Metodika 15 (2008), 306-320
Received: 12.10.2007

EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE AND THE NATIONAL CURRICULUM FOR COMPULSORY EDUCATION IN CROATIA

(Introduction to discussion of research results)

Branislava Baranović

Institute for Social Research, Zagreb

Summary *– The article is an introductory summary of the thematic volume that presents the results of the comparative analysis of the national framework curricula of 11 European countries (a sample of old and new EU members) and Croatia conducted between 2002 and 2005. The results of the analysis show significant conceptual, structural and content-oriented differences between teaching programmes in Croatia and the national curricula of the countries in the sample. Although there are significant differences between the national curricula of the countries in the sample, unlike Croatia, all the countries have outcome based national curricula (documents focused on educational outcomes, or operationally formulated goals of education). Furthermore, in contrast to the Croatian case where the teaching programmes are centralised and insufficiently internally coherent (i.e. with insufficient interconnections between the individual subject programmes), the national curricula of the countries in the sample exhibit higher degree of integration. Most countries have a national curricular framework that approaches the national curriculum as a unified whole, widely defined curricular areas whose content is interlinked through common educational outcomes and explicitly defined cross-curricular topics. The curricula of European countries also develop students' competences that are absent from the Croatian teaching programmes: such as entrepreneurship, and information-communication competence as a cross-curricular theme. Finally, the development of the national curricula in European countries charts a course of development of key competences the students need in order to live in the knowledge society. They are currently working on integrating the key competences for knowledge society (the concept of lifelong learning) defined on the pan-European level through the European competence framework.*

Key words*: European countries, Croatia, comparative analysis, knowledge society, national curricula, compulsory education, key competences*

Since the 1920s, when the first scientific analyses of the school curricula appeared in the US, to present day, the development of the curriculum and its interpretation have gone through several phases:

1. initial and narrow definition of the curriculum as the syllabus oriented towards programmatic planning of educational content
2. widening of the concept to include planned and un-planned processes of teaching and learning conducted or organised by the school.
3. accentuating the effects or outcomes of the implementation of the planned curriculum (outcome oriented curriculum).

(Wiles and Bondi, 1998: 10-12)

Shifting the focus of the definition and development of curriculum onto outcomes is of a recent origin. In the US it first appears in the early 1960s and continues under different variations to today, whilst in Europe, its development begins at the end of the 1980s, intensifies throughout the 1990s to achieve a dissemination to most European countries in the early 2000s (old and new EU members). The exception are mainly the countries of former Yugoslavia excluding Slovenia, and Albania, which initiated the first changes in the 2000s. Croatia falls into this group of countries as well.

The advances in theory, including the very conceptualisation of the curriculum, are not based solely on the logic of theoretical and scientific analyses, but also on curricular practice and its changes. These express the developmental complexities and diversification of the curriculum field that resulted from different factors such as: technological, economic, cultural demographic and general social factors. The analyses show that the formation of the outcome oriented curriculum in the European countries (the English speaking countries) is tied to the development of the knowledge based economy and spread of the influences of globalisation processes into social life (Hargreaves, 2003; Ball, 2007; Haralambos, 2002). From the perspective of education a significant influence comes from economic stagnation and trends in national politics to reduce the public funds and strengthen the market principles in order to create a more favourable social context for the development of productive resources for the upcoming knowledge society, as well as to strengthen the economic competitiveness of the individual countries in the globalised market. In the field of education these processes have introduced a requirement for a more efficient educational system able to produce better quality education whilst reducing input costs. This is the education that is expected to provide for novel educational needs of the societies and individuals. Although the requirements named had multiple repercussions on the changes in education, it is important to name here that they have led to the redefinition of goals and quality of education and the infusion of the market principles into educational practice.

In terms of the quality of education one of the foundational questions had been the content of basic competences that education had to provide for all children in order for them to lead a successful life in the new social context built on

continued innovation and application of knowledge (primarily the knowledge in science and technology) and strong global competition. In summation, the answer was sought as to what kind of education the children should have in order to successfully deal with the continued changes in working and living environments further characterised by increasing competitiveness. The task of defining the new quality of education, or education for new competences, also implied answering the question how to teach the new competences, with special emphasis on the methods of teaching and the role of the teachers in the educational process (making students' interests and achievements central, and reducing the role of the teacher to that of the facilitator), as well as the organisation of work and life in schools (transformation of schools into learning communities). (Letschert, 2004; Hargreaves, 2003).

In short, the issue of defining the new quality of education primarily accentuated the discussion of the quality of educational attainment of students (acquisition of competences, i. e. performances of students upon completion of compulsory education), the role and quality of the work of teachers and the quality of the functioning of schools as educational institutions.

On the other hand, the provision of efficacy of the schools' operations examined the methods of establishing whether the set of educational goals had been achieved, or how to "measure" the quality of schooling and its outcomes, i.e. the educational attainment of the students. It is worth mentioning that the request for a more efficient system of public education led to the introduction of market principles into the field of education that were implemented through various mechanisms. Alongside the requests for measurement of the quality of school operations and their products or the educational attainment of the students (e.g. A-level in England or state matura at the end of compulsory education in Slovenia (Tavčar Krajnc, 2006) it also included the following: encouraging parents to freely choose the school for their children, linking financing of the schools to the number of enrolled students, participation of the private sector in the management of educational institutions (companies increasingly take on the management of schools, provide the required human resources, production and procurement of the teaching materials etc.), commercialisation of education itself (universities and schools increasingly sell their services to other schools, including the schools in other countries etc.). (Hargreaves, 2003; Ball, 2007).

Whilst avoiding a deeper analysis[1], the above phenomena are named for the role they played in marking the directions of development which strongly influenced the changes in education. They also placed in the spotlight the problem of redefinition of the curricular policy and reform of curricular systems, especially in the area of compulsory education which is the foundation of all subsequent

1 Positive and negative aspects of development of contemporary curriculum are discussed in detail in "Knowledge Society and National Curriculum for Compulsory Education" (Baranović, 2006a: 15-43).

education, and as such is of special importance in the knowledge society that is based on the continuous innovation of knowledge, and accordingly, the need for lifelong learning.

The EU countries, and developed countries in general, assign great importance to education as one of the means of development of human capital and strengthening of the social cohesion, and thus individual countries' competitiveness that is becoming increasingly important in the progression of the processes of globalisation. It is thus not surprising that the definition and appropriation of key competences, which play the crucial role in the development of knowledge economy, have been allocated prime strategic importance. Their definition and development became one of the common goals of development of education in the European countries. The importance of education and development of new competences through education in the EU is illustrated through the fact that they were debated not only in the bodies adjacent to the European Commission, but also in those of the European Parliament. The resulting Recommendations of the European Parliament and the Council on key competences for lifelong learning provide a European reference framework that defines eight key competence areas that need to be covered in the education of every citizen. Having been developed through many years in special workgroups of the European Commission, the definition of key competences is in the said document finalised to consist of: 1) Communication in the mother tongue; 2) Communication in foreign languages; 3) Mathematical competence and basic competences in science and technology; 4) Digital competence; 5) Learning to learn; 6) Social and civic competences; 7) Sense of initiative and entrepreneurship; and 8) Cultural awareness and expression. The document stresses that the European Competence Framework represents the means of facilitation of national and European policies and efforts to accomplish commonly agreed goals, including the field of curriculum. (Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on key competences for lifelong learning).

In the course of time, given that Croatia is a future member of the EU, as the strategic decisions and improvements in the field of education become an important reference frame for definition of educational policies, changes in educational systems and national curricula in the European countries gain increasing theoretical and practical importance in Croatia.

In such context, the Institute for Social Research's Centre for Educational Research and Development initiated and implemented (from 2002 to 2005) the research project "Evaluation of Syllabi and development of Curricular Model for Compulsory Education in the Republic of Croatia". The project consisted of two parts. In the first, an empirical research (on a sample of 120 schools, which makes up 15% of all schools in Croatia) of the attitudes of teachers, students and headteachers towards teaching programmes (syllabi), their implementation and possible alterations was conducted. The empirical research aimed to provide an

insight into the characteristics of the teaching programmes (syllabi) in Croatia. The results of the research are published in *National Curriculum for Compulsory Education in Croatia: different perspectives* (Baranović, 2006a). The second part of the research project was focused on the comparative analysis of national framework curricula for compulsory education in European countries, analysing their conception, structure and content.[2] The project was constructed in this way so as to yield indicators that could contribute to the design and development of the national curriculum for compulsory education in Croatia suitable for the Croatian educational and social context, but ensure its alignment with the developmental trends in Europe. The comparative analysis was conducted on the sample of 11 European countries ('old' EU members and transitional countries): Sweden, Finland, Norway, Scotland, Ireland, England, Netherlands, Germany – Nordrhein Westfalen (NRW), Austria, Hungary and Slovenia. The research matrix analysed the following dimensions of the national curricula:

- ***Aims and outcomes*** (general aims, goals of curricular areas and subjects, their operationalisation in the expected outcomes)
- ***Description or definition of a subject*** (significance of the subject, role of the subject in education as whole, reasons for teaching the given subject)
- ***Curricular organisation of the subject*** (separate subject or not, part of a larger integrated subject area, cross-curricular theme, etc.)
- ***Curricular areas*** (what curricular areas there are, what is the structure of the curricular areas, etc.)
- ***Grades, educational cycles or stages*** of compulsory education (what subjects/modules/cross-curricular topics are taught and to what extent across cycles and classes, etc.)
- ***Status of the subject or area in the curriculum*** (compulsory, optional, etc.)
- ***Number of lessons per week and academic year*** prescribed for the teaching of the subject, etc.
- ***Teaching guidelines***
- ***Conditions of implementation of the curriculum*** (additional explanations of special circumstances of implementation of the curriculum, etc.)
- ***Evaluation*** (suggestions for forms of evaluations of students' achievement, certification upon completion of educational stage, etc.)

2 The comparative analysis was conducted by the following team: Dr Baranislava Baranovic (team leader), Prof. Ante Bežen, Prof. Zoran Curić with assistants, Prof. Aleksandra Čižmešija, Mladen Domazet, Petra Hoblaj, Prof. Vjeran Katunarić, Snježana Koren B.A., Prof. Ankica Marinović Bobinac, Dr Iris Marušić, Prof. Jelena Mihaljević Djigunović, Magdalena Najbar-Agičić B.A., Saša Puzić M.A., Prof. Pavel Rojko, Prof. Vera Turković, Prof. Aleksandar Štulhofer.

The curricular documents have been collected throughout the period of 2004-2005. The analysed curricula in the sample cover both stages of compulsory education: primary education and lower secondary education (ISCED1 and ISCED2). Although the national curricula are constantly evaluated and updated, all the documents analysed in the project are still in force. In the Croatian case the syllabi resulting from the HNOS project of 2006 were analysed.

The analysis uncovered significant conceptual, structural differences, as well as differences in subject content, between the Croatian teaching programmes (including those of 2006) and the national curricula of the analysed countries. Some of them can be summarised here. These are primarily differences in the length and structure of primary and compulsory education, where primary education is defined in accordance with the ISCED (International Standard Classification of Education), not only with the designators used in individual countries.

Table 1: Duration of primary and compulsory education in analysed European countries and Croatia

Country	Duration of primary education	Duration of compulsory education
Finland	6	9
Norway	7	10
Sweden	6	9
England	6	11
Ireland*	8	10
Scotland	7	11
Netherelands**	8	12
Germany (NRW)	4	9/10
Austria***	4	9
Hungary	4	12
Slovenia	6	9
Croatia	4	8

Source: Key data on Education in Europe 2005, Luxemburg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2005: 45-48

Remarks:

* – ***Ireland*** includes the final two years of preschool (4 to 6 years of age) into primary education (ISCED 1) raising the duration of primary education to 8 years (4 to 12 years of age). However, according to the law compulsory education starts from 6 years of age, not 4. This means that *compulsory* primary education lasts for 6, not 8 years. Compulsory education, on the whole (primary and lower secondary), takes 10 years, from 6 to 16 years of age. The national curriculum analysed covers the whole length of compulsory education.

** – ***Netherlands*** – although more than 90% of children start schooling at the age of 4, the legal age to enter compulsory education is 5. Legally, compulsory education lasts till the 17th year of age, i.e. children are free to leave school having reached the age of 16. Of the total 12 years of compulsory education, *compulsory* primary education takes 7 years, i.e. from the age 5 to 12.

For the majority of children who start schooling at the age of 4, primary education takes 8 years (from 4 to 12 years of age). The curricula for 8-year primary and general lower secondary education were analysed.

*** – ***In Austria***, those students who choose not to pursue further education, having completed 4 years of primary and 4 years of lower secondary education, are obliged to complete a one-year course in the Polytechnische Schule, i.e. a ninth grade of compulsory education. Given that students in Austria undergo an external differentiation, after primary education, into different types of lower secondary schools, curricula for only one type of school were analysed: the Allgemeine höhere Schule. That is, the curricula for four-year primary and four-year lower secondary AHS education were analysed.

As is evident from Table 1, compulsory education in the European countries analysed takes 9 to 12 years, and is divided into primary and lower secondary education. Unlike the European countries analysed, Croatia has an 8-year compulsory education that does not contain lower secondary education, but lower primary (or just primary by ISCED) and higher primary education. It differs in the duration of primary education, which in Croatia lasts for 4 years, whilst in most other countries it takes 6 or more. Methodologically, it is also important to note that the organisational structure of the curriculum can, but needn't, coincide with the division of compulsory education into primary and lower secondary. Ireland and the Netherlands are examples of countries where the national curricula follow the organisation of the system through primary and lower secondary education. In other countries the curricula can be presented through educational cycles, as is the case in England where the curriculum follows the structure of 4 key educational stages (grades 1-2, 3-6, 7-9, and 10-11). The first two key stages, the first 6 grades, make up the primary education. Finnish curriculum is structured through clusters of 'age-groups'/grades depending on the duration of implementation of individual subjects (e.g. the curricular components for mother-tongue are defined for the grade clusters 1-2, 3-5 and 6-9). Austria and Hungary exemplify the countries whose national curricula are structured according to individual grades for all school subjects.

In the case of national curricula, the analysis illustrates the differences, not only between Croatia and the countries in the sample, but also between the countries within the sample. Nonetheless, in all European countries there is a national framework curriculum document that, in more or less detail, defines the basic elements of what will be taught and what should be learnt through compulsory education. In other words, a document that constitutes the national common core of compulsory education. Depending on the elements they are composed of, as well as the form of their presentation, the analysed curricula can be shown to fall into several groups.

The first group is comprised of Nordic countries in the sample (Finland, Norway and Sweden), countries which have the national framework curricula with a general determination of the basic curricular components, including the basic characterisation of the subjects and cross-curricular areas (e.g. the goals of compulsory education, values it is based on, aims of the subjects, a short description of subjects, standards of students' achievement at various stages of compul-

sory education et al.). There are, however differences between these national curricula in terms of content and organisational structure of the components. So, for example, the Finnish curriculum is structured of goals and foundational content of the subjects in individual clusters of grades (1-2, 3-5, 6-9). On top of those, the standards of students' achievement at the end of the second and fifth grade are listed for each subject, as well as the standards for final evaluation after eighth grade. In the final, ninth, grade external evaluation is conducted on a sample of schools. The document also provides a framework timetable for several years (the clusters above) by individual subjects or groups of subjects (subject areas).

Unlike the Finnish, the Swedish curriculum lists two additional types of aims, on top of the general goals and values that the compulsory education is based on. These are: 1. the aims that streamline the schools' operations towards achieving the goals of compulsory education ("the goals to strive towards"), and 2. the aims that define the minimal expected outcomes of students' education upon completion of the compulsory segment expressed as the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes the students are expected to have developed ("goals to be attained") (Curriculum for the Compulsoy School System, the Preschool Class and the Leisure-Time Centre Lpo 94. 2006:8) The national curriculum defines the minimal number of lessons throughout (nine years of) compulsory education for each individual subject. Alongside the framework curriculum document there are also subject curricula (or syllabi) which specify and operationalise the basic elements of the national curriculum framework. The Norwegian national curriculum also gives a summary description of individual subjects and curricular areas, following the common prescriptions relevant to all subjects and curricular areas, such as goals and values of the compulsory education and common structural elements of individual subjects. In describing individual subjects and curricular areas, the national curriculum defines overall goals of the subject for the whole of compulsory education and the goals by individual educational cycles (grades 1-4, 5-7, 8-10) expressed in terms of outcomes. Like the Swedish curriculum, the Norwegian national curriculum sets the minimal timetable for individual subjects and curricular areas, where it refers to individual educational cycles and the overall compulsory education.

The second group of countries consists of two British educational systems: English and Scottish, and that of the Republic of Ireland. The English national curriculum stands out in this group. That is, Scotland and Ireland, unlike England, have national framework curricula that in general terms determine the basic curricular components. It is characteristic of these curricula that they do not describe the subjects, but curricular areas and cross-curricular themes, including the presentation of their goals and expected outcomes in terms of knowledge, skills and attitudes that students have to acquire during compulsory education. In line with this integrated approach to topics and broad conceptualisation of the contents of education, the Scottish and Irish national curricula set out the timetable by curricular areas. Or, more precisely, the Scottish curriculum sets the minimal percentage

of the total time in primary and lower secondary education for each curricular area. The Irish curriculum recommends the minimal weekly timetable for individual curricular areas and subjects.

Unlike those, the English national curriculum, alongside the summary of common curricular elements, sets much greater emphasis on the description of individual subjects with explicit charting of expected educational outcomes (expressed in 8 standard levels with additional level for exceptional performance) by cycles or stages. The English national curriculum, alongside the named general, common determinants, contains the 4 key stages of teaching and evaluation of students' achievements. Thus the equivalent of subject syllabi are organised through the 4 stages and each contains the description of what the students should learn (the subject content) and the skills and cognitive achievements that are expected of them upon completion of every stage. The students' achievements are tested (external evaluation) upon completion of every stage, and the national examination is administered upon completion of all 4 key stages. The national curriculum sets no timetable, but through the strategies for improvement of literacy and numeracy the government recommends the minimum of three lessons a week in English language and mathematics respectively, in the first and second key stage.

The third group of countries consists of those with subject-based national curriculum (Austria, Slovenia, Hungary), but an accent on definition of educational outcomes and weekly timetable for each subject. Hungary stands out in this group, as a country that has had frequent alterations of the national curriculum (unlike the other two). There are currently two valid curricular documents. The National Core Curriculum that defines the expected outcomes in 10 cultural domains or areas through cycles that end in fourth, sixth and eighth grade, as well as the cross-curricular areas. Since 2000 this document represents the basic, foundational curricular document. In the 2003/4 version of the same document, competences associated with each of the cultural domains are organised through the following cycles/stages of compulsory education: grades 1-4, 5-6, 7-8, and 9-12. The other document, *Framework Curricula*, on top of other information contains a detailed description of subject content by grades (from 1 to 8), including the minimum weekly timetable. Curricular frameworks are intended to help schools and teachers in implementing the national curriculum (the core), i.e. to assist them in developing their individual school curricula. The analyses indicate that the framework curricula still carry more weight in practice than the national core curriculum (Kuiper et al., 2005: 66-67). The comparative analysis reported here used the framework curricula.

The fourth group consists of Netherlands and Germany whose curricula are highly specific. On a national level, Netherlands has curricular frameworks for primary and lower secondary education (i.e. basic secondary education) expressed solely through expected outcomes (attainment targets) in subject areas and cross-curricular themes. The list of the attainment targets is accompanied by an out-

line of curricular areas and cross-curricular themes. The lower secondary education curriculum in each curricular area, subject, cross-curricular theme specifies those attainment targets that are a part of a general achievement that rests on all areas, subjects and cross-curricular topics. It also suggests the timetable, but it is not mandatory. Analyses of the Dutch curriculum, which, just as the English, puts a strong emphasis on the expected outcomes, indicates a difference of approach where the Dutch version is less detailed and prescriptive (leaving greater freedom to schools) and implemented in an educational context that is to a lesser extent defined by the culture of national examination and external control (Kuiper et al., 2005: 71-73).

Germany is undergoing a process of modification of the national curriculum. Educational standards for compulsory education are defined at the federal level, and then further developed in each individual federal unit where they serve as a base for the development of new curricular documents (the documents from the federal state of Nordrhein-Westfalen were used in the analysis). The new national curricula are also defined through the students' expected outcomes and standards, and are an example of transition from a highly centralised system to increased school autonomy.

The differences in the conceptualisation and structure of the national curricula can in part be attributed to the differences in educational tradition and context of the individual countries in the sample. The Nordic countries, United Kingdom and Netherlands are countries with a longstanding tradition of decentralised educational and curricular systems, i.e. a tradition of strong autonomy of school in creation and implementation of curricular policies. Some of them, on the other hand, have shown a tendency (England during 1990s, Finland and Sweden during 2000s) towards centralisation of the national curriculum for compulsory education.[3] The case of Finland and Sweden shows that centralisation of curricular policy today comes not only in the form of greater government control over the curriculum, through the definition of goals/outcomes and content of education (*What* ought to be learnt and known), but also through increasing government intervention into *how* teaching and learning should progress. (Kuiper et al.: 2005: 74). Even with such developmental trends, it has to be stressed that from the Croatian perspective the national curricula of the said countries are highly decentralised.

3 During 60s and 70s England had a highly decentralised school system. State-wide national curriculum that defines what will be taught in all the schools in the country and what the expected learning outcomes will be was introduced in 1989. In the context of strong external evaluation of learning outcomes (national testing at the end of every educational cycle) and the guidelines for implementation of the curriculum this was a great turn towards centralisation of the curricular policy in England. (Haralambos, 2003; Hargreaves, 2003). Following the criticism and evaluation of the curriculum, the latest document, from 2000, is less prescriptive compared to those from the 90s, but is still much more centralised than the documents preceding the 'great turn'. Sweden and Finland have had decentralised curricular policy roughly since 1960s, or 70s, but have recently shown signs of centralisation. (Kuiper et al., 2005: 57-77).

The analysis indicates that majority of European countries is developing curricular documents that provide for integration and connection of the curricular components, at the teaching programme level, into a coherent and integrated system. Unlike Croatia, with its fragmented curriculum with insufficient coordination between subjects (Baranović, 2006a), most of the analysed countries have national curricular frameworks as foundational documents that provide a framework definition of basic curricular components (goals and outcomes, curricular areas and subjects, minimum timetable provision, and the like). This is an important difference to note, as the national framework curriculum, precisely because it sets off from the holistic concept of the curriculum, has a clear vision of the national curriculum as a rounded whole. It perceives the components of the curricular system in their interdependence and thus enables their coordination and integration into a coherent whole. As a foundational curricular document, the national curriculum framework provides the bedrock for creation of other curricular documents such as the subject curricula, guidelines for implementation of the national curricular documents, development of textbooks and other teaching aides. It also serves as the foundation for construction of the school curricula which align the national curriculum policy (operationalised through the national curriculum) with the profiles of individual schools and the needs of the local communities which the schools operate in.

The important difference from the teaching programmes in Croatia is in the greater focus in the national curricula of European countries on the educational outcomes, defined at various levels: for compulsory education as a whole, cycles, or (in some countries) school grades (e.g. Austria, Hungary, and Slovenia). In some curricula educational outcomes or students' attainments are also defined through curricular areas, cross-curricular topics and subjects. It is interesting that the analysed national curricula plan the development of students' competences in the fields not even present in the Croatian teaching programmes, such as entrepreneurship, cross-curricular use of information-communication technology, etc.[4] Furthermore, unlike Croatia, the curricula of most of the countries analysed provide a higher degree of integration of curricular content, which is evident in the development of the national curricular frameworks, introduction of wider curricular areas whose content is connected through common outcomes, and the explicit definition of cross-curricular topics and their educational outcomes.

Although the national curricula of European countries differ in the degree of centralisation, prescriptiveness, and in the competences they purport to develop, most countries focus on the national curricula that plan the educational outcomes ('outcome based curricula'). These presuppose a great autonomy for schools to realize the goals and outcomes of education. The success in achieving

4 For more on the similarities and differences in the structure of the national curricula of the said countries cf. Baranović (2006b: 181-201).

these set goals is measured through internal, but also external evaluation (e.g. external evaluation through national examination).

Only some characteristics of the national curricula in the European countries analysed are summarily presented above, with accent on elements relevant for the curricular approach and those that pose a stark contrast to the current teaching programmes (syllabi) mandatory in Croatia. A more detailed presentation of the said curricula by individual curricular areas is presented in the successive articles. This volume presents the areas of natural science, geography, history, intercultural education, citizenship education and religious education. The analysis of the presentation of other curricular areas and subjects will be presented in the subsequent volume. It is important to note, though, that all the articles present the result of an analysis conducted on the programme level of the foundational curricular documents mandated by the government in the given countries. There are, of course, numerous other curricular documents, such as the detailed subject documents and school curricula that were not the object of analysis in this project. The analysis therefore presents a partial insight into the curricular documents. A thorough inspection at the level of teaching programme would require an analysis of other legislating and guiding documents that regulate the curricular system and operationalise the curricular policy (e.g. different directives for implementation of the national curricula, special documents and those that regulate the timetable allocation, laws and government acts that constrain different aspects of compulsory education etc.). Of course, all document analyses are insufficient for a thoroughgoing conclusion concerning the characteristics of the curricular system of a given country. A meticulous grasp requires the analysis of the remaining two levels of the curricular system: 'the implemented curriculum', and 'the attained curriculum'.[5] On the whole, though, despite its cognitive limits and insufficiencies, analysis of this kind can provide valuable insights for practicalities of development of the national curriculum in Croatia, and further analyses of the national curricula in European countries.

5 Some of the results of the analysis of the national curricula had been presented at the conference held on 1st December 2006, organised by the Institute for Social Research's Centre for Educational Research and Development, in collaboration with the Faculties of Teacher Education, and of Social Science and Humanities of the University of Zagreb, the Mathematics and Geography departments of the Faculty of Science of Zagreb University.

LITERATURE:

- Ball, S. J. (2007) *Education plc – Understanding private sector participation in public sector education.* London and New York: Routledge
- Baranović, B. (2006a) Društvo znanja i nacionalni kurikulum. [Knowledge Society and the National Curriculum] In: Baranović, B. (ed.) *Nacionalni kurikulum za obvezno obrazovanje u Hrvatskoj: različite perspektive* [*National Curriculum for Compulsory Education in Croatia: various perspectives*]. Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja. [Institute for Social Research]
- Baranović, B. (2006b) Nacionalni kurikulum u europskim zemljama i Hrvatskoj: komparativan prikaz [National Curriculum in European Countries and Croatia: comparative overview]. *Sociologija sela*, [Rural Sociology] 44 (2/3):181-200.
- Haralambos, M. & Holborn, M. (2002). *Sociologija: Teme i perspektive*. [Sociology: Themes and Perspectives] Zagreb: Golden marketing.
- Hargreaves, A. (2003)*Teaching in the Knowledge Society*. New York: Teachers College Columbia University.
- Letschert, J. (ed.) (2004). *The integrated person. How curriculum development relates to new competencies*. Enschede: CIDREE.
- Kuiper, W., van den Akker, J., Hooghoff, H., Letschert, J. (2005) Curriculum policy and school practice in a European comparative perspective. U: Letschert, J. (ed.) *Curriculum development re-invented*. Enschede: SLO.
- Tavčar Krajnc, M. (2006) External and internal assessment in the final examination in secondary schools in Slovenia, International studies in sociology of education. 16 (2): 121-137.
- Wiles, J., Bondi, J. (1998) *Curriculum Development. A Guide to Practice.* London: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- European Commission, *Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on key competences for lifelong learning*, 2006/962/EC.
- *Key data on Education in Europe 2005*. Luxemburg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- The Netherlands, Ministry of Education, Culture and Science
  An English version of attainment targets primary education:
  www.minocw.nl/english/education/doc/Kerndoelen_basisonderwijs_Engels.doc, February, 2005.
  Attainment targets basic secondary education:
  www.minocw.nl/english/education/pdf/kerndoelenVO_engels.pdf, February, 2005.
- National Council for Curriculum and Assessment, The Republic of Ireland
  Primary School Curriculum:
  h ttp://www.curriculumonline.ie/index.asp?locID=2&docID=-1, February, 2005.
  Junior Cycle Curriculum:
  http://www.curriculumonline.ie/index.asp?locID=917&docID=-1, February, 2005.

- *Curriculum for the Compulsoy School System, the Preschool Class and the Leisure-Time Centre* Lpo 94. National Agency for Education. http://www. fritzes.se, February, 2005.
- *Framework Curricula for Primary education* (2000) Dinasztia Publishing Company, Budapest.
  Role of the National Core Curriculum in the regulation of the content of public education. Ministry of Education and Culture, Budapest, http://www.okm.gov.hu/, studeni, 2007.
- Ministerium fuer Schule, Jugend und Kinder des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (2003) *Richtlinien und Lehrplaene zur Erprobung fuer die Grundschule in Nordrhein-Westfalen. Frechen*: Ritterbach Verlag.
- Ministerium fuer Schule, Jugend und Kinder des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (2004) *Kernlehrplan fuer das Gymnasium – Sekundarstufe I in Nordrhein-Westfalen, Englisch*. Frechen: Ritterbach Verlag.
- Ministerium fuer Schule, Jugend und Kinder des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (2004) *Kernlehrplan fuer die Hauptschule – Sekundarstufe I in Nordrhein-Westfalen, Englisch*. Frechen: Ritterbach Verlag.
- Ministerium fuer Schule, Jugend und Kinder des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (2004) *Kernlehrplan fuer das Gymnasium – Sekundarstufe I in Nordrhein-Westfalen, Mathematik*. Frechen: Ritterbach Verlag.
- Ministerium fuer Schule, Jugend und Kinder des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (2004) *Kernlehrplan fuer die Hauptschule – Sekundarstufe I in Nordrhein-Westfalen, Mathematik*. Frechen: Ritterbach Verlag.
- Ministerium fuer Schule, Jugend und Kinder des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (2004) *Kernlehrplan fuer das Gymnasium – Sekundarstufe I in Nordrhein-Westfalen, Deutsch*. Frechen: Ritterbach Verlag.
- Ministerium fuer Schule, Jugend und Kinder des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (2004) *Kernlehrplan fuer die Hauptschule – Sekundarstufe I in Nordrhein-Westfalen, Deutsch*. Frechen: Ritterbach Verlag.
- *Lehrplan der Volksschule* (2001) Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur, Wien.
- *Lehrplan AHS*, Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur, (BGB1. II Nr. 133/2000).
- *Nastavni plan i program za osnovnu školu* [Teaching Programmes for Compulsory Education] (2006): Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i športa, [Ministry of Science, Education and Sport] Zagreb.
- *National Core Curriculum for Basic Education*. (2004): Finnish National Board, Helsinki.
- Sekretariat der Staendigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Laender in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (2004) *Bildungsstandards im Fach Physik fuer den Mittleren Schulabschluss*. Bonn.
- Sekretariat der Staendigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Laender in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (2004) *Bildungsstandards im Fach Chemie fuer den Mittleren Schulabschluss*. Bonn.

- Sekretariat der Staendigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Laender in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (2004) *Bildungsstandards im Fach Biologie fuer den Mittleren Schulabschluss*. Bonn.
- *The Curriculum for the 10-year compulsory school in Norway*. (1999) The Royal Ministry of Education, Research and Church Affairs.
- The National Curriculum, Key stages 1-3, *National curriculum online.* www.nc.uk.net, February, 2005.

  The National Curriculum, Key stages 3 and 4, *National curriculum online.* www.nc.uk.net, February, 2005.
- *The structure and Balance of the Curriculum. 5-14 Guidelines*. (2000) Learning and Teaching Scotland, Glasgow.
- *Veljavni učni načrti*, [Current Teaching Programmes] Zavod RS za šolstvo, [National Education Institute, Republic of Slovenia]. http://www.mss.gov.si/si/delovna_podrocja/osnovnosolsko_izobrazevanje/program_devetletne_osnovne_sole/obvezni_predmeti_v_devetletni_osnovni_soli/**,** February, 2005.

Metodika 15
Vol. 8, br. 2, 2007, str. 321-343
Izvorni znanstveni rad
Primljeno: 14.10.2007.

EUROPSKA ISKUSTVA I KURIKULUM POVIJESTI U OBVEZNOM OBRAZOVANJU

Snježana Koren
Magdalena Najbar-Agičić

Filozofski fakultet Zagreb, Sveučilište u Zagrebu

Sažetak *– Autorice donose rezultate komparativne analize kurikuluma povijesti nekoliko europskih zemalja: Engleske, Škotske, Irske, Norveške, Švedske, Finske, Njemačke, Nizozemske, Austrije, Mađarske i Slovenije. U istraživanju se nastojalo prepoznati mjesto koje povijest kao školski predmet zauzima u obveznom obrazovanju tih zemalja. Promatra se također način na koji se u tim zemljama definiraju važni elementi poput svrhe i ciljeva nastave povijesti i očekivanih učeničkih postignuća. Dobiveni podaci uspoređuju se sa situacijom u kojoj se nalazi nastava povijesti u Republici Hrvatskoj. Autorice naglašavaju važnost definiranja ciljeva i očekivanih postignuća u većini analiziranih kurikuluma nasuprot hrvatskoj praksi definiranja obveznih tema i detaljnog opisivanja propisanih sadržaja.*

Ključne riječi: *nastava povijesti, kurikulumi povijesti, ciljevi, očekivana učenička postignuća, europska iskustva*

Uvod

Nastava povijesti u Europi prolazi od kraja 1980-ih godina kroz intenzivan proces promjena[1] koje su dobrim dijelom bile usredotočene upravo na razvoj novih programa povijesti. Utjecaji pod kojima su se zbivale te promjene bili su raznoliki. S jedne strane je slom komunizma potaknuo reforme obrazovnih sustava

1 Istraživanja nastave povijesti započela su još potkraj 19. stoljeća, a osobito su se intenzivirala nakon oba svjetska rata. Projekti poput onih koje su pokrenule Liga naroda nakon Prvoga svjetskog rata, ili UNESCO nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata, osobito su bili usredotočeni na udžbenike, s ciljem uklanjanja pogreški, predrasuda i neprijateljskih slika o drugima. O radu na reviziji udžbenika povijesti više u Pingel, 2000: 9-21. Na području JI Europe ta su istraživanja dobila poticaj u 1990-ima, osobito nakon ratnih sukoba na području nekadašnje Jugoslavije. Za područje JI Europe vidjeti osobito *Clio in the Balkans,* a za Hrvatsku: Karge, 1996; Höpken, 1996a; Stojanović, 1996, 2002; Agičić, 1998, 1998a, 2003; Najbar-Agičić, 2001, 2006; Koren, 2003, 2006; Koren i Najbar-Agičić, 2002.