DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 557 PS 018 740

AUTHOR Galton, Maurice
TITLE Dissemination of the Project's Findings. National Seminar (14th, Zagreb, Yugoslvaia, July 5-7, 1989). The CDCC's Project No. 8: "Innovation in Primary Education."
INSTITUTION Council for Cultural Cooperation, Strasbourg (France).
REPORT NO DECS/EGT(89)27
PUB DATE 12 Dec 89
NOTE 36p.; For related documents, see ED 315 172-175 and PS 018 735-740.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Innovation; *Educational Policy; *Educational Practices; Educational Theories; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Curriculum; Foreign Countries; Information Dissemination; Leadership; *Program Implementation; Seminars; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Barriers to Change; Head Teachers; *Yugoslavia

ABSTRACT

A 3-day conference was convened in Zagreb, Yugoslavia for the purpose of disseminating results of the Council of Europe's Council for Cultural Cooperation's (CDCC) Project 8, Innovation in Primary Education (IPE). Changes in theoretical approaches to and organizational practices of primary education in Yugoslavia were discussed. A total of 61 educators attended. A review of the IPE project was followed by lectures on: (1) the need for innovation in primary school, sources of and resistance to change, and variables related to the introduction of innovations; (2) the rationale and implementation strategies of the IPE; (3) theoretical bases and empirical testing of experimental models of internal reform of primary schools; (4) major issues and changes in educational policy for primary school in Yugoslavia in an international perspective; and (5) the traditional role of head teachers, their contemporary role as agents of innovation, and demands for innovation. After the lectures, a number of participants made short presentations describing innovations in Yugoslavia. The presentations were then discussed. Summarized in this report are lectures, participants' contributions and discussion of them, and rapporteurs' reports. (RH)

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

DECS/EGT (89) 27

Project No. 8 of the CDCC
"Innovation in primary education"

Dissemination of the project's findings

14th National Seminar:
Yugoslavia - Zagreb, 5-7 July 1989

Council for Cultural Co-operation
School Education Division

Strasbourg 1990

Strasbourg 12 December 1989 DECS/EGT (89) 27
ADECSEGT27.89

The CDCC's Project No. 8:
"Innovation in Primary Education"

DISSEMINATION OF THE PROJECT'S FINDINGS - 14th NATIONAL SEMINAR:

YUGOSLAVIA

Zagreb, 5-7 July 1989

Internal Primary School Reform: Innovation in Primary Education

Report written by

Professor Maurice GALTON
Director of the School of Education
University of Leicester

COUNCIL FOR CULTURAL CO-OPERATION (CDCC)
School Education Division

Strasbourg 1989

22.392
04.2

1. OPENING CEREMONY

Dr. Nikša Nikola Šoljan, President of the Commission for Co-operation with International Organisations of the Committee for Education, Culture, Physical and Technical Culture of the Socialist Republic of Croatia, Zagreb, took the Chair.

Dr. Šoljan, introduced the first speaker, Dr. Stjepan Rodek, Director of the Institute for Educational Research. Dr. Rodek extended a warm welcome on behalf of the Organising Committee of the symposium and from the Institute for Educational Research in the University of Zagreb. Special thanks were extended to Dr. Soljan for the support provided by the Committee for Education of the Republic of Croatia. Dr. Rodek also expressed his appreciation for the presence at the opening ceremony of Mrs Dara Zimic, the Deputy Director of the Federal Administration for Scientific, Educational, Cultural and Technical Co-operation, Belgrade, Dr. Josip Pivac, President of the Educational Council of the Socialist Republic of Croatia, Zagreb, Dr. Milivoj Solar, President of the Committee for Education, Culture, Physical and Technical Culture of the Socialist Republic of Croatia, Zagreb and finally Mrs Giulia Podestà Le Poittevin, representing the Council of Europe, and the two distinguished visiting speakers, Dr. Antonis Papadopoulos and Professor Maurice Galton.

Dr. Rodek continued by stressing the topicality of the theme of the conference. There had been much interest in Yugoslavia in the report of Project No. 8. Many of the project's findings were also to be found in the analysis from Yugoslav studies. At this moment primary education in Yugoslavia was at a turning point both in terms of theoretical approaches and organisational practice. It was these things that the symposium would discuss. In Yugoslavia a new concept of learning was now being developed. There was a shift away from directed to independent approaches, a stress on the need for life-long education, a concern that pupils should become flexible and able to adapt easily to new situations and a further concern that citizens of the future should take an international rather than a nationalistic view. The traditional concepts of directed teaching were really only relevant when studying how to study. The new concepts of teaching and learning were not only concerned to pass on to pupils knowledge which was already available but also to help them learn how to discover new things. Existing knowledge was not without use but there was also a need for more innovative approaches into today's society. We all had to turn to education for the further development of man as an individual and as part of changing society. This was the important work of the seminar and he wished it much success.

The Chairman, Dr. Šoljan, thanked Dr. Rodek, not only for his words of welcome but for the excellent way that he had introduced the topic of the seminar. He then invited Mrs Dara Zimic, Deputy Director, Federal Administration for Scientific Educational Cultural and Technical Co-operation, Belgrade to address the seminar.

Mrs Zimic explained that it was her task to co-ordinate co-operation with the Council of Europe's Council for Cultural Co-operation (CDCC). For many participants at the seminar this was probably the first occasion in which they had been involved with the Council of Europe and Mrs Zimic hoped that it might be valuable if she were to set out the relationship which existed between Yugoslavia and the CDCC.

The Council of Europe was the oldest organisation of its kind. It had recently celebrated its fortieth anniversary. It had begun life in 1949 at the time of the cold war. Then its aims and ideals seemed a distant dream but time had shown how valuable these aims were. The number of member states, co-operated closely and participated in many of the functions as an observer. This year, on 5 May, Hungary and Poland, had been invited to accede to the European Cultural Convention, and during the present seminar, President Gorbachev would address the Council of Europe's Parliamentary Assembly in Strasbourg. This was an important new step marking the beginning of closer co-operation among European nations from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Yugoslavia has co-operated with the CDCC for over twenty years. By 1987, Yugoslavia had ratified several conventions, particularly those relating to immigrants and various cultural and educational activities. Since its accession to the European Cultural Convention in October 1987, the doors of the CDCC had been wide open to Yugoslavia. The enormous number of programmes and projects which had been carried through by the CDCC had helped Yugoslavia as it sought to develop its European identity and to prepare its citizens for the twenty-first century. Although by the time that Yugoslavia entered the CDCC many of the projects had been completed, it had been possible to take over this shared experience of the other member states and integrate it with Yugoslavia's own efforts. Innovation in primary education, the report of Project No. 8 was one such area. The Institute of Educational Research had helped disseminate knowledge about Project No. 8. Mrs Zimic expressed the hope that delegates would use this knowledge to improve education for all young people in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as they moved towards the twenty-first century. She wished the seminar success in its work.

The Chairman, Dr. Soljan, in thanking Mrs Zimic, endorsed her remarks about the importance of future links with the CDCC and hoped that she would continue to press for many more two-way communications of the kind typified by this seminar. Dr. Soljan then introduced the next speaker, Dr. Josip Pivac, President of the Educational Council of the Socialist Republic of Croatia.

Dr. Pivac extended warmest greetings to participants on behalf of the Socialist Republic of Croatia. The task of everyone present was not just to become familiar with national and international innovations but to help to translate these into educational policy. Although the heritage of primary education was a rich one it was necessary to continually review questions of function. We needed a critical analysis of past models of classroom organisation and pedagogy which took into account religious, sociological, technological and ecological factors. In the past there had been no pure paradigms but each particular model had its own methods and working practices. A study of the ideology of each of these paradigms enabled us to carry out an analysis of present practice and to review the nature of progressive models of teaching and learning. There was, however, little research which dealt with the bureaucratic activities of education of which Yugoslavia had much experience. There was a need for a scientific analysis of these trends. For the most part our approach to schooling was rooted in an industrial society which was essentially reproductive. In Dr. Pivac's view we now needed to move towards a more scientific, problem solving approach. Only political

questioning would result in action to bring about this new thinking but this action must be based upon three things; first, there must be a scientific basis for the change, second, the school must be an active agent in such changes and third, there must be new organisational structures. These three points formed a central basis of school renewal. In the last resort, schools must be responsible for their own change but they needed a theoretical framework within which to operate. This framework required co-operation, not only of educationalist but also of other scientific researchers. Dr. Pivac, therefore, strongly urged participants to engage in this important work.

Mrs Giulia Podestà Le Poittevin, Head of the School Education Division, Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport for the Council of Europe, then responded to the expressions of welcome and support for the activities of the CDCC as expressed by previous speakers. She expressed the warmest thanks on behalf of the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Mrs Catherine Lalumière, to the Yugoslav educational authorities and to the authorities of the Socialist Republic of Croatia for hosting this seminar in the beautiful town of Zagreb which for seven centuries bore the title of "Royal and Free".

The speaker paid tribute to the very active role played by Yugoslavia in the educational and cultural activities of the Council, since, and even long before, its accession to the European Cultural Convention on 7 October 1987. For example, Yugoslavia had been involved for years as an observer in CDCC's Project No. 7 on the "Education and Cultural Development of Migrants" and Yugoslavia had also fully participated in the final conference of Project No. 8 which was held in Nice at the beginning of December 1987. Last October it took part in the international symposium on "Experiences of Innovation in Primary Education in the Netherlands" at Noordwijkerhout.

In the course of the current year, as well as during next year, Yugoslavia would have hosted several meetings convened by the CDCC including a conference on the learning and teaching of modern languages, a colloquy on the relationship between Baroque and Byzantine Art, a Pan-European symposium on computational linguistics and language technology and the sixth Pan-European Conference of Directors of Educational Research Institutes which would be convened in co-operation with UNESCO on the theme "Literacy and Basic Education in Europe on the Eve of the Twenty-First Century". Moreover, Yugoslavia's universities belonged to a network comprising Universities of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom which had been set up for the purpose of exchanging postgraduate students in computational linguisitics.

In the wider sphere of the Council's activities, Yugoslavia had now been granted special guest status with the Parliamentary Assembly so that it could now appoint a delegation to participate in the Assembly's sessions. The twenty-three Council of Europe member states and Yugoslavia and the Holy See, who were all Parties to the European Cultural Convention, would shortly be joined by Hungary and Poland who had been invited by the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers, to accede to the convention in a context of "developing contacts and extending co-operation" with East European countries having entered a "reform policy" likely to lead to "greater respect for human rights and the development of genuine democracies throughout Europe".

The Council of Europe representative went on to explain that the Council's educational activities could be considered from four standpoints. Namely:

1. The promotion of understanding and communication among young Europeans.

2. The promotion of mobility and equivalence of diplomas.

3. The promotion of democratic values among young Europeans.

4. Educational and cultural responses to the problems of European societies.

Under the first standpoint there had been a number of endeavours to enhance European citizenship and awareness of a cultural identity, such as, the participation in children's and youth theatre encounters and participation in European schools day competitions. Under the second standpoint there was a teacher bursary scheme which helped educators to take part in short INSET courses abroad thus fostering the broadening of their professional experience by exchanging ideas and teaching materials with colleagues. Standpoints three and four were interlinked and covered such activities as human rights education, intercultural education, the principles enshrined in Project No. 1 on Preparation of Life which aimed at giving people from 14-19 years old a good basis for continuing their studies or for starting work.

In the near future, the Council would probably embark on a project on science education which would concern both primary and secondary schools. This new project would not, of course, lead to a neglect of the humanities.

Mrs Podestà Le Poittevin then outlined the aims of Project No. 8 which sought to help educational policy makers and research workers, teachers and trainers, develop educational systems so that they could respond on the one hand to external pressures arising from demographic and societal factors and on the other hand internal pressures which arose from the increased knowledge about the psycho-emotional development of the child. Project No. 8 was launched by the CDCC towards the end of 1982 and the group responsible for it completed its task at the end of 1987 in compliance with its terms of reference and with the support of a network of twelve schools ("contact schools") having undertaken innovative activity. The aim of the project originally, to study and define the role, objectives, content and organisation of primary education in member states over the forthcoming twenty years, proved to be too vast and ambitious, considering the time allocated to the project so that the Group concentrated its efforts instead on innovation, its nature, scope, ways and means of implementation and its management. Within the project, innovation was conceived as a dynamic process. Great emphasis was placed on the role that the school was called to play in bringing about change. The underlying philosophy of the project was respect for the child's individuality which implied affording every pupil an opportunity to develop all his or her aptitudes and potentialities harmoniously, thus ensuring an equality of attainment through differentiated teaching. The two concepts - the school as an educational community and the child as an individual - called for the achievement of continuity of teaching whether between various levels of education (pre-primary, primary, secondary) or between school and family.

In the Group's opinion, primary education extended beyond the basic skills of reading, writing and arithmetic. It sought to give children wider perception of their immediate and more distant cultural and physical environment, to stimulate their general development, to enable them to exercise and acquire democratic values. It took account of personal and cultural characteristics of each child and sought to stimulate the development of values, interests and knowledge, life skills, know-how and learning techniques, thus preparing children for the demands of secondary education, work, the family and the community. The attainment of these objectives implied a far-reaching curricular reform as well as an overhaul of initial and in-service training. In particular, initial training should include training in innovation methods. Moreover both initial and INSET training should, in order to ensure mobility, be placed in a European context. Thus the development of common training modules was advocated by the Group. In the latter's view, fundamental aspects of education, such as human rights, intercultural education, peace education and environment education, should be incorporated into the general curriculum rather than treated as separate areas. In particular, with a view to intercultural education, there was an increasing emphasis in all of the member countries on the importance, as stressed in the Final Report of Project No. 8, of introducing a language other than the mother tongue at primary level.

The impact of Project No. 8 on national educational systems had been considerable. In various Bills, White Papers, expert reports, there had appeared statements which seemed to have been taken verbatim from Project No. 8's Final Report, or, at least, were based upon the ideas expressed in it. For example, in France a committee set up at the end of last year by the Minister of Education has laid down principles in line with most of the recommendations of Project No. 8. Other countries, such as Austria, Belgium, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Portugal and Switzerland, had publicly declared that future reforms of their school system or of the curricula would be based on the underlying philosophy expressed in Project No. 8.

In conclusion, the speaker wished to express her gratitude to her host, Dr. Rodek and to the lecturers Dr. Šoljan, Dr. Matijevic and Dr. Bognar and to all the participants to the seminar. She also paid a tribute to the ambassadors for Project No. 8, Professor Maurice Galton and Dr. Antonis Papadopoulos, for their unfailing commitment to the project throughout all the years and for their efforts in making its results more widely known.

The Chairman, Dr. Šoljan, thanked Mrs Podestà Le Poittevin for the description of the Council's activities and, in particular, for the information about the work of Project No. 8. He then introduced the final speaker in the opening session, Dr. Milivoj Solar, President of the Committee for Education, Culture, Physical and Technical Culture of the Socialist Republic of Croatia.

Dr. Solar began by expressing the hope that the symposium would be successful. He wished to make clear to all participants that the work of the symposium was highly valued. He promised that those responsible for initiating new educational policy would pay great attention to the discussions over the next few days and seek to

integrate the conclusions with existing reforms in the Republic of Croatia. Dr. Solar then went on to itemise the reasons why changes in the present educational system were necessary. First, there needed to develop greater co-operation between political decision making and educational science. Second, closer links needed to be made between the experiences in other countries so that Yugoslavia could learn the lessons both positive and negative from these experiences. Third, although those responsible for the political decisions should listen to educational theorists, educational theorists, at the same time, should recognise that politics was the art of the possible. Politicians therefore should be expected to listen and not obey. If these rules were followed then Dr. Solar was convinced that co-operation in the field of education could contribute to the current problems and the current crisis in Yugoslavian education.

This co-operation should be based on shared experiences and the careful evaluation of the results, for it was only by conducting such evaluations and admitting past mistakes that progress could be made. But Dr. Solar was convinced that the symposium could make an important contribution to this debate. It therefore gave him great pleasure to declare the symposium open.

In reply Dr. Soljan thanked Dr. Solar for his promising words of hope and promised that the symposium would work towards some imaginative solutions to the problems to which Dr. Solar had referred.

2. 1st LECTURE - Dr. ANTONIS PAPADOPOULOS

In his opening lecture Dr. Papadopoulos considered in some detail the factors promoting the need for innovation in primary school and the sources of and resistance to such changes. Dr. Papadopoulos began by noting that we lived in an era which was characterised by many pressures exercised on the educational system. These pressures were both external arising from demographic economic and cultural factors and also internal dictated by the increasing knowledge of the psycho-emotional development of children and of their learning process. At the same time, the great faith in education which prevailed during the sixties and the early seventies was subject to doubt. Whereas in the seventies the crisis for schooling had to do with attempts to individualise instruction and introduce new relevant curricula, today many educators defined the crisis in schooling as concerned with standards. Schools were now attacked for encouraging mediocrity and for abandoning basic subjects and academic goals and for not exercising sufficient authority over pupils. Generally, therefore, schools were criticised because they were doing what they were asked to do to face the crisis of the early seventies. Dr. Papadopoulos drew two conclusions from this situation. First, the changes in all sectors of society take place very rapidly and consequently schools have to continually introduce innovations to enable them to cope with these changes. Second, we still know very little about the nature of the educational process so we need to keep studying it in order to develop new strategies for coping with this rapid state of change.

Dr. Papadopoulos then dwelt in some detail on the various external and internal pressures which were forcing primary schools to change. Major demographic changes and the economic recession had created problems which were reflected in the multicultural nature of our present European society; the growing influence of the media, in

particular television, on our thinking; and the considerable changes in family structure as women increasingly took on more responsible roles in society. Moreover, the knowledge explosion, which had taken place during the present century, meant sheer volume of the information available was doubling every five years. Turning to internal pressures, Dr. Papadopoulos briefly sketched the changes in the way that new ideas about child development had altered our conception of thinking. The teacher's role was now to help children by analysing problems and giving practical aid or creating adequate educational situations in order that the pupils themselves could find solutions and incorporate these into their own mental structures. Dr. Papadopoulos stressed the importance of learning being seen as a successful exercise in communication between teacher and pupils and put forward the idea of the "didactic contract" in which pupils were able to exercise an element of control over their own learning. This process also extended to assessment where, whenever possible, pupils should be able to take over responsibility for analysing and recording their own work. Such assessments should respect individual differences and the rhythms and styles of individual learning while at the same time being based on a defined minimum of subject matter and respect for cultural pluralism.

Dr. Papadopoulos then went on to consider the forces which supported and resisted such changes. He quoted the observation that "change is a process, not an event" and argued that it needed a period of time to transform individuals or situations. Fundamentally, for teachers, innovation could be an uneasy and threatening business because it often involved failure. Teachers therefore needed considerable support, especially at the early stages of an innovation, to help to overcome their natural fear of loss of career prospects and loss of power and prestige which might occur as a result of the changes. Many members of a school organisation had a vested interest in maintaining the existing system.

Dr. Papadopoulos then considered the ways in which those responsible for introducing innovations could help to reduce teachers' resistance to the intended changes. Among the arguments developed was the importance of administrators making teachers feel that they were a full participating member of the innovation and that it was not being foisted upon them by outsiders. Teachers needed to see any change reducing rather than increasing their present burdens. The values and ideas behind an innovation project needed to have been generally agreed. Objections should be recognised and steps taken to relieve unnecessary fears with provision for feedback on the perceptions of the project by those required to introduce it into the classroom. Finally, it must be accepted by those who managed innovation that any project should be open to revision and consideration if subsequent experience indicated that further changes were desirable.

In order to manage the innovation successfully it was necessary to understand how teachers change. Change was a process of considerable disequilibrium, confusion and pain. Dr. Papadopoulos quoted one view that changing attitudes occurred over time and had three phases. First, an "unfreezing" phase resulting from a change in the pressures on individuals, disturbing their equilibrium and motivating them to consider change. Second, a changing phase in which the direction of the change was determined and new attitudes were learnt and then a third "refreezing" phase in which the new attitudes become an integral part of the individual.

This process depended mainly on the degree of motivation of the individual and the strength of the incentives provided. Important incentives were the drive for status and prestige, the need to identify with certain groups, the need to feel successful, to win social acceptance and to contribute to general progress. Project No. 8's own conclusions from the "contact schools" endorsed these findings.

Dr. Papadopoulos then went on to list the factors identified by Project No. 8 as aiding innovation: these include administrative support, adequate resources, time for teachers to meet and discuss ideas, support from the parents and researcher/consultants who could supply expertise, particularly concerning ways of helping children with learning difficulties to cope with the new changes. Among the obstacles encountered by teachers as identified in Project No. 8 were the reluctance of colleagues to accept the proposed changes, the lack of shared decision making structures in some schools, the general stress of teaching and the failure of national and local policy makers to take account of the school's special circumstances. Concluding his talk, Dr. Papadopoulos stressed that innovation in school was not an easy undertaking. Above everything it implied a close collaboration and communication between all the participants including the central authorities, those responsible for local policy and administration, those responsible for the management of schools, the teachers themselves, the parents and even the pupils. The process of change implied commitment, faith and co-operation among the participants. It implied an understanding and a creative leadership which could provide the necessary climate for free communication, effective interaction and authentic collaboration.

Following on from Dr. Papadopoulos' talk participants raised the question of the role of headteachers. Practices in Yugoslavia varied considerably and the role of the headteacher was very different from that in most Northern European countries. Participants at the seminar also raised the question of training teachers. It was pointed out that the kinds of changes Dr. Papadopoulos had outlined required very flexible teachers; yet, the methods of training were very inflexible. It was felt important to look at this issue in some detail. Questions were also raised about ways of monitoring the process of change. It was pointed out by some participants that often there was an appearance of an acceptance of an innovation and that the whole cycle could be completed without substantial change having taken place. It was therefore very necessary to define different levels of commitment to an innovation and to relate these levels to observable behaviours.

3. 2nd Lecture - Dr. MILAN MATIJEVIĆ and Dr. LADISLAV BOGNAR

Drs. Matijevic and Bognar then gave a presentation on the theoretical foundations and empirical testing of certain experimental models of schooling. Dr. Bognar began by outlining something of the history of school reform in Yugoslavia. The involvement of school teachers and educationalists had generally been characterised by a systematic study of certain small segments of teaching and gradual information of certain elements such as group work, programmed instruction, television and computing. The role of political bodies usually consisted of a reduction on innovations in the form of legislation and different types of formal resolutions. This often took place against a background of insufficient preparedness of the

schools' teachers and parents to cope with these changes and resulting dissatisfaction of all parties involved in the schools. Such legislative changes had included decrees concerning different types of productive work of pupils, ways of grading pupils' work and new ways of teaching subjects. Often these changes have been at the instigation of individual government ministers who relied on their own particular views rather than basing change on "scientific elaborations" of the problems of learning and teaching.

In spite of these practices, in certain parts of Yugoslavia experimental schools had been created, largely through the enthusiasm of influential individuals. Many schools, unfortunately, tended to drop the innovative model once the testing of the programme had been carried out but a few had continued to develop the new ideas.

Dr. Bognar then went on to describe research carried out by the Institute for Pedagogical Research and Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb together with the Institute for Educational and Pedagogical Services in Osijek. The project was a longitudinal one which combined theoretical studies and empirical, experimental and non-experimental action research. Forty researchers from the two institutes had been involved but a central role was taken by teachers' teams of four experimental elementary schools involving one hundred and twenty-nine teachers. The main originators in defining the experimental models of working were the school teachers. At the beginning of the project in 1986 the team had a number of working sessions and scholarly meetings in which research methodology, educational goals and models of work in elementary schools were discussed. A specification of objectives was devised which besides the traditional pedagogical goals of primary school concerning the acquisition of knowledge skills included the development of the feeling for change, the preparation for the changes which will take place in the course of a working life, training for the solution of problems and for creativity and for ways of seeking new information. Training for independent learning for use of research methods and for the ability to experience the beauty in art nature and human relationships were also introduced. Implicit in the development of these objectives was a shared understanding that they could not be achieved when the lecturing method dominated teaching. The experimental programme therefore required radical changes of internal organisation at the level of classroom teaching.

Dr. Bognar then went on to consider the weaknesses of the present school system among which was the exaggerated differentiation of subjects of textbook material with a resulting lack of integration, too much memorising of numerous facts from textbook and programmes. There was an emphasis on competition and sitting listening, watching, on the part of the pupils who because of differentiated subject matter could find themselves being taught by ten or more teachers. There were poor links between schools and the community. In suggesting a contemporary conception of the elementary school Dr. Bognar stressed the concept of a self-managing school which allowed for the natural differences among children resulting in individually tailored programmes reflecting the abilities and interests of each pupil. The emphasis would be on individual work in small groups. The aim would be to cut down the present level of direct instruction by the teacher from seventy-two per cent to around thirty-seven per cent.

Dr. Matijević then, with the help of a video recording, illustrated aspects of the practice of some of the new experimental schools. Five kinds of experimental programmes were available ranging from a programme of the young pioneer community which was produced by the pupils themselves to a basic teaching programme which was meant for all pupils but allowed for considerable differentiation. Pupils were offered a choice of different activities which were divided into scientific, art, working and sports programmes. In the annual school plan, the distribution of tasks among the teaching teams was carefully set out and each plan of instruction for individual classes entered in a diary. The progress of the annual plan was discussed on the first Saturday of each month which was dedicated to planning, self management problems and in-service activities. The contents and the way of carrying out the work for each of the following weeks was then established. Each pupil worked out their individual working plan which was then analysed with the form master. The plan had to satisfy both the pupils' specific interests and needs and at the same time be in accord with the schools annual plan.

In medium and younger age groups an integrated week was practised while in the older age groups a flexible timetable applied. The school building was open to pupils before and after formal classwork so that pupils could play, meet together and carry out different tasks such as gardening, feeding animals, etc. Dr. Matijevic then went on to discuss various aspects of the curriculum. For example, in science, covering both natural and social sciences as well as mathematics, pupils were expected to define problems, compose questions, look for possible solutions and set up hypotheses. To do this they required skills of observation, collecting and analysing data and acquiring indirect experience by simulation and role playing. In the arts area, concerned primarily with the human emotional sphere, the emphasis was on spontaniety and the ability of the child to master the language of literature, the theatre, music and the visual arts.

Evaluation of the new programmes was carried out at both micro and macro levels. At the macro level the adequacy of the programming and planning was monitored by members of the pedagogical-developmental service or by teacher teams. The subjective experience of the participants, pupils, teachers and parents was also used to determine the success of the programme.

At micro level the evaluation concentrated on the individual pupil. The form master had prime responsibility for recording pupil's progress with the emphasis on what children had achieved rather than on ranking pupils. Although the programme has been underway for only a year some general evaluation had been made by the team. After the first term questionnaires were sent to teachers, pupils and parents in order to obtain data concerning the actual changes carried out in the school and the attitudes of the teachers, pupils and parents towards the changes. The data obtained suggested substantial innovation had occurred. For example, pupils usually mentioned that the emphasis on subject content had been reduced, there were less formal rules, there was greater opportunity for free activities and relations between teachers and pupils had changed so that there was more co-operation. The teachers' assessments suggested that the pupils were more active, that work was now differentiated according to pupils' ability and

these changes had been carried out without loss in discipline or in the general level of attainment. Other changes had occurred more slowly, particularly attempts to change teacher/pupil relationships so that the degree of mutual planning of work between teacher and pupils varied from school to school. The initial conclusion therefore was that while changes had occurred in the organisation and structure of the classroom the changes in the relationship between pupils and teachers had developed more slowly. Generally, fifty per cent of the parents had given their support to this type of approach while forty-two per cent did not have a definite attitude. Parents negative attitudes were more often expressed at the beginning but as the implementation of the project had progressed there has been an increase in parental support.

Much discussion followed Dr. Bognar's and Dr. Matijevic's paper, focusing particularly on the ways in which the action research approach used in the experimental schools could be extended. Participants noted that this had been a problem in Project No. 8 but the development of the experimental school programme described by Dr. Bognar had not yet reached this stage. Questions were also raised about the use of questionnaire approaches to evaluate the programme and the need for more direct observational studies to monitor changes in teaching approaches. Attention was drawn to recent research on "time-on-task" for example where pupils although concentrating on their work tended to find ways of slowing down the activity with a result that teachers tended to accept this slower rate of working by assuming that the pupils concerned lacked concentration and were "slow learners". One of the teachers from the experimental schools then described her record system which was used to monitor pupil performance. At the end of each mathematics unit pupils received diagnostic tests with ten little units (or questions). It was recognised, however, that record keeping could make large demands on the teacher when it covered a range of subjects. The symposium discussed ways of dealing with this problem involving pupil's evaluation of their own work, the organisation of the work day to allow for periods of recording and the integration of different forms of assessment within the same task so that for example in science activities mathematical skills could also be assessed.

4. 3rd Lecture - Dr. NIKOLA SOLJAN

Dr. Nikša Nikola Šoljan presented a view of the main issues and changes in educational policy which were now taking place at primary school level in Yugoslavia. Dr. Šoljan began by reminding participants of Project No. 8's concept of innovation as change which united policy with practice. Any change at the micro level of the school therefore needed to reflect the wider context. Dr. Soljan drew attention to the phenomenon of universalisation of primary education. Primary education was now desirable for everybody and all countries had this goal. This aim had almost been totally realised among the industrially developed societies although in underdeveloped countries it was still a problem. In Yugoslavia although, over the last eight years, the goal had been reached, there remained problems, particularly at the top end of the primary school where truancy was a factor lowering attendance. It needed to be remembered that after 1992 there will be a greater mobility in the population with a trend in migration towards industrialised countries, creating new pressures for reform. Many reforms in primary education deal with "invisible

capital", the human resources of a country. After 1992 however the integration of European countries should co-ordinate this invisible capital. The intentions expressed in Project No. 8's report were a sound basis for achieving this aim.

Turning to Yugoslavia, Dr. Šoljan remarked that although the education system shared this goal of excellence the idea had never been explicated either theoretically or as a policy. Mostly the goal of excellence had been seen as a "self evident" truth and therefore had remained a slogan. Running contrary to this goal was the erosion of educational standards due to inflationary trends. It now took a greater amount of resources than a decade ago to maintain current levels of educational provision. The last major Yugoslavian reform (1974), mainly concerned the secondary school. At that time the advocates of reform had regarded primary schools as basically settled with only minor changes needed. Among these minor changes were the reduction of the entry age from seven to six, the abandonment of marks in favour of more descriptive assessments, the integration of handicapped children into normal school and the forging of closer links between the primary and secondary sectors. These concerns were common to all the republics.

Gradually it had become clear that this was an inappropriate approach. Most educationalists saw themselves as passive transmitters of these changes and although the structures changed the intentions behind these innovations remained unrealised. There had been a lack of participation of teachers and parents in the planning phase. For example, lowering the school entry age to six did not result in new teaching approaches. Integration of the handicapped had been mechanical. There was little evidence that such pupils were treated any differently now that they were present in the normal school. Where more attention had been given to these handicapped pupils less time had been given to others so that the goal of improvement for all pupils was now even further away. Gifted pupils, in particular, were neglected and caused problems for teachers. Neither had changing the assessment procedure resulted in changes in the curriculum. Primary schools did not begin to focus on areas such as study skills, lifelong education, etc. The links between primary and secondary phases were weakened. Each institution tended to close up within itself and to legitimise its own practice within its own ideologies.

A further problem concerned the autonomy of the provinces for implemeting educational reform. National aspirations for educational change had to accommodate the different dynamic which existed in the different provinces in attempting to translate theoretical concepts into practice.

5. 4th Lecture - PROFESSOR MAURICE GALTON

THE RATIONALE AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES OF THE CDCC'S PROJECT NO. 8 ON INNOVATION IN PRIMARY EDUCATION

Professor Galton began by summarising the purposes of Project No. 8. The project was mainly concerned with change and innovation in schools and how this could be brought about effectively. The focus of the project was on the need to change the role of the teacher in order to develop new approaches to children's

learning. As previous speakers had explained, this concern with new approaches to learning had arisen because of our increased knowledge about child development and because of the rapidity of social change which schools had to cope with. This central theme of effective learning impinged on a number of factors which were of great concern to the CDCC relating to such issues as multi-culturalism, the role of women in society and the integration of the handicapped into the normal school programme. The CDCC's member states were also concerned that children should learn to cope with the new technology so that they were equipped to face the challenges of the twenty-first century. For the project therefore innovation meant the adaptation to a school system to a set of demands originating not only in the development of society but also in the expansion of our knowledge of child development.

This definition implied that all changes within the educational system, no matter at what level they were conceived, were bound to have profound effects in the other parts of the educational system. In particular, decisions taken at the political level always had important consequences for the relationship between teachers and children in the classroom. It was this relationship which prompted the project to endorse the suggestion of Professor Vandenberghe for an innovation approach based upon the concept of "backward mapping". The approach advocated by Professor Vandenberghe required policy makers to identify the problems that schools were likely to face during the implementation stage of curriculum innovation both at the school and the classroom level. The aim of this approach was to reduce as many unanticipated consequences as possible during the innovation process.

Professor Galton continued by describing the results of the analysis carried out by Project No. 8 on the styles of innovation which were currently in use among the member states of the CDCC.

The project identified five main styles of innovation. Two of these, course development and team training, were generally used when education authorities had pre-determined the innovation and espoused a clear set of objectives. School-based discussion and the use of consultants were generally associated with a more open "problem solving approach". The latter, however, presented many problems for local and national authorities who were attempting to implement change across the whole system since schools became highly committed to the changes carried out within their own institution and were often reluctant to modify these changes in the face of shifts in national policy. Because of this the project found an increasing use by member states of the cluster approach where groups of schools were required to work collaboratively together. In the examples of innovation studied, 33% were course based with no follow up, 25% of innovations used the cluster approach, 32% involved consultants or the use of training teams and 20% were internal school-based innovations.

Professor Galton also reported the results of a survey of teachers in the Project's "contact schools". These schools were chosen by various countries participating in Project No. 8 as examples where interesting innovations had been carried out. The analysis of replies showed that, in particular, teachers stressed the need for time to reflect about the process of innovation since most teachers

were too tired by the end of the school day to be able to think critically. He drew attention to the "contact schools'" report which emphasised the need for support from outside the school and clear frameworks within which schools could operate. Finally, Professor Galton drew attention to the implications of the Project's findings for both initial and in-service training. Professor Galton argued that there was a need, as identified in the Final Report, to look for ways in which initial and in-service training could be more closely co-ordinated.

6. 5th Lecture

DR. PAPADOPOULOS - THE ROLE OF HEADTEACHER

Dr. Papadopoulos then delivered his second lecture on the role of the headteacher and began by reminding participants that the headteacher's role had always been a complex and difficult one. In its current state the role of the headteacher had gone through many phases which reflected various theories and approaches to management styles. The main approaches involved the bureaucratic model, the scientific management model, the human relations approach, a compromise model, a competency based model and the management by objectives model.

The bureaucratic model emphasised efficient forms of organisation but it also conjured up unpleasant images of inflexibility and "red tape". Bureaucratic models involved hierarchical structures of responsibility and tended to lead to impersonal treatment of people. The scientific management approach, like the bureaucratic model, gave less consideration to individuals but stressed measurable outcomes so that supervision and planning became very important and detailed. Individuals were paid according to results and the model was often criticised because it appeared to treat individuals like machines rather than human beings.

The human relations approach was a response to the mechanistic and impersonal scientific and bureaucratic approaches. This approach had had a profound effect on school administration. The model had been criticised, however, because it tended to place too much emphasis on individual needs and to neglect productivity. In response to this a synthesis (compromise) approach to management was developed which combined the more important aspects of bureaucratic and scientific management while taking account of human relations approaches. The emphasis was on developing a committed workforce exhibiting a degree of interdependence through shared purposes and common goals within the organisation.

More recent approaches had emphasised the competencies or skills which headteachers should have in order to perform their responsibilities as institutional leaders. An examination of the various competency models indicated that the emphasis was on the role of the headteacher as one who developed the goals of the schools and who allocated both personnel and resources and managed time. Thus, to a certain extent, the model retreated to more centralised forms of management associated with the bureaucratic and scientific models of a previous era. The management by objectives model, which concerned itself with specific measurable time bounded objectives or, more

recently, performance indicators, had obvious advantages in that it helped all participants to have a clear notion of their targets from the very beginning. On the other hand, it again tended to emphasise the control aspects and a need for measurable outcomes which were a feature of the scientific management model which, in the past, resulted in low levels of commitment to innovation among teachers.

Dr. Papadopoulos then drew attention to a further feature of the traditional models of management in that they tended to emphasise competition rather than co-operation amongst participants. He drew attention to the research on the effects of co-operation on problem solving groups and the advantages of this approach. Whereas co-operation tended to promote positive attitudes towards the task and to other members of the group and to promote positive self attitudes, competition tended to encourage rejection of cultural and individual differences, promoted distrust and suspicion and was less effective in solving complex problems. Headteachers therefore should not see themselves as "superstars" outshining all others. The effective leader should not take all the credit for what happens.

These ideas then led Dr. Papadopoulos to suggest a new role for headteachers whereby they moved from the viewpoint "I did it" to "we did it". In school the emphasis had to move from closeness to openness, from centralisation to decentralisation, from isolation to communication, collaboration and co-operation. Headteachers had to abandon the role of "crisis" managers who simply reacted to events and problems on a day-to-day basis. In their new role headteachers needed to be motivators and catalysts in unifying staff effort. Headteachers had to be aware of the factors which brought about innovation in schools and which encouraged co-operation and commitment of teachers in this process. The effective headteacher established frameworks of expectations for the schools and involved others in helping to set the goals within this framework. They gave teachers specific expectations and closely monitored the change through classroom observation, reviews of lesson plans and student performance. The headteacher provided assistance and support as needed. All these demands were consistent with the responses obtained from the survey of teachers in the "contact schools" as part of Project No. 8 and were supported by a wide number of research studies.

Dr. Papadopoulos then continued by elaborating the project's message with regard to leadership. He drew attention to the report on the "contact schools" which emphasised the role of the school leader as directing the processes, the content and the conditions of change. He stressed that the sharing of decision making was an important message to emerge and that teachers expected the school leader to be able to handle conflicts, to bridge differences between staff and to encourage effective communication, co-operation and collaboration. Headteachers should be able to create an excellent team spirit - an open climate of trust. Dr. Papadopoulos also referred to the discussions which had taken place at a European Teachers' Seminar he had directed in Donaueschingen (Federal Republic of Germany) on the role of the school leader. This seminar concluded that in any effort to implement innovations in primary schools, headteachers should not lose sight of the basic aim of schooling which was the uninterrupted process of the development of each individual child. Headteachers also needed to accept that different people would view the change process from different perspectives. Accordingly, headteachers should examine very carefully all possible perspectives through which certain innovations might be viewed in order to avoid conflicts and ensure a smooth development and implementation of the innovation. Headteachers had also to recognise a paradox which made their role more difficult and sometimes painful in that although many teachers might agree that

change was necessary they wished at the same time for stability and to avoid problems and conflicts. To be an effective innovator, headteachers had to show qualities and skills which could be categorised as being conceptual, technical and human. It should be recognised that one person was unlikely to process all the necessary skills. Hence the importance of team building so that decision making and planning were shared among a management team. Dr. Papadopoulos concluded by stressing the importance of in-service training both for and during the implementation phases of an innovation. The task of the headteacher was therefore a very demanding one and local authorities had a duty to concern themselves with the professional development of the headteacher. This should concentrate on enhancing the qualities and skills outlined above.

Following Dr. Papadopoulos' talk there was considerable discussion concerning the role of the headteacher. Headteachers in Yugoslavia usually did not possess the same degree of autonomy as in the CDCC countries who took part in Project No. 8. Generally, management strategies still involved a bureaucratic approach. Discussion centred on ways to bring about a change in the headteacher's management style. All agreed that there was a need to clarify the different functions of the school leader and to investigate the role of the state and the way this influenced the autonomy of headteachers. It was thought helpful to study training methods in other CDCC countries and to contrast the headteacher's role with that in Yugoslavia. It was felt that there was considerable research to be done in this area. The headteacher's role in socialist countries had not yet been fully investigated. Hence, no one, not even headteachers, really understood their function and so no one was satisfied.

7. CONTRIBUTIONS BY YUGOSLAV PARICIPANTS

A number of participants to the seminar then made short presentations describing innovations that were taking place in Yugoslavia.

Vida BUKOVEC described an innovation involving pupils in the early years where attempts to extend kindergarten practice had taken place. In these classrooms pupils were not forced since not all children were ready to study when they first arrived at primary school. Games were therefore used to motivate pupils. Teachers and pupils organised work together and problem solving approaches to teaching were introduced. The work day was integrated with an emphasis on individualisation and differentiation between pupils to the highest possible degree. Co-operation with parents was emphasised and parents were encouraged to go on trips with the school. Teachers visited homes to discuss pupils' work. Similar groups were now being tried out in the third and fourth grades and many teachers who did not belong to the experimental group also were beginning to try out these new approaches. Dissemination had taken place by means of exhibitions, seminars and contributions from individual teachers. Evaluation had shown that both parents and teachers were satisfied and local psychologists also agreed that the reform was useful.

Viktorija ZMAGA GLOGOVEC also described a programme involving kindergarten staff. Initially, through seminars and lectures, teachers, headteachers and advisers, discussed possible changes and also tried out some of the proposals on more gifted children. The aim

was to start from theory and to create practice which reflected perceived needs. This exercise had proved difficult and sometimes didn't go beyond mere talking. Only kindergarten staff who had wanted to be involved in the project were asked to participate. Workshops were held and the staff then split into four teams, each led by a teacher from the kindergarten. The teacher leaders were chosen for their knowledge and for the quality of their practice. Each group of teachers then were given a specific task.

Group A devised topics created out of the earlier educational programme of seminars and lectures.

Group B devised topics using principles provided by educationalists.

Group C developed topics which were desired by children.

Group D devised topics which were desired by the community.

Each group of teachers tried out each other's material. In all there were eighty-three different outcomes. The supervision team acted as consultants rather than inspectors. There had been exchanges between teachers, mostly between friends, and each teacher had worked with four other colleagues, thus replicating the innovation. The evaluations suggested that the following changes had been brought about. The school climate had changed and children were more wiling to work with other teachers and visitors. There were better communications between teachers so that now teachers said that "we learn things together". Parental involvement had increased significantly.

Discussions were now under way about what to do next. Other teachers had heard about the project and wanted to become involved. The original sixteen teachers had now become a permanent "expert group" to disseminate good practice.

The next speaker, **Gordana ZINDOVIĆ VUKADINOVIĆ**, described a project called "Preparation of Primary Children for Self-Education". This was part of the UNESCO network and consisted initially of a three year pilot phase involving a system of exercises designed to help pupils (12-15 years) to learn and practice skills needed for independent study. The project included preparation for lifelong education and there was an emphasis on the social dimension. Children came from mixed backgrounds, some who were familiar with books and computers from an early age. The project offered a chance for children to progress according to needs and interest. To carry out this programme, children needed help with library skills and information processing skills. Skills covered included research and information, keeping notes and presentation. Some problems were experienced with pupil motivation because the topics were limited by UNESCO and not all of them captured pupil interest. There were other problems of implementation. To be successful the school needed a good media library. Even in places where this was provided there were difficulties because some staff did not like the freedom afforded to children to move to and from the library without permission. Generally, staff involved in the project were enthusiastic but other teachers resented the children's attempts to extend this method of

working into other subjects. Some teachers were concerned when children attempted to go to the library to conduct research because they thought it was an excuse to play truant and go home. In other cases pupils continued to work on the topic at the expense of other subjects. Thus the main problem of dissemination was to find ways of integrating the project approach to learning into other subject areas.

The next speaker **Jasmina ŠEFER** described an attempt to encourage creativity in the early years. The study involved the regular school curriculum with all subjects except mathematics being taught by an interdisciplinary approach. Group work and individual work was emphasised at the expense of class teaching. Drama encouraged pupils to express themselves emotionally and the learning environment was extended to extra curricula activities such as playtime. Creativity was assessed according to the degree of divergent imagination, complexity and sophistication of the pupils ideas. Co-operation was assessed according to the degree to which pupils involved others in solving problems, helped to solve conflicts and supported other pupils.

Each school was placed either in an experimental or control group matched for achievement at pre-school level. Four age groups were monitored as part of a longitudinal study. Pre- and post-testing was carried out followed up by expert evaluations of on-going work, including interviews with pupils and analysis of taped conversations. The results obtained so far tended to show more positive evaluations in the experimental group. There was greater enthusiasm amongst the experimental group for the new working methods and transfer of the effects on the pupils into other areas of the curriculum not covered by the experiment.

Ranka JINDRA gave an account of a teacher training college project aimed at persuading students to use new teaching approaches. Great difficulties were experienced because many of the lecturers in subject areas continued to use a traditional approach whereby students were told "you should" or "you ought" etc. Students tended to replicate the same approach when they came to teach these subjects to pupils in the primary school. Where regulations had been devised as a means of persuasion teachers in the schools had become apathetic or even hostile to the proposed reforms.

Irena VODOPIJA described a survey of the teaching of mother tongue language in the early years. The research had analysed teaching programmes in Croatia, Serbia and Bosnia and the results suggested that the present curriculum did not cover all kinds of texts which children could manage. There was a tendency therefore to underestimate pupils potential. It would appear that discursive language was neglected and there was an imbalance between the teaching of the cognitive functions of language and the development of the spontaneous use of language. The programme was now concentrating on developing materials to encourage teachers to remedy this imbalance.

Marko STEVANOVIĆ summarised the results of the previous presentations and suggested that didactic approaches were still widely prevalent. Present policy was still too conservative so that governments provided limited support for new innovation involving individualised approaches to learning. The present model of

innovation used in Yugoslavia perhaps placed too much emphasis on a rational "objectives" approach and did not take sufficiently into account the needs of the teacher. Teachers needed concrete things to do not simply advice. They needed time to digest and modify the innovation to their own particular needs. They needed support particularly in monitoring the changes and training. A new approach was needed to innovation that began by making specific proposals which allowed the innovation to be described in concrete terms. Teachers then needed to be motivated and encouraged to innovate creatively with plenty of opportunity given for them to change and revise the suggested programme.

Ljubica ACIGAN recounted how, two years previously an attempt had been made to conduct research into teacher training using ideas developed by the OECD. In particular, attempts were made to change the role of the trainers so that there was less direct instruction and more attempts to advise and facilitate, etc. There was considerable resistence to these changes. Staff were reluctant to consider new ideas and there were financial obstacles. In particular, attempts to develop an interdisciplinary course was strongly resisted by members of the training college who claim that integration would lead to disrespect for their disciplines.

The whole project was now being reconsidered with greater attention given to the development of the separate disciplines within the integrated framework.

Kiro POPOVSKI raised questions about the pre-conditions for effective dissemination of didactic and methodological changes. The study examined how schools felt about change by drawing up a list of possible topics for consideration including individualised learning, programme learning, computers, the use of independent study skills, etc. A questionnaire investigated the degree of interest in these topics. A similar instrument was sent to members of the training college to see whether they would like to help schools in this work.

The results showed that schools had not yet put into practice many of the innovations listed but they were willing to take part in a programme of innovation centring around these themes. Training college staff, were willing to help but only by giving lectures. Few were willing to act as consultants giving practical help to teachers in the school. The programme was now under way. Help had been offered to some schools who had responded enthusiastically. It was now necessary to wait and see what would happen.

Mladen ARAPOVIĆ reported on a study which was attempting to establish the optimum conditions for modernising educational processes in the primary school. Attempts had been made to systemise primary education so that changes could be embedded into a specific context. One such change concerned new technology. Within the programme the role of the teacher and optimum standards were defined. Both the headteacher and the deputy had returned to active teaching and teaching skills were the main criteria for promotion.

Ranka PRAŠINOVIĆ then described a programme for central restructuring of the primary school. The innovation attempted to overcome a number of problems associated with the current state of primary education. Although the school day had been extended pupils

tended to do more of the same thing. There was "informational pollution" - too much telling. Pupils were under stress to absorb new facts and adopted negative attitudes to the school and to their teachers. Although the law stated that classes should not be more than thirty, in practice many contained over forty pupils. This made pupil teacher interaction extremely difficult.

The new programme had extended the idea of communication competence taking into account modern linguistic theories. It extended the area of scientific knowledge and included courses in personal and social skills. There were also courses on world awareness and in pre-preparation for vocational education.

Dora GOBEC explained she attended the final meeting of Project No. 8 and had brought the ideas to the attention of her colleagues. They had said "how interesting" but did nothing. However, teachers were more sympathetic and a number of psychologists agreed to support attempts to implement some of the recommendations of Project No. 8. There were, however, difficulties. Although in the seventies, Yugoslavia had started to remove some of the bureaucratic features from the school system, there still remained features which made innovation difficult. It was also necessary for the participants to learn how to engage in purposeful discussion. Most of all it had been found necessary to supply considerable support to schools and to teachers as they attempted to implement the new paradigms.

Rado WECHTERSBACA then described a project concerning the application of microcomputers in school involving logo, measurements and robotics courses. The project called "Circulating Courses" attempted to provide positive experiences to teachers and pupils in the implementation of modern educational and computer technology into schools. New curriculum materials had been developed in a number of core schools whose task is then to circulate this practice among neighbouring institutions. The project arose from a seminar held in 1987 at the Ljubljana fare concerning Computer Assisted Measurements in Physics and Logo in the Primary School. The seminar leaders presented twelve interfaces for computer assisted measurement in physics. Rather than distribute them to twelve schools it was decided to join all the available equipment together and arrange for it to travel from school to school. This allowed the equipment to be used for the whole year instead of for part of the year and to be used out of school terms for teacher education and training. Each project was conceived and led by a chosen core school which organised all the activities inside the course. After a year the complete equipment was designated to the permanent usage of the core school which in return was obliged to organise similar activities for nearby schools.

Three types of "circulating courses" had been developed concerning robots, measurements and logo. Additional financial resources had been provided for the robotics and measurement courses. The results of the project had been presented at computer workshops and several accompanying activities had been organised involving teacher education and training. Pupils had been involved in the preparation of the activities connected with the project. Mentors were given special training in the core schools so that they could extend their experiences into the neighbouring institutions. For the future it was planned that core schools should be responsible for

teacher education and training in nearby schools without the support of the central team. Future experiments would extend the programmes for use with other types of hardware and future projects would attempt to introduce an interdisciplinary approach to the use of technology. It was also hoped to develop "circulating courses" which were appropriate to pupils with special educational needs including the blind and mentally handicapped.

Darja PICIGA highlighted the difficulties that teachers found in appraising cognitive skills and helping to promote these in their pupils. Teams of experts and teachers needed to be brought together to deal with this difficult problem. The work of Piaget had dealt largely with the problem of cognitive conflict - knowledge became stable when it resulted in a resolution between experience and existing ideas but more attention now had to be paid to the social conflict. Ideas were more easily retained if the concepts were presented in ways which conformed with the accepted social situation. It was necessary for researchers to analyse the social interaction within schools and certain of the models developed by French theorists were very useful in this respect.

Korad ZVONIMIC raised the need for new forms of evaluation. In 1982 new kinds of programmes had been implemented, attempting to change the curriculum through continuous systematic development. This innovation had been largely completed by 1988. Evaluation had taken place two years after the introduction into Grade 1 in 1982. This time lag of two years was too great. Curriculum developers needed to obtain results of the evaluation more quickly if they were to modify existing programmes.

One reason for this time lag was the use of an objectives approach to curriculum planning. The evaluation then consisted of questionnaires to teachers, the assessment of outcomes and the measurement of attitudes (both teachers and pupils). Such evaluation however did not really describe how the curriculum worked in practice. In future there was a need to use other forms of evaluations which attempted to describe what it was like to participate in the new curriculum programme.

Finally, **Irena LEVIČNIK**, described some new approaches to innovation in pre-school education. A number of minor projects had been introduced to improve pre-school pedagogical practice. One such programme involved the Faculty for Physical Culture developing a number of organised sports activities as part of a pre-school programme of physical education. In collaboration with pre-school institutions the Board of Education of the Socialist Republic of Solvenia chose four core themes, formulated in the forms of questions.

1. Were pre-school children capable of listening individually to cassettes with spoken text as part of literacy education?

2. Could more flexible and less rigid organisational forms of pre-school life be developed?

3. Could individualised approaches be devised for developing children's hand co-ordination in preparing them for writing in the primary school?

4. Could children's continuous interaction with natural phenomenon have positive educational effects?

Teachers were free to introduce their own ideas into the programme which involved sixty teachers so that 240 participants were engaged on all four projects. In fact the projects were oversubscribed and eventually 291 pre-school teachers took part. Nearly half the teachers had between eleven and fifteen years' experience covering the pupils' age ranges 2-7 years. An initial meeting was held to put forward the main ideas of the project. After this, teachers worked for three months with their own groups of children and then presented their "own projects" at a second meeting.

The evaluation of the programme suggested considerable engagement by individual teachers in the programme. Many, for example, created special areas for listening to the cassettes. The actual implementation of individual projects seemed to have an effect on other teachers working in the same pre-school. Parents became actively, involved contributing their own cassettes to the kindergarten and listening to them together with the children. Many project reports emphasised the improvement in children's attitudes to individual work and described their co-operation in helping to arrange the room for listening to cassettes. Although these results from such a very small project could not be generalised it did appear that the innovation brought about more happiness in these particular children's lives and more satisfaction to the teachers in their work.

8. DISCUSSION OF THE PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Following these reports there was extensive discussion. Participants focused, in particular, on the need to reform teacher training. Programmes of training needed to operate in a flexible way so that it encouraged students to be more flexible. Traditional methods of working in the training colleges tended to encourage students to adopt similar methods when they entered school.

In response to questions Professor Galton described the ideas of Project No. 8 and the CDCC on teacher training. Project No. 8 wanted to link pre-service and in-service training so that students could work with teachers who were involved in change.

Other speakers pointed out that there were resource implications in adopting more flexible training approaches. Traditional methods of training involving large lectures were less costly. The issue was reaching crisis proportions because training for the primary schools of tomorrow demanded that teachers should teach not only their own specialist subject but other subjects. This would require training colleges to modify their programmes but at the moment higher education was not in a position to meet these new demands. Higher education also had its difficulties. It was very difficult for those who wished to innovate to implement through changes in curriculum. The literature dealing with new approaches was not always available because of slow rates of publication. More money was needed not only for salaries but also for resources. At the moment any attempt at innovation had to be paid for out of existing budgets. Channels of communication were also poor between teachers in the institutes and training colleges to have a clear idea of what students required of them in preparation for teaching in the primary school.

Another speaker complained about the bureaucratic nature of the existing system. Education was not teacher centred nor pupil centred but regulation centred. Teachers feel they lack authority to make the necessary changes towards more individualised ways of working. The situation was not helped because of the "negative selection of teachers'. In the primary area, teachers were drawn from the less gifted range of students and yet they received inadequate training.

The final contributor endorsed these previous views concerning the need to break down the existing structures. At the moment, nearly forty-seven per cent of those involved in education were not working in the school classroom. For every hundred dinas spent on education the school receive only forty. Sixty per cent of expenditure went on administration. Solutions to these problems had to begin in the schools themselves, hence, the importance of action research programmes involving teachers as full participants in the innovation process. Given the existing rigid structure, innovations imposed on schools by the outside authorities had little chance of success.

9. RAPPORTEURS' REPORTS

Professor Galton began by expressing his interest in and enthusiasm for all that he had learnt during the previous day when various participants had reported on the kinds of innovation which were taking place throughout the education system in Yugoslavia. He noted that the major thrust of all these innovations were consistent with the principles outlined in Project No. 8 and in particular, the stress on the autonomy and co-operation between pupils, what in the contact school report was termed "active individualisation", was warmly welcomed.

Having this, however, Professor Galton suggested that as Yugoslavia moved towards the wider implementation of these educational principles it might be profitable to look closely at the research findings on individualised learning which had emerged not only in Europe but also in the United States in studies of "open" classrooms. In general, teachers had been quick to adapt to new forms of organisation so that the pupils no longer sat in rows of desks but were grouped around tables. The main teaching approach had also changed and teachers spent less time in front of the whole class but tended to move around the room dealing with individual pupil's problems. Classrooms had become more friendly places and certainly both the teachers and pupils seemed to gain more enjoyment from this relaxed atmosphere.

However, although the structure of the classroom had been radically altered, less change had been observed both in the didactic methods used and in the curriculum activities provided. Teachers still tended to be very direct. Most of the exchanges between the teacher and the pupils were concerned with information giving or with classroom management. These exchanges were also very brief. In a recent study carried out in the United Kingdom by Professor Galton nearly 40% of all exchanges between pupils and teachers did not last more than five seconds. In this classroom climate, therefore, there was very little opportunity for pupils to engage in higher order thinking activities.

Secondly, there was still a tendency to concentrate on the basics within the various curriculum areas. Thus although many teachers agreed that it was important to use the basic skills of computation to solve practical mathematical problems there was very little of this kind of activity in many primary classrooms. Instead children usually carried out a large number of practice examples taken straight from the worksheet or the book. One important reason for this rather limited curriculum diet was that teachers found it easier to control a classroom when children were given very straightforward tasks to do.

The third area where there was some concern about new teaching methods involved the work rate of some pupils. When the teacher was concerned mainly with individual pupils there were considerable opportunities for time wasting. Some studies in the United States had found that children were "off task" for as much as 50% of the school day. In a recent study of seven year old pupils in London schools the figure was 42% on average.

The general conclusion of this research was that teachers needed to choose wisely the most appropriate teaching method for different tasks and not just adopt one particular style of teaching. Thus for low level outcomes such as learning the basic rules of grammar, learning to add and take away, multiply and subtract, etc a directed approach was more effective. However, in creative activities, such as problem solving, writing stories, testing out scientific hypotheses, etc active individualisation was to be preferred. One recommendation which Professor Galton would like to make to the seminar was that the Yugoslav authorities should organise a conference in which these research findings on classroom practice in the primary school were reviewed and that experts from both the United States and European countries where this research had been carried out should be invited to attend.

Turning to the other issues which had arisen during the symposium, Professor Galton singled out in particular the importance of school management in promoting innovation. It had become apparent, as a result of the discussion on the role of the headteacher in innovation, that there was a wide variety of practice and responsibilities allowed within the different Republics within Yugoslavia and that the role of the school leader varied enormously. Again further work needed to be done in defining and developing the role of the headteacher because it was generally agreed that this individual was perhaps the most important determinant of the successful school-based innovation.

Finally, Professor Galton drew attention to the grave concern expressed during the seminar about the role of the universities in training new teachers who could implement these new approaches to learning. He agreed with participants that students who were taught in a highly didactic way were very likely to adopt similar practices when they, in turn, began to teach children. In many European countries, universities had, on the whole, resisted educational reform and were reluctant to play their part in bringing about changes at school level if it required changes in their own practice. Increasingly therefore, in many European countries and also in the United States governments were resorting to legislation in order to encourage the desired changes in universities. In the United Kingdom,

for example, the government had set up the Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) which inspected all courses on teacher training. Unless CATE was satisfied with the programmes of study and the teaching methods they did not recommend to the Minister for Education that the course should be recognised. Obviously, there were dangers to academic freedom in this kind of intervention by governments but some such initiative was necessary, if universities were to take seriously the ideas developed during the symposium.

Finally, Professor Galton, on behalf of his colleague, Dr. Papadopoulos, thanked the organisers of the seminar for the arrangements which had been made on their behalf. Both Dr. Papadopoulos and Professor Galton had learnt much from the exchanges and they hoped that this meeting would be the first of many contacts between their own countries and the participants in the seminar.

Dr. Nikša Nikola Šoljan then presented the second Rapporteur's report. He began by complimenting Professor Galton on his excellent review of the problems of implementing new working methods in the primary school and for suggesting future directions for research and innovation. Dr. Šoljan set himself the task as Rapporteur of summarising the results of the symposium and in particular, of emphasising ways in which future co-operation between Yugoslavia and the CDCC could be established. He announced that a project report would be prepared which would describe the various innovations and programmes discussed at the seminar. In addition, the report of Project No. 8 had been translated in Serbo Croatian including a special section on the contact school programme.

Turning to the symposium itself, Dr. Šoljan said that there had been two lectures and sixteen contributions describing events in Yugoslavia. This gave an idea of where things now stood, especially concerning the didactic reform of the primary school. Two key issues had emerged from these presentations. First, a need for more resources to sustain innovations and second, a need to modernise teacher training programmes. The present situation was mainly the result of the enthusiastic efforts by individuals. At the moment there was little sustained support from the administrative authorities. There was a need for a better analysis of the theoretical principles which should underpin educational reforms in Yugoslavia so that mistakes and failures might be avoided. The role of researchers was therefore essential. They needed to work closely with educationalists in order to carry out this theoretical analysis.

Many people in Yugoslavia were now aware of the need for reform and the need to devote resources to the study of innovation processes as recommended by the CDCC. Teaching, however, was a lifelong process calling for continuous renewal. There was a need therefore for innovative programmes at both the initial and in-service levels. To prepare teachers for work in the new primary schools required an extension of training periods for all teachers from two to four years. This change would force those responsible for training to rethink their conceptual framework.

Finally, Dr. Šoljan recommended that the proceedings of the symposium including a selection of the projects should be available in English in order to promote closer co-operation between the educational community within the CDCC and Yugoslavia. It was

important that this co-operation with the CDCC should continue and all speakers at the symposium, particularly the distinguished visitors at the opening ceremony, had advocated greater involvement with the CDCC. On behalf, therefore, of all participants, Dr. Šoljan wished to express satisfaction for the opportunity that the seminar had provided for the exchange of views with CDCC experts in such a friendly atmosphere. He expressed his gratitude to Yugoslav colleagues for their support, particularly those colleagues who were members of the Organising Committee for this meeting. Thanks were also due to the Socialist Republic of Croatia for financial support.

Following Dr. Šoljan there was a brief discussion of the rapporteurs' reports before they were adopted unanimously by the symposium. It was announced that in 1990 a further meeting would be held to discuss the results of the project on "Innovation in the Primary School" presented by Drs. Bognar and Matijevic. It was hoped that representatives from the CDCC would be able to attend this meeting. Among further suggestions made was that information should be collated by participants over the next few years and arrangements made to share these experiences. There was a need to publish materials in English so that ideas could be more widely shared. Participants thanked the visiting experts from the CDCC. They had provided an excellent analysis of the current situation and drawn attention to the important points that could be recognised in future work on innovation in Yugoslavia. Above all, there was a need to review the use of power and how it was used within the school system. There was a great tendency for those who rule to use power. Teachers had power over pupils and headteachers over teachers. School reform was very complex but the seminar had encouraged everyone to continue to engage in innovation.

10. CONCLUDING REMARKS

On behalf of the CDCC, Mrs Giulia Podestà Le Poittevin expressed her deepest gratitude to the authorities of the Socialist Republic of Croatia for their warm hospitality and to the Federal Authorities for their support. In particular she wished to thank Dr. Stjepan Rodek as President of the Organising Committee of the meeting and Dr. Šoljan who had acted as the "conscience of the meeting". Special thanks were also due to the excellent lecturers and to the contributions of other members of the symposium who were too numerous to mention individually. She expressed the hope that one of the main principles of Project No. 8 - the essential role of the school as an active agent of its own change - would be among the criteria leading to innovation in Yugoslav primary education.

Finally, the President of the Organising Committee, Dr. Rodek expressed his great pleasure on behalf of the Organising Committee at the successful completion of the symposium. Special thanks were extended to Mrs Podestà Le Poittevin and to the two visiting experts for ensuring that a most useful exchange had taken place. CDCC visitors had shown much patience and understanding in the efforts of the Yugoslav delegates to tackle the problems of modernising primary schools. It was excellent that some of the materials presented at the seminar would be translated into English. This would be helpful in the efforts to reform the primary school so that they not only provided basic competencies but also trained pupils to adapt to new situations. In conclusion Dr. Rodek expressed his thanks to everyone who had participated in the seminar and wished all a safe return journey home.

A P P E N D I X 1

TIMETABLE

WEDNESDAY, 5th July 1989

10.30 am - 11.00 am

Opening Ceremony

11.15 am - 11.45 am

Giulia Podestà Le Poittevin
Head of the School Education Division
Council of Europe

CDCC'c Project No. 8 on "Innovation in Primary Education" within the context of the Council of Europe's educational activities

11.45 am - 12.00 noon

Coffee Break

12.00 noon - 12.45 pm

Dr. Antonis Papadopoulos
Director of Primary Education
Ministry of Education, Nicosia, Cyprus

The need for innovation in primary school: sources of and resistance to change; variables related to the introduction of innovations

12.45 pm - 1.30 pm

Discussion

1.30 pm - 3.00 pm

Lunch break

3.30 pm - 4.00 pm

Professor Maurice Galton
Director of the School of Education
University of Leicester, United Kingdom

The Rationale and Implementation Strategies of CDCC's Project No. 8 on "Innovation in Primary Educati n"

4.00 pm - 4.50 pm

Discussion

4.50 pm - 5.30 pm

Dr. Milan Matijević
Dr. Ladislav Bognar

Internal Reform of Primary School: Theoretical Bases and Empirical Testing of Experimental Models

5.30 pm - 6.00 pm

Discussion

THURSDAY, 6th July 1989

9.00 am - 9.30 am

Dr. Nikša Nikola Šoljan
Primary School in Yugoslavia in International Perspective: Main Issues and Changes in Educational Policy

9.30 am - 10.15 am

Dr. Antonis Papadopoulos
Director of Primary Education
Ministry of Education, Nicosia, Cyprus

The role of the headteachers: their traditional role and demands for innovation; their contemporary role as an innovation agent

10.15 am - 10.30 am

Discussion

10.30 am - 11.00 am

Coffee Break

11.00 am - 1.30 pm

Contributior by Yugoslav Experts

1.30 pm - 3.30 pm

Lunch

3.30 pm - 6.00 pm

Contributions by Yugoslav Experts

FRIDAY 7 July 1989

9.30 am - 12.00 noon

Reports by general rapporteurs

Professor Maurice Glaton
Dr. Nikša Nikola Šoljan

Participants' suggestions and opinions

12.00 noon - 12.30 pm

Closing of the symposium

1. GENERAL BACKGROUND OF THE SYMPOSIUM

1.1 Aims of the symposium:

i. To review and discuss the results obtained during the work on the project "Innovation in Primary Education", carried out by the Council of Europe's CDCC

ii. To present results of the research on innovation in primary education in Yugoslavia;

iii. To discuss the possibility for Yugoslav institutions to co-operate in the CDCC's project on "Innovation in Primary Education".

1.2 Participants in the symposium:

The symposium brought together experts involved in the realisation of the Council of Europe's project "Innovation in Primary Education", as well as professionals working at educational institutes, institutes for educational services, faculties of arts and letters, teacher training colleges, and the departments of education of all Yugoslav republics

1.3 Organisers

Institute for Educational Research
Departments of Educational Sciences
Faculty of Philosophy
University of Zagreb

1.4 Co-organisers

i. Federation of Self-Managing Communities of Interest for Education and Primary Education of SR Croatia, Zagreb

ii. Institute for Educational Services of SR Croatia, Zagreb

iii. Školske novine, Newspaper Publishing House, Zagreb.

1.5 Co-ordination

i. Federal Administration for International Scientific, Educational, Cultural and Technical Co-operation, Belgrade

ii. Department for Education and Culture of SR Croatia, Zagreb

1.6 ORGANISING COMMITTEE

Ljubica	ACIGAN, Novi Sad
Mladen	ARAPOVIĆ, Sarajevo
Naima	BALIĆ, Zagreb
Ante	BEŽEN, Zagreb
Dora	GOBEC, Ljubljana
Stjepan	JAKOPOVIĆ, Zagreb
Vujo	KNEŽEVIĆ, Belgrade
Milan	MATIJEVIĆ, Zagreb

Matko	MEŠTROVIĆ, Zagreb
Kiro	POPOSKI, Skopje
Stjepan	RODEK, Zagreb
Ante	ŠELAK, Zagreb
Niksa Nikola	ŠOLJAN, Zagreb
Dara	ZIMIĆ, Belgrade

President of the Organising Committee:

Stjepan	RODEK, Zagreb

Secretary of the Organising Committee:

Ivan	BIONDIĆ, Zagreb

APPENDIX 2 / ANNEXE 2

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

A. Council of Europe Representatives/Représentants du Conseil de l'Europe

1. Giulia PODESTÀ LE POITTEVIN, Head of the School Education Division, Council of Europe, Strasbourg/Chef de la Division de l'enseignement scolaire

2. Antonis PAPADOPOULOS, Director of Primary Education, Ministry of Education, Nicosia, Cyprus/Directeur de l'Enseignement primaire

3. Maurice GALTON, Director of the School of Education, University of Leicester, United Kingdom/Directeur de l'Institut d'Education

B. Sudionici iz Jugoslavije

1. Milivoj SOLAR, Republički komitet za prosvjetu SR Hrvakske, Zgb

2. Dra ZIMIĆ, Savezni zavod za medjunarodnu naucno-prosvjetnu, kulturnu i tehnicku saradnju, Beograd

3. Matko MEŠTROVIĆ, Zavod za kulturu SR Hrvatske, Zagreb

4. Ljubica BLAŽEVIĆ, Prosvjetni savjet SR Hrvatske, Zagreb

5. Ljubica ACIGAN, Institut za pedagogiju Filozofskog fakulteta Novi Sad

6. Gordana ZINDOVIĆ VUKADINOVIĆ, Republički zavod za unapredivanje vaspitanja i obrazovanja, Beograd

7. Jasmina ŠEFER, Republički zavod za unapredivanje vaspitanja i obrazovanja, Beograd

8. Milenko BRKIĆ, Republički komitet za obrazovanje SR Bosna i Hercegovina, Sarajevo

9. Mladen ARAPOVIĆ, Republički pedagoski zavod, Sarajevo

10. Duro SVRDLIN, Republički zavod pedagoski, Sarajevo

11. Razija ARSLANAGIĆ, SIZ osnovnog obrazovanja i vaspitanja SR Bosna i Hercegovina, Sarajevo

12. Kiro POPOVSKI, Republički zavod za unapredivanje obrazovanja SR Makedonije, Skopje

13. Dusko AČOVSKI, Republički zavod za unapredivanje ... Skopje

14. Blagorodna NIKODINONSKA, Republički zavod za unapredivanje, Skopje

15. Blagorodna LAKINSKA, Filozofski fakultet, Skopje
16. Milena ĆULUMOVA, Zavod za školstvo, Titov Veles
17. Dora GOBEC, Pedagoški inštitute, Ljubljana
18. Darja PICIGA, Pedagoški inštitute, Ljubljana
19. Angelca ZEROVNIK, Pedagoški inštitute, Ljubljana
20. Bogomir NOVAK, Pedagoški inštitute, Ljubljana
21. Darko ŠTRAJN, Pedagoški inštitute, Ljubljana
22. Irena LEVIČNIK, Zavod za školstvo SR Slovenije, Ljubljana
23. Vida BUKOVEC, Zavod za školstvo SR Slovenije, OE Celje
24. Viktorija ZMAGA GLOGOVEC, Zavod za školstvo SR Slovenije, Ljubljana
25. Vrška MARGAN, Zavod za školstvo SR Slovenije, Ljubljana
26. Milena MARKIĆ, Republički komite za njego ... SR Slovenije, Ljubljana
27. Vida KRIŽMAN Izobraževalna skupnost Slovenije, Ljubljana
28. Ranka JINDRA, Pedagoški fakultet, Osijek
29. Irena VODOPIJA, Pedagoški fakultet, Osijek
30. Marko STEVANOVIĆ, Pedagoški fakultet, Pula
31. Barica MARENTIČ-POŽARNIK, Filozofska fakulteta, Ljubljana
32. Ladislav BOGNAR, Zavod za prosvjetno-pedagošku službu, Osijek
33. Sreto BRATANOVIĆ, Zavod za prosvjetno-pedagošku službu, Osijek
34. Radojka ŠERBIĆ, Zavod za prosvjetno-pedagošku službu, Osijek
35. Zorica GALIĆ, Osnovna škola "I G Kovačić", Borovo
36. Blanka GETO, Osnovna škola "Matija Gubec", Čeminac
37. Stanislav ANTIĆ, Zavod za prosvjetno-pedagošku službu SRH, Zagreb
38. Nada TOMIĆ, Zavod za prosvjetno-pedagošku službu, SRH, Zagreb
39. Stjepan JAKOPOVIC, Zavod za prosvjetno-pedagošku službu, SRH, Zagreb
40. Rudolf ZGOMBIĆ, Zavod za prosvjetno-pedagosku sluzbu, SRH, Zagreb
41. Vladimir MUŽIĆ, Pedagoški fakultet, Osijek
42. Nada GOLLNER, Zagreb
43. Tihana SKREBLIN, Zagreb

44. Srećko MANDIĆ, Zagreb

45. Alka AŇČIĆ, Velika Gorica

46. Josip MARINKOVIĆ, Filozofski fakultet, Institut za pedagogijska istrazivanja, Zagreb

47. Josip PIVAC, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb

48. Valentin PUŽEVSKI, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb

49. Stjepan RODEK, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb

50. Ivan SOVIĆ, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb

51. Nikša Nikola ŠOLJAN, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb

52. Milan MATIJEVIĆ, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb

53. Nikola PASTUOVIĆ, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb

54. Nedjeljko KUJUNDŽIĆ, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb

55. Ranka PEAŠINOVIĆ, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb

56. Mile SILOV, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb

57. Dubravka MALEŠ, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb

58. Ana SEKULIĆ-MAJUREC, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb

59. Ante GRCANAC, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb

60. Ivan BIONDIĆ, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb

61. Zvonko KORAJ, Filozofski fakultet, Institut ..., Zagreb