

- OECD (2017). *Educational opportunity for all: Overcoming inequality throughout the life course*. OECD Publishing, Paris. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264287457-en>
- Protner, E. (2000). *Pedagogika in izobraževanje učiteljev (1919 – 1941)*. Nova Gorica: Educa.
- Protner, E. (2020). Klasifikacija pedagoških paradigem v Sloveniji. In R. Kroflič, T. Vidmar & K. K. Ermenc (Eds.). *Živa pedagoška misel Zdenka Medveša* (pp. 61-103). Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani.
- Schmidt, V. (1968). Pedagoški nazori slovenske socialne demokracije. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 19(1-2), 5-24.
- Schmidt, V. (1982). *Socialistična pedagogika med etatizmom in samoupravljanjem*. Ljubljana: Dopolna delavska univerza UNIVERZUM.
- Strmčnik, F. (1980). Zveza društev pedagoških delavcev Slovenije v luči svoje pozitivne pedagoške tradicije. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 31(1-2, 3-4), 15-35, 81-87.
- Špindler, D. (1974). U borbi za pravdu i slobodu. In O. Cicmil, M. Dimitrijević, L. Đurić, M. Ivanović, Đ. Mandić, M. Mijušković, ... P. Šegula (Eds.), *Učesnici i svedoci; Zbornik sećanja o delatnosti naprednog učiteljstva Jugoslavije do 1941. godine* (2nd book, pp. 145-147). Beograd: Društvo za izučavanje delatnosti naprednog učiteljstva Jugoslavije.
- Šuligoj, A. (1928). Stanovanjske razmere in njihov vpliv na otroka. *Popotnik*, 50(3-4), 89-91.
- Šuligoj, A. (1929). Vpliv gospodarskih in stanovanjskih razmer na razvoj otroka. *Popotnik*, 50(7), 210-212.
- Tancer, M. (1991). Življenje in delo dr. Franja Žgeča. In M. Tancer (Ed.), *Dr. Franjo Žgeč socialno-pedagoški reformator na Slovenskem (Bio-bibliografski oris)* (pp. 5-28). Maribor: Univerza v Mariboru, Pedagoška fakulteta, Raziskovalni inštitut.
- Toličič, I. & Zorman, L. (1977). *Okolje in uspešnost učencev*. Ljubljana: DZS.
- Žgeč, F. (1923). *Problemi vzgoje najširših plasti našega naroda*. Ljubljana: Udruženje Jugoslovenskega učiteljstva – Poverjenišvo Ljubljana.
- Žgeč, F. (1926a, January). Za otroka *Učiteljski tovariš*, 1, 1.
- Žgeč, F. (1926b). Razvoj otroka v šolski dobi. In G. Šilih (Ed.), *Pedagoški zbornik* (Vol. XXIII, pp. 46-112). Ljubljana: Slovenska šolska matica.
- Žgeč, F. (1928). Idejni in praktični program "Pedagoške centrale" v Mariboru. In G. Šilih (Ed.), *Pedagoški zbornik* (Vol. XXIV, pp. 145-150). Ljubljana: Slovenska šolska matica.
- Žgeč, F. (1991). Ustanovitev KP v Dornavi, Ptuj in v nekaterih okoliških vaseh. In M. Tancer (Ed.), *Dr. Franjo Žgeč socialno-pedagoški reformator na Slovenskem (Bio-bibliografski oris)* (pp. 95-96). Maribor: Univerza v Mariboru, Pedagoška fakulteta, Raziskovalni inštitut.

RADEKA Igor

University of Zadar, Department of Pedagogy, Croatia

PEDAGOGY WITHOUT TELEOLOGY

Abstract: The development of pedagogy in Croatia in the period between the two world wars was strongly influenced by reformist trends. Cultural pedagogy, also called theoretical or philosophical pedagogy, explores pedagogy as a scientific discipline and fundamental teleological questions of pedagogy and education. It is based, on the one hand, on conceptual pluralism, individualism in education, and balanced approach to child's personality needs and, on the other, on community expectations, increasing the appreciation of child's personality. Cultural pedagogy contributed considerably to the establishment of academic autonomy of pedagogy and education, to the clarification of relationships between pedagogy and education, pedagogy and philosophy, psychology and culture in general, of relationships between culture and education, and personality and education, as well as to the problem of defining educational goals and a number of other essential pedagogical questions.

A productive development of pedagogy in Croatia was crudely interrupted after the Second World War. Within the new, socialist socio-political framework and under ideological control, pedagogy was forced to forget its heritage and break ties with international developments.

After independence and renewed pluralisation of society in the 1990s what predominates is an eclectic selection of various pedagogic research from among international resources, without critical questioning of their theoretical and methodological grounds, without exploration of the meaning and purposefulness of pedagogy and education.

The following paper analyses circumstances and consequences of the disappearance of pedagogic teleology, which has reduced pedagogy in Croatia to studying educational methods.

Keywords: Pedagogy, Teleology, Croatia

Introduction

Initial discussions about education in Croatia go as far back as Humanism and Renaissance: Nicola Vitov Gučetić (1549-1610), a philosopher and polymath from Dubrovnik, published his important first work *Governo della famiglia* (Gučetić, 1998) in Venice in 1589, which addressed, among other questions, the theory of education. Regardless of this and other relevant, if sporadic, contributions dating from older times, a more intense development of the pedagogical theory started in Croatia in 1850 with the appearance of *Obuka malenih ili katehetika: za porabu učiteljem i svećenikom*, a book written by the then priest and school prefect Stjepan Ilijašević (1814-1903). Since that period, pedagogy in Croatia has been developing through four stages: (I) pedagogy of the “enlightenment” (until the First World War), (II) pluralist scientific pedagogy (between the two world wars), (III) monistic socialist pedagogy (after the Second World War) and (IV) a return to pluralism in pedagogy (since Croatian independence at the beginning of the 1990s) (for more details, see Radeka, 2007).

Prolegomena to Pedagogy in Croatia

At different periods during the span of almost seven decades of the first stage of the so-called pedagogy of the “enlightenment” (1850-1918), three different and in many respects contrary tendencies were assuming dominance: the absolute dominance of the theological orientation in pedagogy (from 1850 to the 1870s), the supremacy of the Herbart’s approach in pedagogy (from the 1870s to the end of the 19th century) and the strengthening of reformist trends in pedagogy with gradual weakening of Herbartianism (from the beginning of the 20th century to the First World War). These three trends were not isolated from one another, but to a certain extent interspersed, so the dominance of either of the three tendencies appeared gradually. During this stage, pedagogical materials were created without scholarly pretensions or originality, for the purpose of educating the teaching staff and enlightening the wider public. This stage is significant for the development of pedagogy in Croatia as an introduction to its later scholarly recognition (for more details, see: Radeka, 2007).

Pluralized, Scholarly Recognized Pedagogy in Croatia

In the second stage of the development of pluralized scholarly pedagogy in Croatia, during more than twenty years between the two world wars, not only the practice of pedagogy had been improved, but also the theory. Various reformist pedagogy trends from abroad took theoretical precedence, creating plurality of pedagogical ideas, approaches and theories. At that time, discussions about pedagogy were no longer focused on educational politics, the system of schooling, and the assembling of different approaches more or less passively taken from foreign pedagogical literature, as was the case during the first stage. Pedagogy was beginning to be built on scholarly foundations and in an active relationship to international pedagogical trends.

Among the kaleidoscope of influences from various fractions of reformist pedagogy, working school and cultural pedagogy left the most visible trace in Croatia. By the number of supporters,

both theoreticians and practitioners, **working school** was certainly the most popular reformist movement in Croatia. It was focused on introducing practical work in schools, but it also created a positive environment for changes in the pedagogical theory. It was very well accepted among readers. **Cultural pedagogy**, also called “theoretical” or “philosophical” pedagogy, triggered great changes by its holistic exploration of pedagogy as a science and of fundamental teleological questions in pedagogy and education. Cultural pedagogy created a rich pedagogical heritage in Croatia, which is based on conceptual pluralism, individualization and personalization of education, on a more balanced approach to the needs of the student on the one hand and the community on the other, along with increased appreciation of the student’s personality, on respecting the values of a civil society in education, on establishing a scholarly autonomy of pedagogy and autonomy of education, on explication of the relationship between pedagogy and education, of relationships between pedagogy and philosophy, psychology and culture in general, of the relationship between culture and education and personality and education, on resolving the issues of defining the aim of education and social and cultural dependency of education, on recognizing the power and limits of education, as well as other essential questions in pedagogy and education. As a consequence of the development of cultural pedagogy, at that time pedagogy in Croatia completed its process of becoming an independent scholarly discipline and reached the level of international pedagogical trends (for more details, see Radeka, 2000).

Socialist Pedagogy in Croatia

After the Second World War, the process of pluralist development of pedagogy and education in Croatia was suddenly interrupted. After the liberation of the country, pedagogical science could not continue its natural growth in the totalitarian socialist context. Ideologically and politically controlled pedagogy in Croatia was forced to forget and sever the ties with its own pre-war heritage and global pedagogical trends. Monistically based socialist pedagogy was reduced to a passive reception of ideologically determined pedagogy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics headed by Russia and after the links with the countries of the socialist block were broken, to creating its own path of development within the politically determined socialist ideological framework⁵².

In the post-war period, there were two phases: before the political separation of the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia (of which People’s Republic of Croatia was a constitutive part) from the Soviet Union, pedagogy and the new approach to education grew under the direct patronage of the USSR: after the separation, there was a period of socialist development with a gradual decentralization of society and a search for own, so-called third way of developing a self-managed socialist pedagogy, which followed its own path, diverging from the Soviet-type socialism, but still maintaining a distance towards civic democratic societies that it considered “bourgeois” and anti-people.

Despite gradual democratization of social (as well as pedagogic) circumstances, during the entire period of socialist pedagogy (from the Second World War to the Croatian War of Independence

⁵² The post-war socialist totalitarian society caused an even sharper interruption in pedagogy than the previous Nazi-fascist totalitarianism imposed after the second stage. Socialist pedagogy severed its ties with its own heritage, as well as with the German cultural circle on which Croatian pedagogy had been focused until the Second World War. In contrast, during the so-called Independent State of Croatia, that quisling entity existing in Croatia during the war allowed the usage of certain segments of pedagogical heritage (not only of working school, but also of cultural pedagogy) and was informed by some aspects of German pedagogy (such as pan-pedagogism of Ernst Krieck, social pedagogy of Paul Natorp etc.). For that reason, a significantly more destructive state totalitarianism sponsored by Nazi Germany during the war, in a system that had caused incomparably more human suffering and material damage, paradoxically allowed more freedom for the development of pedagogy and education than the post-war socialist era.

in the 1990s), there was no visible relationship between the pedagogy in Croatia and the German cultural circle, or indeed the pedagogical heritage of the Western block. During this period, pedagogy relied on the value system established upon politically proclaimed goal of education in the service of socially conditioned pedagogy, which was based on collectivism in education, socialist patriotism and the development of a new socialist man in accordance with the prescribed social values.

Under these circumstances, the post-war development of pedagogy in Croatia was determined by a non-pedagogical social context. Pedagogy had to align its internal structure with ideologically predetermined requirements of the state. It became a servant to the regime. Fundamental, essential questions of pedagogy and education were defined by the leading ideological and political body – the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (1920-1952), later named the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (1952-1990).

A Return to Pluralist Pedagogy in Croatia

Free development of pedagogy in the democratic Republic of Croatia began in the 1990s, after the country gained independence and the process of de-ideologization started. Since that time, over the last three decades, pedagogy in Croatia has been opening towards international pedagogical trends. However, what predominates is an eclectic reception of various pedagogic research from abroad, without a clear stance towards its theoretical-methodological grounds. On the other hand, pedagogical research in Croatia is focused on studying educational methods.

Consequences of such an approach can already be felt in the tumult of unclear cross-influences of various theoretical and practical starting points, with inconsistent interlacing of the dominant empirical pedagogy with different, often unclearly articulated constructivist approaches, with influences from normativism, as well as elements of a paradigmatic approach, hermeneutics, postmodernism and other perspectives. Such an eclectic selection of various international pedagogical research, without critical questioning of its theoretical-methodological grounds and without exploring the meaning and purposefulness of pedagogy and education, has resulted in a large amount of ambiguity.

During the period of socialist pedagogy in Croatia, which lasted for almost half a century and in which the strategic guidelines for the development of the whole society were defined by the said political party officially proclaimed as the avant-garde of the revolutionary society, the basic questions of pedagogy and education were outside of the scope of scholarly research. The democratization and de-ideologization of the society created large expectations from pedagogy. Unfortunately, pedagogy in Croatia is still focused on the questions of methods of education. For that reason, experts familiar with the existing pedagogical circumstances in Croatia agree with the prominent Croatian pedagogy scholar Antun Mijatović (1939-2005), who claimed, in a kind of pedagogical testament, that *Pedagogy in Croatia at the beginning of the 20th century had a better academic standing and was in a better state than at the beginning of the 21st century* (2001, p. 149). The relationship to pedagogical and educational research has not changed since.

Today, Croatia is faced with a number of new challenges – such as globalization and EU integration, migrations and multiculturalism, the implementation of lifelong learning primarily as a leverage of economic growth while ignoring the humanist foundations, the reduction of education to acquiring competencies for the world of labor instead of advocating integral education of responsible citizens in a challenging world (for more details, see Radeka, 2011; 2022) – which is why contemporary pedagogical research in Croatia should, more than ever, question the status of pedagogy under the new circumstances, explore the power and limits of education, re-open the problem of defining the goal of education, as well as other fundamental teleological questions in pedagogy and education.

In that context, after an unnatural, discontinuous development, pedagogy in Croatia should take a new approach, complementary taking into account two important aspects: a revalorization and a scholarly redefinition of its own heritage, whilst critically accepting relevant international pedagogical and educational research (for more details, see Radeka, 1998).

It is particularly important to re-conceptualize the achievements of cultural pedagogy in Croatia between the two world wars, as it can offer answers to a number of significant teleological questions that have been unjustly ignored. The time has come to pay due attention to the roots of pedagogical science in Croatia. Not only for a clearer past, but for a safer future.

Recent Challenges for Pedagogy in Croatia

The key problem of the current development of pedagogy in Croatia is that it still has not found a direction and a way of development suitable for the listed challenges. It is focused on researching practical educational problems, primarily methods of education, and while trying to answer the question *how to educate*, it has completely ignored the question *what is education*. Pedagogy has thus seriously limited its own possibilities and its scope of influence. “If we compare current pedagogy with the pedagogy of its founder Johann Friedrich Herbart (1779-1841), we can identify certain key losses in the current period, such as the absence of pedagogical teleology, an incoherent structure of the pedagogical science, ignored role and importance of education in the development of moral character, moving away from the articulation of the teaching process and the educational nature of teaching etc.” (Radeka, 2011: 664). Therefore, critical interrogation of the status of pedagogy and the position of education in contemporary society should be a starting point of essential pedagogical changes in Croatia.

In terms of such a role and significance of pedagogy, Stjepan Pataki (1905-1953), one of the leading figures of cultural pedagogy in Croatia, agrees with the normative approach of Johann Friedrich Herbart when he says: “(...) Just as pedagogical discipline stems and begins from practice, so it should eventually come back to practice, to serve it, to guide it and organize it, in the scope and meaning, of course, in which the nature of the educational function requires and allows. To that purpose, it has appeared and it exists. Only in that way, pedagogical discipline will completely fulfil its task and will not stop half way” (Pataki, 1936: 8). These are the questions that pedagogy in Croatia today is not taking into account.

Indeed, there are very few authors who engage in a critical discussion about the existing crisis of pedagogy and education in Croatia. Apart from Antun Mijatović, among these few there is also Ante Vukasović (1929-2021), a Croatian pedagogue devoted to moral education, who addressed the issue critically, stating that “until the end of the Second World War, Croatian philosophical and pedagogical thinking was very prolific and inspirational. That is our positive philosophical-pedagogical tradition and value-based pedagogical heritage. (...) New generations of Croatian pedagogues should not forget and abandon our rich and valuable pedagogical heritage. We must return to it, study it and use it to enrich the pedagogic theory and the practical work of education” (Vukasović, 2010: 112). The key role of education is not in gaining knowledge, which can be achieved, as Vukasović points out, by any common criminal; instead, it is in human development or education as a more complex phenomenon. He continues: “Educational work is very complex, the process of educating is layered, multifaceted, comprehensive. Its object is man, his growth, development, formation of cultured personality and its lifelong existence. Human education is related to a totality of culture and civilization, it encompasses all areas of science, art, morality and spirituality in general. It gives necessary knowledge and practical skills and habits to all human beings, developing their physical and intellectual powers and abilities, and builds positive characteristics of a cultured personality.” (2010: 100). In this context, he concludes, teleology is of utmost importance: “In education, pedagogical teleology contemporizes the question of meaning, educational

ideal, educational purpose and principal tasks of education. These are primary questions on which the entire educational effort depends. Without clear answers to these questions, education would have no direction, no signpost, it would be disorganized, practice-based, blind and powerless. Pedagogical teleology defines it, lights its way, shows its importance, gives it value-based meaning. It is part of the education theory that deals with determining the meaning and main purpose of educating, in short – it is a theory of educational purpose.” (Vukasović, 2010: 105). Along these lines, Vladimir Filipović (1906-1984), an esteemed Croatian philosopher close to cultural pedagogues, points out that the educational ideal provides the basis, direction and purpose to all pedagogical work: “First, I need to know where I want to go in order to find the quickest and shorter routes. First, I need to know ‘what I want’ in order to choose the best ‘how I want it’” (1934: 1).

Unfortunately, all three authors (Antun Mijatović and Ante Vukasović as pedagogues and Vladimir Filipović as a philosopher) belong to older generations and are no longer with us. Today, there are no more discussions about key issues of pedagogy and education in Croatia. Even though there are five programmes of study, at undergraduate and graduate levels, four of which offer postgraduate doctoral studies, employing a substantial number of academics professionally researching pedagogy and education, the basic teleological questions have been completely ignored in Croatia.

This problem affects not only the quality of the work performed by the existing 1,200 pedagogues – who work in professional development teams in 1,300 elementary and secondary schools and student homes that aim to improve the education of 450,000 pupils – it affects the education of teachers in elementary and secondary schools, who acquire their pedagogical competencies in such context. Vukasović is, therefore, right when he says: “Today, pedagogy is a diverse discipline. It encompasses many pedagogical branches or fields. However, in spite of the richness of disciplines and the diversity of systems, pedagogical teleology and axiology are utterly forgotten; they are not studied nor taught in teaching and pedagogy related university programmes. This also indicates the need to return to our value-based pedagogical heritage. (...) Disregard of the educational function is closely followed by disregarding the training of teacher-educators and pedagogues for performing specific educational tasks. They should all be thoroughly familiar with the purpose of education, and pedagogical teleology is not a part of their pedagogical training” (2010: 113).

Conclusion

If pedagogy decreases its influence on the methods of education, it becomes removed from the essence of its discipline and the fundamental purpose of its study. There is no true pedagogy without a continual search for answers to current issues that people encounter in contemporary society, just like there is no true education without an integral, informed and collaborative action of educators and students that provides answers to contemporary challenges. An informed and critical approach to practice is a condition of success in that respect. In that context, without returning to fundamental teleological questions and without a holistic assessment of pedagogy and education, there is no way out for Croatia from the blind alley in which it now resides.

Bibliography

- Gučetić, N. (1998). *Upravljanje obitelji*. Zagreb: Hrvatski studiji – Studia Croatica.
- Filipović, V. (1934). Pedagogija i aksiologija. *Napredak*. Zagreb. No. 5.
- Kujundžić, N., Marjanović, I. (1991). *Personalistička pedagogija Stjepana Matičevića: Odabrani tekstovi s uvodom studijom dra Nedjeljka Kujundžića*. Zagreb: Katehetski salezijanski centar.
- Mijatović, A. (2001). Pogled na Hrvatsku pedagogiju na kraju stoljeća. *Napredak*, No. 2, p. 143-156.
- Pataki, S. (1928). Filozofijski osnov pedagogijske teleologije. *Nastavni vjesnik*. Zagreb. No. 9-10. p. 323-343.

- Pataki, S. (1936). *Pedagogijska nauka i problem odgojne funkcije*. Zagreb: Tiskara Merkantile.
- Pataki, S. (1933). *Problemi filozofijske pedagogije: Odnos filozofije i obrazovanja*. Zagreb: Zadruska štamparija.
- Pataki, S. (1938). *Problemi i pravci reformne pedagogije*. Zagreb: Minerva.
- Radeka, I. (1998). O potrebi rekonceptualizacije suvremene povijesti pedagogije u Hrvatskoj. In: *Kvaliteta u odgoju i obrazovanju: The Quality in Education and Teaching*. Rijeka: Pedagoški fakultet u Rijeci, Odsjek za pedagogiju. p. 68-77.
- Radeka, I. (2000). *Pedagogija Stjepana Patakija u kontekstu razvoja suvremene povijesti pedagogije u Hrvatskoj*. Doctoral dissertation defended at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Rijeka.
- Radeka, I. (2001): Pomen pedagoške teleologije na primeru kulturne (pan)pedagogike na Hrvaškem in v Sloveniji med svetovnimi vojnami. *Sodobna pedagogika*, Ljubljana, No. 3, p. 160-174.
- Radeka, I. (2007): Reformna pedagogika v procesu razvoja pedagogike na Hrvaškem. *Sodobna pedagogika*. Ljubljana. No. 4, p. 106-129.
- Radeka, I. (2011). Odgoj ličnosti ili obrazovanje kompetencija? *Pedagoška stvarnost*. Novi Sad. Vol. 57, No. 7-8., p. 655-666.
- Radeka, I. (2022). Karakter odgoja i obrazovanja i odgoj i obrazovanje karaktera, In: Vican, D.; Karamatić Brčić, M. /Ed./: *Inovativnost, kreativnost i poduzetnost u odgojno-obrazovnom sustavu*. Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru. p. 35-42.
- Vuk-Pavlović, P. (1996). *Filozofija odgoja*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Vukasović, A. (2010). Odgojna preobrazba u teleologijskom i aksiologijskom ozračju, *Odgojne znanosti*. Zagreb. Vol. 12. No. 1. p. 97-117.

RADOVANOVIĆ Vesna

University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

KOVAČEVIĆ Jasmina

University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

JACHOVA Zora

Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Faculty of Philosophy, Institute of Special Education and Rehabilitation, Skopje, North Macedonia

RISTOVSKA Lidija

City General Hospital "8th September", Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Division of Audiology, Skopje, North Macedonia

SOCIAL DISTANCE OF THE PARENTS OF STUDENTS WITH TYPICAL DEVELOPMENT TOWARDS STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION⁵³

Abstract: The aim of the study was to examine the willingness of the parents of students with typical development to accept a certain type of social relations with peers with disabilities. A modified Bogardus social distance scale was used for research purposes. The sample consisted of families of students with typical development who attend inclusive primary schools on the territory of the Republic of Serbia. From the total of 398 students in the sample, 136 (34.2%) attend the class with children with intellectual disabilities, 57 (14.3%) children with autism, 51 (12.8%) children with behavioral disorders, 38 (9.5%) children with motor disorders, 33 (8.3%) children with learning disabilities, 31 (7.8%) children with developmental dysphasia, and 52 (13,1%) children

⁵³ This paper was written within the project entitled *Creating Protocol for Assessing the Educational Potential of Children with Disabilities as Criteria for the Development of Individual Educational Programmes*, supported by the Ministry of Science and Technological Development, Belgrade, 451-03-68/2022-14.