



## Second Call for Papers 29<sup>th</sup> Round Table on Giftedness

It is our honour and pleasure to invite you to participate and give your scientific contribution to  
**the International Conference:**

### Giftedness Complexity in Learning Culture

**Time and place:** 07 July 2023, Vrsac

**Organization:**

- Preschool Teacher Training and Medical College, Vrsac, Serbia
- University “Aurel Vlaicu”, Arad, Romania
- University of Maribor, Pedagogical Faculty, Slovenia
- The International Centre for Innovation in Education (ICIE), Ulm, Germany
- University “Saint Kliment Ohridski”, Pedagogical Faculty, Bitola, Macedonia

**Gathering character:** international scientific conference

Keynote speaker:

**Prof. Dr Milena Letić Lungulov** – Philosophical Faculty, University in Novi Sad

**Key note speech topic:** *Education as a central path of development and giftedness actualization*

**Prof. Dr Sandra Kadum** – Faculty of educational sciences, *Juraj Dobrila* University in Pula, Croatia

**Key note speech topic:** *Teachers of gifted students: understanding, teaching and professional development*

**Maruška Željeznov Seničar, MA** – The International Talent Education Institute (ITEI), Slovenia

**Key note speech topic:** *Tema: A stimulating learning environment for gifted students from the perspective of different learning theories*



### Conference Registration

The registration deadline: 7 June 2023.

A potential presenter at the Round Table can apply with only one paper (author, co-author).

Along with the paper title, please send an abstract of the paper and the key words (up to 5) in B5 format (900 to 1000 characters) in mother tongue, as well as in the English language.

#### The application should contain:

the title, name and surname of the author  
institution and place

e-mail

the title of the paper

paper abstract in mother tongue and in the English language, key words.

Please send your abstracts and papers by e-mail [okruglisto1vs@gmail.com](mailto:okruglisto1vs@gmail.com) or post to the following address:

Preschool Teacher Training College (**for the Round Table**)

Preschool Teacher Training and Medical College, Vrsac, Serbia

Omladinski trg 1

26300 Vršac

Serbia

#### Contact person:

**Snežana Prtljaga**

**e-mail:** [okruglisto1vs@gmail.com](mailto:okruglisto1vs@gmail.com)

**mobile phone:** +381 60 08 36 015

The conference is organized for those invited, while the abstracts and paper will be reviewed by a panel of experts from the country and abroad who are appointed by the Conference Committee and who have exclusive and binding authority to accept or reject any paper. You will be informed whether your paper has been selected until **15 June 2023**. The book of abstracts will be printed and distributed to Conference participants before the conference.

Please send your full paper to [okruglisto1vs@gmail.com](mailto:okruglisto1vs@gmail.com) until 08 September 2023 paying special attention to the following paper requirements:

- **Microsoft Word B5 format**, font **Times New Roman, 10 points** letter size, **single** spacing, **standard** Windows margins.
- The maximum acceptable length of a submitted scientific paper is 15 pages (30 000 signs), a review article is up to 6 pages (10 000 signs) and professional article is up to 3 pages (5000 signs).
- citations should follow the standard (standard APA convention) guidelines.
- Papers should be sent in both mother tongue and English language.

Selected papers will be published in the Book of Collected Articles 29.

The Book of abstracts from the last year 28<sup>th</sup> Round table: The Gifted: Personal and Social Perspective has already been published and is available on the following link:

**<http://www.nauka.uskolavrsac.in.rs/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Zbornik-rezimea-28.pdf>**

For those participants who need accommodation the organizers recommend the following hotels:

Hotel *Srbija*: <http://www.hotelsrbija.rs>;

Hotel *Vila Breg*: <http://www.villabreg.com>;

Motel *Vetrenjača*: <http://www.vetrenjaca.co.rs>;

Tourist organization of Vrsac: <http://www.to.vrsac.com>.

In Vrsac, May 2023.

On behalf of the Conference Organization Committee

Danica Veselinov

### Scientific Committee

Academician Victor Neumann, University De West, Timisoara, Romania  
Academician Grozdanka Gojkov, Serbian Academy of Education  
Academician Miodrag Milin, *Aurel Vlaicu* Arad, Romania  
Academician Marjan Blazic, Faculty of Business and Management Sciences Novo mesto, Slovenia  
Prof Dr Gabriela Kelemen, University "Aurel Vlaicu", Arad, Romania  
Prof. Dr Daniel Mara, Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, "Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu, Romania  
Prof Dr Geraldine Lee-Treeweek, University of Birmingham, UK  
Prof. Dr. Taisir Subhi Yamin  
The International Centre for Innovation in Education (ICIE), Ulm, Germany  
Prof Dr Dalila Lino, Higher School of Education, Institute Polytechnic of Lisbon, Portugal  
Prof Dr Ljupco Kevereski, Pedagogical Faculty, Bitolj, Macedonia  
Prof Dr Petar Stojaković, Philosophical Faculty, Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina  
Prof Dr Aleksandar Stojanovic, University of Belgrade Techer Education Faculty end Preschool Teacher Training and Medical College, Vrsac, Serbia  
Prof Dr Ante Kolak, Philosophical Faculty, Zagreb, Croatia  
Dr Jelena Prtljaga, Preschool Teacher Training and Medical College, Vrsac, Serbia  
Prof Dr M.V. Silantjeva, MGIMO University, Moscow, Russia  
Prof Dr Gojkov Rajic, University of Belgrade Techer Education Faculty end Preschool Teacher Training and Medical College, Vrsac, Serbia  
Dr Danica Veselinov, Preschool Teacher Training and Medical College, Vrsac, Serbia  
Prof. dr Mojca Jurisevic, Pedagogical Faculty, Ljubljana, Slovenia  
Prof Dr Svetlana Kurteš, University of Madeira, Portugal  
Prof Dr Matjaz Duh, Pedagogical Faculty, Maribor, Slovenia  
Prof. Dr. Jelisaveta Šafranj, Faculty of Technical Sciences, Novi Sad, Serbia

### Organizing Committee

Preschool Teacher Training College "Mihailo Palov" Vrsac, Serbia

Dr Danica Veselinov  
Dr Jelena Prtljaga  
Dr Tanja Nedimovic  
Dr Eudjen Cinc  
Dr Ivana Djordjev  
Dr Prtljaga Predrag  
Dr Ljiljana Kelemen  
Dr Snezana Prtljaga  
Mr Biljana Vujasin



## **GIFEDNESS COMPLEXITY IN LEARNING CULTURE**

The aim of the conference is to consider the phenomenon of giftedness from the angle of conceptual, theoretical and practical reaches and limitations of the findings of research on stimulating of giftedness development in the current learning culture circumstances. The complexity of giftedness phenomenon has for some time now been an enigma that attracts attention of researchers, practitioners, as well as educational policy. In the current conceptual and theoretical reflections on the aspects and dimensions of education quality, proclaimed in the Education 2030 Agenda on global developmental aims educational policy pays significant attention to the imperfections and challenges in the harmonization of global and national strategies, aiming at improving the quality of education. As a consequence, viewed from the angle of the Agenda, the concept of education quality has been used as an instrument for creating global EU policy; taking a broader view, the same is used for creating global educational policy. Therefore, education, and especially the phenomenon of education quality has in globalisation currencies been on the very top of the list of interests. The characteristic of these currents and trends is an observation that quality of education has been researched as a gap emerging between the ambitions of global aims and local reality, which has been to a great extent ignored. For all of us who have been dealing with the ways the development of the gifted and their potentials is stimulated, which is relevant for the conference topic and discussion impulses, what was said above is a context where certain events take place on the scene of the gifted education. Thus, an observation is significant that at the world level a significant risk of implementation of the global concept of quality has been re-examined, enrooted in the attributes of global economic architecture, making severe limitations in investments in education quality, indisputably affecting the gifted; thus, the issue of context is relevant for the discussion to be developed during the conference.

The above-mentioned Agenda 2030 has for its task to be a universal agenda for all EU countries, explicitly acknowledging that developmental aims should no longer be seen solely as the aims concerning different countries, but “Universality of country coverage” (UNESCO 2016: 10) assumes that the approaches, concepts and operational tools will reflect diversity and involve experiences and practices from different regions. But the current concept of quality, expressed in Education 2030 Agenda comes from “global players” and international organizations located in the north and supported mostly by the rich countries, which, directly or indirectly, define the agenda. National educational policies, especially in developing countries, have been facing the challenge which could be briefly described in the following way: how to arrange education in the gap between global aims and national practice. In this package and from the angle of the conference topic it would be important to consider the place of the gifted in the mentioned Agenda 2030, having in mind that it significantly influences other closely related issues. And this means thinking about teleological aspect of education quality considered to be always associated with certain value, fulfilment of an aim, while it is important to take into consideration the differences in standpoints within which educational aims are understood as transcendent good, or defined in the group of sociocultural assumptions related to society or individuals or both (Burbules 2004).

Consequently, the context of the conference topic opens up the question of quality of education, which is not universally defined and undisputable concept, but a consensus, a value cluster of criteria decided by those who have the possibility or power to make decisions. Quality of education reflects a paradigm, values and aims of those defining them, raising the question of the method used to define, estimate and evaluate quality; as well as purpose and nature of the concept and what it serves for, what kind of results it should produce or achieve (Popović & Maksimovic 2014).

There is an opinion expressed in literature (Stancic 2012) that the essence of quality of education is best explained by the essence of the very phenomena met in the given context and the substance of connections and relations existing among these phenomena: the essence of education itself and its aims, understanding of knowledge, learning and teaching, acts and relationships between actors in educational process, etc; the problem of unambiguous definition of quality in education is, among other things, the consequence of the complexity of educational process and numerous factors influencing it and its outcomes, coupled with its interactivity, changeability and multiple conditioning (Stancic 2012), which is directly linked with the topic of complexity of giftedness in the time which according to its intentions recognized in the syntagm “learning culture”. Following the prior context, other numerous questions are raised related to teleological orientation and the place of the gifted within it, introduction of standards in the form of universal values, the question of boiling a curriculum down to what is possible to measure, indicators of achievement, test results and marks on exams; at institutional and social level (Stronach 2000), competition at global economic market according to which the score at a test is a purpose of education...

Having outlined the context a question of standards could be raised from the angle of the gifted, or, to put it differently, to what an extent standards are meaningful for the gifted and in which form, is it possible to accept in the situation which we have the statement “when the measure becomes an aim, it ceases to be a good measure (Patern 1997, as cited by Stancic 2012). We could also discuss the example of TIMSS or PISA which inaugurated “education as a global competition” (Stronach 2000, as cited by Stancic 2012), according to which “quality culture” has introduced its “general monetary metrical system” (Stronach 2000, as cited by Stancic 2012); or we could deal with the question: is there any sense to set standards when gifted are in question and what do standards mean and to whom in this case? And this is the arena for philosophy of education and for the issues of the viewpoint on complexity of the gifted from the angle of establishing education according to participatory, active and cooperative methods of teaching and active forms of learning, based on the assumption of theoretical-epistemological ground of change and on the measure according to which the principles are derived from contemporary trends in postmodern didactics (and before it in pedagogical psychology), as certain criteria for practical decisions in the system of upbringing and education. Accordingly, the issue of complexity of the gifted in the new learning culture would also be interesting: to what an extent is “contextual approach” sufficient, which has shifted the focus from the research on the ability to learn and results to the capacities of a learner to regulate one’s own learning and the ability of a teacher to create suitable learning environment; do tolerated attempts, as part of learning, and in what sense contribute to the development of the autonomy of the gifted; to what an extent are didactic views on the models of learning in teaching confronted with constructivism as epistemological frame of didactics and what are the consequences for the curriculum; can Sternberg’s triarchic theory of intelligence be considered sufficient to “cover” psychological substance of metacognition, which could be further considered an important element of metatheoretical ground of a curriculum; does the constructivist definition of learning as a process of personal construction of meaning mean exactly this what has up to now been seen as a solution of a learner, or student; how much do the use of cognitive and other strategies and self-regulation influence academic learning; to what an extent new didactic models, built on constructivism promise more than previous traditions for the understanding of the complexity of the gifted and stimulating their development in the new learning culture; to what an extent can learning of the gifted in all its complexity be limited to a single model; what about statements of the critics emphasizing that knowledge is not acquired through reflexive abstraction, as assumed by Piaget...? What about the standpoint that learning of concepts and procedures does not take place through engraving or embedding new information into prior knowledge, but prior knowledge actually is an obstacle on the cognitive and emotional plan; what about the statements that the previous phase should be deconstruction of a learner’s concept, which does not happen easily, having in mind that the student or the learning finds it difficult to abandon previously validated competence, which is her/his only available means (serving as a frame for interpretation). In spite of the fact that many authors used to believe and many even today see constructivist models as rather promising, there are increasingly more and more criticisms – to what in extent have they from the angle of practitioners been enlightened and how much is the link between cognitive and affective neglected in constructivism...?

A special field of challenge related to the topic of the conference refers to the complexity of the gifted, which has in the last decades been marked by a striving heading towards the search for organization enabling realization of a number of important principles proclaimed in the aims of personalization, holistic approach, self-regulation, learning autonomy. Former challenges have been especially emphasized by the appearance of electronic media. What comes to the scene is the term e-learning, raising questions on the efficacy of learning, followed by stimulating of a learning to strive for academic efficacy, directly linked to designing of hypermedia.

Modernity in which young people learn now is in the sign of digital technology and the Internet, which have in the previous decade caused great changes in communication, so that some already talk about mediatization of society and research the phenomena in this field from different aspects. It is considered that media education is necessary in the field of education. A new discipline has been developed (media pedagogy). Thus, intensive attention has been paid to the media, especially in the time of necessity of organizing online teaching during the pandemics. This state is followed by rather conflicting attitudes and research findings, ranging from optimistic expectations to pessimistic standpoints warning about the latent dangers hiding between their massive application, even though their more intensive implementation in education is associated with the claims on the importance for encouraging motivation in learning and teaching, enabling application of new methods with greater academic efficacy. Findings of the research conducted up to now do not offer sufficient data to empirically confirm previous statements. In this sense Rodek (2011) suggests that there is more sense to accept the findings of the research ascertaining that the mechanism of media action is much more complex than it seems on first sight, and that the significant role of media effect belongs, before all, to individual factors (ability, metacognitive strategy, learning styles, affective styles, personality traits, prior knowledge of an individual, motivational strategies, social norms and values, as well as the context in which learning takes place). The same author contributes great importance to the variables associated with didact-methodological arrangement of learning and teaching. So that in this context, we are more frequently faced with the question: what a learner does with the media, rather than what media do to a learner (Rodek 2011). For this conference, apart from research findings, empirical checks could also be interesting, as

well as the experiences of practitioners and their insights into how much electronic media in the current learning culture significantly contribute to learning efficacy. So, if there is a consensus on the attitude that the media do not influence achievements directly, but indirectly, opening up possibilities of didactic-methodological organization of learning, it would be interesting to hear about the findings and critical views on their assessment from the angle of new approaches to learning and teaching, ranging from orientation towards efficacy of teaching to the process of learning. There are in this sense numerous new forms, procedures and methods of learning and teaching, which, from the angle of stimulating potentials of the gifted require empirical validation, so that the discourses on these issues would significantly contribute to the explanation of conflicting research findings on their efficacy (Schüssler, 2004; Conner & Clawson, 2004; Sembill & Seifried, 2006; Tobias & Duffy, 2009).

Emergence of new culture of learning goes in parallel with the changes at the world social scene. The trends of modern social needs expressed in the syntagm “knowledge society” supported by digital media have conditioned a new culture of learning, based on the constructivist paradigm of learning, further reflected on the organization of learning and teaching, the role of a teacher in these processes, etc. So, viewed from this angle, traditional learning culture has been gradually transformed into a new learning culture characterized by self-determination, self-regulation, self-management. In the broader context, it has been talked about social pluralism (postmodern discourse) and in educational context different models of learning culture have been mentioned: constructivistic, system-constructivistic, action oriented learning model, learner oriented learning model, competence development oriented learning model, etc. It is a fact that with constructivistic approach learning has been put in the centre of education, but it should be also born in mind that the idea of advantages of learning over teaching is not completely new. It can be found in reformistic pedagogues, or even earlier. While the traditional notion of teaching is predominantly oriented towards guided learning realized through teaching, for the new notion of learning, as it has been stated by certain authors, guidance and teaching is relevantly only if it is in the function of independent learning, i.e. “learning of learning”. The new culture of learning does not negate the meaning of teaching, but it emphasizes that in the complex modern life characterised with increasingly greater and faster changes and discontinuity as well as instability, more and more meaning should be attributed to innovative and anticipatory learning based on restructuring, redefining and transformation. As a consequence, anticipation is emphasized as a basic feature of the new culture of learning, as opposed to the notion of adaptation in the classical learning paradigm. It is characteristic for anticipation learning that it uses the techniques of prognosis, simulation models, scenarios and models, i.e. imagination based on facts. A question for discussion on the conference is raised: how much attention is paid to upbringing within this new approach, or: to what an extent there are values within aims in the quality of learning of the gifted; or: how much is knowledge culture oriented towards life, with emphasized existential sense and anticipation, carrying a humanistic notion and wellbeing of the gifted?

Many kinds of learning cultures are associated with the notion of culture of learning and they differ according to type of knowledge, support to learning and styles of knowledge acquisition, while learning processes take place in various media (see more in: Siebert 1999). It should also be born in mind that it is important to refer to the qualification “new” in a reflexive manner (critically), since a question is raised to what an extent it is actually new and how much wellbeing it brings to the gifted, having in mind that many of the ideas emerged from the so called Reform pedagogy, i.e. a whole century ago, and they were for the most part built into the traditional learning culture. So that the significant change shifting the focus in learning process from a teacher to a learner, instead of adaptation emphasizes participation, responsibility of an institution has been transferred to a subject, instead of qualifications competencies are used, instead of external factors self regulation is in focus, with efforts to moving from “teaching society” to meet “learning society” and for the common good and good of the gifted.

Previous statements from the angle of defining the notion of a new learning culture are only one aspect as related to a great number of other understandings of the term, directly reflecting on the learning and teaching of the gifted. Its definition is still open in pedagogical literature, but what can be noticed as basic characteristics is as follows: stress on self-regulation in an arranged system of support and application of a variety of methods, in order to develop potentials of an individual and readiness for learning with expressed autonomy in the learning process, networking of contents and competencies acquisition (see more in: Simons et al 2000). The number of forms of learning in the new learning culture is still not final, and it is important for the topic of the conference to deal with experiential and informal learning and separate (school, faculty) in self-regulated learning of the gifted. There is another question here – the one regarding the attitude towards determination of the aims of institutional learning. In other words, the question is to what an extent can a statement be accepted that the maximum of self-regulation is not always the optimum?

The stress on the need to respect specific individual assumptions and conditions, shaping of specific arrangements for learning and determination of strategies of intervention, being a learner’s starting point in orientation in one’s individual activity, is an assumption implied in enabling of the learning process, but this didactic-methodological orientation does

not do more but merely enables learning. What remains is the question – what about learning expected to take place predominantly as self-organized learning; what if motivation disappears and a negative pattern of attitude towards learning, i.e. negative attributions to failure are adopted...? Where are in these situations borderlines of institutional education of the gifted and what is the role of informal learning and in which form we see them as useful and how they should be organized (realization in the context of free time...). This should be born in mind especially if we take into consideration the statement that in spite of such a great conjecture, fundamental notions of constructivistic learning and teaching have not even nowadays been significantly developed and sharpened. At the same time, relying on track of constructivism, numerous learning concepts have been created in the educational practice of certain countries today: problem-based-learning, inquiry learning, cognitive apprenticeship, anchored instruction, cognitive flexibility theory, knowledge building communities, etc. Although calling upon to constructivism, the mentioned concept differ significantly, if not for other reason then because there are different constructivist ideas expressed in them – systematic-theoretical, cognitive-psychological, developmental-psychological, social-constructivistic. We could also say that there are different aspects of pedagogic arrangement build into them. In the recent disputes on constructivism in learning and teaching the ideas of radical constructivism have been rejected, pointing to unrealistic expectations related to certain forms of learning. Furthermore, there are again discussions on the required share of instruction, i.e. teaching in the process of learning (Tobias & Duffy, 2009). Questions of reaches of constructivism in teaching are important for this conference, as well as the sufficiency of constructivism for meeting the needs of encouragement of giftedness development, significant as a challenge for practical experiences in a discourse, providing grounds for new tests of this metatheoretical concept in the didactics of the gifted.

New learning culture assumes a changed role of a teacher, and it is based on the constructivistic approach to learning, according to which learning cannot be initiated automatically extrinsically, but can only be enabled. This imposes new didactic demands to the teacher and they mostly refer to creating and shaping of adequate learning environment. Thus, his/her role is directed to the help provided for the learning in knowledge construction. In other words, the role is more animating, counselling oriented to complex conditions of learning, not only extrinsic, but also intrinsic, related to the learner him/herself, focused on metacognitive strategies, personality traits, motivation, learning strategies, affective styles, cognitive styles... The question that follows is: what are the experiences of a teacher like regarding their success in encouraging a learner or a student to reach conscious individual reflection of the learning process helping them in the development of self-evaluation of the achieved results and personal responsibility for the achieved results, i.e. for defining their own aims of learning; to what an extent learners or students rule different learning strategies and how much they are aware of the criteria of quality of successful learning; most importantly, how much are they motivated for learning and how to help them if they have not mastered these competencies? To what an extent are the competencies of teachers in line with these expectations and how to find a way to harmonize them? Are critical self-reflection and action research of teachers of any help in all this?

It is thought that the new learning culture is supported by the role of electronic media, which have a significant place in didactic design of learning environment, encouragement of development of metacognitive strategies, nurturing of dialogue of cultures in construction of knowledge, etc. Digital media, as significant modern means, i.e. great technical potential for acquisition of information do not act automatically. In other words, they do not have an automatic influence on efficacy on learning. On the contrary, research findings show that their application is limited and put on a test (Rodek). According to research, designing of hypermedia is observed from the standpoint of types of activities in which students (learners) find adequate sources for academic achievements, related to the issues of attitude towards using of ICT and personality traits, self-confidence, learning styles, metacognitive strategies, affective styles, motivational strategies, etc. In this sense the findings are important considering theoretical and design issues related to the use of hypermedia as learning environment. How many open questions there are in this field can be illustrated by the examples of numerous studies, e.g. Wells & McCrory (2011), pointing to the statements on the efficacy of electronic media for promoting memory, synthesis, integration, preservation of information, i.e. certain forms of academic efficacy, suggesting that even though promises made by the hypermedia seem persuasive, there certain limited evidence on differentiated cognitive influences base on differentiated design. The findings of Dillon & Jobst (2005) show that there are no structural differences in hypermedia which follow more minimal design, analysing discrete points of information, instead of representing highly interrelated and interconnected pieces of information facilitating learning, which otherwise enables using of hypermedia as a system of non-sequential or non-linear text, opening up possibilities for students to freely research and connect information in the ways they find meaningful. The findings also imply that hypermedia, as a teaching means in the new learning culture, consisting of more related texts and other media forms (pictures, video, audio), do not guarantee that the process of searching for the discrete resource will make an individual to mentally build coherent understanding on how the resource are connected with each other and that this process subsequently facilitates certain types of learning. Furthermore, findings are important (Dillon & Jobst, 2005) pointing out that non-linear web presentations (i.e. those allowing looking in more different sequences) can lead to deficient free memory and learning of

factual pieces of information, as compared to traditional linear web design similar to printed materials (Gojkov Rajić, et. al, 2021; Gojkov Rajić & Prtljaga, 2016; Stojanović, et. al, 2021). Findings of another research seem also significant (Stojanović, et. al. 2021) indicating that linear design of sites encourages learning of facts, while non-linear increases the density of knowledge structure. However, the effects of elaboration and selective scanning are mixed.

Another question is raised after the previous illustrations of the reaches in the design of hypermedia: can we agree with the opinion of Foltz and Landauer (1998) that the systems should first be empirically tested in order to see whether they are useful and usable? In accordance with this, the design of hypermedia for stimulating learning of the gifted which, according to research findings (Stojanović, et. al, 2021) have nowadays in the learning culture been imposed as significant means for learning and teaching, is burdened by illisiveness. Additional burden refers to the known facts of idiosyncratic differences in abilities, having in mind that even though the gifted make a special cluster, research have confirmed that they are not a homogenous group. So, the issue of mentorship, as one of the most efficient method in guidance of the gifted towards self-realization requires special ways of getting to know the features which best define essential characteristics of an individual, necessary for contents and didactic procedures, without which cognitive abilities of hypermedia are limited. Nevertheless, integrated learning with the possibilities for networking via the Internet, coupled with the "classical" forms and methods opens up possibilities for successful communication, possibilities for interpersonal forms of learning, personal forms of learning, enabling monitoring, counselling, support, critical reflection and evaluation of shared process of learning along with good mentorship (see more in: Ziegler 2021). What has been said requires new organization of the learning process, based on different standards (the number of classes a teacher should have in teaching, time for mentoring work, for preparation of learners and students for competitions, as good motivational means for advancement of the gifted, adequate evaluation of the work of teachers, support of electronic contents, i.e. mediating help in application of materials for adequate offer to learners or students, etc). And the new organization of teaching can find inspiration in the known experiences of the early reform movements from the beginning of the last century in which special attention is paid to independent individual work of learners (Clapared's "school by measure", Ferrière's "active school", Decroly's "school for education for life", Dalton-plan H. Parkhurst etc.). For those who have not dealt with the history of pedagogy, it should be mentioned that the principles of the working school of manual orientation (Kerschesteiner) and spiritual (Gaudig), focused on independent critical thinking as an aim of upbringing were oriented towards encouragement of the spiritual development of learner's personality, and the basic means of upbringing and education was independent work, according to which learning was not a process of passive knowledge acquisition, but a conscious process of active acquisition, nowadays known as self-regulation.

Previous statements point to the need for deeper consideration of the complexity of giftedness in learning culture, which itself has not reached the level which could be suitable for the challenges of the complexity of the gifted and expectations the modern world has from their abilities. Digital media offer possibilities and space which can significantly determine the whole communication and interaction of an individual, but it will not be possible to consider the Internet in this new learning culture as offering only cooperation, communication etc, but it will have to reach the level of usage in the sense of broadened possibility for fulfilment of participation, cooperation, commenting, social knowledge construction, and thus self-articulation of an individual through learning. There are possibilities for the role of media in the new learning cultures to have broader usage power in which main characteristic can be interaction for cooperation between a learner and a mentor, among learners and in a broader environment, but only with the fulfilment of the basic principle for them to have great motivational abilities. And in all this there will be space for traditional forms of learning, techniques and media of learning, and they will be used with right in the future – books, textbooks, magazines, journals and other textual materials, learners will have to read, knowledge will be strengthened by repetition and skills will be developed through exercises and rehearsals. And, as suggested by Rodek (2007) we are witnesses that not all new forms of learning are completely new. What is new is the arrangement within which they are implemented and combinations in which they appear. This means that the new learning culture still uses and relies on traditional forms of learning, but what is in the centre of attention are those forms of learning providing participation and activity of the learning subject. The shift from traditional to the new learning culture encourages those who work on the incitement of the gifted to reach higher achievements, advocating for more participation in the choice of aims, contents and methods of learning and cooperation with others. The question remains for the discussion on the conference: to what an extent will reality with standards and educational policy be able to go in hand with this vision, having in mind that there is an impression that it can be concluded now that the application of digital media, as it was already realized, does not itself lead to a better outcomes in education. It is only a little open window, created space or auxiliary means for the development of new learning culture. Let us hope that these promising steps will be luckier than those from the beginning of the last century, on whose ideas we have stationed ourselves.

Another issue for discussion could also be: what concretely should be done for better didactic and pedagogically examined application of digital media in education, referring to reflections on the question of the relation between the



didactics of mediation and teaching, oriented to a teacher, according to didactics of enabling and learning, oriented to a learner, or a student, along with the awareness of the steps or the context which can neglect all this. The complexity of the topic, apart from the mentioned questions, offers a lot of space for raising new questions and getting to new ideas for new angles of consideration. Those are all very welcome.

March, 2023.

*Grezdanka Gajkov*

