

Zdenko Medveš

Socialistična pedagogika, ujeta v mit o pravičnosti enotne šole in kulturno hegemonijo

Povzetek: Razprava raziskuje »socialistično pedagogiko« na podlagi razlikovanja pedagogike kot izobraževalne dejavnosti, torej kot šolske politike, ter pedagogike kot paradigmatično pluralne (akademsko) znanosti. V tem prispevku bomo prikazali razmerja med šolsko politiko in pedagoško znanostjo v nekdanji Jugoslaviji ob šolskoreformnih projektih, ki so bili idejno navdihnjeni s temeljnimi vrednotami t. i. socialistične pedagogike oziroma socialistične šole. Prikazujemo, da je bila v povojni Jugoslaviji šolska politika monolitna – stremela je namreč k eni sami šolski vrednoti: k odpravi šolskega dualizma z enotno šolo. Vzpostavljanje enotne šole je potekalo v dveh fazah, v prvi z nastankom enotne osemletne osnovne šole, v drugi pa s podaljšanjem enotnega šolanja še za dve leti v srednje izobraževanje ter z odpravo t. i. dualizma med srednjimi šolami, ki pripravljajo le za študij (gimnazijo), in šolami za delo oziroma poklic (poklicnimi šolami). Šolska reforma v drugi fazi, znana pod geslom usmerjeno izobraževanje, se kaže kot strokovno sporen proces, poln konfliktov, ki se je začel leta 1965 in je doživel svoj popoln polom v začetku devetdesetih. Utemeljujemo hipotezo, da pravi vzroki za propad te reforme niso bili v strokovnih šolskopsistemskih rešitvah, ki so bile večinoma ideološki konstrukt vere v pravičnost enotne šole, temveč v spopadu med centralistično in unitaristično naravnano šolsko politiko ter neukrotljivim odporom za ohranitev šolske avtonomije in kulturne identitete posameznih nacionalnih entitet. Predstavljali bomo tudi poglede pedagoške znanosti na reformne tokove, in to z namenom, da pokažemo različnost med šolsko politiko in pedagoško znanostjo ter utemeljimo neustreznost rabe pojma socialistična pedagogika za označevanje šolske politike in pedagoške znanosti v povojni Jugoslaviji. To pa bo mogoče docela utemeljili le s študijem pedagoških znanstvenih paradigem v tem obdobju, kar pripravljamo kot temo za nadaljevanje te razprave.

Ključne besede: pedagogika, znanost, politika, socialistična pedagogika, šolska reforma, enotna šola, usmerjeno izobraževanje, skupna vzgojno-izobrazbena osnova, skupna programska jedra, srednje izobraževanje, gimnazija

UDK: 37(091)

Znanstveni prispevek

Dr. Zdenko Medveš, zaslužni profesor, Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za pedagogiko in andragogiko, Aškerčeva cesta 2, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija; e-naslov: zdenko.medves@guest.arnes.si

Uvod

V razvoju jugoslovanske pedagogike se je po letu 1945 uveljavil pojem socialistična pedagogika, ki pa ni notranje diferenciran in se je uporabljal tako za označevanje šolske politike kot pedagoške znanosti. Razvoj kaže, da takšno stapljanje šolske politike in pedagoške znanosti v enotnem imenu ni korektno, ker zamegljuje paradigmatške, vsebinske in metodološke razlike med šolsko politiko in pedagoško znanostjo, zato bom pojem socialistična pedagogika v tem prispevku uporabljal le v pomenu šolske politike, ne pa tudi pedagoške znanosti, kot se je razvijala na univerzah ali znanstvenoraziskovalnih inštitutih. To razlikovanje med politiko in znanostjo nam pomaga, da bolj konsistentno ovrednotimo določene pojave v razvoju jugoslovanske šolske politike. Obenem lahko pokažemo, da se je pedagoška znanost v tem obdobju razvijala relativno avtonomno in v refleksivnem odnosu do šolske politike. Predvsem pa izraz socialistična pedagogika ni primeren za označevanje znanstvene smeri in tudi ne predstavlja ustrezno pedagoškega mišljenja v povojnem jugoslovanskem obdobju, ker pedagogiko enostransko navezuje na tedanjo idejnopolično ureditev, a v resnici je bil njen mišljenjski prostor tudi v tem obdobju mnogostranski, to pomeni teoretsko pluralističen, in kar je najpomembneje, bolj navezan na dominantne znanstvene paradigme v mednarodnem prostoru kot na šolsko politiko v Jugoslaviji. Razmislek o tem bo sicer predmet druge razprave, ki naj bi pokazala, da sta v povojnem času v Sloveniji močno zastopani duhoslovna oziroma kulturna pedagogika ter socialno-kritična ali kritično-emancipacijska ali na kratko kritična pedagogika, v manjši meri pa tudi reformska pedagogika in herbartizem. Zamisel razprave torej gradim na nujni distanci med šolsko politiko in pedagoško znanostjo.

Na neustreznost rabe pojmov, kot so socialistična ali samoupravljalvska pedagogika, za označevanje teoretskih tokov v pedagoški znanosti in raziskovanju nas opozarja množica virov¹ (zlasti v drugi polovici prejšnjega stoletja), ki

¹ Z vidika sinteznega prikaza glej zlasti *Historisches Wörterbuch der Pädagogik* (2004). Tema o pedagoških tokovih je postala aktualna že v dvajsetih letih prejšnjega stoletja in kaže na zavedanje različnih diskurzov v pedagoškem mišljenju in z njimi povezanih novih pedagoških praks, pri čemer pa v nobenem viru o pedagoških tokovih ni zaznati, da bi se lahko ti tokovi opredeljevali s političnimi orientacijami, kot se je dogajalo v času po drugi svetovni vojni pri nas, in sicer z izrazi, kot so fevdalna, buržoazna, socialistična, sovjetska, nemška pedagogika.

opredeljujejo znanstvene tokove pedagogike na podlagi teoretskih paradigem ali filozofskih sistemov. V nobenem od teh virov ne najdemo klasifikacij pedagoških smeri, ki bi se označevale z družbenoekonomskimi ureditvami (fevdalna, meščanska, socialistična), kar se je v pedagoških besedilih pri nas utrdilo takoj po letu 1945 (glej Schmidt 1982). Uporaba pridevnika »socialistična« za označevanje znanstvene paradigme ali toka znanstvenega mišljenja in raziskovanja je lahko pomenila le prisilno podrejanje pedagoške znanosti šolski politiki. Ustvarila je tudi napačno predstavo, da je bila pedagoška veda v obdobju t. i. socializma oziroma samoupravljanja teoretično monolitna in idejno (mišljenjsko) popolnoma podrejena politiki. A resnica je daleč od tega. V tem prispevku bomo skušali dokazati prav obratno – da se je slovensko teoretsko pedagoško mišljenje tudi po vojni razvijalo avtonomno in kritično do konkretnih šolskopoličnih projektov. Pri tem pa se ni lotevalo samo operativnih vprašanj izvajanja pouka ali notranje organizacije šole, temveč tudi ključnih konceptualnih šolskopoličnih vprašanj, povezanih s cilji vzgoje in izobraževanja in z vizijami razvoja, kar pomeni vprašanj, čemu in komu naj služita pedagogika in šola.

Šolska politika je bila ideološko monolitna, a razcepljena med centralizmom in nacionalnimi interesi

V nasprotju s pluralnim razvojem pedagoške znanosti² je bila socialistična šolska politika v letih 1945–90 izrazito monolitna, zato se vsebinsko ne bom veliko ukvarjal z njenim programom in idejami, saj namen prispevka ni podroben zgodovinski pregled, temveč iskanje ozadij njenih ideoloških linij. Poleg tega pa ni mogoče veliko povedati o programskih vizijah šolske politike tega obdobja, saj je bila tedaj jugoslovanska prosvetna politika povsem monolitna. *Vseh 50 let je sledila samo dvema idejama: uvedbi enotne šole ter razvoju samoupravljanja*. Posvetili se bomo predvsem prvi ideji, to je poenotenju šolskega sistema, kar hkrati pomeni odpravljanje t. i. šolskega dualizma oziroma šolske diferenciacije,³ saj vse kaže,

² Ta teza je iz tega članka razvidna le deloma, v celoti pa jo bom razvil v samostojnem članku.

³ Ideja samoupravljanja v jugoslovanski šolski politiki simbolizira vsaj štiri dimenzije: *decentralizacijo* šolstva, tj. iskanje ravnotežja med centralizmom federacije ter šolsko avtonomijo republik in pokrajin; *deetatizacijo* šolstva, kar je pomenilo prenos pristojnosti z države na izobraževalne skupnosti kot skupnosti socialnih partnerjev; *sistem organizacije in upravljanje šol* z razvojem šolske avtonomije ter ne nazadnje *koncept vzgoje* participativnega državljana. Ideja je dobila pozitiven pomen tudi v polju pedagoške znanosti, zlasti po letu 1970, ko je pedagoška znanost prepoznavala samoupravljanje v vseh štirih dimenzijah kot plodno šolsko-pedagoško idejo (Schmidt 1970/1982, str. 132–147) – prva letnica pomeni leto, ko je razprava prvič izšla, druga pa njen ponatis, po katerem so povzete reference), vendar je prosvetni politiki očitala, da je samoupravljanje v šoli razumela predvsem v njegovih organizacijskih vlogah (organiziranje sistema izobraževalnih skupnosti, organiziranje šol po enaki logiki, kot je veljala za organizacijo proizvodnih organizacij), kar je sicer vpeljalo tudi določene elemente šolske avtonomije: upravljanje s šolskimi sveti, sodelovanje staršev in učencev/dijakov, predvsem pa krepitev nekaterih pristojnosti (kadrovskih in finančnih) ravnatelja. Pedagoška funkcija samoupravljanja, ki naj bi se razvila v samoupravi učencev, je bila v marsičem vrednotena kot oblika ideološke ali politične vzgoje, in to tudi po krivici, saj so se nekatere osnovne šole res izkazale s pomembnimi vzgojnimi programi in dosežki; v sedemdesetih in osemdesetih letih je bil splošno znan in zgleden dosežek organizacije pristočasnih interesnih programov osnovne šole v Podčetrtku.

da je bila enotna šola ključno geslo, s katerim se je socialistična pedagogika identificirala v povojnem obdobju. Proces poenotenja šole je potekal v dveh etapah: do leta 1958 kot razvoj enotne osemletke, potem pa do devetdesetih let kot neuspešen poskus podaljšanja enotnega šolanja še za dve leti v srednje izobraževanje, simbolno rečeno, kot nastajanje desetletke, in kot odprava t. i. dualizma med gimnazijo ter poklicnim in strokovnim šolstvom.

Nastanek osemletke

Prva etapa se je eksperimentalno začela že kakih deset let po koncu vojne z odpravo nižjih (in višjih) osnovnih šol in nižjih gimnazij ter sklenila z uvajanjem enotne osemletke. Ta reforma je temeljila na *Splošnem zakonu o šolstvu* (1958). Zakon je sprejela Skupščina Jugoslavije, ki je takrat še imela vsa pooblastila za sprejemanje okvirnih zakonov s področja šolstva. Osemletko sta relativno složno uvajali šolska politika in pedagoška znanost, in sicer vse tja do leta 1964, če štejemo, da je uvajalno obdobje obsegalo tudi preizkušanje, spremljanje in dopolnjevanje osnovnošolskega programa.⁴ Poseg v reformo osnovne šole je potekal nekako v spravnem razmerju in aktivnem soglasju (sodelovanje) prosvetne politike in pedagoške znanosti tudi zato, ker je politika zagotovila pogoje za predhodno eksperimentalno spremljanje učinkov pouka v osemletki in nižji gimnaziji ter spremljanje osemletke po frontalni uvedbi leta 1958, kar je omogočalo raziskovalno preverjanje novih učnih načrtov in njihovo sprotno dopolnjevanje.

Nastanek zamisli »desetletke« v Predlogu za razvoj sistema izobraževanja na II. stopnji⁵ – in njena zavrnitev

Leto dni po tem, ko je bilo objavljeno poročilo⁶ o uvajanju osemletke, že lahko štejemo za *začetek druge faze* poenotenja šolskega sistema. To je bilo leto 1965, ki je v razvoju pedagoške znanosti pomenljivo zaradi študije Strmčnika (1965), predstavljene v razpravi *Enotna osnovna šola je bistveni element socialističnih družbenih odnosov*, v kateri avtor dokazuje, da je pravična enotna osnovna šola bolj papirnata fikcija kot realnost, saj zaradi neustrezne izpeljave, togega razumevanja enotnosti in uniformiranosti programa ter neupoštevanja razlik med učenci pri njegovi izvedbi enotna osemletna šola ni izpolnila pričakovanj, predvsem pa se uspeh in položaj otrok nižjih socialnih slojev v njej nista izboljšala. Gre za prvo empirično utemeljeno kritiko socialistične šolske politike, natančneje, gre za razbijanje mita o enotni šoli kot socialno pravični šoli. Še več, gre za razbijanje mita, da je enotna šola temelj socialistične pedagogike, kar je leto pozneje pokazal

⁴ S to reformo se ne bom posebej ukvarjal. Podrobno jo je obdelal Kožuh (1987), ki pokaže nastajanje ideje osemletke v političnih dokumentih, razišče nasprotna mnenja ob uvajanju osemletke v prakso, analizira ključne dosežke znanstvenega spremljanja ter način odpravljanja slabosti v skladu z znanstvenimi spoznanji.

⁵ Predlog je izdelal Jugoslovanski zavod za proučevanje šolskih i prosvetnih pitanja v Beogradu.

⁶ Za zaključek raziskovalnega uvajanja osemletke bi lahko šteli leto 1964, ko je izšlo poročilo *Učni načrt osnovne šole v teoriji in praksi*, ki je nastajalo v Republiškem zavodu za preučevanje šolstva pod vodstvom dr. Ive Šegula, poznejše direktorice Pedagoškega inštituta.

Schmidt (1966/1982), ko je dokazoval, da s formalno enotno šolo ni mogoče odpraviti krivic, ki jih v socialnem pogledu povzročajo diferencirani šolski sistemi. Enotna osemletka se torej ni še niti utrdila in končala je ni niti prva redna (neeksperimentalna) generacija (izdelana pa je bila njena utemeljena kritika), a leta 1965 je nastal že nov reformno-politični projekt, in sicer *Predlog za unapredjenje sistema obrazovanja na II. stupnju* (Predlog ... 1965), katerega ključno reformno izhodišče je spet boj proti šolskemu dualizmu, tokrat v srednjem šolstvu. In tudi tokrat je rešitev enaka kot ob uvedbi osemletke – podaljšanje enotnosti še v prvi dve leti srednje šole. *Predlog 1965* je namreč predvideval, da bi se v začetku srednjega šolanja za vse vrste srednjih šol poenotila splošna izobrazba, ki bi obsegala prvi leti in za ta čas tudi odložila poklicno odločitev. Ti dve leti šolanja naj bi se izvajali pri osnovnih šolah (torej gre za nekakšno podaljšanje osemletke v desetletko) ali pa z novo nastalo skupno (splošno) srednjo šolo, ki bi bila kot posebna stopnja v sistemu postavljena med osnovno šolo in dveletno strokovno šolo. *Predlog 1965*, v katerem je zlahka prepoznati zasnovo poznejšega usmerjenega izobraževanja (glej Resolucija ... 1970 in 1974), je bil v Sloveniji zavržen celo kot neprimeren za javno obravnavo in vsaj za pet let popolnoma umaknjen z dnevnega reda šolskih reform v Sloveniji.⁷

Schmidt (1966/1982) je *Predlog 1965* zavračal najprej z metodološkimi argumenti, češ da se politična oblast odloča o projektu nove reforme brez empiričnega preverjanja in eksperimentalne utemeljitve prednosti predlaganega novega sistema pred obstoječim. V oceni najdemo tudi naravnost grobe politične kvalifikacije *Projekta 1965*, češ da »vrača našo pedagogiko v metodološkem smislu nazaj v čase pred informbirojem« (prav tam, str. 117). Gre celo za precej jasne, čeprav ne eksplicitne, namige, da je projekt zamisel političnih sil v nekaterih delih Jugoslavije, ki jim je še vedno zgled Sovjetska zveza in se zavzemajo za kopiranje sovjetske desetletke.

V ospredju Schmidtovega obračuna s projektom je očitek neustrezne metodološke priprave *Projekta 1965*. Temeljna poanta Schmidtovega razmisleka je, da reforme šolstva niso dopustne brez zanesljivih odgovorov o njihovih učinkih, ki jih lahko ponudi le metodološko natančno načrtovano znanstvenoraziskovalno preverjanje reformnih predlogov. Besedilo pa je hkrati tudi monumentalna vsebinska kritika ideoloških vzorcev, ki naj bi jih projekt črpal iz socialistične pedagogike, in na tem temelji vsebinska kritika praktično vseh novosti, ki jih ponuja *Predlog 1965*. Za nas je besedilo zanimivo zato, ker nam barvito dokazuje, kako daleč sta si v tistem zgodovinskem trenutku šolska politika in pedagoška znanost. Pravzaprav med načeli, ki jih izpostavijo avtorji *Predloga 1965*, ni nobenega, ob katerem Schmidt ne bi plastično opisal razlike, kako načelo razume tedanja šolska politika in kako pedagoška znanost. Že samo zaradi tega članka je pedagoška znanost in šolsko politiko nesmiselno »dajati v isti koš«. Pri tem je Schmidt vseskozi zvest socialnokritičnemu znanstvenemu diskurzu, ki je zelo blizu pedagogiki zatiranih,

⁷ Najostrejši je bil odziv Filozofske fakultete v Ljubljani, polemične pa so bile tudi razprave v pedagoških strokovnih društvih. Med pedagogi je v razpravi na posvetu, ki ga je o projektu leta 1965 organiziral Republiški sekretariat za prosveto in kulturo in so se ga udeležili tudi sestavljavci projekta, predlog strokovno utemeljeno zavrnil Vlado Schmidt (1966/1982), na strokovnem posvetu številnih strokovnih društev pa je to storila še Milica Bergant (1966).

pedagogiki delavskih gibanj, pedagogiki socialne demokracije in tudi socialistični pedagogiki, vendar samo na ravni semantike, ne pa po teoretski interpretaciji in metodološkem diskurzu.

Najprej se loti vloge politične zavesti in znanstvenega raziskovanja v snovanju šolskih reform: »[N]i dvoma, da so sestavljavci 'Predloga' napačno odgovarjali [...] [na vprašanje, ali je za reformo potrebna znanost, op. Z. M.], ko so dovolj na glas izpovedali naziranje, da za obvladovanje šolske reforme zadoščata ideološka izgrajenost in socialistična politična usmerjenost, znanstveno raziskovanje pa pri tem ni potrebno.« (Schmidt 1966/1982, str. 99–100) V tem ostrem in nepopustljivem slogu se loteva vsebinskih vprašanj. Zgleden je obračun z razumevanjem enotne šole, ki je primer nekakšnega ideološkega knock outa, zato navedimo nekoliko daljšo pasajo, ki demonstrira slog, v katerem je napisana celotna razprava. »Najbrž je [za vsebino Predloga 1965, op. Z. M.] kriva v socialistični pedagogiki dokaj razširjena zmotna, da je enotna šola socialistična specialiteta, tako rekoč nedotakljiva socialistična svetinja, in da v njene vsestranske odlike že zgolj iz ideoloških razlogov ni dovoljeno dvomiti, kaj šele jo v raziskovalnem procesu – zaradi njegove objektivnosti – postaviti v enakopraven položaj dualističnim šolskim sistemom [...] Avtorji 'Predloga' bi eksperimentiranje omejili samo v okvir enotne šole. Tu je povezanost med izkrivljenim racionalnim mišljenjem in njemu ustrezno empirijo zelo očitna.« (Prav tam, str. 114–115) Sledijo dokazi, da enotna šola ni posebnost socialistične, temveč meščanske pedagogike. Na pomoč priključijo najvišjo avtoriteto teorij socializma. »Razvoj buržoazne šole potrjuje Leninovo stališče, da ta šola ne potrebuje nobene organizacijske diferenciacije, ker izloča buržoazija revne učence od nadaljnjega šolanja s svojo ekonomiko in ne s šolskim sistemom,« kar potrdi Schmidt še z zgodovino, da so »zamiseli enotne šole jasno izrazili pedagoški načrti francoske revolucije« (prav tam, str. 115). Schmidt pozna in kot argument proti enotni šoli uporabi tudi že omenjeno Strmčnikovo študijo o tem, da je pravičnost ob uvedbi enotne osnovne šole samo formalna, papirnata fikcija, ker niso bile zagotovljene ustrezne materialne razmere za delo šol in otrok. Enoten program pa ne more izboljšati položaja revnih otrok in njihove uspešnosti v osnovni šoli – brez ustreznih materialnih razmer ga lahko celo poslabša.

In v tem slogu Schmidt nadaljuje. Podobno kot enotno šolo razglasi za ideološke zmote socialistične pedagogike tudi vsa temeljna načela *Predloga 1965*: zaupanje v moč šole, da lahko spreminja realne socialne odnose v družbi, sumničavost do intelektualne elite, povečevanje fizičnega dela nad umskim, razglašanje šolske diferenciacije in posebej ukrepov za spodbujanje nadarjenih za ostalino meščanske pedagogike, neupoštevanje psiholoških osnov pri načrtovanju in izvedbi pouka, zaupanje v avtomatično vzgojno vrednost proizvodnega dela učencev, politehnično zasnovanost, razporeditev splošne in strokovne izobrazbe v dve fazi, očitjanje elitizma gimnaziji.

Resolucija o razvoju vzgoje in izobraževanja na samoupravnih podlagi ter začetki iskanja slovenske izobraževalne agende

Poglavitne ideje usmerjenega izobraževanja se v nadaljevanju obnovijo z bistveno večjo avtoriteto, kot jo je imel *Predlog 1965*. Skupščina Socialistične federativne republike Jugoslavije je leta 1970 sprejela dokument *Resolucija o razvoju vaspitanja i obrazovanja na samoupravnoj osnovi* (Resolucija ... 1970). Njen osrednji namen je bil razvoj izobraževalnih skupnosti, ki naj bi od države prevzele najpomembnejše programske in finančne naloge na področju izobraževanja (ideološka formula za deetatizacijo šolstva). A resolucija se ni mogla izogniti predlogom za razvoj izobraževalnega sistema, pri čemer pa je na določen način le povzela ključne ideje *Projekta 1965*. Tako v *Resoluciji 1970* najdemo znane politične kritike nepravilnosti dualistične ureditve srednjega izobraževanja, prisotna je ideja o skupni splošni izobrazbeni osnovi (v nadaljevanju SVIO) v poosnovnem izobraževanju, zahteva, da vsaka stopnja po osnovni šoli pripravlja za vstop v delo in nadaljnje izobraževanje. Prisotna je tudi nekoliko razširjena zamisel permanentnosti izobraževanja, ki je v sedemdesetih letih postala stalnica šolske politike, češ da naj v izobraževanje po srednji šoli prihajajo študentje z dela ali ob delu, neposredno po srednji šoli pa naj bo to omogočeno samo najprizadevnejšim in najuspešnejšim.⁸ Odzivi na *Resolucijo 1970* so bili v različnih območjih Jugoslavije različni. V Vojvodini in na Hrvaškem so ključno idejo resolucije (SVIO v vse srednje šole) hitro izpeljali v praksi in v *Izveščaju o stanju, problemima i politici obrazovanja u SFRJ 1980* (Izveštaj ... 1980) lahko preberemo, da sta obe območji sistem srednjega izobraževanja prenovili že do leta 1974. To je razvidno iz popisa stanja v *Izveščaju 1980*, kjer je navedeno, da so že leta 1974 obstajale šole kot dveletna »občetezniška šola« ali »splošna (skupna) srednja šola«, po katerih je bil mogoč vpis v tretji letnik srednje šole katere koli stroke oziroma smeri (prav tam, str. 119). Vrste šol kot »splošnotezniške šole« ali »skupna osnova« so navedene tudi v shemi jugoslovanskega izobraževalnega sistema v obdobju 1974–1977 (prav tam, str. 121).

Slovenija je na podlagi *Resolucije 1970* šele začela pripravljati lasten šolskorazvojni dokument. Prosvetnokulturni zbor (PKZ) Skupščine Socialistične Republike Slovenije je leta 1971 (PKZ 1971) je sprejel sklep o pripravi *Dokumenta o razvoju vzgoje in izobraževanja v SR Sloveniji* (Resolucija ... 1972) in v zadnjih mesecih 1972 že opravil kratko razpravo o tezah za to resolucijo, in sicer v vseh družbeno-političnih organizacijah na ravni republike Slovenije, od stroke pa so bili vanjo vključeni Oddelek za pedagogiko Filozofske fakultete v Ljubljani, Pedagoški inštitut in Zavod RS za šolstvo (PKZ 1972). Za naš članek so zanimive predvsem rešitve, ki se v tezah za slovensko šolsko-razvojno resolucijo nanašajo na ključno vprašanje: odpravo dualizma v srednjem izobraževanju in zagotavljanje enakih pogojev ob vstopu v srednje izobraževanje. Gradivo za resolucijo kot ključno rešitev za odpravo dualizma predvideva *olajšanje prehajanja med različnimi vrstami sre-*

⁸ V razpravah na plenumu Centralnega komiteja Zveze komunistov (CK ZK) Slovenije so v letih 1967/77 prisotne celo pobude, da naj bi se celotna generacija po končani obvezni šoli za nekaj let zaposlila ter šele po takšni prekinitvi nadaljevala srednje šolanje.

dnjih šol, zlasti iz poklicnih in strokovnih šol v gimnazijo, ki naj bi »vključevala več mladih iz gospodarsko manj razvitih območij« (Resolucija ... 1972). Gimnaziji je tako dokument namenil celo pomembnejšo vlogo v sistemu, kot jo je imela do tlej, saj predpostavlja njeno okrepitev, ne pa zmanjšanje vpisa ali celo odpravo, kar bi pričakovali po *Resoluciji 1970*. Prehodnost med programi naj bi v sistemu zagotovili s tremi vrstami ukrepov, in sicer: a) *programskimi*: s »povečanjem splošnega znanja v poklicnih ter strokovnih šolah [...], z obveznim enotnim, obveznim izbirnim in fakultativnim programom v prvem ali v prvih dveh letih« (to je hkrati slovenski odgovor na zamisel *Resolucije 1970* o uvajanju SVIO, vendar brez delitve na dve fazi izobraževanja); b) *organizacijskimi*: združevanje različnih vrst šol (ali bolje: izobraževalnih programov) v šolske centre (v končnem besedilu je namesto »šolski centri« v resoluciji zapis »institucionalno enotna, a programsko diferencirana ... prožna organizacijska šolska oblika, ki bi omogočala prehajanje med šolami (programi) brez fizične menjave šol; c) s *sistemom usmerjanja*, kar je pomenilo uvajanje različnih ukrepov za spremljanje in spodbujanje uspešnosti ter prehodnosti dijakov med programi. Osrednja je bila ideja, da organizacijsko strukturo srednjega šolstva – členitev na različne tipe šol – zamenja programska struktura, torej členitev v različne vrste programov. Pripombe Oddelka za pedagogiko (PKZ 1972) kažejo naklonjenost takšnim rešitvam, zlasti odpravi zaprtosti in nefleksibilnosti v srednjem šolstvu ter zgodnji dokončnosti odločanja dijakov s prvo izbiro izobraževanja, hkrati pa so v mnenju tudi zadržki, ki apelirajo na realnost pričakovanj ob prehajanju, in opozorila proti morebitnemu poenotenju programov med poklicnim in gimnazijskim izobraževanjem. Poudarjena je tudi nujnost diferenciacije že v osnovni šoli, čeprav tudi v končnem besedilu resolucija poleg notranje diferenciacije in individualizacije dopušča le vsebinsko raznolike prostovoljne dejavnosti ter dodatni in dopolnilni pouk. Osnutek *Resolucije 1972* je obravnaval PKZ na 50. seji 7. januarja 1974, ko je bil sprejet tudi *sklep, da se pripravi predlog dokumenta* (Sejni zapiski ... 1974a, str. 172), isti dan pa je potekal tudi enoten zbor na 34. seji. Vsi zbori so sprejeli enoten sklep, da sprejemajo osnutek resolucije, določili so, naj traja javna razprava o njej do 15. marca 1974 ter naj se pripravi predlog resolucije do 20. aprila 1974 (Izrezki iz zapisnika ... 1974). V programu dela za leto 1974 je PKZ sprejem *resolucije* opredelil »kot pomembno nalogo, ki terjaja intenzivno pripravo« (Sejni zapiski ... 1974b, str. 276). Ta zadnji sklep je bil sprejet na zasedanju 31. maja 1974, tj. en dan po tem, ko je 10. kongres ZK Jugoslavije sprejel resolucijo *Naloge Zveze komunistov Jugoslavije v socialistični samoupravni preobrazbi vzgoje in izobraževanja* (Resolucija ... 1974). Bržkone je bila ta resolucija vzrok, da s slovensko šolskorazvojno resolucijo ni bilo nič; priprava njenega predloga je bila ustavljena. V zapisnikih naslednjih sej PKZ ni zaslediti nikakršnega pojasnila, zakaj predlog ni pripravljen in zadnji sklep PKZ ni uresničen. V arhivu (SI AS 2015, *reforma usmerjenega izobraževanja*, šk. 50) sem našel le dopis Republiškega sekretariata za prosveto in kulturo, naslovljen na Skupščino Socialistične republike Slovenije, da je Zveza komunistov Jugoslavije (ZKJ) sprejela posebno resolucijo, ki bo pomenila podlago za reforme vzgoje in izobraževanja tudi v Sloveniji. Iz izreza iz zapisnika 7. seje predsedstva Skupščine SRS je razvidno pojasnilo predsednika družbenopolitičnega zbora, da

»je bilo po preliminarne razgovorih s predstavniki družbenopolitičnih organizacij domnjeno, da resolucije o vzgoji in izobraževanju, kakršna je bila zamišljena, po sprejemu ustreznih dokumentov s kongresa ZKS, ne bi bilo treba sprejemati« (Izrezki iz zapisnika ... 1974).

Resolucija 1974 – ostane pri desetletki, ost ideološkega kopja pa zapiči v srce izobraževalnega sistema – gimnazijo

Zamisel usmerjenega izobraževanja je oktroirala Zveza komunistov Jugoslavije na svojem 10. kongresu. Glede na naravo svojega delovanja in končno tudi zato, ker je bila zveza politična organizacija, zamisli ni utemeljevala z nobenimi raziskavami, čeprav obstaja podatek, da je Jugoslovanski zavod za preučevanje šolskih in prosvetnih vprašanj v letih po letu 1966 »organiziral eksperimentalno realizacijo in preverjanje te koncepcije [iz Predloga 1965, op. Z. M.]« (Izveštaj ... 1980, str. 145).⁹ *Resolucija 1974* spet ponavlja iste mantre o socialnem zlu šolskega dualizma, a tokrat kritika ni naperjena le proti dualizmu v programih splošne izobrazbe med srednjimi šolami, temveč proti dualizmu v zgradbi sistema, in sicer med gimnazijo (kot šola za elito) in poklicnim ter strokovnim šolstvom (kot šolami za delo). Plod obračuna s tem dualizmom je radikalna zahteva resolucije, da »nobena šola ne oblika izobraževanja ne more pripravljati mladih izključno za študij« (*Resolucija ... 1974*, str. 151). *Ob tej zahtevi slovenska zamisel o reševanju šolskega dualizma s prehodnostjo med srednjimi šolami (programi) ni bila več mogoča.*

Kongres ZKJ je na Slovenskem presekala gordijski voz, ki ga je ustvarila slovenska pedagogika, ko je s kritiko *Predloga 1965* pomembno vplivala na njegovo odložitev, dokler ne bodo opravljene potrebne raziskave. Kot smo videli, so bile te celo na voljo. Poleg omenjenih (v opombi 13) tudi Strmčnikova v Sloveniji, ki je kazala vso zmoto šolske politike, ki v razumevanju šolske pravičnosti stavi na enotno šolo, a vendar je *Resolucija 1974* zahtevala, da »je treba v učnih načrtih in programih na začetku usmerjenega izobraževanja zagotoviti skupno vzgojno-izobrazbeno osnovo [ter] osnovno šolo povezati s prvo fazo usmerjenega izobraževanja« (prav tam, str. 151–152, poudaril Z. M.). *Resolucija 1974* pa ni natančno opredelila SVIO – nikjer ni omenjala institucionalne oblike: ali naj se izvaja kot desetletka, skupna ali pa enotna srednja šola. Iz navedenega citata prej kot namig na samostojno šolo ali stopnjo lahko razberemo celo zavzemanje za razporeditev SVIO v celoten program usmerjenega izobraževanja. Prostor za umeščanje SVIO v programe se je zdel ob tej opredelitvi nekoliko širši kot v *Predlogu 1965*, kar je pozneje tudi omogočalo različne izpeljave v posameznih republikah in pokrajinah. Ni pa bilo manevrskega prostora pri tem, da je SVIO enoten program za vse oblike srednjega izobraževanja. Toda za slovensko vizijo razvoja šolstva, ki je nastajala v letih 1972–74, je večjo težavo kot SVIO pomenila zahteva *Resolucije 1974*, da vse oblike izobraževanja po osnovni šoli pripravljajo za vključitev v delovni proces in da nobena šola ne oblika izobraževanja ne more pripravljati samo za nadaljnje izobraževanje. Ta zahteva je nedvoumno napovedovala odpravo gimnazije.

⁹ *Revija šolstva i prosvetna dokumentacija* je v letu 1967 objavila prvo poročilo o eksperimentu (št. 3–4, str. 187), sledijo pa podobna poročila v različnih krajih Srbije in Črne gore (do leta 1977).

Izveštaj 1980 navaja podatke, kako se je usmerjeno izobraževanje začelo uvajati v različnih delih Jugoslavije. Na Hrvaškem in v Vojvodini, eksperimentalno pa v Srbiji in na Kosovu, se je prva stopnja (SVIO) usmerjenega izobraževanja uvajala v prakso že v letu 1975/76, Slovenija ter Bosna in Hercegovina pa sta prvo generacijo vpisali v usmerjeno izobraževanje zadnji, šele v letu 1981/82¹⁰ (*Izveštaj... 1980*, str. 155). Vse republike in pokrajine, ki so prve uvedle usmerjeno izobraževanje takoj leta 1975, so uporabile sistemsko-tehnično precej preprosto varianto in so usklajeno sledile zahtevam *Resolucije 1974*. V bistvu se je, kot smo že pokazali, reformiranje srednjega šolstva začelo že kmalu po sprejemu *Resolucije 1970*. SVIO je predstavljal najprej splošnoizobraževalni program prvih dveh let (tj. prva faza), kamor je bila razporejena celotna splošna izobrazba srednje šole, v drugi fazi, tj. v tretjem in četrtem letu srednjega šolanja, pa je bilo izobraževanje strokovno usmerjeno; od splošnih predmetov so se nadaljevali le materinščina, matematika, teorija in praksa samoupravljanja ter telesna vzgoja. Druga faza je nujno vodila do takšne ali drugačne poklicne usposobitve (prav tam, str. 156). Sistemsko-tehnične rešitve so bile preproste, saj so se dotedanji izobraževalni programi samo vsebinsko prestrukturirali, tako da je bil kompendij srednješolske splošne izobrazbe v večini razporejen v prvi dve leti šolanja. Zato je bil marsikje v Jugoslaviji po sprejemu *Resolucije 1974* postopek uvedbe usmerjenega izobraževanja preprost. Treba je bilo le na novo zakonsko urediti vpisovanje v srednje šole, kar je na primer Hrvaška storila s preprosto zakonsko novelo, da se dijaki vpisujejo v srednjo šolo, najbližjo svojemu bivališču. Po končani pripravljalni stopnji pa se na podlagi razpisa vpisujejo v različne programe zaključne faze srednjega izobraževanja, ne glede na to, na kateri šoli so končali pripravljalno fazo.¹¹ Glede na to, da so leta 1977 usmerjeno izobraževanje v prakso uvedli tudi Srbija, Kosovo in potem Makedonija, je bilo to izobraževanje ob koncu sedemdesetih let za Slovenijo *fait accompli*.

Slovenija še naprej išče svojo lastno izobraževalno agendo

Zvezna partija je bila leta 1974 očitno dovolj močna. Brez hrupa in težav je »umirila« nacionalni skupščinski sistem in pometla z načrtom slovenske skupščine, da sama poišče lastno šolsko identiteto. Ker pa partija po ustavni spremembi leta 1974 ni imela možnosti, da bi prek zveznih organov neposredno vodila izvedbo *Resolucije 1974*, saj na ravni federacije ni bilo šolskega ministrstva, niti nobenega drugega organa, ki bi bil pristojen za šolstvo, je bila leta 1975¹² ustanovljena

¹⁰ Pri uvedbi so bile uporabljene različne variante: v Vojvodini predšolska vzgoja, osnovna šola in SVIO sestavljajo splošno izobraževalno stopnjo, vse preostalo izobraževanje pa je poklicno usmerjeno izobraževanje in tako je prva, ki je odpravila področne šolske zakone in v enem Zakonu o vzgoji in izobraževanju (SAP Vojvodina 1977) urejala celotno izobraževanje od vrtca do univerze; Hrvaška je uvedla dveletno skupno srednjo šolo, Srbija in Kosovo kombinirano, v Sloveniji je SVIO obsegal približno tri četrtine programov prvih dveh let srednjega šolanja, Makedonija pa je razporedila program SVIO v vsa štiri leta (*Izveštaj ... 1980*, str. 155).

¹¹ *Opći kriteriji za donošenje odluka o upisu učenika u završni stupanj srednjeg usmjerenog obrazovanja* (1977; *Prosvjetni vjesnik*, 30, št. 3, str. 38).

¹² 11. decembra 1974 je Izvršni svet Socialistične republike Slovenije dobil dopis, da imenuje slovenske predstavnike v MKRI, in sicer republiškega sekretarja, pristojnega za izobraževanje, predsednika Strokovnega sveta za vzgojo in izobraževanje in direktorja Zavoda za šolstvo (SI AS 2025, šk. 50).

Medrepubliška in medpokrajinska komisija za reformo izobraževanja (v nadaljevanju MKRI), ki naj bi prevzela to usklajevalno nalogo. Seveda samo s pripravo in usklajevanjem predlogov izvedbenih strokovnih rešitev, saj odločitve MKRI niso bile neposredno izvedljive; bila je le prostor dogovarjanja, usklajevanja, odločitve pa so lahko prejemale pristojni organi v posamezni republiki ali avtonomni pokrajini. Naloga ni bila lahka, saj v Jugoslaviji na področju izobraževanja ni bila več v praksi *uniformiranost*. Od *Resolucije 1970* je za urejanje šolstva že veljalo načelo *idejna enotnost, a raznovrstnost poti v izvedbi*, kar je kot izhodišče prisotno že v jugoslovanski ustavi iz leta 1963.¹³

Če imamo v zavesti prizadevanje Slovenije v letih 1972–74, da razvije lastno izobraževalno agendo, je razumljivo, da leta 1975 na Slovenskem ni bilo nikakršnih pogojev za hitro uvedbo usmerjenega izobraževanja. Nasprotno, pokazalo se je, da zgodba Slovenije o iskanju lastne šolske identitete še ni bila končana. Naslednja leta do leta 1981 je Slovenija uporabila za to, da je razvila in v MKRI uveljavila tri specifične sistemske rešitve glede na druga območja Jugoslavije:

1. SVIO v Sloveniji ni obsegal celotnih prvih dveh let šolanja, temveč le leto in pol, pomenljivo pa je, da ni bil izpeljan kot samostojni program ali faza izobraževanja, temveč je bil razporejen v vsak izobraževalni program skupaj z ustreznimi strokovno-teoretičnimi in praktičnimi vsebinami v prvih dveh letih šolanja.¹⁴ To je omogočalo, da se je izobraževanje za določene poklice lahko končalo že po dveh letih; za določene, manj zahtevne poklice pa še prej. Zanje je bil zato iz SVIO izbran le manjši del (skrajšani program). V slovenski izpeljavi je izobraževalni program razumljen kot celota, ki obsega neprekinjeno dve-, tri- ali štiriletno izobraževanje. Sistem torej ni poznal delitve na prvo in drugo fazo, skupen pa je bil prvi letnik, kar je predpostavljalo, da se dijaki odločajo za konkreten poklic (bodisi za tehnika bodisi za ustrezen poklic širokega profila) *znotraj istega strokovnega področja* šele po prvem letniku (Zakon o usmerjenem izobraževanju 1981, 49. člen).
2. Ker SVIO ni bil samostojni program, se vanj tudi ni bilo mogoče vpisati. Vpis v srednjo šolo se ni izvajal po teritorialnem načelu, temveč so si morali učenci po osnovni šoli izbrati ustrezen program (stroko/poklic) srednjega šolanja (prav tam). To je odprlo možnost diferenciacije že pri vpisu v srednjo šolo.
3. Tretja posebnost slovenske rešitve je izhajala iz interpretacije zahteve *Resolucije 1974*, da usmerjeno izobraževanje v drugi fazi (tretji in četrti letnik) pripravlja za delo in poklic in da ni šole ali oblike samo za nadaljevanje šolanja. Ker v slovenski izpeljavi izobraževalni program ni poznal delitve na prvo in drugo

¹³ *Ustava 1963* je še predvidevala, da zvezna skupščina sprejema zakone na področju šolstva, vendar le okvirne, ki pa se ne morejo uporabljati neposredno, temveč samo prek republiških šolskih zakonov. Dokončno decentralizacijo v šolstvu je izpeljala *Ustava 1974*, ki je odpravila pristojnost federacije za sprejemanje šolskih predpisov, obenem pa je tudi odpravila zvezni upravni organ v tem sektorju ter podelila šolsko avtonomijo tudi avtonomnim pokrajinama.

¹⁴ Slovenija je v MKRI na seji 11. junija 1976 (SI AS 2025, šk. 282) dosegla sprejetje sklepa, da se SVIO izvaja v dveh variantah. Varianta a obsega dva letnika in varianta b (imenovana tudi slovenska) obsega letnik in pol.

stopnjo, je zakon za program v celoti zahteval, da »obsega [...] SVIO in druge vsebine splošne izobrazbe ter vsebine [...] strokovno-teoretičnih in praktičnih znanj v posamezni dejavnosti ali stroki«, dopustil pa je tudi možnost usmeritve izobraževanja za »*skupine strok [...] s poudarkom na družbeno-jezikovnem in naravoslovno-matematičnem področju*« (prav tam, podaril Z. M.). S tem je zakon postavil v sistem možnost nastajanja izobraževalnih programov, ki ne pripravljajo za konkreten poklic in delo, temveč za določeno strokovno področje. V tej normi je zakon sicer implicitno odpravil gimnazijo kot tip srednje šole, a je hkrati definiral možnost za nastajanje strokovno usmerjenih programov s širšim profilom, čeprav ne s splošnim, kot ga je imela dotedanja gimnazija. Izvedbo te norme v praksi lahko pozneje prepoznamo v štirih različnih programih: naravoslovno-matematičnem, družboslovno-jezikovnem, splošnokulturnem in pedagoškem, pri čemer pedagoški program sploh ni predvideval praktične usposobitve, medtem ko so preostali trije omogočali usposabljanje za določena strokovna dela.¹⁵

Na ohranitev nadomestkov gimnazije v štirih različnih programih, ki smo jih navedli zgoraj, so se člani MKRI iz drugih delov Jugoslavije odzvali cinično, a z grenkobo.¹⁶

Nočem trditi, da so bile slovenske rešitve boljše. Razporeditev SVIO v različne vrste programov bi teoretično že morala povzročati manj pedagoških in didaktičnih težav kot dveletna srednja šola, ki je programsko enotna za celotno generacijo. Toda tudi vpis v prvi letnik, ki je ločen po izobraževalnih programih in kot ga je izpeljala Slovenija, težav izvedbe ni lajšal v tistih programih, kjer je bil enoten prvi letnik. V teh programih se je formalna diferenciacija izobraževanja tehnikov in poklicev širokega profila začela šele v drugem letniku. Ob vpisu v drugi letnik so se dijaki morali odločiti za dve- ali triletno nadaljevanje izobraževanja, kar je pomenilo tudi odločitev za različno zahtevne poklice. Enoten prvi letnik zato ni pomenil samo težav, znanih iz poučevanja heterogenih skupin. Težave so preprosto bile (glej Ermenc 2009), povečevale pa so se, ker učiteljev v srednjih šolah nihče ni načrtno pripravljaj na delo v heterogenih oddelkih. Večina med njimi takšne prakse ni imela, saj so dotlej poučevali v oddelkih, ki so bili bistveno bolj homogeni. Težave z diferenciacijo v drugem letniku pa so bile tudi sistemske, saj izbira poklicne oziroma tehniške smeri pri napredovanju v drugi letnik ni mogla potekati na podlagi razpisa. To pa pomeni, da pogoji oziroma merila za vklju-

¹⁵ V prvi generaciji (vpis 1981) je imel program Naravoslovno-matematična dejavnost tri smeri tehnikov: matematični tehnik, fizikalni tehnik in biološko-kemijski tehnik; program Družboslovno-jezikovna dejavnost dve smeri: družboslovno in jezikovno; Splošnokulturni program pa je omogočal pridobiti poklice, kot so knjižničar in knjigar ter organizator kulturnega življenja, posredovalec kulturnih prireditev, arhivski referent, muzejski referent (Programske zasnove ... 1981).

¹⁶ Ko je bilo leta 1981 končno znano, kakšen je sistem usmerjenega izobraževanja v Sloveniji skupaj s štirimi programi, ki niso bili standardno poklicno profilirani, je tedanji hrvaški minister za šolstvo, Stipe Šušteršič, ki je takrat tudi predsedoval seji MKRI, pred začetkom seje, zunaj dnevnega reda torej, z neformalno opazko članom komisije sporočil, da so »Slovenci pretihotapili [prikrijumčarili] gimnazijo v usmerjeno izobraževanje«, čeprav je Slovenija člane MKRI že obvestila, kako bo izvedla reformo gimnazije (Zapisnik 28. seje, 1. julij 1979, SI AS 2025, šk. 281).

čitev v eno ali drugo smer izobraževanja niso bila jasno in javno določena. Zato je takšna ureditev povzročala problem, kako zagotoviti, da bo delitev dijakov v smeri pravična, predvsem pa skladna z ustavno zahtevo o izbiri izobraževanja pod enakimi pogoji. Problem ni bil obroben, saj je takšne programe obiskovalo okoli 70 % celotne generacije srednješolcev (Medveš 2008).

Je bila neenotnost izvedbe tako velika, da je Jugoslaviji grozila nostrifikacija spričeval?

SVIO je povzročal tudi globlje sistemske probleme. Priprava izobraževalnih programov je tudi v Sloveniji pokazala, da je SVIO kljub redukciji na leto in pol preobsežen in je ostalo premalo časa za strokovne predmete ter praktični pouk, da bi dijaki lahko dosegli ustrezno kvalifikacijo že po dveh letih šolanja. Zato so po nekaj letih v Sloveniji popolnoma izginili dveletni programi izobraževanja *širokih* poklicev (Programske zasnove ... 1989). Ostali so le skrajšani programi za *ozke* poklice, ki so jih po letu 1996 nasledili programi nižjega poklicnega izobraževanja, a ti so postajali iz leta v leto bolj marginalni zaradi majhnega vpisa (oba letnika skupaj v letu 1983 okoli 1000, leta 2006 pa le 400 oseb) in majhnega števila programov (sprejetih 14, leta 2007 pa se jih izvaja le osem) (Medveš idr. 2008). Posledica povečanega obsega splošne izobrazbe je bilo podaljšanje izobraževanja vseh poklicev širokega profila na najmanj tri leta. To pa je imelo usodne sistemske posledice v razlikovanju stopenj izobrazbe med Slovenijo in drugimi območji Jugoslavije, ker ni bilo več vzporednosti med izobrazbeno stopnjo (trajanjem izobraževanja) in stopnjo kvalifikacije, v katero so bili razvrščeni istovrstni poklici.¹⁷ Stopnja kvalifikacije za enako število let srednjega šolanja v Sloveniji je bila za eno stopnjo višja kot v drugih delih Jugoslavije. Glede na enoten trg dela bi to moralo imeti katastrofalne posledice v pravicah prebivalstva pri zaposlovanju. Ne vem, ali je kdo raziskoval, kako je ta neusklajenost v osemdesetih letih delovala na trgu dela ter ali je imela praktične učinke na zasedanje delovnih mest in razvrščanje v tarifnih pogodbah ter sistemu plač.¹⁸

Kot smo videli, dve varianti izvedbe SVIO, ki ju je MKRI dopustila, že sami po sebi pomenita hud pedagoški in sistemski problem, enotna ideja usmerjenega izobraževanja pa se je na tej točki začela krhati. Poskus, da bi se proces disperzije zaustavil, pomeni *Družbeni dogovor republik in pokrajin o temeljih sistema vzgoje in izobraževanja* (Družbeni dogovor ... 1981). *Dogovor 1981* sicer še vedno vztraja, da je usmerjeno izobraževanje »celota srednjega, višjega in visokega izobraževanja« (prav tam, 7. člen), a je olajšal nekatere druge najradikalnejše zahteve *Resolucije*

¹⁷ Družbeni dogovor o enotnih temeljih za razvrščanje poklicev in strokovne izobrazbe je za triletno srednje izobraževanje (SVIO + 1 leto stroke) določal tretjo stopnjo kvalifikacije, za štiriletno (SVIO + 2 leti) pa četrto stopnjo kvalifikacije (tehnik); v Sloveniji pa so programske zasnove za dveletno izobraževanje določale tretjo stopnjo kvalifikacije, za triletno četrto stopnjo kvalifikacije, za štiriletno pa peto stopnjo kvalifikacije (tehnik). Ko so bili odpravljeni dveletni programi, je v Sloveniji tretja kvalifikacijska stopnja ostala prazna.

¹⁸ V gradivu *Temeljna vprašanja* (1986) je predlog, da se to neskladje odpravi, a izkaže se, da ni prave rešitve, saj bi se porušilo notranje razmerje v Sloveniji, ker bi morali biti na primer absolventi poklicno-tehniških šol in mojstri razvrščeni za eno kvalifikacijsko stopnjo višje kot tehniki.

1974. Ne določa sistemске umestitve SVIO, temveč v 10. členu samo zavezuje, da bodo republike in pokrajine zagotavljale pogoje, da vsi končajo programe srednjega usmerjenega izobraževanja, ki vsebujejo SVIO. Nikjer ni več omenjen SVIO kot prva faza, niti ni delitve srednjega izobraževanja na prvo in drugo fazo. Torej ni več niti sledu o desetletki. Slovenske posebnosti v strukturi usmerjenega izobraževanja so bile povsem v skladu z *Dogovorom 1981*; mogoče bi lahko bile izvedbene rešitve v pripravi programov v Sloveniji že leta 1982 fleksibilnejše, kot so bile na podlagi »trdih« formulacij *Resolucije 1974*.

Dogovor 1981 je bil očitno podlaga za to, da se je prva faza usmerjenega izobraževanja začela postopoma opuščati, na Hrvaškem že leta 1981,¹⁹ v Srbiji pa se je SVIO razporejal na vsa leta izobraževanja šele leta 1986 (Informacija ... 1986). Vsaka sprememba je očitno povezana s povečevanjem, ne pa zmanjševanjem razlik. Vzroke za ta neskladja bi lahko videli tudi v veliki nedodelanosti ali pa celo v samovoljnem oblikovanju reformnih idej v samem vrhu upravno-strokovnih služb, ki so pripravljale strokovna gradiva. Tako je na primer *Izveštaj 1980* komaj leto dni pred *Dogovorom 1981*, ki se je pripravljajl več let,²⁰ še trdno zastopal pogled na SVIO kot prvo in samostojno fazo usmerjenega izobraževanja, ki »bi jo bilo treba programsko povezati z osnovno šolo«. *Izveštaj 1980* celo napoveduje, da »bodo morale republike in pokrajine, ki ob uvedbi prve faze niso opravile ustrezne programske revizije SVIO, to opraviti«, in to tako, »da bodo iz dveh ciklusov splošne izobrazbe [osnovnošolskega in SVIO, op. Z. M.] [...] pripravili linearno-progresivni program splošne izobrazbe od prvega razreda osnovne šole [Hrvaška od predšolske stopnje] do drugega razreda srednjega izobraževanja« (*Izveštaj ... 1980*, str. 156²¹). Ta program splošne izobrazbe bo »izhodiščna točka za vse nadaljnje izobraževanje, tako tisto, ki vodi do prvega poklica, kot tudi za vse višje ravni usmerjenega in splošno permanentnega izobraževanja« (prav tam, str. 149). Da, to je zdaj ključna ideja in gotovo najdrznejša misel v *Izveštaju 1980*,

¹⁹ Indici za to so v gradivu *Zajednička programska osnova usmjerenog obrazovanja i izbor prvog zanimanja* (za sejo MKRI 3. aprila 1981, SI AS 2015, šk. 437) in gradivu *Osnove usavršavanja i uskladjivanja usmerenog obrazovanja od I. do V. stupnja stručne spremlje* (SI AS 2025, šk. 438); prvo gradivo se zavzema za prvo izbiro poklica po koncu osnovne šole, a na 50. seji MKRI 19. marca 1982 je bil ob obravnavi te teme sprejet sklep, ki dopušča vse možnosti: »opredelitev in usposabljanje za poklic in stroko naj se omogoči po končani osnovni šoli, med in najpozneje po končanem SVIO« (prav tam), s čimer je komisija potrdila vso dotedanjo raznolikost v razmerju med SVIO in strokovno usmerjenim izobraževanjem. MKRI preprosto ni bil sposoben doseči soglasja o rešitvah, če je temu nasprotovala samo ena enota (tudi če samo začasno).

²⁰ MKRI je priprave *Dogovora 1981* začel že na 17. seji decembra 1977 v Ljubljani (SI AS 2025, šk. 281 in 282), v naslednjih štirih letih pa je do predložitve dogovora podpisnikom razpravljajl o njem še najmanj na 13 sejah; vsebina dogovora bi morala biti Beograjskemu zavodu dobro poznana, posebno če vemo, da je pristojni organ SZDL Jugoslavije maja 1979 pripravljajl že rezime razprav, ki so o dogovoru potekale po republikah in pokrajinah (Zapisnik 19. seje MKRI; SI AS 2025, šk. 282).

²¹ *Izveštaj* ni kakršen koli dokument. Iz opombe na hrbtu notranje naslovnice ugotovimo, da ga je »pripravil Republiški zavod za napredek vzgoje in izobraževanja v Beogradu za Zvezni zavod za mednarodno znanstveno, prosvetno-kulturno sodelovanje kot podlago za preučevanje izobrazevalne politike SFR Jugoslavije v OECD«. Iz izveštaja je sklepati, da je bil ta republiški zavod pomembno središče, v katerem so rasle najradikalnejše zamisli usmerjenega izobraževanja; pripravljajl je že *Predlog 1965* in očitno je bil eden od glavnih zagovornikov fazne delitve usmerjenega izobraževanja, skupne (enotne) srednje šole ali desetletke.

in sicer da je končan drugi razred srednje šole pogoj za vpis v terciarno izobraževanje, saj »uspešno končan program SVIO usmerjenega izobraževanja v sedanji fazi omogoča na primer *enake pravice in enake izobraževalne možnosti* vsem, ki se pojavijo kot kandidati za vpis v [sedanje poimenovanje] višje in visoke šole, ne glede na stroko. To je tako rekoč 'nova gimnazija', ki jo bodo v prihodnje imeli vsi« (prav tam). *Izveštaj 1980* končno jasno sporoči, da bo SVIO skupaj z osnovno šolo pomenil desetletko. To je Schmidt med vrsticami prebral že v *Predlogu 1965*, ko je ocenil, da gre za prenos sovjetskega šolskega modela (Schmidt 1966/1982, str. 111). O zadnjih dveh idejah (o linearno načrtovanem desetletnem programu, ki združuje osnovno šolo in prvi dve leti srednje šole; obenem naj bi bil tudi pogoj za vpis v terciarno izobraževanje) v Sloveniji nikoli ni nihče resno razpravljal. Mislim, da sploh nista bili poznani. Iz *Izveštaja 1980* pa lahko razberemo še eno konstrukcijo šolskega sistema. Kot dokončno dejstvo je razvidno, da prva faza pomeni končano splošnoizobraževalno šolanje ter da je vpis v začetno stopnjo poklicno usmerjenega izobraževanja (v starem sistemu to pomeni v tretji razred srednje šole, op. Z. M.) mogoč le na podlagi javnega razpisa (*Izveštaj 1980*, str. 158), končana prvi in drugi razred poklicno usmerjenega izobraževanja (mišljena sta tretji in četrti razred srednje šole v starem sistemu) pa omogočata zaposlitev in le najbolj nadarjenim ter prizadevnim nadaljevanje šolanja na višjih in visokih šolah, sicer pa naj bi bilo tako, da višja ko je stopnja izobraževanja, več ljudi naj bi prihajalo na šolanje z dela in ob njem (prav tam, str. 95–96). Težko je razbrati, kaj je veljalo kot dogovor med pisci izveštaja – ali prejšnja ideja o »novi gimnaziji« ali ta zadnja »nova« ideja o vstopu v visoko izobraževanje po končanem tretjem ali četrtem razredu. Ne vem, ali je izpričan kak primer, vsaj ne v Sloveniji, da bi se kdo od absolventov t. i. prve faze usmerjenega izobraževanja prijavil za vpis v višje ali visoke šole. Strokovna navezava srednjega in visokega izobraževanja pa je ena od spornih zamisli usmerjenega izobraževanja in je tudi v Sloveniji prispevala k temu, da se je v *Zakonu o usmerjenem izobraževanju* (1981) skupaj urejalo *srednje in visoko* šolstvo, tudi *univerzo* – vključno z doktorskim študijem.

Skupna programska jedra kot začetek nekega konca

V MKRI je bilo po letu 1980 že slišati dramatična opozorila, da gre razvoj reforme v smer, ko bo v Jugoslaviji treba nostrificirati spričevala. V letih 1979–84 se je šele pokazala prava zanka različnih variant razumevanja SVIO. MKRI je leta 1979 sklenil zmanjšati sistemске razlike med republikami in pokrajinama z usklajevanjem vsebine izobraževalnih programov od predšolske vzgoje do univerze (Informacija... 1986). Analize in primerjave predmetnikov, učnih načrtov za splošnoizobraževalne predmete ter programov poklicno usmerjenega izobraževanja so kazale, da se razlike povečujejo na vseh ravneh sistema.

Z ustavno decentralizacijo šolstva leta 1974, ko sta šolsko avtonomijo znotraj Republike Srbije dobili tudi avtonomni pokrajini Kosovo in Vojvodina, prihaja do nekaterih politično zelo izzivalnih dogajanj. Najobčutljivejše in tudi politično najizzivalnejše pa so razlike, ki so se začele pojavljati na kulturni ravni in so se

pokazale ob obravnavanju vsebin učnih načrtov ter ob razlagah posameznih zgodovinskih, družbenih in kulturnih pojavov v učbenikih.²² To pa je že rob, kjer se razlike ne merijo več v številu ur pouka določenega predmeta in tudi ne ob vprašanih priznavanje izobrazbe ter kvalifikacij, temveč se začne izpostavljati pomen nacionalno-identitetnega korpusa vrednot v vzgoji mladega rodu. V tej dimenziji pa so razlike že dobivale pomembne politične prizvoke (ne)sprejemljivosti.

MKRI se je v letih 1979–84 znašel pred najtežavnejšo nalogo – kako uskladiti učne načrte za osnovno šolo in SVIO. Prvotna zamisel nekaterih republik, da bi MKRI pripravil kar celotne predloge predmetnikov in učnih načrtov za osnovno šolo in SVIO, ki bi jih potem posredoval v potrditveni strokovni svet republik in pokrajin, je propadla takoj, ko je MKRI sprejel možnost izvajanja SVIO v različnih variantah. Dve varianti sta ustvarili dva različna okvirna predmetnika SVIO. Ob različnem številu ur predmeta pa ni mogoče pripravljati enotnih učnih načrtov, zato se je MKRI na 29. seji odločil pripraviti skupna programska jedra za programe predšolske vzgoje ter predmete v osnovni šoli in SVIO.

Skupno programsko jedro je, preprosto povedano, (*skupni*) *del učnega načrta* za posamezen predmet v osnovni šoli in SVIO, ki bi bil *enak za vse republike in pokrajine*. Stvar se je zapletla že ob pripravi in sprejemanju meril za izdelavo skupnih programskih jeder, ko so se pokazale vse mogoče razpoke zelo različnih interesov. Že razlike ob tehničnih in metodičnih vprašanih, tj. v razumevanju pedagoškega načrtovanja vsebin (podrobno ali okvirno), v konceptualizaciji pouka (transmisijsko ali konstruktivistično) in didaktični izvedbi (frontalno, predavateljsko, laboratorijsko, eksperimentalno), so bile težko obvladljive. Razlike, ki izhajajo iz kulturno-zgodovinskih identitet posameznih jugoslovanskih entitet, pa so se dramatično izražale ob pripravi meril za izdelavo jeder, še posebno za t. i. nacionalne skupine predmetov (materni jezik, književnost, glasba, geografija, zgodovina). Za jedra so bila usodna merila, ki jih je opredeljevala redakcijska skupina za pripravo »jeder«. Prvi postavljeni ključni so zahtevali, da jedra obsegajo 80 % »skupnih vsebin glede na število letnih ur« v nekaterih predmetih (marksizem celo 90 % proti čemur so nekatere republike tudi protestirale) (Zapisnik redakcije ... 1983). Delež skupnega se je zaradi pritiskov posameznih republik kmalu zmanjšal pri nacionalni skupini predmetov in MKRI je očitno moral arbitrirati, ko je sprejel sklep, da tudi pri teh predmetih obseg skupnega ne sme biti manjši od 50 % (Skupna ... 1983). Največ težav je povzročalo »jedro« književnosti zaradi izbora literarnih ustvarjalcev in del. Dokončno se je zapletlo ob vprašanju, katera dela – predvsem pa koliko del in ustvarjalcev – iz posameznega naroda in narodnosti Jugoslavije naj se uvrsti v skupno »jedro«. Odločitev je bila, da se kot merilo uporabi paritetni ključ, to je ključ sorazmerne zastopanosti pisateljev glede na deleže narodov oziroma narodnosti med prebivalstvom Jugoslavije. Ko je bil

²² Spomnim se, da je na zasedanju MKRI v Sarajevu (1. marca 1977) minister za izobraževanje Republike Srbije med odmori članom komisije iz drugih delov Jugoslavije neformalno razlagal dogajanja v AP Kosovo po letu 1974, ko naj bi šolska oblast na Kosovu po tem, ko je dobila to pristojnost, prevzemala in potrjevala učbenike, ki so se uporabljali v Albaniji, in da naj bi te učbenike celo prevajala za uporabo v šolah s srbskim učnim jezikom. Politično najizzivalnejša je bila v pripovedi informacija, da naj bi se otroci v šolah s srbskim jezikom učili srbske zgodovine iz albanskih učbenikov.

namesto kanoniziranega literarnega vrha kot merilo za izbor uporabljen paritetni ključ (prav tam in Zapisnik redakcije 1983), so »jedra« pokazala najšibkejšo točko medrepubliškega usklajevanja.

MKRI priprave skupnih jeder ni dokončal, čeprav je bila leta 1983 objavljena njihova integralna verzija, v kateri so bila tudi jedra za nacionalno skupino predmetov – tudi za literaturo –, k temu pa slovenski zastopniki v MKRI niso dali soglasja. V Sloveniji so razprave o jedrih potekale jeseni 1983.²³ Uvajanje usmerjenega izobraževanja je tedaj nasploh močno vznemirilo javnost. Glavna vzroka sta bila padec gimnazije in vertikalna strokovna navezava visokega šolstva na srednje. Na pobude javnosti so bile v letih 1981/82 organizirane polemične javne razprave v Cankarjevem domu, ki so kazale neukrotljivo nasprotovanje reformi in niso kazale nobenega razumevanja za kategorične zahteve obeh kongresov ZKJ (1974 in 1978), in sicer o prvi fazi, skupni vzgojno-izobrazbeni osnovi, o načelu, da vsaka šola pripravlja za poklic, ter o navezavi visokega šolstva na srednje. Javno mnenje je bilo neobvladljivo proti in tudi zaveze politike, da bo zagotovljeno znanstveno spremljanje ter hitro odzivanje na ugotovljene slabosti, večine niso prepričale. To vzdusje do skrajnosti razgrejejo jedra, posebno za literaturo in umetnost. In ni bilo pričakovati drugega kot njihovo kategorično zavrnitev.

Novica o zavrnitvi je preplavila tudi Jugoslavijo. V *NIN-u* (Slovenačko ... 1984, str. 20–21) je bil 17. junija 1984 objavljen članek *Slovenačko jezgro*, kjer lahko beremo obširno informacijo o zavrnitvi jedra za književnost v Sloveniji. Novinarka je citirala izjave iz slovenskih razprav, da so programska jedra »poseg v ustavno avtonomijo republik in pokrajin, [...] da so atentat na nacionalno kulturo«, posebej je predstavila izjavo zbora Društva slovenskih pisateljev septembra 1983, češ da so jedra »jedra razdora« in pomenijo »srbsko, beograjsko, unitaristično zvijačo [ujdurmo]«²⁴. Novinarka je najprej ugotovila, da jedrom nasprotujeta Slovenija in Kosovo. Kosovo zahteva, da se v literarno programsko jedro vključijo tudi pisci, ki so bili rojeni, so živeli in ustvarjali v Albaniji; Slovenija pa nasprotuje jedrom zaradi paritetnega ključa, češ da je porušil vse literarne kriterije in so se v jedrih znašli pisci, ki so neznani tudi najboljšim poznavalcem. Pokazala je, da se je Slovenija odgovorno lotila obravnave literarnega jedra v skupini, v kateri so zastopane vse najkompetentnejše institucije od Akademije znanosti in umetnosti, univerz, vseh družboslovnih in humanističnih fakultet, do Društva slovenskih pisateljev, Marksističnega centra in Zavoda za šolstvo. Novinarki je bila pomenljiva utemeljitev zavrnitve Društva slovenskih pisateljev, češ da smo »vedno podpirali spoznavanje kulture in literature narodov in narodnosti Jugoslavije [in] tudi naprej bomo sodelovali z drugimi republikami in pokrajinami. Mislimo pa, da so pouk, njegove vsebine in cilji ustavna pravica vsake republike oziroma pokrajine in da so zato posebna skupna jedra nepotrebna. Vsaka republika in pokrajina naj v svoje učne

²³ V Sloveniji je Republiški družbeni svet za vzgojo in izobraževanje najprej zavrnil jedra, 14. marca 1983 pa je sprejel *Stališča in predloge o predlogu skupnih programskih jeder* (Stališča ... 1983). Od oktobra 1983 do januarja 1984 se je zvrstila množica razprav političnih in strokovnih teles, strokovnih društev, fakultet in srednjih šol (SI AS 2025, šk. 510).

²⁴ Tega zadnjega dela citata pa ni mogoče najti v Protestni izjavi (1983) Društva slovenskih pisateljev, čeprav so pisatelji »jedra« zavrnil s težkimi besedami, češ da »so porojena iz zmotnega prepričanja o potrebi po večji politični enotnosti države [...] in] so prvi korak za nadaljnje centraliziranje« (prav tam).

načrte po svoji presoji vključuje kar največ avtorjev iz drugih republik, kar smo v slovenskih učnih načrtih storili že doslej« (prav tam, str. 20), saj so jeziki in književnost drugih narodov Jugoslavije obvezen predmet v slovenski osnovni šoli. Slovenija je po razpravah doma sporočila, da so »predstavniki Slovenije odstopili od nadaljnjega dogovarjanja in dograjevanja predlaganega koncepta skupnega jedra; opredelili so se za pripravo svojega jedra« (prav tam). To je bila informacija *NIN-a* o kategorični zavrnitvi literarnega jedra in prekinitvi sodelovanja.²⁵ Leta 1986 je MKRI ugotavljal, da »[č]etudi je MKRI po letu 1983 [MKRI šteje, da so bila jedra sprejeta leta 1983, op. Z. M.] nekatere dele predloga skupnih programskih jeder še naprej usklajeval in dograjeval (književnost, glasba, zemljepis), delovni skupini do danes ni uspelo razrešiti nesporazumov« (Informacija ... 1986). Vse republike razen Slovenije in SAP Vojvodine so programska jedra vnašale v učne načrte od leta 1983 naprej, za Slovenijo pa se v *Informaciji* (prav tam) ugotavlja, da »v tej republiki skupno programsko jedro ni bilo nikoli sprejeto, ker ni bila sprejeta nomenklatura poklicev« (prav tam, str. 7).

Kljub ostrini in občasnemu iskrenju²⁶ so bile razprave o jedrih v MKRI strpne. Tudi v Sloveniji so razprave spremljali umirjeni in spravljivi toni, brez zavračanja kulturne pluralnosti v pouku literature in umetnosti. Na vseh ravneh je bilo čutiti obremenjenost s politično razsežnostjo. Le trdni argumenti za zavračanje jeder so se naslanjali na ustavne pravice, da »noben medrepubliški organ ne more prevzeti ustavno opredeljene odgovornosti republik in pokrajin pri programiranju, usmerjanju in razvoju vzgoje in izobraževanja« (Stališča ... 1983, str. 1). Strokovna kritika pa je tudi utemeljeno zavrnila »jedra« zaradi paritetnega ključa. Najostrejši so bili v Društvu slovenskih pisateljev, kjer so težavo videli v tem, da podcenjevanje pomena kulturno-nacionalnih identitet prispeva k prodoru jugoslovanske identitete v pripravo programov. To se je izkazalo kot usodno za jedra. In ne le za jedra, saj je MKRI v osemdesetih pripravljala enotna izhodišča in osnove na mnogo področjih,²⁷ a jih ni dokončal – razen dogovorov o enotnih osnovah sistema ter klasifikaciji poklicev in strokovne izobrazbe. Ta nemoč je najbolj označila delo MKRI. Kje bi bili vzroki zanjo? Lahko pri vztrajanju MKRI, da deluje po »načelu omogočiti čim več skupnega v predmetnikih, učnih načrtih in v njihovi realizaciji, [...] da bi bila

²⁵ V »vojni jeder« se je oblikovala tudi dilema z dolgoročnimi posledicami za slovenski pouk književnosti. Strokovni posvet slovenskih slavistov v Ljubljani in Krškem 4.–6. oktobra 1984 je ugotovil, da je v učnih načrtih materinščine »delež svetovne književnosti glede na delež drugih jugoslovanskih književnosti premajhen« (Slovenščina, šolstvo, slovenstvo, SI AS 2025, šk. 510). Pojavljali so se celo predlogi, da predmet slovenski jezik in literatura temelji samo na izboru literarnih ustvarjalcev in literarnih del iz slovenske književnosti, za pouk svetovne in jugoslovanske literature v SVIO pa naj se pripravi nova predmeta. Težko je reči, kako so te razprave vplivale na izbor literarnih ustvarjalcev in literarnih del v predmetu slovenski jezik in literatura ob prenovi programov v devetdesetih letih. To bi lahko pokazala študija, ki bi primerjala učne načrte literarnega pouka za osnovno in srednjo šolo po letu 1990 z učnimi načrti pred letom 1980.

²⁶ Nekatere razprave na 53. seji MKRI 3. julija 1982 so kazale na rahlo nestrpnost do Slovenije: naj ona pripravi lastno verzijo programskega jedra oziroma naj se poišče pravna rešitev, ki bo vse republike in pokrajine obvezovala, da spoštujejo skupna jedra (SI AS 2025, šk. 436).

²⁷ V letih 1979/86 je MKRI pripravljala *enotne osnove sistema vzgoje in izobraževanja*, klasifikacije poklicev in strokovne izobrazbe, izdelave nomenklature poklicev, dokumentacijskega sistema, razporeditve začetne in poklicno usmerjene faze, o skupnih programskih vsebinah na višjih stopnjah izobraževanja, o strokovnih naslovih in akademskih stopnjah.

zagotovljena enotnost sistema, [...] in vse posebnosti, ekonomske, kulturne in druge umeščati tako, da bodo čim manj ovirale prehodnost učencev.« (Zapisnik 50. seje MKRI ... 1982) MKRI je torej interes skupnega postavil nad nacionalni interes, in to tudi na operativni ravni, kar je bilo v nasprotju z *Resolucijo 1970, ki je za urejanje šolstva v Jugoslaviji postavila načelo idejna enotnost, a raznovrstnost poti v izvedbi*. MKRI očitno ni bil zmožen usklajevati reformnih rešitev na priznavanju večnacionalne in večkulturne strukture jugoslovanske družbe, kaj šele da bi v nacionalni raznolikosti in medkulturnosti videl produktivne okoliščine za oblikovanje mladih generacij v večnacionalni in kulturno raznovrstni skupnosti.

Konec usmerjenega izobraževanja – žalosten za poklicno in strokovno šolstvo

Po letu 1981 ob poimenovanju »usmerjeno izobraževanje« ni vrelo le v javnosti, temveč tudi v znanosti. Dozorevali so pogoji za empirično evalvacijo, kar dokazujejo že naslovi diplomskih, magistrskih in doktorskih del na Oddelku za pedagogiko med letoma 1981 in 1993, ki so del sistematične evalvacije posameznih pojavov v usmerjenem izobraževanju.²⁸ Najpogostejši mentor teh diplomskih nalog je bil dr. Janez Sagadin, ki je že v letih 1981–86 vodil program raziskav na Pedagoškem inštitutu in Zavodu za šolstvo, leta 1989 pa skupaj z večjo skupino raziskovalcev z Oddelka za pedagogiko raziskovalni projekt *Nadaljnji razvoj srednjega šolstva v Sloveniji*. Rezultati evalvacije (Sagadin 1986) so kot najizrazitejše slabosti potrdili: enotnost in razporeditev SVIO na začetek srednje šole, osip, proizvodno delo ter osnove tehnike in proizvodnje v SVIO, nepovezanost splošne in strokovne izobrazbe, neracionalnost priprave na delo v programih, ki so nadomeščali gimnazijo. Sagadin je ugotavljal tudi nekatere pozitivne učinke (širina poklicne profiliranosti programov, razvejanost mreže srednjih šol, dvig splošne izobrazbe v poklicnem izobraževanju). Pomenljivo pa je njegovo sporočilo, da rezultati ne »kličejo po povratku na staro« (prav tam, str. 493). V evalvaciji ugotovljene pomanjkljivosti so se začele postopoma odpravljati v dveh fazah od leta 1986²⁹ do 1990.

Razvoj srednjega izobraževanja po letu 1996, ko sta bila sprejeta nov *Zakon o gimnazijah* (1996) in *Zakon o poklicnem in strokovnem izobraževanju* (1996), na

²⁸ Navedimo nekatere raziskovalne probleme diplomskih nalog: odločanje dijakov za izobraževalni program, primerjava letnih uspehov dijakov prvega letnika, uresničljivost učnega načrta za slovenski jezik v prvem letniku usmerjenega izobraževanja, uresničljivost učnega načrta za matematiko v prvem letniku usmerjenega izobraževanja, uspešnost skrajšanih programov za zaposlovanje, usposabljanje delavcev brez strokovne izobrazbe. Diplomске naloge hrani knjižnica Oddelka za pedagogiko na Filozofski fakulteti Univerze v Ljubljani.

²⁹ Prenova je potekala v dveh fazah. Prva faza (1986–1988): diferenciacija vsebin po zahtevnosti; več izbirljivosti; uvajanje strokovnih predmetov v prvi letnik, integracija OTP v strokovne predmete; izbirni predmeti po odločitvi šole; zaključni izpiti (Poročilo ... 1987). V drugi fazi pa je Strokovni svet za vzgojo in izobraževanje leta 1990 uvedel smer »gimnazija« namesto njenih štirih nadomestkov in programa računalništva (Ur. l. SRS, št. 5, 16. februar 1990), leta 1991 pa je smeri tri- in štiriletnega strokovnega izobraževanja spremenil v samostojne programe poklicnega in strokovnega izobraževanja (Ur. l. SRS, št. 12, 22. marec 1991). V programih po letu 1990 tudi ni bilo več predmetov, kot so samoupravljanje s temelji marksizma, osnove tehnike in proizvodnje, obramba in zaščita (glej Štiriletni programi ... 1992).

videz ni bil več težava. Vsaj ne za širšo javnost, brž ko je bila obnovljena gimnazija. Pri prenovi poklicnega in strokovnega izobraževanja pa se zdi, da Sagadinovo svarilo pred obnavljanjem starega ni bilo dovolj slišano. Sicer pa se ni vse vrnilo v prejšnje, staro stanje; v poklicnem izobraževanju se je ohranil povečan obseg splošne izobrazbe, kar je pozitivno, a zgradba poklicnega in strokovnega šolstva je ostala nespremenjena od leta 1980/81 do danes, saj so nižje poklicne, srednje poklicne in strokovne ter poklicno-tehniške šole le kopije nekdanjih programov, ki so ohranile nekdanje vloge, in to kljub velikim spremembam (zlasti pomanjkanju dela za mlade), ki jih je na trgu dela povzročila tranzicija. Tudi poskusi prenove poklicnega izobraževanja leta 1996, da bi se tesneje navezalo na izobraževanje in usposabljanje v delovnem procesu in na trg dela, so se iztekli v napačno smer in poklicno izobraževanje po letu 2000 neustavljivo propada. Stroka ponuja mednarodno primerljive rešitve, a ni slišana (Medveš 2013).

Posebna težava so tehniške in druge srednje strokovne šole. Z nastankom novih višjih šol (1996) in z dvigovanjem izobrazbenih zahtev za tovrstno strokovno delo namreč v sistemu počasi izgubljajo svoj zaposlovalni *raison d'être* (Medveš idr. 2008). Že dve desetletji ne vemo, kaj bi s tehniki (podrobneje v prav tam ter v Medveš 2013). Naj gredo študirat? To že počno! Vsaj poldrugo desetletje že skoraj celotna generacija tehnikov nadaljuje študij. Strokovne in tudi poklicno-tehniške šole so postale torej pripravljavnica za visoko šolstvo. Žal pa niso doživele notranje prenove, zato kot pripravljavnica – ob gimnaziji kot elitni svetinji srednjega šolstva – ostajajo drugorazredne. In tako bo očitno še naprej, kajti popolni spremembi položaja navkljub ni posluha za strokovne predloge njihove prenove. Ostajajo takšne kot pred pol stoletja, ko se je več kot polovica absolventov zaposlila. To ni dobro ne za šole ne za mlado generacijo, ki se vanje vključuje, ne za visoko šolstvo.

Naj sklenemo z mislijo, da je v sodobnem razvoju nekaterih evropskih šolskih sistemov (Švedska, Finska, Španija, Francija) mogoče prepoznati številne zamisli, ki kažejo na trend podaljševanja splošne izobrazbe iz osnovne v srednjo stopnjo, kar smo spoznavali v usmerjenem izobraževanju. A z veliko razliko – brez težnje po poenotenju. Pri nas je pedagoška znanost opozarjala, da je ideološka radikalizacija enotne šole vir zla v usmerjenem izobraževanju. Tudi sam sem bil daljše obdobje (1975–1982) vključen v operativno izvedbo usmerjenega izobraževanja, in sicer ob nastajanju zakona, izvršilnih predpisov, izobraževalnih programov in mreže šol. Kar nekaj let sem verjel, da je smiselno sodelovati, ker je politiko z zdravo pametjo in formalno logiko mogoče prepričati, da spregleda in ublaži, če že ne opusti, politično radikalno reformiranje šole. Verjel sem, da ni politike, ki bi se lahko odrekla dobri šolski tradiciji. Ob misli na sistemsko-tehnične rešitve, ki so se razvile v usmerjenem izobraževanju, pa se vendar tedanjih časov spominjam tudi z zadovoljstvom, in to kar v več točkah. Nekatere rešitve, ki smo jih pripravljali v številnih timih, so vsaj začasno zmanjšale stopnjo radikalnih zahtev v izvedbi usmerjenega izobraževanja: uspelo nam je »pretihotapili« naslednice gimnazije, veljali sta dve varianti programa SVIO, v Sloveniji SVIO ni bil samostojna stopnja izobraževanja. Druge rešitve pa zame pomenijo višjo kakovost v razvoju sistema in so ostale tudi po odpravi usmerjenega izobraževanja: povečal se je delež splošne izobrazbe v poklicnem izobraževanju; z nadaljevalnimi programi – danes

poklicno-tehniškimi šolami – so se odprle možnosti za nadaljevanje izobraževanja po poklicni šoli brez vračanja v prvi ali drugi letnik srednje strokovne šole, nadaljevalni programi bi lahko že ob nastanku nadomestili nekdanje mojstrske šole, a so, žal, odpirali samo vstop v študij, zmanjšana je bila drobitev poklicev in razvito izobraževanje za širše poklicne in strokovne profile, odpravljeno je bilo brezplačno vajeništvo, ki je ostalo še iz časov sistema učencev v gospodarstvu in nam ga je oporekala tudi tujina, češ da gre za obliko zlorabe brezplačne mlade delovne sile.

Za konec vprašanje: Ali je bila enotna šola le prvi korak k homogenizaciji kulturne in politične socializacije v Jugoslaviji?

Slovenci smo si po *Resoluciji 1974* vzeli sedem let za uvedbo usmerjenega izobraževanja, da bi našli rešitve tudi ob upoštevanju preteklih strokovnih kritik *Predloga 1965*. A pretekle kritike so bile očitno bolj breme kot navdih. Ozadja, iz katerih se je napajala radikalna šolska ideologija v usmerjenem izobraževanju, so bila globlja in trdovratnejša kot še tako racionalni pedagoški principi. Analiza teh ozadij še vedno ni opravljena, vzroki za radikalizacijo načela enotne šole pa so še zamegljeni. V tem prispevku so podani le namigi, da teh vzrokov ni mogoče preprosto pojasniti s socialistično pedagoško deklaracijo, da hočemo enotno šolo, ker je edina pravična za »delavce in delovne ljudi«. Takšen argument pa sploh odpove, ko se projekt enotne šole razširi na poenotenje poklicnih profilov, kvalifikacij, programov izobraževanja, predmetnikov, učnih načrtov, izvedbe pouka, izobraževanja učiteljev in učbenikov. Zamisel enotne šole je postala ob vseh poskusih za poenotenje izvedbe, ki sežejo do enotnih učbenikov, sredstvo za programsko in vsebinsko poenotenje sistema. Iz strokovnih gradiv sčasoma izginja tema o šolski pravičnosti, nadomesti pa jo stremljenje k enotni ureditvi šolstva v celotni državi. Zamisel reforme je v izvedbi očitno transformirala. Če v začetku izhaja iz ideje *enotne šole* in je naravnana na zagotavljanje pravičnosti v *izobraževanju*, se v osemdesetih letih težišče reforme prestavi na *poenotenje vsebin, in to v njihovih subtilnih kulturnih dimenzijah*, kar pa ima očitno pomembnejše socializacijske kot izobrazbene učinke. V državi, skupnosti, ki je večnacionalna in kulturno pluralna, pa ima socializacija v duhu večje politične enotnosti in državne pripadnosti vse znake kulturne in nacionalne homogenizacije. Ali bi lahko bila enotna šola le maska politike za sidranje enotne jugoslovanske kulture in etnije? Mnogo je vprašanj, ki bi jih bilo treba raziskati, da bi odgovorili na to, kako je mogoče, da so poenotenje zahtevali izvedbeni dokumenti, ki so jih pripravljale strokovno-administrativne službe, ne pa politični dokumenti, zlasti ne resolucije oziroma dogovori, ki so jih sprejemale zvezna ali republiške in pokrajinske skupščine. V tem vidim velik razkorak med politiko najvišjih samoupravnih teles, ki pri urejanju izobraževanja deklarirajo načelo: *idejna enotnost, a raznovrstnost poti v izvedbi*, ter usmeritvami administrativno-strokovnih služb, ki so pripravljale izvedbena gradiva, s katerimi se vsiljuje prav *enakost v izvedbi*. Bržkone strokovno-administrativne službe v tedanjem političnem sistemu ne bi mogle o tem samoiniciativno odločati in izvajati homogenizacije v šolstvu, zato ostaja odprto tudi vprašanje, ali sta bila

raznoverstnost in pluralizem izvedbe v političnem vrhu domišljena in iskrena ali pa je v projektu enotne šole mogoče že videti začetek političnega projekta, katerega cilj je preobrazba nacionalno-kulturno pluralne družbe v nacionalno-kulturno homogeno družbo. Ni pa naključje, da vsestransko poenotenje šolstva v MKRI ni bilo ideja vseh republik in pokrajin. Vse to pa zastavlja mnogo vprašanj o izvorišču jugoslovanskega kulturnega hegemonizma.

Literatura in viri

- Bergant, M. (1966). Pedagoška analiza stališč in utemeljitev v načrtu za unapredjenje sistema obrazovanja na II. stupnju. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 17, št. 3–4, str. 59–68.
- Družbeni dogovor SR in SAP o skupnih osnovah sistema vzgoje in izobraževanja. (1981). Ljubljana: *Uradni list SRS*, XXXVIII, št. 15, 21. 5. 1981.
- Družbeni dogovor o enotnih temeljih za razvrščanje poklicev in strokovne izobrazbe. (1980). Ljubljana: *Uradni list SFRJ*, št. 29/1980.
- Dopis Republiškega sekretariata za prosveto in kulturo BiH IS RS Slovenije o imenovanju članov MKRO. Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025, šk. 50.
- Dopis Republiškega sekretariata za prosveto in kulturo SRS Skupščini SRS o usmerjenem izobraževanju. Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025, šk. 50.
- Ermenc, K. S. (2009). From de-tracking to re-tracking in Slovenian upper secondary education. V: J. Hopfner in E. Protner (ur.). *Education from the past to the present: pedagogical and didactic lessons from the history of education*. Bielsko-Biala: Filozofska fakulteta, Mednarodna založba Oddelka za slovanske jezike in književnosti, str. 122–138.
- Informacija o uvedbi skupnih programskih jeder. (1986). Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025 (MŠŠ), šk. 510.
- Izveštaj o stanju, problemima i politici obrazovanja u SFRJ. (1980). Beograd: Republički zavod za unapredjivanje vaspitanja i obrazovanja.
- Izrez zapisnika. (1974). Arhivsko gradivo: AS SI 1115, f. 1357, 61–50, III. mapa.
- Kožuh, B. (1987). *Pedagogika in šolske reforme*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta Univerze Edvarda Kardelja v Ljubljani. Oddelek za pedagogiko.
- Medveš, Z., Kodelja, Z., Mažgon, J., Ermenc, K. S., Peček, M., Lesar, I. in Pevec, S. (2008). Prispevek poklicnega in strokovnega izobraževanja k pravičnosti in socialni vključenosti. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 59, št. 5, str. 74–94.
- Medveš, Z. (2013). Poklicno izobraževanje je pred desetletjem skrenilo na slepi tir. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 64, št. 1, str. 10–31.
- Medveš, Z. (1988). Pojem enotnosti vzgojno-izobraževalnega sistema. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 39, št. 5/6, str. 271–281.
- Naloge Zveze komunistov Jugoslavije v socialistični samoupravni preobrazbi vzgoje in izobraževanja (Resolucija 1974). (1974). *Sodobna pedagogika*, št. 5–6, str. 147–159.
- Novak, B., Sagadin, J. in Kosovel, I. (1986). *Razvoj usmerjenega izobraževanja v Sloveniji (Usmerjeno izobraževanje)*. Ljubljana: Pedagoški inštitut.
- Opći kriteriji za donošenje odluka o upisu učenika u završni stupanj srednjeg usmjerenog obrazovanja. (1977). *Prosvjetni vjesnik*, 30, št. 3, str. 38.

- Osnove usavršavanja i usklajevanja usmerenog obrazovanja od I. do V. stupnja stručne spreme.* Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025, šk. 438.
- PKZ. (1971). 39. seja 10. 11. 1971. Arhivsko gradivo: AS SI 1115, f. 1355, 61–50, I. mapa.
- PKZ. (1972). Arhivsko gradivo: AS SI 1115 f. 1356, 61–50 II. mapa.
- Poročilo o preobrazbi vzgoje in izobraževanja.* (1987). Gradivo za zasedanje Skupščine SRS 18. 2. 1987. Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025 MŠŠ, šk. 552.
- Predlog za unapredjenje sistema obrazovanja na II. stupnju. (1965). *Revija šolstva i prosvetna dokumentacija*, št. 5. Beograd: Jugoslovenski zavod za proučavanje šolskih i prosvetnih pitanja.
- Programske zasnove. (1981). V: B. Dobnikar (b.l.). *Genealogija gimnazijskih in z njimi povezanih programov in smeri v obdobju 1975 do 2012 (neobjavljeno gradivo)*. Ljubljana: Urad za šolstvo.
- Programske zasnove. Programska zasnova za oblikovanje vzgojno-izobraževalnih programov v usmerjenem izobraževanju. (1989). *Poročevalec ISS*, 7, št. 3.
- Protestna izjava Društva slovenskih pisateljev z dne 20. 9. 1984.* (1984). Arhivsko gradivo: AS SI, 1115, f. 1357, 61–60, III. mapa.
- Reforma usmerjenega izobraževanja.* (1974). Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025, šk. 50.
- Resolucija o razvoju vaspitanja i obrazovanja na samoupravnoj osnovi.* (1970). Beograd: Uradni list SFRJ, 16. 4. 1970.
- Resolucija o razvoju vzgoje in izobraževanja v SR Slovenije* (objavljeno v nedatirani prilogi dnevnih časopisov marca 1974). (1974). Arhivsko gradivo: AS SI 1115, f. 1357, 61–50, III. mapa.
- Sagadin, J. (1986). Reforma srednjega izobraževanja in njeno nadaljnje usmerjanje v luči rezultatov reformnih raziskav. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 37, št. 9–10, str. 467–483.
- Schmidt, V. (1982). *Socialistična pedagogika med etatizmom in samoupravljanjem*. Ljubljana: Dopisna delavska univerza Univerzum.
- Sejni zapiski.* (1974a). Dostopno na: SISTORY.SI/publikacije/ID27237page171 (pridobljeno 15.5.2015).
- Sejni zapiski.* (1974b). Dostopno na: SISTORY.SI/publikacije/ID:27927 (pridobljeno 15. 5. 2015).
- Skupna programska jedra.* (1983). Stališča Republiškega družbenega sveta za vzgojo in izobraževanje. Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025, šk. 510.
- Slovenščina, šolstvo, slovenstvo.* (b. l.). Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025, šk. 510.
- Slovenačko jezgro. (1984). *NIN*, 17. 6. 1984, str. 20–21.
- Stališča in predlogi Republiškega družbenega sveta za vzgojo in izobraževanje o predlogu Skupnih programskih jeder.* (1983). Ljubljana, 14. 3. 1983. Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025 MŠŠ, šk. 560.
- Strmčnik, F. (1965). Enotna osnovna šola je bistveni element socialističnih družbenih odnosov. *Sodobna pedagogika*, št. 3–4.
- Šegula, I. (1964). *Učni načrt osnovne šole v teoriji in praksi – rezultati petletnega preizkusa*. Ljubljana: Zavod za napredek šolstva.
- Štiriletni programi tehniških in drugih strokovnih šol.* (1992). Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za šolstvo in šport, Zavod Republike Slovenije za šolstvo in šport.

- Temeljna vprašanja spreminjanja in dopolnjevanja zakona o usmerjenem izobraževanju.* (1986). Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025, šk. 552.
- Zajednička programska osnova usmerjenog obrazovanja i izbor prvog zanimanja.* (b. l.). Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2015, šk. 437.
- Zakon o usmerjenem izobraževanju.* (1981). Ljubljana: Časopisni zavod Uradni list Slovenije.
- Zakon o vaspitanju i obrazovanju.* (1977). Novi Sad: Radnički univerzitet Radivoj Ćirpanov.
- Zapisnik seje MKRI.* (11. 6. 1976). Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025, šk. 282.
- Zapisniki 17. in naslednjih sej MKRI.* (b. l.). Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025, šk. 281 in 282.
- Zapisnik 28. seje MKRI.* (1. 7. 1979). Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025, šk. 281.
- Zapisnik 19. seje MKRI.* (b. l.). Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025, šk. 282.
- Zapisnik 29. seje MKRI.* (6. 7. 1979). Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025, šk. 282.
- Zapisnik 50. seje MKRI.* (19. 3. 1982). Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025, str. 6, šk. 436.
- Zapisnik redakcijske skupine za pripravo skupnih programskih jeder.* (1983). Arhivsko gradivo: SI AS 2025, šk. 437.

Zdenko Medveš

Socialist pedagogy: Caught between the myth of the fairness of the unified school and cultural hegemony

Abstract: The paper explores “socialist pedagogy” on the basis of a differentiation between pedagogy as an educational activity, i.e. as education policy, and pedagogy as a paradigmatically plural (academic) science. In this paper we will illustrate the relationships between education policy and pedagogical science in the former Yugoslavia in the context of education reform projects that were ideologically inspired by the fundamental values of so-called socialist pedagogy or the socialist school. We show that education policy in post-war Yugoslavia was monolithic and directed towards a single educational value: the abolition of educational dualism by means of the unified school. The establishment of the unified school took place in two phases: *first* with the creation of a unified eight-year school, and *secondly* with the extension of unified schooling for a further two years into (upper) secondary education and the abolition of the so-called dualism represented on the one hand by secondary schools designed only to prepare students for further study (the *gimnazija*, the equivalent of the *Gymnasium* in German-speaking countries) and on the other by schools that prepared them for the world of work (vocational schools). The second phase of the education reform, known as vocationally oriented education, is revealed to be a technically questionable process full of conflicts that began in 1965 and experienced a total collapse in the early 1990s. We attempt to show that the real causes of the collapse of this reform did not lie in technical solutions within the education system, which for the most part were an ideological construct of belief in the fairness of the unified school, but in the conflict between a centralist and unitarist education policy and the intractable resistance to it on the part of those who wished to maintain the educational autonomy and cultural identity of the individual national entities. We shall also present the views of pedagogical science on the currents of reform, in order to show the difference between education policy and pedagogical science and the unsuitability of the term “socialist pedagogy” as a description of education policy and pedagogical science in post-war Yugoslavia. The only way to demonstrate this in full, however, will be through a study of the paradigms of pedagogical science in this period, which we are currently preparing as the topic of a continuation of the present paper.

Keywords: pedagogy, science, policy, socialist pedagogy, education reform, unified school, vocationally oriented education, common educational basis, common programme cores, secondary education, *gimnazija*

UDC: 37(091)

Scientific article

Zdenko Medveš, Ph.D., professor emeritus, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts, Department of Educational Sciences, Aškerčeva cesta 2, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia;
E-mail for correspondence : zdenko.medves@guest.arnes.si

Introduction

In the development of Yugoslav pedagogy the term “socialist pedagogy” began to gain currency after 1945. It was not, however, internally differentiated and was used to characterise both education policy and pedagogical science. Development has shown that this combining of education policy and pedagogical science under a single name is not correct, since it blurs the paradigmatic, substantive and methodological differences between education policy and pedagogical science. For this reason I only shall use the term “socialist pedagogy” in this paper in the sense of education policy, and not in the sense of pedagogical science, by which I mean above all academic pedagogy as developed at universities and research institutes. This differentiation between policy and science helps us to evaluate more consistently certain specific phenomena in the development of Yugoslav education policy. On the other hand, we can show that educational science in that period developed relatively autonomously and in a reflexive relationship with education policy. Above all, the expression “socialist pedagogy” is not suitable for the characterisation of a scientific discipline. Neither does it appropriately represent the conceptual dimensions of pedagogical thought in the post-war Yugoslav period, since it unilaterally ties pedagogy to the ideological and political system of that period, while in reality its conceptual dimensions were many-sided even in this period, in other words theoretically pluralist and, most important, more tied to the dominant scientific paradigms in the international context than to education policy in Slovenia. Consideration of this aspect will be the subject of another paper that will aim to show that humanistic or cultural pedagogy and socially critical or critical-emancipatory (or simply critical) pedagogy were well represented in the post-war period in Slovenia; as were, to a lesser extent, reform pedagogy and Herbartism. The idea of the present paper is therefore built on the necessary distance between education policy and pedagogical science.

The unsuitability of terms such as socialist or self-management pedagogy to characterise theoretical currents in pedagogical science and research is indicated

by many sources,¹ particularly from the second half of the last century, which define the scientific currents of pedagogy on the basis of theoretical paradigms or philosophical systems. In none of these sources do we find classifications of pedagogical orientations that are characterised by socio-economic formations (feudal, bourgeois, socialist), as became the consolidated practice in pedagogical texts in this country immediately after 1945 (see Schmidt 1982). The use of the adjective “socialist” to characterise a scientific paradigm or current of scientific thought and research could only mean the forcible subjection of pedagogical science to education policy. It also created the misconception that pedagogical science in the “socialist” or self-management period was theoretically monolithic and conceptually entirely subordinate to policy. The truth, however, is very different. In this paper we shall attempt to prove the exact opposite, namely that even after the war Slovene theoretical pedagogical thought continued to develop autonomously and critically with regard to specific education policy projects. It did not merely address operational questions regarding the implementation of teaching or the internal organisation of the school, but also key conceptual questions of education policy relating to the aims of education and visions of development, in other words questions of what and whom pedagogy and the school were supposed to serve.

Education policy was ideologically monolithic but split between centralism and national interests

In contrast to the plural development of pedagogical science,² socialist education policy in the period 1945–90 was markedly monolithic. I shall not therefore go into detail about its programme and ideas, since the purpose of this paper is not a detailed historical overview but rather an attempt to discover what lay behind its ideological lines. Neither is there much to say about the programmatic visions of the education policy of this period, since Yugoslav education and cultural policy at that time was entirely monolithic. *For the entire 50-year period it followed just two ideas: the introduction of a unified school and the development of self-management.* We shall therefore dedicate ourselves above all to the first idea, i.e. to the unification of the education system, which the same time means the elimination of so-called educational dualism or the differentiation of schools,³

¹ For a synthetic account, see in particular *Historisches Wörterbuch der Pädagogik* (2004). Pedagogical currents were a topical subject in as early as the 1920s, reflecting an awareness of different discourses in pedagogical thought and the new pedagogical practices related to them. In none of the sources, however, are these currents defined by political orientations, as occurred in Yugoslavia after the Second World War, with expressions such as feudal, bourgeois, socialist, Soviet and German pedagogy.

² This thesis is only partly evident from this article; I shall develop it more fully in a separate article.

³ The idea of self-management in Yugoslav education policy symbolises at least four dimensions: the *decentralisation* of education, i.e. the search for a balance between the centralism of the federation and the educational autonomy of the republics and autonomous provinces; the *destatisation* of education, which meant transfer of competences from the State to education communities as communities of social partners; the *system of organisation and management of schools* through the development of

since everything indicates that the unified school was the key watchword with which socialist pedagogy identified throughout the entire post-war period. The process of unification of education took place in two stages: up to 1958 with the development of the unified eight-year school, and then up to the 1990s as an unsuccessful attempt to extend unified schooling for a further two years into secondary education – which, symbolically speaking, means the creation of the ten-year school and the elimination of the so-called dualism between the *gimnazija* system and vocational and technical education.

Creation of the eight-year school

The first stage begins in experimental form some 10 years after the end of the war with the abolition of lower (and higher) elementary schools and lower *gimnazije* and ends with the introduction of the unified eight-year school. This reform is based on the *General Education Act* of 1958. The Act was adopted by the Federal Assembly of Yugoslavia, which at that time held all powers for the adoption of framework laws in the field of education. The eight-year school was introduced by education policy and pedagogical science in relative harmony right up until 1964, if we consider that the introductory period also included the testing, monitoring and supplementing of the elementary school programme.⁴ The intervention in the reform of the elementary school system took place in a kind of conciliatory atmosphere with the active consent (cooperation) of education policy and pedagogical science, in part because education policy guaranteed conditions for the preliminary experimental monitoring of the effects of teaching in the eight-year school and lower *gimnazija* and the monitoring of the eight-year school following its frontal introduction in 1958, which enabled the new syllabuses to be verified by researchers and supplemented on an ongoing basis.

school autonomy; and last but not least, the *concept of education* of the participative citizen. The idea also acquired a positive meaning in the field of pedagogical science, particularly after 1970, when pedagogical science began to recognise self-management in all four dimensions as a fruitful educational/pedagogical idea (Schmidt, 1982) and to accuse education policy of understanding self-management in schools above all in its instrumental functions (organisation of the system of educational communities, organisation of schools according to the same logic that applied to manufacturing organisations), which did however introduce specific elements of school autonomy: management via school councils, participation of parents and students and (above all) the strengthening of some of the powers of the head teacher (relating to staffing and finances). The pedagogical function of self-management, which was supposed to develop in the self-management of students, was in many ways evaluated as a form of ideological or political education, perhaps unfairly, since some elementary schools distinguished themselves with notable educational programmes and achievements; in the 1970s and 1980s the organisation of free-time activity programmes by the elementary school in Podčetrtek was widely known and held up as a model achievement.

⁴ I do not intend to devote particular attention to this reform. It has been covered in detail by Kožuh (1987), who traces the emergence of the idea of the eight-year school in political documents, explores opposing opinions regarding the introduction of the eight-year school in practice, and analyses the key achievements of scientific monitoring and the method of eliminating weaknesses in accordance with scientific findings.

The emergence of the idea of the “ten-year school” in the Proposal for the Development of the Education System at the Second Level⁵ – and its rejection

The publication of the report on the introduction of the eight-year school a year later⁶ may be considered the *start of the second phase* of the unification of the education system. The year 1965 was a significant one in the development of pedagogical science because of the study by Strmčnik (1965), presented in the paper *The unified elementary school is a fundamental element of socialist social relations*, in which he shows that a fair, unified elementary school is more a fiction on paper than a reality, since as a result of inadequate implementation, a rigid understanding of the unity and uniformity of the programme and a failure to take into account differences between pupils in its implementation, the unified eight-year school did not meet expectations. Above all, the success and position of children from lower social classes did not improve in it. This was the first empirically based critique of socialist education policy or, more accurately, a shattering of the myth of the unified school as a socially fair school. Not only that, it was a shattering of the myth that the unified school is the foundation of socialist pedagogy, something demonstrated a year later by Schmidt (1966, 1982⁷) when he proved that it was not possible to eliminate the injustices caused, from the social point of view, by differentiated education systems by means of a formally unified school. The eight-year school had thus not yet even consolidated itself, and the first full-time (non-experimental) generation of students had not yet completed it, when the first well-founded criticism of it appeared, and in as early as 1965 a new reform project began. This was the *Predlog za unapredjenje sistema obrazovanja na II stupnju* (Proposal for the improvement of the education system at level II; *Predlog 1965*), in which the key starting point for reform was once again the fight against educational dualism, this time in secondary education. The solution proposed was the same as at the time of the introduction of the eight-year school: the extension of the uniform curriculum to the first two years of secondary school. *Predlog 1965* in fact envisaged making general education uniform across all types of secondary schools in the first phase of secondary education. This general education would cover the first two years and students' decisions about careers would be postponed for the same amount of time. These two years of schooling would either be provided by elementary schools (in other words a kind of extension of the eight-year school to a ten-year school) or by the newly created common (general) secondary school, which would be a special stage in the system between elementary school and the two-year technical school. *Predlog 1965*, in which it is easy to recognise the basis of the later vocationally oriented education (see *Resolucija 1970* and *Resolucija*

⁵ This proposal was developed by the Yugoslav Institute for Educational Research (Jugoslovenski zavod za proučavanje školskih i prosvetnih pitanja) in Belgrade.

⁶ We may consider 1964 to be the end of the experimental introduction of the eight-year school. This was the year of the publication of the report *Učni načrt osnovne škole v teoriji in praksi* [The elementary school syllabus in theory and practice], drawn up by the Republic Institute for Educational Research under Dr Iva Šegula, later director of the Educational Research Institute (Pedagoški institut).

⁷ The first date represents the year the paper was first published, while the second is the date of its reprinting, from which the references are taken.

1974), was rejected in Slovenia as being unsuitable for public discussion and for at least five years was entirely removed from the agenda of education reforms in Slovenia.⁸

Schmidt (1966, 1982) rejected *Predlog 1965* with methodological arguments, on the grounds that the political authorities were making decisions on the new reform project without empirical verification and without experimental justification of the advantages of the proposed new system over the existing one. His assessment also includes a very frank political qualification of *Predlog 1965*, on the grounds that “in the methodological sense it sends our pedagogy back to the time before the Cominform” (ibid., p. 117). There are even clear (though not explicit) hints that the project was the idea of political forces in some parts of Yugoslavia for whom the Soviet Union was still a model and who advocated copying the Soviet ten-year school.

In the foreground of Schmidt’s critique of the project is an accusation of inadequate *methodological preparation*. The fundamental point of Schmidt’s argument is that education reforms are not acceptable unless there are reliable answers about their effects, which can only be provided by carefully planned research-based verification of the reform proposals. The text is at the same time a monumental substantive criticism of the ideological models which the project was supposed to have drawn from socialist pedagogy and, on this basis, a substantive criticism of practically all the innovations offered by *Predlog 1965*. The text is of interest to us because it illustrates very vividly just how far apart education policy and pedagogical science were in that moment of history. There is actually no principle highlighted by the authors of *Predlog 1965* for which Schmidt does not clearly list the differences in the way it was understood on the one hand by education policy at that time and on the other by pedagogical science. This article alone is enough to show why it does not make sense to put pedagogical science and education policy in the same basket. Throughout the article, Schmidt remains loyal to socially critical scientific discourse, which is very close to the pedagogy of the oppressed, the pedagogy of workers’ movements, the pedagogy of social democracy and also socialist pedagogy, although only at the semantic level, not in terms of theoretical interpretation and methodological discourse.

He begins by addressing the role of political awareness and scientific research in the design of education reforms: “...there is no doubt that the drafters of the *Predlog* gave the wrong answer [to the question of whether science is necessary for reform] when they loudly espoused the view that ideological soundness and a socialist political orientation are sufficient for the management of education reform, and that scientific research is unnecessary” (Schmidt 1966, 1982, p. 99–100). He addresses substantive issues in the same penetrating and uncompromising style. His account of the understanding of the *unified school*, which is

⁸ The sharpest response to it came from the Faculty of Arts in Ljubljana, while discussions within professional teaching associations were also polemical. Among educationalists it was rejected by Vlado Schmidt (1966, 1982) in a debate at the conference on the 1965 project organised by the Republic Secretariat for Education and Culture, which was also attended by the authors of the project, and by Milica Bergant (1966) at an expert conference of numerous professional associations.

an example of a kind of ideological knock-out, is a textbook case, so we will quote a slightly longer passage that illustrates the style in which the entire article is written. "It is likely that the blame [for the content of *Predlog 1965*] lies in the misconception, fairly widespread in socialist pedagogy, that the unified school is a socialist speciality, a kind of untouchable socialist sacred cow, and that – merely for ideological reasons – it shall not be permitted to doubt its universal merits, let alone place it in an *equal position* with dualist education systems in the research process – because of the latter's objectivity. The authors of the *Predlog* would limit experimentation to the context of the unified school. Here the connection between distorted rational thought and the corresponding empirical knowledge is very clear." (ibid., pp. 114–115). Schmidt then offers evidence that the unified school is not a speciality of socialist pedagogy but of bourgeois pedagogy, summoning to his aid the highest authority of theories of socialism: "The development of the bourgeois school confirms Lenin's view that this school needs no organisational differentiation because the bourgeoisie excludes poor pupils from further education through its economics, not through its education system..." Schmidt confirms this with another reference to history, namely that "... the idea of the unified school was clearly expressed by the pedagogical plans of the French Revolution" (ibid., p. 115). Schmidt is familiar with Strmčnik's study, mentioned earlier, and uses it as an argument against the unified school, citing Strmčnik's finding that at the time of the introduction of the unified elementary school "fairness" was merely formal, a mere fiction on paper, because adequate material conditions for the work of schools and children were not guaranteed. A uniform curriculum cannot improve the situation of poor children or their success at elementary school, and without adequate material conditions can even worsen it.

And so on.⁹ In a similar manner he proclaims all the fundamental principles of *Predlog 1965* to be ideological misconceptions of socialist pedagogy: trust in the power of schools to change real social relations in society, suspicion of the intellectual elite, glorification of physical labour over intellectual work, declaring educational differentiation and, in particular, measures to encourage gifted students to be a remnant of bourgeois pedagogy, a failure to take into account basic psychology in planning and implementing teaching, trust in the automatic educational value of manufacturing work by students, the "polytechnic" conception, the organisation of general and technical education in two phases, accusations of elitism against the *gimnazija*.

The Resolution on the development of education on a self-management basis and the beginnings of the search for a Slovene educational agenda

The principal ideas of vocationally oriented education were subsequently renewed by a significantly higher authority than that of the *Predlog 1965*. In 1970 the Assembly of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia adopted the *Resolucija*

⁹ Readers who wish to gain a fuller impression of Schmidt's critical style are recommended to read the text for themselves.

o razvoju vaspitanja i obrazovanja na samoupravnoj osnovi (Resolution on the development of education on a self-management basis; *Resolucija 1970*). The central purpose of this resolution was the development of educational communities that would take over from the State the most important programmatic and financial functions in the field of education (the ideological formula for the destatisation of education). The resolution was, however, unable to avoid proposals for the development of the education system, where in a certain sense it merely recapitulated the key ideas of *Predlog 1965*. Thus in *Resolucija 1970* we find familiar political criticisms of the unfairness of the dualist arrangement of secondary education, the idea of a common general educational basis (CGEB) in post-elementary education, and the requirement that every stage after elementary school should prepare students for entry to the world of work and further education. Also present is the relatively widespread idea of the permanence of education, which in the 1970s became an education policy “hit”. According to this idea, students should come to education after secondary school either from work or on a part-time basis while working, while further education directly after secondary school should only be possible for the most diligent and successful.¹⁰ Reactions to *Resolucija 1970* differed in different parts of Yugoslavia. In Vojvodina and Croatia the key idea of the resolution (CGEB in all secondary schools) was implemented relatively quickly in practice, and it is apparent from the 1980 *Izveštaj o stanju, problemima i politici obrazovanja u SFRJ* (Report on the situation, problems and policy in education in the SFRY; *Izveštaj 1980*) that both these areas had already overhauled their secondary education systems by 1974. This is clear from the account of the situation in *Izveštaj 1980*, where it is stated that by 1974 schools already existed as two-year “general technical schools” or “general (common) secondary schools”, where enrolment in the third year of secondary school was possible from any discipline or stream (*Izveštaj 1980*, p. 119). Schools are also indicated as “general technical schools” or “common basis” in the diagram of the Yugoslav education system for the period 1974–77 (*Izveštaj 1980*, p. 121).

In Slovenia, *Resolucija 1970* was the basis for the beginning of preparations of a Slovene document on the development of education. In 1971 the Education and Culture Committee (PKZ) of the Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia adopted the decision (PKZ 1971) to prepare a “Resolution on the development of education in the Socialist Republic of Slovenia” (*Resolucija 1972*) and in the last months of 1972 held a brief debate on the theses behind this resolution. This debate involved all sociopolitical organisations at the Republic of Slovenia level, including, from the education field, the Department of Pedagogy at the University of Ljubljana’s Faculty of Arts, the Educational Research Institute (Pedagoški inštitut) and the Education Institute (Zavod za šolstvo) (PKZ 1972). Of particular interest for our concerns are the solutions contained in the theses for the Slovene educational development resolution in relation to one key question: the abolition of dualism in secondary education and the guaranteeing of equal conditions on

¹⁰ In discussions at the Plenum of the central committee of the Communist Party of Slovenia between 1967 and 1977 there were even proposals that on completing compulsory education all students should work for some years and only continue secondary education after this interruption.

entry to secondary education. The material for the resolution envisages, as a key solution for the abolition of dualism, the *easing of transitions between different types of secondary schools*, in particular from vocational and technical schools to the *gimnazija* system, which “should include more young people from economically less developed areas” (Resolucija 1972). The document thus actually ascribes to the *gimnazija* system a more important role than that which it had had to date, since it presupposes a strengthening of the *gimnazija* and not a reduction of enrolment or even its abolishment, which could have been expected from *Resolucija 1970*. Transition between programmes was to be guaranteed in the system by means of three types of measures: a) *programmatic* – by increasing general knowledge in vocational and technical schools [...] through a compulsory unified programme, a compulsory elective programme and an optional programme in the first year or the first two years (this is at the same time the Slovene response to the idea of *Resolucija 1970* on the introduction of a CGEB, although without a division into two phases of education); b) *organisational* – the combination of different types of schools (or rather education programmes) into education centres (the final text of the resolution uses, instead of the phrase “education centres”, the formulation “institutionally uniform but differentiated in terms of programme”, a flexible form of organisation in order to enable transitions between schools (programmes) without physically changing school; and c) a *system of orientation* – which meant the introduction of various measures to monitor and encourage success and the transition of students between programmes. Central to this solution was the idea that the organisational structure of secondary education – the division into different types of schools – would be replaced by a programme-based structure – i.e. division into different types of programmes. The observations of the Department of Pedagogy (PKZ 1972) indicate a favourable attitude towards such solutions, in particular the elimination of closedness and inflexibility in secondary education and the premature finality of students’ decision-making with their first choice of education. At the same time, however, the opinion questions whether expectations regarding transition are realistic and warns against the potential unification of programmes between vocational and *gimnazija* education. The necessity of differentiation even at elementary school is also emphasised, although apart from internal differentiation and individualisation, the final text of the resolution only allows different contents for voluntary activities and additional and supplementary teaching. A first draft of *Resolucija 1972* was considered by the PKZ at its 50th session on 7 January 1974, when a *decision to prepare a formal draft document* was also adopted (Session minutes, 1974a, 172). It was also considered, on the same day, by the unified chamber at its 34th session. A uniform decision was taken to adopt the draft of the resolution and it was determined that public consultation should last until 15 March 1974 and that a formal draft should be prepared by 20 April 1974 (Extracts from the minutes 1974). Within its programme of work from 1974, the PKZ defined the adoption of a *resolution* as ‘an important task that demands intensive preparation (Session minutes 1974b). This last decision was adopted at the session of 31 May 1974, in other words a day after the 10th Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia adopted the resolution

Tasks of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in the socialist self-management transformation of education (Resolucija 1974). This resolution was probably the reason why nothing came of the Slovene resolution on the development of education; the preparations of its draft were halted. The minutes of subsequent sessions of the PKZ contain no trace of an explanation of why the draft was not prepared, or why the last decision of the PKZ was not implemented. All I have been able to find in the archives (SI AS 2015 Reforma usmerjenega izobraževanja, Box 50) is a letter from the Republic Secretariat for Education and Culture addressed to the Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia, in which it is stated that the League of Communists of Yugoslavia has adopted a special resolution that will also represent the basis for education reforms in Slovenia. Extracts from the minutes of the 7th session of the Presidency of the Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia include the clarification of the president of the Sociopolitical Chamber that “following preliminary discussions with representatives of sociopolitical organisations, it has been agreed that after adoption of the relevant documents from the SKJ Congress there would be no need to adopt a resolution on education such as the one conceived” (Extracts from the minutes 1974).

Resolucija 1974 maintains the idea of the ten-year school; the point of the ideological lance is thrust into the heart of the education system – the gimnazija

The idea of vocationally oriented education was imposed by the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (SKJ) at its 10th Congress. Given the way it functioned, and also because it was a political organisation, not even the SKJ justified the idea with any research, although we do know that after 1966 the Yugoslav Institute for Educational Research “organised the experimental realisation and verification of this conception” (author’s note: from *Predlog 1965*) (Izveštaj 1980, p. 145)¹¹. *Resolucija 1974* once again repeats the same mantras about the social evil of educational dualism, although this time the criticism is not only levelled at dualism between secondary schools in general education programmes, but at the dualism in the structure of the system, in other words between the *gimnazija* (as a school for the elite) and vocational and technical education (as schools for work). The fruit of the attempts to address this dualism is the radical requirement of the resolution that “no school or form of education can prepare young people exclusively for further study” (Resolucija 1974, p. 151). *In the face of this requirement, the Slovene idea for resolving the issue of educational dualism by facilitating transition between existing secondary schools (or programmes) was no longer possible.*

In Slovenia the SKJ Congress cut the Gordian knot that had been created by Slovene pedagogy when, through its critique of *Predlog 1965*, it played a significant part in postponing the project’s implementation until the necessary research had been carried out. As we have seen, such research was in fact available. Besides the studies already mentioned (see footnote 13), there was Strmčnik’s research in Slovenia, which pointed out everything that was wrong with an education policy

¹¹ In 1967 *Revija školstva i prosvetna dokumentacija* published the first report on the experiment (No 3–4, p. 187). Similar reports in various parts of Serbia and Montenegro follow up until 1977.

that in its understanding of a fair education system advocated a unified school. Yet *Resolucija 1974* contained the requirement “to ensure a common educational basis in syllabuses and programmes at the start of vocationally oriented education [and] link elementary school with the *first phase* [author’s emphasis] of vocationally oriented education” (ibid., pp. 151–152). *Resolucija 1974* did not, however, offer a precise definition of the CGEB, and nowhere did it mention the institutional form, in other words whether it should be implemented as a ten-year school, a common secondary school or a unified secondary school. Rather than hinting at an autonomous school or level, the above quotation may be interpreted as advocating the distribution of the CGEB throughout the entire programme of vocationally oriented education. The space for inserting the CGEB into programmes appeared, in this context, slightly broader than in *Predlog 1965*, something that later also enabled different interpretations in individual republics and autonomous provinces. There was, however, no room for manoeuvre with regard to the fact that the CGEB was a uniform programme for all forms of secondary education. A bigger problem than the CGEB, however, for the Slovene vision of the development of education that was formulating in the years 1972–74 was the requirement of *Resolucija 1974* that all forms of education after elementary school should prepare students for inclusion in the labour process, and that no school or form of education could prepare students merely for further education. This requirement unambiguously dictated the abolition of the *gimnazija*.

Izveštaj 1980 provides information on how vocationally oriented education had begun to be introduced in various parts of Yugoslavia. In Croatia and Vojvodina, and on an experimental basis in Serbia and Kosovo, the first stage (CGEB) of vocationally oriented education was put into practice in as early as the 1975/76 academic year, while Slovenia and Bosnia and Herzegovina were the last to enrol the first generation of students in vocationally oriented education – in 1981/82¹² (*Izveštaj 1980*, p. 155). All the republics and autonomous provinces that introduced vocationally oriented education immediately in 1975 used a variant that was relatively simple from the systemic and technical points of view and followed the requirements of *Resolucija 1974* in a coordinated manner. Essentially, as we have already shown, the reform of secondary education began shortly after the adoption of *Resolucija 1970*. Initially the CGEB represented a general education programme for the first two years (i.e. the first phase), which included the entirety of secondary general education, while in the second phase, i.e. the third and fourth years of secondary education, the curriculum was vocationally oriented and the only general subjects to remain in the curriculum were mother tongue, mathematics, theory and practice of self-management, and physical education.

¹² Different variants were used on its introduction: in Vojvodina preschool-education, elementary school and the CGEB formed the general education level, while all other education represented vocationally oriented education. Vojvodina was thus the first territory to abolish sector-specific education legislation and regulate the whole of education from nursery school to university within one Education Act (SAP Vojvodina, 1977); Croatia introduced the two-year common secondary school; Serbia and Kosovo introduced a combined school; in Slovenia the CGEB accounted for roughly three-quarters of the programmes of the first two years of secondary school; and Macedonia distributed the CGEB programme among all four years (*Izveštaj 1980*, p. 155).

The second phase necessarily led to a vocational qualification of one kind or another (*ibid.*, p. 156). The systemic and technical solutions were simple, with a mere restructuring of the content of previous education programmes, with the result that the compendium of secondary general education was for the most part allocated to the first two years of secondary school. This meant that the process of introducing vocationally oriented education following the adoption of *Resolucija 1974* was a simple matter in many parts of Yugoslavia. All that was needed was a new legal arrangement for enrolment in secondary schools, which Croatia, for example, did by means of a simple amending statute under which students enrolled in the school nearest to where they lived. After completion of a preparatory level they enrolled in the various programmes of the final phase of secondary education *on the basis of an invitation for applications*, regardless of where they had completed the preparatory phase.¹³ In view of the fact that Serbia, Kosovo and then Macedonia all put vocationally oriented education into practice in 1977, by the end of the 1970s vocationally oriented education was a *fait accompli* for Slovenia.

Slovenia continues to search for its own education agenda

In 1974 the federal Communist Party was evidently sufficiently powerful. With little noise or fuss it simply “calmed” the national assembly system and did away with the plan of Slovenia’s Assembly to find its own educational identity. Since after the amendment to the Constitution in 1974 the Party no longer had the opportunity to directly lead the implementation of *Resolucija 1974* via federal bodies, in that there was no education ministry or any other body competent for education at the federal level, the Inter-Republic and Inter-Provincial Education Reform Commission (MKRI) was established in 1975¹⁴ to take over this coordinating role. Only in an instrumental sense, of course, through the preparation and coordination of proposed technical solutions, since the decisions of the MKRI were not directly enforceable: it was simply a place for finding agreement and coordination, while actual decisions could only be taken by the competent authorities in the individual republic or autonomous province. The task was not a simple one, since *uniformity* was no longer in practice in Yugoslavia in the field of education. Since *Resolucija 1970* the regulation of education had been subject to the principle of *uniformity of idea but diversity of implementation* – already present as an essential principle in the Yugoslav Constitution of 1963.¹⁵

¹³ Opći kriteriji za donošenje odluka o upisu učenika u završni stupanj srednjeg usmjerenog obrazovanja (General criteria for deciding on the enrolment of students in the final phase of secondary vocational education) (*Prosvjetni vjesnik*, Vol. 30 (1977), No 3, p. 38).

¹⁴ On 11 December 1974 the Executive Council of the SR Slovenia received a letter inviting it to appoint Slovene representatives on the MKRI. These were to be the Republic secretary responsible for education, the chair of the Expert Council for Education and the director of the Education Institute (Zavod za šolstvo) (SI AS 2025, Box 50).

¹⁵ The Constitution of 1963 still envisaged the adoption of education laws by the Federal Assembly, but only of framework laws, which cannot be applied directly and must instead be applied via the education laws of the individual republics. The decentralisation of education was completed by the Constitution of 1974, which did away with the federation’s competence to adopt education regulations, abolished the federal administrative body in this sector and granted educational autonomy to the two

If we bear in mind Slovenia's efforts between 1972 and 1974 to develop its own education agenda, it is understandable that in 1975 conditions were not in place in Slovenia for the rapid introduction of vocationally oriented education. Quite the opposite: despite the Party's blow against the assembly system, the story of Slovenia's search for its own educational identity was not yet over. Slovenia used the following years, up to 1981, to develop three specific systemic solutions that differed from those in other areas of Yugoslavia and present them to the MKRI.

1. In Slovenia the CGEB did not cover the whole of the first two years of secondary education but only a year and a half. Significantly, it was not implemented as an autonomous programme or phase of education but was inserted into every education programme together with the corresponding technical/theoretical and practical content throughout the first two years of secondary school.¹⁶ This meant that education for specific occupations could be completed after just two years, or even sooner for some less demanding occupations; for these only a small part of the CGEB was selected (abridged programme). In the Slovene variant the education programme is understood as a whole, consisting of a continuous two-, three-, or four-year programme. The system therefore did not include a division into a first phase and a second phase, while on the other hand there was a common first year; which assumed that students would only choose a specific occupation (be it an individual technical field or a broad profile) *within the same vocational field* after the first year (Vocationally Oriented Education Act, Article 49).
2. Since the CGEB was not an autonomous programme, it was also not possible to enrol in it. Enrolment in secondary school was not carried out according to the territorial principle, but instead students had to choose a suitable secondary school programme (field/occupation) after completing elementary school (*ibid.*). This opened up the possibility of differentiation even at the time of enrolment in secondary school.
3. The third particularity of the Slovene solution derived from the interpretation of the requirement of *Resolucija 1974* that the second phase of vocationally oriented education (the third and fourth years) should prepare for work and an occupation, and that no school or form of education should prepare students merely for further education. Since in the Slovene variant the education programme was not divided into first and second levels, the Act required that the programme as a whole should "contain [...] the CGEB and other general educational contents, as well as contents [...] of specialised theoretical and practical knowledge in an individual sector or discipline", while at the same time it allowed the possibility of orientation of education for "*groups of di-*

autonomous provinces.

¹⁶ At the 11 June 1976 session of the MKRI (SI AS 2025, Box 282), Slovenia succeeded in bringing about the adoption of a decision under which two variants of the CGEB would be implemented. Variant »a« of the CGEB covered two years, while variant »b« (also known as the Slovene variant) cover the year and a half.

sciplines [...] with an emphasis on the social science / linguistic and natural science / mathematics fields" (ibid.; author's emphasis). In this way the Act introduced to the system the possibility of education programmes that did not prepare students for a specific occupation and type of work, but rather for a specific vocational field. Although in this norm the Act implicitly abolished the *gimnazija* as a type of secondary school, at the same time it defined the possibility of the formation of vocationally oriented programmes with a broad profile, though not the general profile that the *gimnazija* had had up to that time. The implementation of this norm in practice can be recognised later in four different programmes, namely natural sciences/mathematics, social sciences/linguistic, general cultural and pedagogical, where the pedagogical programme did not envisage practical training at all, while the other three enabled training for specific specialised types of work.¹⁷

The members of the MKRI from the other parts of Yugoslavia responded cynically and with a certain amount of bitterness to the retention of substitutes for the *gimnazija* in the four different programmes mentioned above.¹⁸

I do not wish to say that the Slovene solutions were better. The insertion of the CGEB into programmes of different types should theoretically have caused fewer pedagogical and didactic problems than the two-year secondary school with a uniform programme for an entire generation. But even enrolment in a first year that was differentiated by programme, as implemented in Slovenia, did not alleviate the problems of implementation in those programmes where the first year followed a uniform curriculum. In these programmes the formal differentiation between technical education and education for broad occupational profiles did not begin until the second year. On enrolling in the second year, students had to choose between a two-year or a three-year continuation of their education, which also meant choosing between occupations of different levels of difficulty. A uniform first year therefore did not only imply the well-known difficulties associated with teaching heterogeneous groups. There were difficulties (see Ermenc 2009), and they increased because nobody had methodically prepared secondary school teachers for working with heterogeneous classes. The majority of them had no practical experience of such work, since they had hitherto taught in classes that

¹⁷ For the first generation of students (enrolment in 1981), the natural sciences/mathematics programme incorporated three technician streams: mathematics technician, physics technician and biology/chemistry technician; the social sciences/linguistic programme consisted of two streams: social sciences and languages; the general cultural programme enabled students to qualify for occupations such as librarian, bookseller, cultural organiser, cultural events mediator, archivist, museum official, etc. (Programske zasnove 1981).

¹⁸ In 1981, when it was finally known what system of oriented education Slovenia was proposing, including four programmes that did not fit standard vocational profiles, the then Croatian education minister Stipe Štivar, who was also chairing the MKRI session, commented informally to the members of the commission before the start of the session: "The Slovenes have smuggled the *gimnazija* into oriented education". This was despite the fact that Slovenia had already informed the members of the MKRI how it was going to implement the reform of the *gimnazija* system (Minutes of the 28th session, 1 July 1979; in: SI AS 2025, Box 281).

were significantly more homogeneous. The difficulties with differentiation in the second year were also systemic, since the choice of a vocational or technical stream when progressing to the second year could not be done by inviting applications. This meant that the conditions and criteria for enrolment in one stream or another were not publicly and clearly defined. This arrangement therefore triggered the problem of how to ensure that the division of students into streams would be fair and, above all, compliant with the constitutional requirement of a choice of education under equal conditions. The problem was not a marginal one, since around 70% of the entire generation of secondary school students attended such programmes (Medveš et al. 2008).

Was the lack of uniformity of implementation so great as to require Yugoslavia to introduce a process of formal recognition of certificates of education?

The CGEB also caused deeper systemic problems. Even in Slovenia the preparation of education programmes showed that the CGEB, despite being reduced to a year and a half, was too extensive and that too little time was left for specialised subjects and practical instruction for students to be able to gain a suitable qualification after just two years of schooling. As a result, two-year programmes for *broad* occupational fields entirely disappeared in Slovenia within a few years (*Programske zasnovne* [= Programme outlines] 1989). Only abbreviated programmes for *narrow* occupational fields remained. They were succeeded after 1996 by lower vocational education programmes, but these became increasingly marginal from year to year because of the low number of enrolments (a total of around 1,000 students in both years in 1983, but just 400 in 2006) and the small number of programmes (of the 14 adopted only three were still being implemented in 2007) (Medveš et al. 2008). A consequence of the increased scope of general education was an extension of education for all broad occupational profiles to at least three years. This had serious systemic consequences for the differentiation of levels of education between Slovenia and the other parts of Yugoslavia, since there was no longer a parallel between the level of education (i.e. duration) and the level of qualification at which occupations of the same type were classified.¹⁹ The qualification level for the same number of years of secondary education was one level higher in Slovenia than in other parts of Yugoslavia. Given the single labour market, this must have had catastrophic consequences in terms of employment rights. I am not aware that anyone has researched how this inconsistency affected the labour market in the 1980s and whether it had any practical effects with regard to the filling of vacancies and classification in tariff agreements and the pay system.²⁰

¹⁹ The *Social agreement on a unified basis for the classification of occupations and professional qualifications* classified three-year programmes (CGEB + 1 year of specialisation) as a level 3 qualification and four-year programmes (CGEB + 2 years) as a level 4 qualification (technicians); in Slovenia, however, the *Programske zasnovne* defined two-year programmes as level 3, three-year programmes as level 4 and four-year programmes as level 5 (technicians). When two-year programmes were abolished, level 3 remained empty in Slovenia.

²⁰ *Temeljna vprašanja* (Fundamental questions; 1986) contains a proposal to do away with this

As we have seen, the two variants of the CGEB allowed by the MKRI were already in themselves a serious pedagogical and systemic problem, and at this point the uniform idea of vocationally oriented education began to crumble. An attempt to halt the process of dispersion came in the form of the *Družbeni dogovor republik in pokrajin o temeljih sistema vzgoje i izobraževanja* (Social agreement of the republics and autonomous provinces on the foundations of the system of education; Dogovor 1981). While *Dogovor 1981* continued to insist that vocationally oriented education was “the whole of secondary, further and higher education” (Article 7), it nevertheless relaxed some of the other most radical requirements of *Resolucija 1974*. It did not define the systemic incorporation of the CGEB, merely requiring in Article 10 that the republics and autonomous provinces ensured conditions that allowed all students to complete secondary vocationally oriented education programmes containing the CGEB. No longer is the CGEB mentioned as the first phase, nor is there any reference to the division of secondary education into a first and second phase. In other words there is no trace of the ten-year school either. The particularities in the structure of vocationally oriented education in Slovenia were perfectly compatible with *Dogovor 1981*, and it is possible that the implementing solutions adopted when drafting programmes in Slovenia in as early as 1982 could have been more flexible than they were on the basis of the solid formulations of *Resolucija 1974*.

Dogovor 1981 was clearly the basis for the first phase of vocationally oriented education to begin to be gradually abandoned. This process began in Croatia in as early as 1981²¹, while in Serbia the CGEB was extended to all years of education in 1986 (Informacija 1986). Every change was clearly linked to an increasing of differences rather than to their reduction. Reasons for these discrepancies may also be sought in the incompleteness of the system or even in the arbitrary creation of reforming ideas at the very highest level of the specialised administrative services responsible for preparing technical materials. Thus for example *Izveštaj 1980*, barely a year before *Dogovor 1981*, which was several years in the preparation,²² still solidly espoused a view of the CGEB as a first, autonomous

discrepancy, but this turns out not to be a real solution since it would have upset the internal balance in Slovenia, where for example graduates of vocational-technical schools and master craftsmen would have to be classified one qualification level higher than technicians.

²¹ Indications of this can be found in the material *Zajednička programska osnova usmjerenog obrazovanja i izbor prvog zanimanja* (Shared programmatic basis of oriented education and choice of first interest; for the MKRI session of 3 April 1981, in: SI AS 2015, Box 437) and *Osnove usavršavanja i usklađivanja usmerenog obrazovanja od I. do V. stupnja stručne spreme* (Basics of development and coordination of oriented education from level I to V of vocational qualifications; SI AS 2025, Box 438). The first of these documents advocated the first choice of vocation after completion of elementary school, but following discussion of the topic at the 50th session of the MKRI on 19 March 1982, a decision was adopted allowing all possibilities: »the choice of and training for an occupation and profession should be facilitated after the completion of elementary school, during and by no later than the end of the CGEB« (ibid.). In this way the commission approved all the diversity in the ratio of CGEB to vocationally oriented education that had existed up to that point. The MKRI was simply not able to achieve consensus on the solutions if even one entity opposed this, even if only temporarily.

²² The MKRI began drafting *Dogovor 1981* at its 17th session in Ljubljana in December 1977 (SI AS 2025, Box 281 and 282), while in the following four years leading up to the submission of the *Dogovor* to the signatories, it debated it at least 13 more sessions; the contents of the agreement must have been

phase of vocationally oriented education which “should be programmatically linked to elementary school.” *Izveštaj* 1980 even announces that “those republics and autonomous provinces that did not carry out an adequate programmatic revision of the CGEB when introducing the first phase will have to do so,” in such a way “as to prepare, from the two cycles of general education [author’s note: elementary and CGEB], a linearly progressive programme of general education from the first year of elementary school (from the pre-school level in Croatia) to the second year of secondary education” (*Izveštaj* 1980, p. 156²³). This programme of general education would be the »starting point for all subsequent education, both that leading to a first occupation and that leading to all higher levels of oriented and generally permanent education” (ibid., p. 149). Yes, this is now the key idea and undoubtedly the boldest concept in *Izveštaj* 1980, namely that completion of the second year of secondary school is a condition for enrolment in tertiary education, since “a successfully completed CGEB programme of vocationally oriented education in the present phase offers, for example, the *same rights and same educational opportunities* to all those who apply for enrolment in (using the present terminology) further education and higher education, regardless of the field. This is, as it were, the ‘new *gimnazija*’, which all will have in the future” (ibid.). *Izveštaj* 1980 finally clearly indicates that the CGEB together with elementary school will mean a ten-year school. This was something that Schmidt had already read between the lines in *Predlog* 1965, when he described it a transfer of the Soviet educational model (Schmidt 1966, 1982, p. 111). The last two ideas (i.e. a linearly planned ten-year programme combining elementary school in the first two years of secondary school, and the use of this a condition for enrolment in tertiary education) were never seriously discussed in Slovenia by anyone. It is my view that people were not aware of them at all. *Izveštaj* 1980 does, however, tell us about another construction of the education system. It is evident as a definitive fact that the first phase means completion of the general education phase and that enrolment in the initial level of vocationally oriented education (in the old system this meant enrolment in the third year of secondary school) is only possible on the basis of a public invitation for applications (*Izveštaj* 1980, p. 158), and that completion of the first and second years of vocationally oriented education (i.e. the third and fourth years of secondary school under the old system) enables access to employment and, for the most gifted and diligent only, progress to further education and higher education, where the system was supposedly designed to mean that the higher the

well known to the Institute in Belgrade, particularly if we consider that in May 1979 the competent body of the Socialist Alliance of Working People of Yugoslavia was already preparing a résumé of the discussion surrounding the agreement that had taken place in the various republics and autonomous provinces (Minutes of the 19th Session of the MKRI; in: SI AS 2025, Box 282).

²³ The *Izveštaj* is not just any document. A note on the inside back cover states that it was »prepared by the Republic Institute for the Advancement of Education in Belgrade for the Federal Institute for International Scientific and Educational-Cultural Cooperation as a basis for the study of the education policy of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia at the OECD.« It may be concluded from the *Izveštaj* that this republic institute was an important centre in which the most radical ideas of vocationally oriented education developed; it had already prepared *Predlog* 1965 and was clearly one of the main proponents of the division into phases of oriented education, the common (unified) secondary school or the ten-year school.

level of education, the more people would come into education from work or on a part-time basis while working (*ibid.*, pp. 95–96). It is difficult to make out what the agreement was among the writers of the *Izveštaj*: whether the earlier idea of a “new *gimnazija*” or this latest “new” idea of admission to higher education after completing the third or fourth year. I am not aware of any documented case, at least in Slovenia, of any graduate of the so-called first phase of vocationally oriented education applying to an institution of further or higher education. The connection in terms of specialisation between secondary and higher education is, however, one of the controversial ideas of vocationally oriented education, which in Slovenia contributed to the fact that the *Zakon o usmerjenem izobraževanju* (Vocationally Oriented Education Act) regulated *secondary and higher* education together, including *university* and even doctoral studies.

Common programme cores as the beginning of the end

After 1980 dramatic warnings could already be heard at the MKRI that the development of the reform was moving in a direction that would make a formal recognition process necessary for certificates of education in Yugoslavia. It was only between 1979 and 1984 that the true nature of the varying interpretations of the CGEB began to be apparent. In 1979 the MKRI agreed to reduce systemic differences between republics and autonomous provinces by harmonising the content of education programmes from pre-school education up to university (*Informacija* 1986). Analyses and comparisons of curricula and syllabuses for general education subjects and programmes of vocationally oriented education showed that differences were increasing at all levels of the system.

With the constitutional decentralisation of education in 1974, when the autonomous provinces of Kosovo and Vojvodina gained educational autonomy within the Republic of Serbia, some politically extremely challenging developments occurred. The most sensitive and also politically provocative were the differences that began to appear at the cultural level, and which became manifested themselves during discussions of the contents of syllabuses and in interpretations of individual historical, social and cultural phenomena in textbooks.²⁴ This is already a point where differences are no longer measured in terms of the number of hours of instruction of a given subject, or with regard to questions of the recognition of education and qualifications, but instead the importance of the set of values connected with national identity begins to be highlighted in the education of the young generation. In this dimension, the differences were already gaining significant political connotations of unacceptability.

²⁴ My memoirs contain an account of how, during the MKRI session in Sarajevo on 1 March 1977, the education minister of the Republic of Serbia used the breaks to give the members from the other parts of Yugoslavia an informal account of events in the Autonomous Province of Kosovo since 1974: it seems that following the granting of educational autonomy the education authorities in Kosovo had adopted and approved textbooks that were in use in Albania, and had apparently even had these textbooks translated for use in schools where Serbian was the language of instruction. From the political point of view the most provocative aspect of this account was the fact that children in schools where Serbian was the language of instruction were learning Serbian history from Albanian textbooks.

Between 1979 and 1984 the MKRI found itself facing its most difficult task: how to harmonise syllabuses for elementary school and the CGEB. The original idea of some of the republics, that the MKRI would prepare complete draft curricula and syllabuses for elementary school and the CGEB, which would then be sent to the expert councils of the republics and autonomous provinces for approval, fell at the first hurdle when the MKRI accepted the possibility of implementing the CGEB in different variants. The two variants of the CGEB gave rise to two different outline CGEB curricula. With different numbers of hours allocated to the subject it was not possible to draw up uniform syllabuses, and therefore the MKRI decided at its 29th session to prepare common programme cores for pre-school programmes, for subjects at elementary school and for the CGEB. A common programme core was, put simply, a common syllabus for an individual subject that would be the same for all republics and autonomous provinces.

Matters became more complicated during the process of preparation and adoption of criteria for defining the common programme cores, with all manner of rifts appearing between vastly differing interests. Even differences regarding technical and methodological issues – in the understanding of the planning of contents (in detail or as an outline), in the conceptualisation of teaching (whether transmission-based or constructivist) and didactic implementation (frontal, lecture-based, laboratory-based, experimental) – were difficult to manage. Differences deriving from the cultural and historical identities of the individual Yugoslav entities found dramatic expression during the drafting of criteria for the elaboration of the cores, particularly those for the so-called national group of subjects (mother tongue, literature, music, geography, history). The fate of the cores was sealed by the criteria laid down by the committee that was responsible for drafting them. The first of these criteria demanded that the cores should cover “80% of common contents in terms of the number of hours per year” in some subjects (and as much as 90% in Marxism) (*Zapisnik redakcije* [= Minutes of the drafting committee], 1983). The proportion of common contents soon began to be reduced in the national group of subjects as a result of pressures from individual republics, and the MKRI was evidently forced to arbitrate when it adopted the decision that even in these subjects common contents could not account for less than 50% (*Skupna programska jedra* [= Common programme cores], 1983). Most problems were caused by the literature core and the selection of authors and works. Ultimately the situation became entangled over the question of what works and, above all, how many works and authors from an individual nation or national minority within Yugoslavia should be placed in the common “core”. The decision was made to use the criterion of proportionality, where the level of representation of authors would be proportionate to the percentage of the population of Yugoslavia accounted for by individual nations or national minorities. When proportionality was used as a selection criterion instead of the established literary canon (*ibid.* and *Zapisnik redakcije...*, 1983) the “cores” revealed the weakest point of inter-republic coordination.

The MKRI never completed the preparation of the common cores, although in 1983 an integral version was published which included cores for the national

group of subjects, including literature, but to which the Slovene representatives on the MKRI did not give their consent. Debates about the “cores” took place in Slovenia in the autumn of 1983.²⁵ At that time the introduction of vocationally oriented education was causing considerable concern to the general public. The main reasons for this were the decline of the *gimnazija* and the vertical connection between higher education and secondary education. In response to public initiatives, controversial public debates were held at Cankarjev Dom in 1981 and 1982. These revealed staunch opposition to the reform and no understanding at all for the categorical requirements of the two Congresses of the SKJ (1974 and 1978) regarding the first phase, the common educational basis, the principle that every school should prepare for an occupation, and the connection of higher education to secondary education. Public opinion was implacably opposed, and even the promises of politicians that scientific monitoring would be guaranteed, along with a rapid response to any identified weaknesses, failed to convince the majority. The atmosphere was heated to the limit by the cores, particularly those for literature and art. And nothing other than their categorical rejection was to be expected.

The news of this rejection swept Yugoslavia. The 17 June 1984 edition of *NIN* (pp. 20–21) contained an article entitled “Slovenačko jezgro” [The Slovene core], which offered detailed coverage of the rejection of the core for literature in Slovenia. The journalist quotes statements from the Slovene debates describing the programme cores as “an encroachment on the constitutional autonomy of republics and autonomous provinces, [...] an attack on national culture,” and particularly highlights the statement from the assembly of the Slovene writers’ society (Društvo slovenskih pisateljev, DSP) in September 1983 that the cores were “cores of discord” and that they represented “Serbian, Belgrade, unitarist skulduggery.”²⁶ The journalist begins by noting that the cores were opposed by Slovenia and Kosovo. Kosovo was demanding that the literary programme core should also include writers who were born, lived and worked in Albania; Slovenia was opposing the cores because of the criterion of proportionality, on the grounds that it had destroyed all literary criteria and that authors unknown even to literary experts had found themselves in the cores. She shows that Slovenia had responsibly addressed the treatment of the literary core in a group in which all the most competent institutions were represented, from the Academy of Sciences and Arts and the universities, including all social sciences and humanities faculties, to the DSP, the Marxist Centre and the Education Institute. The journalist finds significant the justification of the rejection on the part of the DSP, on the grounds that “we have always supported familiarity with the culture and literature of the nations and national minorities

²⁵ In Slovenia the »cores« were first rejected by the Republic Social Council for Education, which on 14 March 1983 adopted *Stališča in predloge o predlogu skupnih programskih jeder* (Positions and proposals regarding the proposed common programme cores; *Stališča* 1983). Between October 1983 and January 1984 a great number of discussions took place within political and expert bodies, professional associations, university faculties and secondary schools (SI AS 2025, Box 510).

²⁶ This last part of the quotation is not to be found in the Protest Declaration (1983) of the DSP, although the authors rejected the “cores” in no uncertain terms, on the grounds that they were “born of a mistaken belief in the need for greater political unity of the country [...] and are the first step towards further centralisation.”

of Yugoslavia [and] we will continue to cooperate with the other republics and autonomous provinces. We feel, however, that instruction, its contents and aims, are the constitutional right of every republic or autonomous province and that special common cores are therefore unnecessary. Each republic and autonomous province should include in its own syllabuses, according to its own judgement, as many authors as possible from the other republics, something that we have done up till now in our Slovene syllabuses" (ibid., p. 20), since the languages and literature of the other nations of Yugoslavia were a compulsory subject in elementary schools in Slovenia. Following the debates at home, Slovenia also communicated that "the representatives of Slovenia have withdrawn from further discussion and completion of the proposed concept of the common core; they have opted instead to prepare their own core" (ibid., p. 20). This was the information published by *NIN* on the categorical rejection of the literature core and the interruption of cooperation.²⁷ In 1986 the MKRI states that "Although the MKRI continued to coordinate and supplement some parts of the proposed common programme cores (literature, music, geography) after 1983 [author's note: the MKRI considers the cores to have been adopted in 1983], to date the working group has not succeeded in resolving the disagreements" (Informacija 1986). All the republics and autonomous provinces except Slovenia and Vojvodina introduced the programme cores into their syllabuses from 1983, while for Slovenia *Informacija 1986* notes that "in this republic the common programme core has never been accepted, since the nomenclature of occupations was not accepted either" (Informacija 1986, p. 7).

Despite their intensity and occasional sparks,²⁸ the debates about the cores at the MKRI were tolerant. In Slovenia, too, the debates were accompanied by calm and conciliatory tones, without a rejection of cultural plurality in the teaching of literature and art. The burden of the political dimension could be felt at all levels. The only solid arguments for rejecting the cores rested on constitutional rights, namely that "no inter-republic body may take over the constitutionally defined responsibilities of republics and autonomous provinces in programming, directing and developing education" (Stališča 1983, p. 1). Criticism within the education profession also rejected the "cores", justifiably so, because of the criterion of proportionality. The sternest critics were the DSP, who saw the problem in the fact

²⁷ The »core wars« gave rise to another dilemma with long-term consequences for the teaching of literature in Slovenia. A Slavonic studies conference held in Ljubljana and Krško from 4 to 6 October 1984 found that in syllabuses for the mother tongue »the share of world literature was too small compared to the share of other Yugoslav literatures« (*Slovenščina, šolstvo, slovenstvo*, SI AS 2025, Box 510). It was even proposed that the subject »Slovene Language and Literature« should be based entirely on a selection of authors and literary works from Slovene literature, and that new subjects should be developed for the teaching of world literature and Yugoslav literature in the CGEB. It is difficult to say how these discussions influenced the selection of authors and works in Slovene Language and Literature when programmes were revised in the 1990s. This could be illustrated by a study comparing literature syllabuses for elementary school and secondary school after 1990 with those from before 1980.

²⁸ Some of the discussions at the 53rd session of the MKRI, held on 3 July 1982, indicated a slight intolerance towards Slovenia, for example in the suggestion that Slovenia should prepare its own version of the programme core, or that a legal solution should be sought that would compel all republics and autonomous provinces to respect the common cores (SI AS 2025, Box 436).

that underestimating the importance of cultural and national identities would result in the penetration of Yugoslav identity into the preparation of programmes. This proved to be fatal for the cores. And indeed not only for the cores, since in the 1980s the MKRI was preparing uniform starting points and bases in many fields²⁹ – although with the exception of agreements on uniform bases for the system and on the classification of occupations and vocational education, it did not succeed in completing any of them. This powerlessness is what best characterised the work of the MKRI. What were the reasons for it? They may be found in the MKRI's insistence on following the principle of “enabling as much common material as possible in curricula and syllabuses and in their realisation [...] so as to ensure the uniformity of the system [...] and inserting all particularities – economic, cultural and so on – in such a way that they will impede transition by learners as little as possible” (Minutes of the 50th session). The MKRI therefore placed the common interest above the national interest, even at the operational level, which was contrary to Resolution 1970, which for the regulation of education Yugoslavia had set the principle: *uniformity of idea but diversity of implementation*. The MKRI was clearly not capable of coordinating reform solutions in a manner that recognised the multinational and multicultural structure of Yugoslav society, let alone of seeing in national diversity and interculturality productive circumstances for the formation of young generations in a multinational and culturally diverse community.

The end of vocationally oriented education – a sad day for vocational and technical education

After 1981 the words “vocationally oriented education” caused uproar, not only among the general public but also in academic circles. Conditions were ripening for empirical evaluation, as demonstrated by the titles of bachelor's, master's and doctoral theses and dissertations at the Department of Pedagogy between 1981 and 1993, which were part of a systematic evaluation of individual phenomena within vocationally oriented education.³⁰ The supervisor of many of these theses and dissertations was Dr Janez Sagadin, who between 1981 and 1986 headed the research programmes at the Educational Research Institute (Pedagoški inštitut) and the Education Institute (Zavod za šolstvo) and in 1989, together with a large group of researchers from the Department of Pedagogy, led a research project

²⁹ Between 1979 and 1986 the MKRI prepared the following uniform bases: system of education, classification of occupations and vocational education, nomenclature of occupations, documentation system, distribution of the initial and vocationally oriented phases, common programme contents at higher levels of education, professional titles and academic levels.

³⁰ The research topics covered by bachelor's theses in this period included: secondary school students' choice of education programme, a comparison of the results of first-year students, feasibility of the Slovene syllabus in the first year of oriented education, feasibility of the mathematics syllabus in the first year of oriented education, success of abbreviated programmes with regard to employment, training workers without vocational education. The theses are kept in the library of the Department of Pedagogy at the University of Ljubljana's Faculty of Arts.

called *The Further Development of Secondary Education in Slovenia*. The results of the evaluation (Sagadin 1986) confirmed the following areas as the clearest weaknesses: the uniformity of the CGEB and its placing at the start of secondary education, dropout, manufacturing work and the basics of technology and manufacturing in the CGEB, the lack of connection between general and technical education, the irrationality of preparation for work in the programmes that replaced the *gimnazija*. Sagadin also identified some positive effects (the breadth of the vocational profile of programmes, the diversification of the network of secondary schools, the increase of general education in vocational education programmes). Sagadin's conclusion that the results "do not call for a return to the old system" is significant (ibid., p. 493). The weaknesses identified in evaluation began to be eliminated gradually in two phases, between 1986³¹ and 1990.

Since 1996, the year that the new Gimnazija Act and the Vocational and Technical Education Act were adopted, it has appeared that the development of secondary education is no longer a problem. At least not for the general public, once the *gimnazija* had been restored. Regarding the renewal of vocational and technical education, on the other hand, it appears that insufficient heed has been taken of Sagadin's warning about returning to the old system. Not everything has returned to the way it was: within vocational education an increased scope of general education has been maintained, which is positive. Even so, the structure of vocational and technical education has remained unchanged since 1980/81. Today's lower vocational schools, secondary vocational and technical schools and vocational-technical schools are merely copies of the former programmes that have retained their former functions, despite the major changes in the labour market caused by the transition – notably the shortage of work for young people. Even the attempts to renew vocational education in 1996, in order to tie education and training more closely to the work process and the labour market, went in the wrong direction. Since 2000 vocational education has been experiencing an unstoppable decline. The profession offers internationally comparable solutions, but no one is listening (Medveš 2013).

Technical schools and other specialised secondary schools are a particular problem. With the creation of the new higher vocational colleges (1996) and the raising of the level of qualifications required for specialised work of this type, they are slowly losing their *raison d'être* (in terms of employment) within the system (Medveš et al. 2008). For two decades we have not known what to do with the

³¹ The renovation took place in two phases. The first phase (1986–1988) saw a differentiation of contents by level of difficulty; a more significant elective element; introduction of technical subjects in the first year; integration of the basics of technology and manufacturing; elective subjects according to the decision of the school; school-leaving examinations (Poročilo o preobrazbi vzgoje in izobraževanja [Report on the transformation of education]... 1987). In the second phase the Expert Council for Education introduced, in 1990, a *gimnazija* track, replacing its four substitutes and the computing programme (Uradni list SRS, No 5, 16 February 1990), and in 1991 changed the three- and four-year technical education tracks into autonomous programmes of vocational and technical education (Uradni list SRS, No 12, 22 March 1991). Programmes after 1990 no longer include subjects such as Self-management with the foundations of Marxism, Basics of technology and manufacturing, and Premilitary training (see Štiriletni programi... 1992).

graduates of technical schools (covered in more detail in Medveš et al. 2008 and Medveš 2013). Should they go on to study? They already do! For at least a decade and a half practically all technical school graduates have remained in education. Specialised upper secondary schools and also vocational-technical upper secondary schools have thus become preparatory schools for higher education. Unfortunately, however, they have not undergone an internal renewal and therefore remain second-class preparatory schools compared to the *gimnazija*, which is the elite institution of secondary education. And this situation appears set to continue, since despite the total change in the situation, expert proposals for their renewal seem destined to fall on deaf ears. They remain as they were half a century ago, when more than half of school-leavers found employment. This is not good for the schools, for the young generation that enrolls in them, or for higher education.

Let us end with the thought that in the modern development of some European education systems (Sweden, Finland, Spain, France) it is possible to identify many ideas that point to a trend of extending general education from the elementary to the (upper) secondary level such as we were familiar with in the vocationally oriented education system. With the major difference that there is no tendency towards uniformity. In this country pedagogical science warned that the ideological radicalisation of the unified school was a source of evil in vocationally oriented education. I myself was involved for a lengthy period (1975–1982) in the operational implementation of vocationally oriented education, which included the creation of the law, implementing regulations, education programmes and networks of schools. I believed for many years that it made sense to cooperate, on the grounds that it was possible, through common sense and formal logic, to persuade education policymakers to overlook and tone down politically radical education reform, if not abandon it altogether. I believed that no policy could renounce a good educational tradition. But when I think about the systemic and technical solutions that were developed in vocationally oriented education, I nevertheless remember that time with satisfaction, for several reasons. Some of the solutions that we prepared in a variety of teams reduced, at least temporarily, the level of radical demands in the implementation of vocationally oriented education: the successors to the old *gimnazija* were smuggled through, two variants of the CGEB programme were in force, and in Slovenia the CGEB was not an independent stage of education. Other solutions represented, in my view, greater quality in the development of the system, and have remained even after the abolishing of vocationally oriented education: the proportion of general contents in vocational education has increased; continuing education programmes – today’s vocational-technical schools – have opened up possibilities for continuing education after vocational school without returning to the first or second year of a specialised upper secondary school. Continuing education programmes could from the beginning have substituted the former schools for master craftspeople, but unfortunately they only opened up access to further education; the fragmentation of occupations was reduced and education was developed for broader vocational and professional profiles; unpaid apprenticeships were abolished – these were left over from the time of the “pupils

in industry” system and had come in for international criticism on the grounds that they were a form of abuse of unpaid young workers.

To end with, a question: was the unified school merely the first step towards the homogenisation of cultural and political socialisation in Yugoslavia?

It took Slovenia seven years to introduce vocationally oriented education following the adoption of *Resolucija 1974*, in part because of the need to find solutions while also taking into account the past criticisms of *Predlog 1965*. Yet the past criticisms were evidently more a burden than an inspiration. The underlying principles that fed the radical educational ideology in vocationally oriented education were deeper and more stubborn than even the most rational pedagogical principles. Analysis of these underlying principles has still not been carried out, and the reasons for the radicalisation of the principle of the unified school are still unclear. This paper merely hints at the fact that these reasons cannot be simply explained by the socialist pedagogical declaration that we want a unified school because this is the only fair school for “workers and working people”. Such an argument breaks down entirely when the political project of the unified school is extended to uniformity of educational profiles, curricula, syllabuses, teaching, teacher training and textbooks. As a result of all the attempts to unify its implementation, up to and including standardised textbooks, the idea of the unified school became a means to unify the system in terms of programme and content. The topic of fairness in the education system gradually disappears from material on the subject, and is replaced by a tendency towards a uniform regulation of education throughout the entire country. The idea of the reform had clearly changed in its implementation. If in the beginning it derives from the idea of a *unified school* and was oriented towards guaranteeing fairness in *education*, in the 1980s the focus of the reform shifts to *uniformity of contents*, in their subtle cultural dimensions, which clearly has more important effects in terms of both socialisation and education. In a country and community that is multinational and culturally plural, socialisation in a spirit of greater political unity and national affiliation bears all the hallmarks of cultural hegemony. Could the unified school have been simply a mask to hide the anchoring of a uniform Yugoslav culture and ethnic group? There are many questions that would have to be researched in order for us to be able to say how it was possible that unification was demanded by implementing documents prepared by the technical-administrative services, and not by political documents – resolutions or agreements – adopted by the federal assembly or the assemblies of republics and autonomous provinces. Here we can undoubtedly see the considerable divergence between the policy of the highest self-management bodies, which advocated *uniformity of idea but diversity of implementation*, and the orientations of the technical-administrative services, which were responsible for preparing the implementing materials that imposed *uniformity of implementation*. In the political system of that time it is unlikely

that the technical-administrative services would have been able to carry out the homogenisation of the education system of their own initiative, and therefore the question also remains open of whether the diversity and pluralism of implementation were properly thought out and sincere at the political highest level. Or is it possible to see in the unified school project the beginnings of a political project whose aim was the transformation of a nationally and culturally plural society into a nationally and culturally homogeneous society? It may be no coincidence that the universal unification of education at the MKRI was not the idea of all republics and autonomous provinces – a consideration that raises many questions about the origins of Yugoslav cultural hegemonism.

References

- Bergant, M. (1966). Pedagoška analiza stališč in utemeljitev v načrtu za unapredjenje sistema obrazovanja na II. stupnju. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 17, issue 3-4, pp. 59–68.
- Družbeni dogovor republik in pokrajin o skupnih osnovah sistema vzgoje in izobraževanja. (1981). *Uradni list SRS*, XXXVIII, issue 15, Ljubljana, 21 May 1981.
- Družbeni dogovor o enotnih temeljih za razvrščanje poklicev in strokovne izobrazbe. (1980). *Uradni list SFRJ*, issue 29/1980.
- Ermenc, K. S. (2009). From de-tracking to re-tracking in Slovenian upper secondary education. In J. Hopfner and E. Protner (eds.). *Education from the past to the present: pedagogical and didactic lessons from the history of education*. Maribor: Filozofska fakulteta UM, pp. 122–138.
- Extracts from the minutes. (1974). AS SI 1115, f. 1357, 61–50, folder III.
- Informacija o uvedbi skupnih programskih jeder. (1986). SI AS 2025 (MŠŠ) Box 510.
- Izveštaj o stanju, problemima i politici obrazovanja u SFRJ*. (1980). Belgrade: Republički zavod za unapredjivanje vaspitanja i obrazovanja.
- Kožuh, B. (1987). *Pedagogika in šolske reforme*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta Univerze Edvarda Kardelja v Ljubljani. Oddelek za pedagogiko.
- Letter of the Republic Secretariat for Education and Culture of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia on the appointment of members to the MKRI*. In: SI AS 2025, Box 50.
- Letter of the Republic Secretariat for Education and Culture of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia to the Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia on vocationally oriented education*. In: SI AS 2025, Box 50.
- Medveš, Z. (1988). Pojem enotnosti vzgojno-izobraževalnega sistema [The concept of uniformity of the education system]. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 39, issue 5/6, pp. 271–281.
- Medveš, Z. (2013). Poklicno izobraževanje je pred desetletjem skrenilo na slepi tir [Vocational education reached an impasse a decade ago]. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 64, issue 1, pp. 10–31.
- Medveš, Z. et al. (2008). Prispevek poklicnega in strokovnega izobraževanja k pravičnosti in socialni vključenosti [Contribution of vocational education and training to equity and social inclusion]. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 59, issue 5, pp. 74–94.

- Minutes of the session of the MKRI, 11 June 1976.* In: SI AS 2025, Box 282.
- Minutes of the 17th and subsequent sessions of the MKRI.* In: SI AS 2025, Boxes 281 and 282.
- Minutes of the 28th session of the MKRI, 1 July 1979.* In: SI AS 2025, Box 281.
- Minutes of the 19th session of the MKRI.* In: SI AS 2025, Box 282.
- Minutes of the 29th session of the MKRI, 6 July 1979.* In: SI AS 2025, Box 282.
- Minutes of the 50th session of the, 19 March 1982.* In: SI AS 2025, p. 6, Box 436.
- Naloge Zveze komunistov Jugoslavije v socialistični samoupravni preobrazbi vzgoje in izobraževanja (Resolucija 1974). (1974). *Sodobna pedagogika*, 45, issue 5–6, pp. 147–159.
- Novak, B., Sagadin, J., and Kosovel, I. (1986). *Razvoj usmerjenega izobraževanja v Sloveniji*. Ljubljana: Pedagoški inštitut.
- Opći kriteriji za donošenje odluka o upisu učenika u završni stupanj srednjeg usmjerenog obrazovanja. *Prosvjetni vjesnik*, 30, issue 3, p. 38.
- Osnove usavršavanja i usklađivanja usmerenog obrazovanja od I. do V. stupnja stručne spreme.* In: SI AS 2025, Box 438.
- PKZ. (1971). 39th session 10.11.1097, AS SI 1115, f. 1355, 61–50, folder I.
- PKZ. (1972). AS SI 1115 f. 1356, 61–50, folder II.
- Poročilo o preobrazbi vzgoje in izobraževanja [Report on the transformation of education] (material for the session of the Assembly of the SRS, 18.2.1987.* (1987). In: SI AS 2025 MŠŠ, Box 552.
- Predlog za unapredjenje sistema obrazovanja na II. stupnju. (1965). *Revija šolstva i prosvetna dokumentacija*. Belgrade: Jugoslovenski zavod za proučavanje školskih i prosvetnih pitanja, issue 5.
- Programske zasnove. (1981). In: Dobnikar, B. (b. d.). *Genealogija gimnazijskih in z njimi povezanih programov in smeri v obdobju od 1975 do 2012*. Unpublished material. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za izobraževanje, znanost, kulturo in šport.
- Programske zasnove. (1989). Programska zasnova za oblikovanje vzgojnoizobraževalnih programov usmerjenem izobraževanju, Ljubljana: Izobraževalna skupnost Slovenije, Poročevalec ISS 27, 7, issue 3.
- Protest declaration of the Društvo slovenskih pisateljev of 20 September 1984.* (1984). In: AS SI, 1115, f. 1357, 61–60, folder III.
- Reforma usmerjenega izobraževanja.* (1974). In: Letter SI AS 2025, Box 50.
- Resolucija o razvoju vaspitanja i obrazovanja na samoupravnoj osnovi. (1970). Belgrade: Uradni list SFRJ, 16 April 1970.
- Resolucija o razvoju vzgoje in izobraževanja v SR Slovenije.* (1974). Published in an undated supplement to daily newspapers in March 1974. In: AS SI 1115, f 1357, 61–50, folder III.
- Sagadin, J. (1986). Reforma srednjega izobraževanja in njeno nadaljnje usmerjanje v luči rezultatov reformnih raziskav. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 37, issue 9–10, pp. 467–483.
- Schmidt, V. (1982). *Socialistična pedagogika med etatizmom in samoupravljanjem*. Ljubljana: Dopsna delavska univerza Univerzum.
- Session minutes.* (1974a). Retrieved from: SISTORY.SI/publikacije/ID27237page171 (Accessed on 15.5.2015).
- Session minutes.* (1974b). Retrieved from: SISTORY.SI/publikacije/ID:27927 (Accessed on 15.5.2015).

- Skupna programska jedra [Common programme cores].* (1983). Stališča Republiškega družbenega sveta za vzgojo in izobraževanje [Positions of the Republic Social Council for Education]. In: SI AS 2025, Box 510.
- Slovenščina, šolstvo, slovenstvo [Slovene language, education, Sloveneness].* In: SI AS 2025, Box 510.
- Slovenačko jezgro.* (1984). *NIN*, 17 June 1984, pp. 20–21.
- Stališča in predlogi Republiškega družbenega sveta za vzgojo in izobraževanje o predlogu Skupnih programskih jeder [Positions and proposals of the Republic Social Council for Education regarding the proposed common programme cores]. (1983). Ljubljana, 14. 3 1983. In: SI AS 2025 MŠŠ, Box 560.
- Strmčnik, F. (1965). Enotna osnovna šola je bistveni element socialističnih družbenih odnosov. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 35, issue 3–4.
- Šegula, I. (1964). *Učni načrt osnovne šole v teoriji in praksi – rezultati petletnega preizkusa.* Ljubljana: Zavod za napredek šolstva.
- Štiriletni programi tehniških in drugih strokovnih šol [Four-year programmes of technical and other vocational schools].* (1992). Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za šolstvo in šport, Zavod Republike Slovenije za šolstvo in šport.
- Temeljna vprašanja spreminjanja in dopolnjevanja zakona o usmerjenem izobraževanju [Fundamental questions (1986) regarding the amendment of the Vocationally Oriented Education Act].* (1986). In: SI AS 2025, Box 552.
- Zajednička programska osnova usmerjenog obrazovanja i izbor prvog zanimanja [Shared programmatic basis of vocationally oriented education and choice of first interest].* In: SI AS 2015, Box 437.
- Zakon o usmerjenem izobraževanju [Vocationally Oriented Education Act].* (1981). Ljubljana: Časopisni zavod Uradni list Slovenije.
- Zakon o vaspitanju i obrazovanju [Education Act].* (1977). Novi Sad: Radnički univerzitet Radivoj Ćirpanov,
- Zapisnik redakcijske skupine za pripravo skupnih programskih jeder [Minutes of the drafting committee for the preparation of common programme cores].* (1983). In: SI AS 2025, Box 437.

Translated by Hugh Brown