Who are those to educate our Children: The Personal and Educational Features of Future Class Teachers and Subject Teachers in Croatia

A teacher's personal and educational characteristics at all levels of education play an essential part in creating the educational process. Firstly, every teaching scenario may represent a particular "model" that serves as a base of the educational process, and secondly, a teacher can, through a hidden curriculum, further pass specific positive or negative scenarios regarding education, school, teaching, children, and the system. Also, every teacher creates outcomes within the framework of his theoretical approach. This study aimed to examine future teachers' individual and educational characteristics and to which extent the characteristics of university teaching of teacher studies and teacher education explain their goal orientations in learning. The research was conducted among future teachers (N = 747) at the universities in Osijek, Rijeka, and Split. In addition to demographical characteristics, data were collected by the Student Course Experience Questionnaire - SCEQ and the Components of Self-regulated Learning - CSRL. Descriptive analyses of the results of the conducted research show that future teachers estimate that their study programs enable them to develop above-average generic skills, and they estimate most of the other categories as mediocre (teaching, explaining goals and standards, evaluation, workload). Furthermore, future teachers show that they are above average focused on learning, averagely on performance, and work avoidance when learning.

Keywords: future teachers; higher education teaching; goal orientations in learning

Introduction

Investing in the future is the most important thing for the survival of every individual, family, institution, and state. A country's advancement is reflected precisely in the quality of its young generation, which is responsible for progress, growth, and development. Universities and colleges play an important role in shaping the future of the world's society in terms of sustainable development by creating new knowledge and contributing to the development of appropriate competencies. Many scientists have tried to determine which competencies are the most relevant for sustainable development and which need to be developed in future-oriented higher education. We could not find an unequivocal answer to that question. However, Rieckmann (2012) determined that the twelve key competencies crucial for sustainable development can be identified; the most relevant ones are those for systemic, anticipatory, and critical thinking.

It is essential, among other things, to use all scientific achievements to create images of possible, probable, and desirable (positive) futures and to find paths that lead to such a future. The basis of the mentioned effort is the human awareness of the future, which is present in everyday anticipatory behaviour and explicit

prediction. Researchers of the future often emphasize the importance of increasing the mentioned awareness to enable more decisive and more concrete decisions (at a global level) towards more desirable futures, especially in the direction of educational challenges. Despite the importance of the concept of futures consciousness and the proliferation of related concepts, there are only a few solutions. Therefore, Ahvenharju et al. (2018) offered a model that they named the model of five dimensions: 1) time perspective; 2) agency beliefs; 3) openness to alternatives; 4) systems perception; and 5) concern for others. The model is the foundation for Futures Consciousness's conceptual expansion and operationalization, allowing for its use in empirical research. Future awareness is generally considered a holistic concept that draws attention to the future as an internalized and experienced phenomenon, and it can also be defined as being aware of what is possible, probable, and desirable in the future (Lombardo, 2016; 2017). The importance of this topic has been underscored by numerous studies, with a significant increase in research over the past decade on the global stage (Knudsen et al., 2023; Burgess et al., 2021) and in specific regions such as Croatia (Dubovicki, 2020; Dubovicki, & Kostanjčar, 2023). This surge in academic interest further underscores the relevance and urgency of the research and academic discussion.

University teaching as a model of teaching future students

Previous research shows that the quality of university teaching is of great importance. Not only does it represent a model that helps teacher education students to conceptualize their future teaching process, but it also associates the quality of the teaching process with a particular form of social and emotional climate (Bognar & Kragulj, 2010; Bognar & Dubovicki, 2012; Dubovicki & Banjari, 2014). It should be taken into account that we, as university professors, have a direct and indirect influence on the education of those who will raise and educate our children for the next 40 years; we can almost reach the year 2100, which presents us with a great challenge and an even greater responsibility (Dubovicki, 2020). A standard duty of university professors who teach future generations of students is to advocate for a general awareness of the future and to reflect on the future. The results of previously conducted research show that people who perceive their personal and professional future positively have a greater chance of success because they envisioned and planned optimistic scenarios, unlike those who negatively perceived themselves and their future occupation, which ultimately led them to demotivation and giving up (Hideg & Nováky, 2010; Chen & Vazsonyi, 2011). If students are not "taught" to plan, research, and prevent challenges in the future during their university classes, the question arises whether they are ready to face new challenges. According to some experts, educational strategists should study the future and learn from futurologists to create new viewpoints for preparing future trends and educational issues (Singh & Yadav, 2017).

Today's university teaching is commonly conducted in a blended learning environment. Samoylenko et al. (2022) emphasize that the online and face-to-face components must be properly balanced, with methods of motivating and involving students while fostering students' independence and independent study. New learning environments are omnipresent in higher education, impacting changes in study habits related to the time and space of studying, a decline in motivation and its connection to the complexity of the learning goals, and greater flexibility for students (Jereb et al., 2023). In contemporary schooling, the advantages of using digital videos to support learning complex concepts, encourage discussion, and develop higher levels of thinking are highly valued (Batarelo Kokić & Rukavina, 2017). Furthermore, using video cases in teacher education benefits future teachers by demonstrating instructional strategies, providing additional resources to augment the video examples, and providing insights into classroom administration (Kurz & Batarelo, 2010). However, we should stress that including new media in the educational process has never automatically meant a contemporary teaching process if most activities are still focused mainly on listening, observing, and writing down through one-way communication. While focusing on the development of communication skills, special attention should also be paid to the use of social networks since recent research indicates that the role of social media in teacher education students' development of interpersonal relationships in areas including making new contacts, preserving ties offline, learning from one another, and self-presentation (Frania et al., 2023).

The Bologna Process's reform requires a shift of emphasis from university professors to students, who are now more active in the higher education classroom. This shift towards student-centred learning in higher education aligns with contemporary social reality (Osmanović Zajić & Maksimović, 2023). University teachers, and consequently future teachers, are responsible for creating the contemporary and quality teaching process since they are the ones that create it and implement it as well. Therefore, it is necessary to continuously invest in personal and professional growth and development via continuous research and improvement of one's teaching and questioning already established theoretical starting points of taught content through a critical correlation with contemporary achievements and discussions with students (Topolovčan, 2023). The professionalization of the teaching profession requires changes in the initial selection and training of future teachers, which leads to the autonomous teacher who operates in an autonomous setting (Batarelo Kokić & Blažević, 2022).

However, teaching is not the only aspect on which the students focus and "look up to" their teachers during their studies. One of the essential elements, which is also an indicator of the hidden curriculum, are research approaches and methodological frameworks in research of future teachers, which show that the students, following their teachers' examples, most commonly conduct research in the field of positivistic paradigm using a survey as a research tool (Dubovicki et al., 2018; Dubovicki & Topolovčan, 2020). By looking at the global achievements in contemporary methodology, we know that in conducting contemporary research on a phenomenon (and especially those in the field of pedagogy), we cannot "rely" on the benefits of only one research method. Moreover, the pluralism of scientific

paradigms and research methods is emphasized nowadays, all to obtain as reliable, concrete, and comprehensive insights into the research subject as possible (Cohen et al., 2007; Creswell, 2012; Topolovčan & Dubovicki, 2019). Methods from future studies also have a special place in conducting contemporary research. Those methods have been long known in the world and are applied, among other things, to research phenomena in the field of education (Inayatullah, 2004; 2005; Holdaway, 2023) and have their special place. In Croatia, they have been increasingly used and affirmed in the last ten years or so (Dubovicki, 2017; Dubovicki & Beara, 2021; Dubovicki & Dilica, 2022; Dubovicki & Kostanjčar, 2023). We are faced with numerous challenges brought to us by new generations (Jukić & Škojo, 2021; Dubovicki, Jukić & Topolovčan, 2022; Jukić, 2023), those that we need to raise and educate in a way that will enable students to be active, to unleash their potential, to express their ideas freely and take the initiative.

Goal Orientations of Students

A critical question is: What motivates students and future teachers? It is orientation towards achieving a desired and/or set goal, better known as goal orientation. It represents one of the leading theories of motivation in the last few decades, and we can define it as a set of beliefs leading to different approaches, engagement, and responses to situational demands (Đuranović, 2019). Given the importance and "power" that goal orientation has, especially in the educational process, contemporary researchers have compared it with the emotions that students face during exam situations (Burić & Sorić, 2011); academic success and self-regulation strategies among students at different educational levels (Batarelo Kokić et al., 2023; Pahljina-Reinić, 2022; Callan & Shim, 2019; Đuranović, 2019; Pahljina-Reinić & Kukić, 2015), and the relationship between self-regulated learning and non-academic achievements was also researched (Anthonysamy et al., 2020). It is precisely self-regulation that is understood as the most significant predictor of teaching quality, along with learning orientation as an indicator of a positive perception of teaching quality and the importance of challenge and stimulation for achieving greater student involvement (Jurčev et al., 2019).

After a comprehensive review of research spanning three decades, we can draw several key conclusions about goal orientations. These orientations are often linked to beliefs about effort, abilities, and the pace of learning. They are also associated with perceived self-efficacy, goal dedication, task complexity, perseverance, and learning processes. Moreover, goal orientations are frequently tied to positive academic adaptations, with knowledge orientation being the most desirable outcome of the teaching process (Niemivirta, 2002; Vandewalle et al., 2019; Tuominen et al., 2020).

Methodology

The first research goal was to examine future teachers' individual and educational characteristics. We wanted to research the type of study program that student chose to pursue concerning the type of high school they graduated from and their place of residence. Also, this research aimed to examine and present the metric characteristics and factor structure of the Croatian version of the *Student Course Experience Questionnaire* (Ginns et al., 2007) and the *Components of Self-regulated Learning Questionnaire – Goal Orientations* (Niemivirta, 1996, 1998). Furthermore, we wanted to research the characteristics of student experiences in teacher education and the characteristics of future teachers' target orientations. Finally, we wanted to research the connection between students' experience with teaching and specific aspects of the goal-oriented future teachers.

Respondents

The data were collected among a sample of teacher education students, i.e., future teachers (N = 747) from Osijek, Rijeka, and Split universities. There were 91 (12.2%) men and 656 (87.8%) women. Regarding residence, 464 (62.1%) live in the city and 283 (37.9%) in the countryside. Regarding the type of secondary school, 492 (65.9%) completed gymnasium, and 255 (34.1%) completed vocational school. Regarding the university, 286 (38.3%) of them study at the University of Osijek, 269 (36%) at the University of Split and 192 (25.7%) at the University of Rijeka. Regarding the type of study program, 404 (54.1%) of them are studying to become elementary school teachers, and 343 (45.9%) are to become subject teachers. Regarding the study year, 89 (11.9%) are in the first, 125 (16.7%) in the second, 97 (13%) in the third, 203 (27.2%) in the fourth and 233 (31.2%) in the fifth year of study.

Data Collection Instruments

Data were collected on demographic characteristics, i.e., gender (male, female), completed high school (vocational, gymnasium, some other high school), year of study (first, second, third, fourth, fifth), place of residence (city, village), the university where future teachers are studying (University in Osijek, University of Rijeka, & University of Split) and which study program they are studying (teaching, teaching studies). In addition to demographic data, we also collected data on the assessment of the quality of university teaching and self-assessment of goal orientations in learning.

The *Student Course Experience Questionnaire* (SCEQ) (Ginns et al., 2007) collected data on the quality of university teaching. The questionnaire was used with the author's permission and translated into Croatian. The questionnaire consists of twenty-three manifest statements that form five latent factors (1 = *completely disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *neither agree nor disagree*, 4 = *agree*, 5 = *completely agree*) The *Good Teaching Scale* includes six statements that examine the didactic-methodical quality of university teachers' teaching. The *Clear Goals*

and Standards Scale consists of four statements that examine whether the learning outcomes and standards are presented and explained to students. Following is the *Appropriate Assessment Scale* which contains three statements that examine the appropriateness of the assessment. The *Appropriate Workload Scale* consists of four statements that measure the appropriateness of the workload with teaching tasks and learning activities. Finally, the *Generic Skills Scale*, contains six manifest statements that examine the extent to which the university teaching develops generic skills such as democratic communication, planning, and analytical skills. The scales show satisfactory internal reliability, while the intercorrelations of the scales are significant.

Table 1. The results of the factor analysis for the SCEQ

The claims from the *SCEQ*	**Factor saturations**				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Factor 1: Good Teaching Scale					
2.The teaching staff of this degree course motivate me to do my best work.	**.79**	-.01	.03	-.00	-.00
3.The staff make a real effort to understand difficulties I may be having with my work	**.78**	-.01	.12	-.01	.05
6.The staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work.	**.77**	.00	.01	.07	-.10
5.The teaching staff work hard to make their subjects interesting	**.72**	-.01	-.10	-.06	-.10
1.The teaching staff normally give me helpful feedback on how I am going	**.68**	-.01	.02	.03	-.01
4.My lecturers are extremely good at explaining things.	**.58**	-.06	-.03	-.23	-.09
Factor 2: Generic Skills Scale					
21.The degree course has developed my problem-solving skills.	.00	**-.83**	.04	.03	-.04
19.The degree course has sharpened my analytic skills.	-.01	**-.83**	-.07	.02	.00
22.The degree course has improved my skills in written communication.	-.08	**-.77**	-.09	-.07	-.08
18.The degree course has helped me develop my ability to work as a team member.	.06	**-.74**	-.04	.08	.06
23. My degree course has helped me to develop the ability to plan my own work.	.00	**-.72**	.00	-.03	-.03
20. As a result of my degree course, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems.	.03	**-.64**	.20	-.07	.04
Factor 3: Appropriate Workload Scale					
15. The workload is too heavy. *	-.04	.09	**.85**	.07	.02
14. There is a lot of pressure on me as a student in this degree course. *	-.03	.03	**.74**	-.11	-.11
16. I am generally given enough time to understand the things I have to learn.	.21	-.14	**.61**	-.12	.15
17. The sheer volume of work to be got through in this degree means it can't all be thoroughly comprehended. *	.02	-.05	**.51**	.04	-.27
Factor 4: Clear Goals and Standards Scale					
8. It is always easy to know the standard of work expected.	.11	.00	.01	**-.79**	.05

10. It has often been hard to discover what is expected of me in this degree course. *	-.25	.00	.08	**-.76**	-.17
9. The staff made it clear right from the start what they expected from students.	.12	-.05	-.05	**-.75**	.02
7. I have usually had a clear idea of where I am going and what is expected of me in this degree course.	.32	-.05	.04	**-.46**	.04
Factor 5: Appropriate Assessment Scale					
12. Too many staff ask me questions just about facts.*	.17	.03	-.01	-.02	**-.82**
11. The staff seem more interested in testing what I have memorised than what I have understood.*	.13	.01	.01	-.02	**-.78**
13. To do well in this degree all you really need is a good memory.	-.06	-.10	.08	-.02	**-.71**
Explained variance %	29.2	11.24	8.28	6.14	5,58
Characteristic root	6.71	2.58	1.92	1.44	1.33
α	.86	.86	.70	.74	.77

Remark: $N = 747$; *KMO* = .889; Bartlett's sphericity test = 6816.49 ($df = 253$; $p = .000$); * the particles have been recoded.

In order to check the construct validity, a factor analysis (PCA) was performed with saturations greater than .04, characteristic root greater than 1.0 and oblimin rotation. Five latent factors were obtained, which explains 60.72% of the variance (Table 2). The obtained factor structure fully replicates the original factor structure of the *Student Course Experience Questionnaire*, and the internal reliabilities of the factors are satisfactory (Table 1), as well as the intercorrelations of the factors (Table 3).

The questionnaire *Components of Self-regulated Learning – CSRL* (Niemivirta, 1996, 1998) was used to collect data on goal orientations in learning. The questionnaire consists of fifteen manifest statements on a Likert scale (1 = *completely disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3= *neither agree nor disagree*, 4 = *agree*, 5 = *completely agree*) which form three subscales. The questionnaire was used with the author's consent, with the translation from previous questionnaire applications on a sample of Croatian respondents (Pahljina-Reinić & Kukić, 2015). The first scale focuses on learning orientation; it contains five statements and measures the student's orientation toward acquiring new knowledge as a product of the learning process. The second scale focuses on performance orientation; it contains five manifest statements that measure the orientation toward the best possible success for others. The third scale focuses on the work-avoidance orientation, and it consists of five statements that measure the achievement of learning outcomes with as little effort as possible.

Table 2. *The results of the factor analysis for the CSRL*

Claims from the CSRL questionnaire	Factor saturations		
	1	**2**	**3**
Factor 1: Learning orientation			
4. I like the most tasks that I can learn new things from	**.84**	-.09	.01
3. Learning something new feels especially good	**.80**	-.01	.05
5. I like to learn about new things in school	**.77**	.00	-.05
2. An important goal for me in school is to learn as many new things as possible	**.76**	.00	-.04
1. To acquire new knowledge is the most important goal for me in school	**.70**	.01	-.01
Factor 2: Performance orientation			
7. I have succeeded when I get better results or grades than many other students	-.05	**.87**	.07
8. I feel especially good when I succeed in tests better than other students	-.15	**.83**	.02
6. I am particularly satisfied when I do better in school than other students	.05	**.80**	.09
9. It is important to me that other students and teachers consider my schoolwork good	.07	**.70**	-.15
10. I feel good when I manage to demonstrate to other people that I master things	**.400**	**.403**	-.01
Factor 3: Work-Avoidance Orientation			
12. I try to get off with my schoolwork with as little effort as possible		.43	**.85**
11. I try to do my schoolwork with as little effort as possible		.77	**.82**
14. I am not interested in doing anything extra for my schoolwork and studying		.75	**.81**
13. I usually want to do just the required schoolwork, nothing more		.70	**.79**
15. I am very satisfied when my schoolwork does not require too much time or thinking		.56	**.70**
Explained variance %	29.35	20.4	12.61
Characteristic root	4.04	3.06	1.89
α	.84	.80	86

Remark: $N = 747$; *KMO* = .807; Bartlett's sphericity test = 5311.54 ($df = 105$; $p = .000$).

To check the construct validity, factor analysis (PCA) was performed with saturations greater than .04, characteristic root greater than 1.0 and oblimin rotation. Three factors were obtained, explaining 62.37% of the variance (Table 2). The first and second obtained factors share one particle with slightly higher saturation than its original factor. Therefore, it is indicated that the obtained factor structure completely replicates the original factor structure of the *Components of Self-regulated Learning*. The internal reliabilities of the factors are satisfactory (Table 2), and the intercorrelations of the factors are satisfactory (Table 3).

Procedure

The data collection procedure was designed with utmost respect for the respondents' autonomy. The method used was pencil to paper, ensuring a familiar and comfortable environment for the respondents. Filling in the questionnaire was completely anonymous and voluntary, respecting the privacy and rights of the respondents. They were also assured that they could withdraw from filling out the questionnaire at any time, further emphasizing their autonomy and control over their participation.

Research results and interpretation

Descriptive analysis showed that future teachers estimate that their studies enable them to develop above-average generic skills. On the other hand, they believe that the teaching in higher education is mediocre, the goals and standards are averagely explained, the evaluation is mediocre, and the workload is neither too heavy nor too easy. Future teachers show that they are above average focused on learning and averagely on performance, avoiding effort during learning (Table 3).

Table 3. *Descriptive characteristics of the researched factors*

Factors		*N*	Range	Min	Max	*M*	*SD*
SCEQ							
	1.GTS	747	4.00	1.00	5.00	3.13	.80
	2.CGSS	747	3.75	1.25	5.00	3.13	.73
	3.AAS	747	4.00	1.00	5.00	2.87	.93
	4.AWS	747	4.00	1.00	5.00	2.77	.77
	5.GSS	747	4.00	1.00	5.00	3.89	.68
CSRL							
	6.LO	747	4.00	1.60	5.00	4.29	.57
	7.PO	747	1.00	1.00	5.00	3.17	.84
	8.WAO	747	4.00	1.00	5.00	3.24	.80

Remark: SCEQ = Student Course Experience Questionnaire; GTS = Good teaching scale; CGSS = Clear goals and standards scale; AAS = Appropriate assessment scale; AWS = Appropriate workload scale; GSS = Generic skills scale; LO = Learning orientation; PO = Performance orientation; WAO = Work-avoidance orientation; *$p < .05$; **$p < .001$.

Furthermore, the inter-correlations between SCEQ and CSRL scales are presented in Table 4. Pearson's correlation test revealed a highly significant positive correlation among future teachers between five SCEQ scales related to different features of higher education teaching, CSRL learning orientation, and CSRL work-avoidance orientations. Furthermore, a highly significant statistical correlation exists between the SCEQ Good Teaching Scale and the SCEQ Generic Skills Scale with the CSRL performance orientation scale. The data also show no statistical association between CSRL performance orientation with the three SCEQ scales, clear goals and standards, appropriate assessment and appropriate workload scale.

Table 4. *Correlations of the researched factors*

Factors		2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
SCEQ								
	1.GTS	.46**	.38**	.32**	.36**	.26**	.17**	-.23**
	2.CGSS	-	.35**	.35**	.35**	.19**	.01	-.17**
	3.AAS		-	.39**	.24**	.18**	-.01	-.22**
	4.AWS			-	.17**	.15**	-.06	-.12**
	5.GSS				-	.36**	.12**	-.21**
CSRL								
	6.LO					-	.22**	-.32**
	7.PO						-	.03
	8.WAO							-

Remark: SCEQ = Student Course Experience Questionnaire; GTS = Good teaching scale; CGSS = Clear goals and standards scale; AAS = Appropriate assessment scale; AWS = Appropriate workload scale; GSS = Generic skills scale; LO = Learning orientation; PO = Performance orientation; WAO = Work-avoidance orientation; *$p < .05$; **$p < .001$.

Discussion

This study provided answers to the posed research questions. The gathered demographic data show that two-thirds of teacher studies and teacher education students have graduated from grammar schools, and it has been established that slightly more than half of the students live in the city. The obtained data can be viewed in the context of previous research focused on socioeconomic and demographic inequalities regarding access to higher education qualifications. It was determined that regardless of demographic characteristics, one of the main challenges in accessing higher education is the visions (personal and professional) that young people have for themselves (Burgess et al., 2021). Recent studies on the selection of teacher studies (Van Overschelde & Wiggins, 2020) are particularly interesting, and they emphasize the importance of preparing, recruiting, and retaining highly qualified teachers from different socioeconomic and demographic groups.

The results of our study provide a strong validation of the Student Course Experience Questionnaire - SCEQ. The questionnaire demonstrated excellent psychometric characteristics, including content and construct validity, as well as reliability coefficients. Importantly, confirmatory factor analysis confirmed the theoretically assumed five-factor structure of the questionnaire, with scales of good teaching, clear goals and standards, appropriate evaluation, appropriateness of workload and development of generic skills. This robust validation process confirms the assumed factor structure of the original instrument (Ginns et al., 2007), instilling confidence in the reliability of our findings.

Research also showed excellent psychometric characteristics of the Components of Self-regulated Learning questionnaire - CSRL related to content and construct validity and reliability coefficients. Confirmatory factor analysis confirmed the theoretically assumed three-factor structure of the questionnaire, with the scales oriented on learning, performance, and work avoidance orientation. This research confirmed the assumed factor structure of the original instrument

(Niemivirta, 1996, 1998), as well as the earlier translation of the original document into Croatian (Pahljina-Reinić & Kukić, 2015).

Research results point to the characteristics of student experiences in teacher education and teacher studies, according to which respondents estimate that their studies enable them to develop above-average generic skills. Furthermore, they believe that the teaching in higher education is mediocre, the objectives and standards are explained averagely, the evaluation is mediocre, and the workload is neither too heavy nor too easy. The results can be viewed in the context of earlier studies on the quality of university teaching. Thus, the results of research conducted by Harrison et al. (2022) revealed the use of teaching quality: student feedback data, self-assessment tools, peer review of teaching (formative and summative), and the use of teaching portfolios. The authors present data about the efficacy of each of these strategies, suggesting that a multi-modal strategy would be the most successful, but it requires resource consideration.

How teachers define and recognize self-regulated learning in previously conducted research is of significant importance. The study conducted by Callan and Shim (2019) emphasized that researchers and educators need to develop a common language for self-regulated learning before it can be fully integrated into classroom practices. Teachers often think of self-regulated learning as self-directedness, which can lead to misinformation. Therefore, it is not just important but crucial to have a clear understanding of self-regulated learning to ensure its effective implementation in classrooms.

Regarding evaluating the correlation between different aspects of the student's experience with certain aspects of the goal orientation of future teachers, a highly significant positive connection was established between different characteristics of higher education teaching, goal orientations, and orientations to avoid effort. A highly significant positive correlation has been determined between the good teaching subscale and the subscale of the development of generic skills with the goal-oriented subscale. These results relate to the results of previous research on the attitude of students towards classes and self-regulated learning. Batarelo Kokić et al. (2023) examined the four characteristics of perceived self-regulated learning skills in a higher education distance setting. Their study showed a significant correlation between attitudes towards distance education and self-regulated learning skills. The relationship between self-regulated learning and non-academic success is the focus of research conducted by Anthonysamy et al. (2020), and they indicate the equal importance of non-academic and academic outcomes and the need to implement activities that encourage the development of self-regulation skills. The skills of self-regulation of learning are vital to achieving success in highly autonomous situations.

Conclusions

Changes in educational policies, such as the introduction of micro-qualifications at the higher education level, hold immense potential to shape the future of higher education. These changes influence both theoretical and practical

choices in designing new models of higher education, with a clear recognition of the importance of performance orientation and its direct link to generic skills. As we consider the possible trends in defining a new model of higher education, it's crucial to plan optimistic future scenarios. This underscores the significance of future teachers being motivated in both private and business contexts, equipping them to tackle the numerous challenges they will inevitably face.

In the private context, the impact of motivation is straightforward and can lead to quicker employment and earlier independence. In the business context, motivation is equally crucial, as it can provide the necessary material resources, support in lifelong education, and support from the school administration and parents. The student's motivation for the teaching process is not just important, it's essential. This can be achieved through creative teaching methods that make classes more interesting, modern, and fun. However, it is essential to follow the actual potential of the students in order to avoid an overload of students and teachers.

References

Ahvenharju, S., Minkkinen, M. &, Lalot, F. (2018). The five dimensions of Futures Consciousness. *Futures, 104*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2018.06.010

Anthonysamy, L., Koo, A. C., & Hew, S. H. (2020). Self-regulated learning strategies and non-academic outcomes in higher education blended learning environments: A one decade review. *Education and information technologies, 25*(5), 3677-3704. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10134-2

Batarelo Kokić, I., Poljak, P., Kokić, T., & Bušelić, A. (2023). Relation between self-regulated learning and distance education attitudes among higher education students. In *Proceedings of EdMedia + Innovate Learning* (pp. 1381-1389). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).

Batarelo Kokić, I., & Blažević, I. (2022). Profesionalizacija nastavničke struke i aspekti profesionalnog razvoja nastavnika [The Professionalization of Teaching Profession and Aspects of the Professional Development of Teachers]. In Luketić, D. (ed.), *Ogledi o nastavničkoj profesiji*, (pp. 45-68). University of Zadar.

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

Bognar, L., & Kragulj, S. (2010). Kvaliteta nastave na fakultetu [Quality of Teaching at the University]. *Život i škola, LVI*(24), 169-182.

Bognar, L., & Dubovicki, S. (2012). Emotions in the Teaching Process. *Croatian Journal of Education, 14*(1), 135-153.

Burgess, A. P., Horton, M. S. & Moores, A. (2021). Optimising the impact of a multi-intervention outreach programme on progression to higher education: recommendations for future practice and research. *Heliyon, 7*, E07518. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07518

Burić, I., & Sorić, I. (2011). Pozitivne emocije u ispitnim situacijama–doprinosi učeničkih ciljnih orijentacija, voljnih strategija i školskog postignuća. [Positive Test Emotions – Contributions of Students Goal Orientations, Volitional Strategies and Academic Achievement]. *Suvremena psihologija, 14*(2), 183-199.

Callan, G. L., & Shim, S. S. (2019). How teachers define and identify self-regulated learning. *The Teacher Educator, 54*(3), 295-312. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2019.1609640

Chen, P. & Vazsonyi, A. T. (2011). Future orientation, impulsivity, and problem behaviours: A longitudinal moderation model. *Developmental Psychology, 47*, 1633-1645.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson.

Dubovicki, S. (2017). Futurološke metode istraživanja. [Futuristic Research Methods (or Research Methods of the Future?)]. In S. Opić, B. Bognar, S. Ratković (Eds.), *Novi pristupi metodologiji istraživanja odgoja* (pp. 203-221). Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb, Croatia.

Dubovicki, S. (2020). Do We Focus on the Positive Future in Higher Education? In A. Peko, M. Ivanuš Grmek; J. Delcheva Dizarevikj (Eds.), *Dicactic Challenges III: Didactic Retrospective and Perspective Where/How do we go from here?* (pp. 78-91). Osijek: Faculty of Education, Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek.

Dubovicki, S. & Banjari, I. (2014). Students' attitudes on the quality of university teaching. *Sodobna pedagogika, 65*/131(2), 42-58.

Dubovicki, S., & Beara, M. (2021). Metodologija izvan okvira: Polakova igra. In V. Kovač, N. Rončević, & Z. Gregorović Belaić (Eds.), *U mreži paradigmi: Pogled prema horizontu istraživanja odgoja i obrazovanja* (pp. 93-114). Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Rijeka, Croatia

Dubovicki, S., & Dilica, K. (2022). Biographies of the Future as a Creative Method of Visioning in Education. *Journal of Futures Studies, 27* (1), 109-118. https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.202209_27(1).0008

Dubovicki, S., Jukić, R., & Topolovčan, T. (2022). Izazovi nastavničkog poziva u budućnosti [Challenges of the Teaching Profession in the Future]. In D. Luketić (Ed.), *Ogledi o nastavničkoj profesiji* (pp. 155-178). University of Zadar, Croatia.

Dubovicki, S., & Kostanjčar, A. (2023). How can future studies help us in professional and personal development? In S. Inayatullah, S. Dubovicki and A. Bilić (Eds.), *Didactic Challenges IV: Futures Studies in Education* (pp. 46-57). University of Osijek, Faculty of Education & Croatian Academy of Sciences; Center for Scientific Work in Vinkovci

Dubovicki, S., Mlinarević, V., & Velki, T. (2018). Istraživački pristupi i metodološki okviri u istraživanjima budućih učitelja. [Research Approaches and Methodological Framework in the Research of Future Teachers]. *Nova prisutnost, XVI* (3), 595-610. https://doi.org/10.31192/np.16.3.11

Dubovicki S., & Topolovčan T. (2020). Through the looking glass: methodological features of research of alternative schools. *Journal of Elementary Education, 13*(1), 55-71. https://doi.org/10.18690/rei.13.1.55-71.2020

Frania, M., de Sousa Correia, F., Kot Kotecki, A. F. F., & Batarelo Kokić, I. (2022). From Facebook toward the Metaverse–how the future educators build interpersonal relationships using social media. *The New Educational Review, 69*(3), 13-26. https://doi.org/10.15804/tner.2022.69.3.01

Đuranović, M. (2019). Classroom Quality in Final Grades of Lower Secondary Education: Demographic Differences and Relationship with Target Learning Orientations. *Croatian Journal of Education, 21*(1), 11-44. https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v21i1.3384

Ginns, P., Prosser, M., & Barrie, S. (2007). Students` perception of teaching quality in higher education: The perspectives of currently enrolled students. *Studies in Higher Education, 32*(5), 603-615. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701573773

Harrison, R., Meyer, L., Rawstorne, P., Razee, H., Chitkara, U., Mears S., & Balasooriya, C. (2022) Evaluating and enhancing quality in higher education teaching practice: a meta- review. *Studies in Higher Education, 47*(1), 80-96. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1730315

Hideg, É. & Nováky, E. (2010). Changing attitudes to the future in Hungary. *Futures, 42*(3), 230–236. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2009.11.008

Holdaway, M. (2023). Accounting Meets Futures Studies in Interdisciplinary Research: Between a Rock and a Hard Place. *Journal of Futures Studies, 28*(1), 25-39. https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.202309_28(1).0003

Inayatullah, S. (2004). *Causal Layered Analysis: An Integrative and Transformative Theory and Method. The Causal Layered Analysis Reader*. Tamkang University Publications.

Inayatullah, S. (2005). *Causal layered analysis — deepening the future. Questioning the Future: Methods and Tools for Organizational and Societal Transformation*. Tamkang University Press.

Jereb, E., Jerebic, J., & Urh, M. (2023). Studying Habits in Higher Education before and after the Outbreak of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Athens Journal of Education, 10*(1), 67-83. https://doi.org/10.30958/aje.10-1-4

Jukić, R. (2023). What Awaits a Teacher in the Future? In S. Inayatullah, S. Dubovicki and A. Bilić (Eds.), *Didactic Challenges IV: Futures Studies in Education* (pp. 32-45). University of Osijek, Faculty of Education & Croatian Academy of Sciences; Center for Scientific Work in Vinkovci

Jurčev, A., Topolovčan, T., & Maras, N. (2019). The Role of Goal Orientations and the Use of Digital Media in the Classroom Quality in the Final Grades of Elementary Education. *Croatian Journal of Education, 21* (Sp.Ed.1), 29-46. https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v21i0.3508

Knudsen, M., Ahlqvist, T., & Taylor, A. (2023). Defining 'Future Generations': Epistemic Considerations on Conceptualizing a Future-Oriented Domain in Policy and Law-Making. *Journal of Futures Studies, 28*(2), 3-19. https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.202312_28(2).0001

Kurz, T. L., & Batarelo, I. (2010). Constructive Features of Video Cases to be used in Teacher Education. *TechTrends, 54*(5), 46-52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-010-0436-x

Lombardo, T. (2014). The future evolution of consciousness. *World Future Review, 6*(3), 322–335. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1946756714552135.

Lombardo, T. (2016). Future consciousness: The path to purposeful evolution—An introduction. *World Futures Review, 8*(3), 116–140. https://doi.org/10.1177/1946756716673636

Niemivitra, M. (1996). *Motivational-cognitive components in self-regulated learning*. Paper presented at the 5th International Conference on Motivation. Landau, Germany.

Niemivirta, M. (1998). Individual differences in motivational and cognitive factors affecting self-regulated learning: A pattern-oriented approach. In P. Nenniger, R. S. Jager, A. Frey A. & M. Wosnitza (Eds.), *Advances in Motivation* (pp. 23-42). Verlag Empirische Pädagogik.

Niemivirta, M. (2002). Motivation and performance in context: The influence of goal orientations and instructional setting on situational appraisals and task performance. *Psychologia, 45*(4). 250-270. http://doi.org/10.2117/psysoc.2002.250

Osmanović Zajić, J., & Maksimović, J. (2023). The Bologna in the Field of Social Sciences and Humanities: A Precondition for Successful University Education. *Athens Journal of Education, 10*(4), 701-715. https://doi.org/10.30958/ aje.10-4-8

Pahljina-Reinić, R. i Kukić, M. (2015). Ciljne orijentacije studenata i prilagodba na studij. [Students' Goal Orientations and College Adjustment]. *Psihologijske teme, 24*(3), 543-556.

Pahljina-Reinić, R. (2022). Achievement Goal Orientation Profiles and Strategies for the Self-Regulation of Motivation. *Psihologijske teme, 31*(3), 721-742. https://doi.org/10.31820/pt.31.3.13

Rieckmann, M. (2012). Future-oriented higher education: Which key competencies should be fostered through university teaching and learning? *Futures, 44*(2), 127-135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.09.005

Samoylenko, N., Zharko, L., & Glotova, A. (2022). Designing Online Learning Environment: ICT Tools and Teaching Strategies. *Athens Journal of Education, 9*(1), 49-62. https://doi.org/10.30958/aje.9-1-4

Singh, R. & Yadav, Y. (2017). Perspective of Futurology and its Implication in Education. *Global Journal of Enterprise Information System, 9*(4), 57-61.

Topolovčan, T. (2023). The unknown about the known: The myths about teaching, school, learning, instruction and education. In S. Inayatullah, S. Dubovicki and A. Bilić (Eds.), *Didactic Challenges IV: Futures Studies in Education* (pp. 20-31). University of Osijek, Faculty of Education & Croatian Academy of Sciences; Center for Scientific Work in Vinkovci

Topolovčan, T. & Dubovicki, S. (2019). The Heritage of the Cold War in Contemporary Curricula and Educational Reforms. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal, 9*(2), 11-32. https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.567

Tuominen, H., Juntunen, H., & Niemivirta, M. (2020). Striving for Success but at What Cost? Subject-Specific Achievement Goal Orientation Profiles, Perceived Cost, and Academic Well-Being. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*. http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.557445

Vandewalle, D., Nerstad, C. G., & Dysvik, A. (2019). Goal orientation: A review of the miles traveled and the miles to go. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 6*, 115-144. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-041015-062547

Van Overschelde, J. P., & Wiggins, A. Y. (2020). Teacher preparation pathways: Differences in program selection and teacher retention. *Action in Teacher Education, 42*(4), 311-327. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2019.1656116