Pedagogy (Epistemology of Pedagogy)* was published in 1977 by Nikola Potkonjak and it represents one of the most important works in the field of the science of education in our country. The author introduced, through oppositions, dilemmas and theoretical and methodological problems of modern bourgeois pedagogy and the classification of its many directions, methodological foundations of the Marxist concepts of education, the developmental characteristics of Yugoslav Marxist pedagogy and socialist self-management education. Immediately after its publication, this work became an inevitable methodological starting point for scientists and theorists, and its impact on the wider intellectual public and popularization of science was invaluable. This is best illustrated by the fact that, 35 years later, Potkonjak's ideas are not exhausted, as evidenced by hundreds of recent references on the Internet. The study *Methodological Issues of Systemic Research in Pedagogy* (1982) by Nikola Potkonjak draws special kind of attention. He described systemic, structural, functional research in

education, which had been a scientific discovery of that time. By speaking about the origin and extent of systemic studies, the primary reasons for applying these studies in pedagogy and of the methodological characteristics of systemic study as well, the author explained the analysis of connections and relationships, dynamics and functioning of the system, i.e. a hypothetical model, through the construction of a model based on systemic analysis. Potkonjak opened/closed the door for that type of research, but his work has not been surpassed until this day.

After The Eighth Round Table of Journal *Pedagogy* at Igman near Sarajevo in 1986 and The Sixth Congress of Pedagogues in Maribor in 1986, the development of Yugoslav socialist pedagogy was finished.

The Fifth developmental period was called the period of crossroads, when a new identity of pedagogy was supposed to be found, and it lasted from 1986/87 to 1991/92. This was the period of the crisis and collapse of socialist states and it affected all fields of social life, as well as education. By the mid 80's, the state of education had been analysed and, since great differences had been determined, some sort of initiative for re-integration i.e. for greater unity or "unity in diversity" was started. Many pedagogues of that period in Serbia were studying important methodological issues like: reaction of pedagogy to contemporary pedagogical changes, methodology in terms of different paradigms, methodological challenges of new pedagogical currents, the role of Biographical method, the studies of cases and ethnographic researches of pedagogical phenomena, the influence of information technology on the methodology of pedagogy, etc. (Kundačina, 2004, Bandjur and Potkovnjak, 1999). In addition, many methodological studies and discussions, reports, research reports of specific pedagogical issues appeared at the same time and they were commenced by Yugoslav Republic Institute for Research and Advancement of Education. In the 80's, the Institute for Educational Research continued its further promotion in the social and scientific field. Research program was enriched by fundamental and developmental pedagogical issues. The liberation of theoretical-methodological orientation from classical experimental empiricism and positivism was attempted. In addition, the research had been focused on finding new ways to transpose fundamental and other research results into school practice.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE METHODOLOGY OF PEDAGOGY IN SERBIA AT
THE END OF THE 20TH CENTURY (THE PERIOD OF
DEVELOPMENT OF NEW PEDAGOGY)

The period of the development of new pedagogy lasted from 1992 to 2000 and it represented more intensive and independent development of Serbian pedagogical thought. After the disintegration of Yugoslavia in 1991, the disintegration of educational system and pedagogy also occurred. Scientific research in the fields of education was especially intensified, the disintegration of educational system and pedagogy occurred inevitably. However, the development of pedagogical research continued: young scientists appeared, journals and papers of the methodology in pedagogical research were being published. After the foundation of Teacher Training Faculties in Belgrade, Sombor, Užice, Vranje, Jagodina, Prizren, Bijeljina the methodology of pedagogy had been studied as a separate academic subject. *Methodology of pedagogical research* and *Pedagogical Statistics* had been studied as separate academic subjects at the departments of pedagogy at the Faculties of Philosophy in Belgrade, Niš, Priština, while pedagogical statistics had never been singled out as a separate academic subject at the department of pedagogy at The Faculty of Philosophy in Novi Sad. In this period, the wider affirmation of methodology in all fields of education and creativity took place, and the entire scope of pedagogues was dealing with methodological issues.

The needs of modern society set new requirements for educators that referred to changing the role of educators in the way that they were more and more transformed from mere transmitters of knowledge into the diagnosticians and organizers of the research process. During this period, action researches received much attention and their value rested upon the fact that they solved the problem of transferring research results into educational practice. One of the main reasons behind the creation of the concept of action research was to give to the educators, who were not professional researchers, the opportunity to engage in scientific research. Topicality of action research was so much emphasised because there had been an insufficient number of theoretical papers and empirical studies, which should have elaborated on that issue, and because teachers-practitioners had not been trained to apply the research on educational practice. The fact was that action researches included the fields of the methodology of pedagogy, which had been considered, both here and worldwide, to be a very interesting notion of the last decade of the 20th century, especially when that would bring about new insights for the encouragement of subsequent research in educational practice, which

would contribute to the changing role of an educator. Until the eighties, one could have occasionally come across action researches in prominent scientific journals. However, in this period, the situation became more favorable for action researches. Considering the fact that every research tends to find answers to questions or hypotheses, the purpose of action researches can be found in the quest for new perspectives.

The role of an educator in action researches was the topic of a program which had been organized in Banja Luka in 2000 by the Institute of Republika Srpska and it referred to the professional development of educators. The founder of action researches in our region, Veljko Bandjur, wrote a booklet with the same title for that occasion. Action researches in education seem to be the solution to the problem of the use of research in practice and they warn us about the importance of theory in empirical research. This final postulate at the end of this period, suggests a constant interweaving of the methodology of action research with educational activities.

Pedagogues and scientists with innovative ideas regarding the methodology of pedagogy come to the fore at the very end of the previous century. That could be recognized in the following publications: *Innovations in the school as a case study* (1992) by Nikola Potkonjak, *On the research, methods and knowledge* (1995) by Živan Ristić, *Research Methodology in Pedagogy* (1996) by Dušan Savićević, *Basic methodology of pedagogical research* (1997) by Milan Bakovljević, *Educational research in schools* (1996) by Nikola Potkonjak and Veljko Bandjur, *Methodology of Pedagogy* (1999) by Nikola Potkonjak and Veljko Bandjur, *Instruments for School Associates* (1992) by Radosav Ničković, *Instruments for Pedagogues* (1996) by Nikola Potkonjak and Nedeljko Trnavac, *Pedagogy in Action* (1999) by Mirjana Pešić, *Methodology Lab* (1996) by Milenko Kundačina and Veljko Bandjur, *The Collection of Knowledge Tests of the Methodology of Pedagogy* (2000) by Grozdanka Gojkov and Milenko Kundačina, *Lexicon of pedagogical methodology* (1999) which in the next four years was published by Grozdanka Gojkov, Radenko Krulj and Milenko Kundačina. In 1996, the conference *Research in Pedagogy and Andragogy* was held at the Institute for Pedagogy and Andragogy at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade. In the last decade of the 20th century the methodology of pedagogy occupied the position which it should have occupied.

THE METHODOLOGY OF PEDAGOGY AT THE BEGINNING
OF THE 21ST CENTURY

Essential personnel and financial, institutional and some other bases were created in the first decade of the 21st century, which guaranteed the further development of the methodology of pedagogy as well as pedagogy itself in our country. The knowledge of the methodology of pedagogy is quite extensive and the results of numerous pedagogical researches indicate that. The great emphasis is being put on quantitative and qualitative contents of research paradigm in accordance with new tendencies in the development of pedagogy. The interest for action researches does not subside, on the contrary, it has reached its full affirmation. What has marked the methodology of pedagogy for the last 10 years is reconciliation between the qualitative and quantitative paradigm in the research of social phenomena. (Maksimović 2011; Creswell, 2003; Ševkušić, 2009). Many authors (Gojkov2006a, 2006b, 2007a, 2007b; Halmi, 2005; Bandjur and Potkonjak, 1999; Sekulić-Majurec, 2000; Mužić, 1999), emphasise these two basic paradigms: the qualitative and quantitative paradigm. This division is possible only if research methods i.e. methodological aspects of research are selected as criteria. However, in contemporary foreign literature (Maksimović, 2011; König & Zedler, 2001; Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Reason, 1997) many approaches can be found, and they choose philosophical points of view over research methods of a certain scientific approach as a basic criterion for differentiation between research paradigms. This means that only similar methods of research can be used within the approaches to the research, regardless of whether these refer to different scientific paradigms which have been primarily determined by philosophical assumptions.

The science about humans is developed in the pluralism of paradigms, and it is not just about the pluralism of many competing theories, but about pluralism of theoretical orientations. The pluralism of research paradigms corresponds to its target of research and its position in the democratic society. The educational process demands integration of the quantitative and qualitative paradigms, indeed. The methods of qualitative research are used together with the methods of quantitative research in order to fully understand the causes for pedagogical phenomena, or in order to lay the foundation for some other research. The qualitative as well as quantitative methods still have its purpose, on epistemological level, in the contemporary methodology of pedagogy, regardless of its methodological differences. In a related analytical manner, Grozdanka Gojkov realized the research project "Globalization and the Meta-theoretical Basics of

Pedagogical Methodology" funded by the Serbian Ministry of Science for the period 2006-2010.

At the beginning of the 21st century special attention is paid to action researches which are considered to be a new tendency in the improvement of educational practice. This fact deserves special attention, particularly because there has been an insufficient number of theoretical papers and empirical studies that elaborate on these issues. The need to conduct action research points to the necessity of changing the role of teachers in the educational process and gaining a bigger role in teaching process as well. Action researches provide solutions of specific problems that teachers encounter in their practice, i.e. they provide the improvement of that practice. Action researches aim at improving educational practice, but the specificity of these studies is that the problems are identified and solved by teachers themselves, and not by professional researchers. Firstly, action researches start from the needs of teachers - practitioners, and not from the ideas of individuals or institutions outside the school context. However, action researches are closest to the contemporary notion of practice, unlike other approaches to research.

Grozdanka Gojkov, Veljko Bandur, Milenko Kundačina, authors who had strongly marked the methodology of pedagogy in this period, contributed to the development of action research in Serbia. The book *Action researches in the school (teachers as researchers)* by Veljko Bandur and Milenko Kundačina was published in 2004. In the same year, research team composed of Veljko Bandur, Grozdanka Gojkov and Milenko Kundačina submitted a project entitled *Action Researches in Educational Work*, in the contest for the accreditation of programs for training teachers, which had been announced by Serbian Ministry of Education and Sports. The first criterion was focused on the contribution to the improvement of teachers, educators and associates' knowledge, skills and abilities, which were necessary for achieving the goals of education of students and children. The direct objective was to introduce the teachers of elementary, secondary and pre-schools with significant features of action researches and the possibilities of changing phenomena that were being investigated. The long term goal was to train teachers in order for them to implement elements of the strategy for curriculum development, to successfully concretize outcomes of education and to operate the school curriculum and associated elements of a strategy for developing the curriculum and its structure. The second criterion was focused on the applicability in the pedagogical practice. The reasons for the

implementation of the project were: 1) teachers training programs did not provide the preparation for research competence, nor was that problem formulated in a manner that was focused on solving practical problems in education. (2) The solutions to the problems in school practice were crucial to the effectiveness of the educational process, along with the participation of teachers. That was achieved by action researches, among other things. (3) Action researches were not sufficiently promoted in the concept and strategy of school reform that had been underway. (4) In educational practice, teachers were more likely and more willing to support the results from their own research and teaching experience (5) Participation in action researches radically changed the position of teachers in the educational process. The types of activities and subjects of work and time schedule within the second criteria, which had lasted for three days, included the introduction (the (theoretical topics of research and development project), the main part (implementation of action researches) and the final part (interpretation of research results and writing research reports). The evaluation by the participants was provided at the end of the seminar. The handout consisted of workshop topics, contributions for participants, practicum *Action researches for educational process* and organization of teaching activities. Estimation scales, knowledge microtests, anecdotal notes, record files, questionnaires and evaluation plans for the planning and organization of teaching activities were used during the program. The third criterion was related to the existence of technical and professional conditions for the successful implementation of the program in an institution, professional society or association which had carried on business in the field of education. The fourth criterion aimed at the definition and appropriateness of its evaluation procedures in the application. During this period, a significant contribution to science was provided by several doctoral dissertations in the field of the methodology of pedagogy: *Measurement in Pedagogical Research* by candidate Nataša Matović; thesis defended at the Faculty of Philosophy, 2004, under the supervision of Ljubomir Kocić, PhD, *Benefits and Limitations of Qualitative Research in Pedagogy* by candidate Slavica Ševkušić; thesis defended at the University of Novi Sad, 2008, under the supervision of Grozdanka Gojkov, PhD *The Role of Action Research in the Improvement of Educational Practice* by candidate Jelena Maksimović; thesis defended at the Faculty of Philosophy in Eastern Pale-Sarajevo, 2011, under the supervision of Veljko Bandur, PhD. During this period there were published: *Bibliography of Pedagogical Methodology* (2000) by Milenko Kundačina and Grozdanka Gojkov, *An Introduction to Pedagogical Methodology (or Meta-theoretical Concepts of Pedagogical Methodology)* (2004) by Grozdanka Gojkov, *Meta-theoretical Concepts of Pedagogical*

Methodology: An Introduction to Pedagogical Methodology(2007) by Grozdanka Gojkov, *The Qualitative Research Paradigm in Pedagogy* (2007) by Grozdanka Gojkov, *Methodological Issues of Research Talent* (2008) by Grozdanka Gojkov. The following monographs were also published: *Measurements in Pedagogy* (2007) by Nataša Matović, *Action Research in Educational Theory and Practice* (2012) by Jelena Maksimović, *Qualitative Research in Pedagogy* (2011) by Slavica Ševkušić.

At the beginning of the 21st century one can rightfully say that: there is the developed methodology of pedagogy for the complete study of pedagogical reality; there is an epistemological, methodological approach to theoretical research; developmental, prognostic and futuristic researches are equally present; the relationship of the quantitative and qualitative research has been clarified; mathematics and information technologies became necessities; methodological and statistical education is a prerequisite for practicing science.

The heritage of the development of the methodology of pedagogy has laid strong foundation for further and better development of the methodology of pedagogy, and therefore, the strong foundation for the development of pedagogical practice and science.

FINAL REMARKS

It could be noticed, by examination of historical stages of the development of Serbian methodology of pedagogy that ,at the very beginning , there were no institutional framework nor adequate personnel for the further development i.e. for pedagogical research. The following period was also very poor in scientific research,and the reason for this was the influence of Soviet pedagogy which had fluctuated between the extremes and unilateralism. Thus, the methodology of pedagogy was developed under the influence of the methodology of pedagogy from other countries, and many epistemological and methodological weaknesses could not have been overcome for a long time. Pedagogical research was therefore reduced to its minimum.

The intensive development of the methodology of pedagogy started in the second half of the 20th century, when many pedagogues started dealing with the methodological issues of pedagogical research. Many textbooks, journals and lexicons were published then and the course on the methodology of pedagogy as an independent discipline at the faculties (at the departments of pedagogy) was introduced. Modern tendencies in

pedagogical research are increasingly penetrating into educational practice, and an increasing number of methodologically-oriented and empirical research intensifies the development of pedagogy. Its theoretical and methodological soundness is raised to a higher level. Education is slowly but surely turning to pedagogy. The domination of the increasingly rapid development of the methodology of pedagogy, in particular the development of techniques and instruments for empirical research, is taking place. Thus, the weaknesses of so-called deductive and normative pedagogy are being overcome.

The qualitative methodology and qualitative researches, which had been based on the testings of the theory made of variables and on measurements of complex analytical procedures in order to verify predictive generalizations, had the advantage in the development of the methodology of pedagogy in the second half of the 20th century. In the creation of the quantitative research, the perception of reality exists outside and independently of a human. A human participates in the process of research by merely discovering it. Thus, the fact that a researcher and the target of research are completely separated and independent is a characteristic of the process of discovery. In this way, the one who discovers cannot affect neither the target nor the results of his/her research, and the target of the research cannot affect the researcher.

Normative pedagogy (Herbart, 1809), empirical pedagogy and its critical and rational modifications (Petersen, 1926), spiritual pedagogy (Dilthey, 1883) and its return to hermeneutics, the quest for pure science (Popper, 1995), paradigms (Kuhn, 1978) and constructivist models (Lorenzen, 1972), the theory of post-modern society (Lyotard, 1986), as well as the intensive development of pedagogical research at the end of the 20th century—all these contributed to the equal statuses of quantitative and qualitative methodology. Today, the integration of qualitative and quantitative research is a very significant part of the methodology of educational research.

Based on the analysis of relevant literature, historical and methodological work and papers published in pedagogical periodicals, it could be said that there had been a significant improvement in the development of the methodology of pedagogy, during the long historical development of pedagogical thought in Serbia. This development is the inevitable follower of the development of pedagogy in general. Having all of this in mind, it can be concluded that the historical development of the methodology of

pedagogy has achieved full recognition in the last two decades of its existence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Бакић, В. (1897): *Општа педагогика*. Београд
2. Бакић, В. (1921): *Посебна педагогика*. Београд: Државна штампарија.
3. Банђур, В и Поткоњак, Н. (1999): *Методологија педагогије*. Београд: Савез педагошких друштава Југославије
4. Creswell, J.W. (2003): *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
5. Дунђерски, С. Ј. (2008): *На тремеђи културе, патриотизма и слободе – раскрића педагошке мисли Милоша Р. Милошевића*. Нови Сад: Филозофски факултет
6. Gojkov, G. (2006a): Metateorijske koncepcije kao osnove pedagoških teorija i modela. *Pedagogija*, br. 1, str. 38-51.
7. Gojkov, G. (2006b): Triangulacija u pedagoškom istraživanju. *Pedagogija*, br. 2, str. 157-167.
8. Gojkov, G. (2007a): *Metateorijske koncepcije pedagoške metodologije: uvod u pedagošku metodologiju*. Vršac: Viša škola za obrazovanje vaspitača.
9. Gojkov, G. (2007b): *Kvalitativna istraživačka paradigma u pedagogiji*. Vršac: Visoka škola strukovnih studija za obrazovanje vaspitača.
10. Gojkov, G. (2008): Ortodoksna i heterodoksna istraživanja u pedagogiji. *Zbornik radova, O odnosu kvalitativnih i kvantitativnih metoda u pedagoškim istraživanjima*. Novi Sad: Savez pedagoških društava Vojvodine.
11. Gojkov, G. i saradnici (2009): *Metateorijski pristupi u pedagogiji*. Novi Sad: Savez pedagoških društava Vojvodine.
12. Guba, E. (1990): *The paradigm dialog*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
13. Halmi, A. (2005): *Strategije kvalitativnih istraživanja u primijenjenim društvenim znanostima*. Zagreb: Naklada Slap.
14. Јовановић, Ј. Д. (1939): Идејни развитак педагогике у Срба од 1918. до 1938. са освртом на претходно доба. У: *Педагошка Југославија* (ур. Милић Р. Мајсторовић). Београд: Штампарија Привредник
15. Круљ, Р., С. Стојановић & Ј. Круљ-Драшковић (2007): *Увод у методологију педагошких истраживања са статистиком*. Врање: Учитељски факултет у Врању
16. Куп, Т. (1974): *Struktura načnih revolucija*. Beograd: Nolit.
17. Кундачина, М. (2004). Методологија педагошке науке у Србији у другој половини XX века. *Зборника радова, Ужице: Учитељски факултет*
18. Köenig, E. & Zedler, P. (2001): *Teorije znanosti o odgoju*. Zagreb: Educa.
19. Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985): *Naturalistic inquiry*. New York: Sage.
20. Максимовић, Ј (2011): Плурализам истраживачких парадигми у педагогији, *Педагошка стварност*, бр. 1-2, стр. 33-47, Нови Сад.

21. Милошевић, М. (1911): *Општа културна педагогика*. Београд.
22. Миодраговић, Ј. (1914): *Народна педагогика у Срба или како наш народ подиже пород свој*. Београд: Симеон Мироточиви
23. Муџић, В. (1999): *Uvod u metodologiju istraživanja odgoja i obrazovanja*. Zagreb: EDUCA.
24. Муџић, В. (1977): *Metodologija pedagoškog istraživanja*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
25. Недовић В. (1981): *Педагошки погледи Јована Миодраговића*. Врњачка Бања: Културни центар Врњачка Бањац
26. Недовић В. (1988): *Педагошки огледи Сретена Аџића*. Јагодина
27. Поткоњак, Н. (1977): *Теоријско методолошки проблеми педагогије*. Београд: Просвета и Институт за педагошка истраживања.
28. Поткоњак, Н. (1994): *Развој схватања о конститутивним компонентама педагогије у Југославији (1944/45-1991/92)*. Београд: Институт за педагогију и андрагогију Филозофског факултета
29. Поткоњак, Н. (2012): *Педагогија у Срба : (до 1945. године)*. Београд: Eduka
30. Протић, Љ. (2008): *Педагошка питања и педагогика (збирка текстова објављених у периоду од 1914. – 1928. год)*. Београд: Завод за унапређење образовања и васпитања
31. Sekulić-Majurec, A. (2000): *Kvantitativan i/ili kvalitativan pristup istraživanjima pedagoških fenomena-neke aktuelne dileme*. *Napredak*, 141 (3), 289-300.
32. Тешић, Владета (1967): "Педагогија у Лицеју, Великој школи и на Универзитету у Београду до 1914. године", *Седмдесетпет година катедре за педагогију*, Београд: Филозофски факултет у Београду
33. Ševkušić, S. (2009): *Kombinovanje kvalitativnih i kvantitativnih metoda u proučavanju obrazovanja i vaspitanja*. *Zbornik Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja*, 41(1), 45-60.

Biographical note

Jelena Maksimović graduated from the Philosophical Faculty, Pedagogy Department, at the University in Pristina in 2001. She defended her master thesis in 2007 and her doctoral thesis in 2011. She has worked at the Philosophical Faculty in Nis as an associate professor for the courses *Pedagogy Methodology*, *Statistics in Pedagogy* and *Research in Pedagogy*. She has participated in a number of international and national conferences. She has published 4 books and 70 scientific and professional papers in journals and books of collected articles. She has been engaged as a researcher in a scientific project *Pedagogic Pluralism as a Grounds for Strategy of Education* supported by the Ministry for science and technological development of the Republic of Serbia. Fields of interest: pedagogic research methodology, statistics in pedagogy, action research,

data processing in pedagogic research. She speaks English and Russian language.

Jelena Petrović graduated from the Philosophical Faculty, Pedagogy Department, at the University in Pristina in 1999. She obtained master degree there in 2008 and her doctoral thesis was applied for in 2010 in the Philosophical Faculty, Novi Sad University. She has worked at the Philosophical Faculty in Nis as an assistant for the courses *Introduction into Pedagogy*, *Contemporary Pedagogic Movements* and *History of Pedagogy 2*. She has participated in a number of international and national conferences. She has published 1 book and several scientific and professional papers. Fields of interest: history of pedagogy, contemporary pedagogic movements and systems. She speaks English and Russian language.