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Abstract
This paper explores the ways in which ‘curriculum’ has been used and translated in curricular documents in the Greek language, published and used in Greece and/or Cyprus. Already notorious as a complex and multifaceted concept, ‘curriculum’ has been ascribed multiple meanings and nuances, a complexity amplified when we explore its use in diverse languages and contexts. By focusing on how such meanings have been used in Cyprus as a case-study, evidently largely drawing upon both the Anglo-american (curriculum and instruction/teaching) and the continental European (bildung-influenced didaktik) traditions, the directions Curriculum Studies as a field has been taking can be discussed. This discussion is suggested as a tool to identify issues around the ‘transfer’, ‘translation’ and ‘transformation’ and ‘re-contextualization’ of ‘curriculum’ as a concept and term as well as ‘curriculum studies’ as an academic field in contexts other than those in which they emerged, against the background of curriculum research which explores genealogies of the curriculum field internationally (e.g. Pinar, 2013a) or compares Anglo-American and continental European Curriculum Studies (e.g. Autio, 2006; Gundem, 2010; Gundem & Hopmann, 2002; Hudson, 2007; Westbury, Hopmann & Riquarts, 2000). By beginning to explore how curriculum, bildung and didaktik have been historically construed in policy writing in a language other than English through the case of the Greek language in general and the shape of the field in Cyprus in particular, this study cautiously responds to calls for the internationalization of the field of Curriculum Studies, sheds light in the multiple and complex ways in which ‘curriculum’ and the attendant field translates and transforms within a particular sociocultural context, and contributes to understanding ‘Cyprus’ as a case amidst the international map of Curriculum Studies by discussing its unique characteristics and challenges.
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Introduction
The study from which this paper draws upon stems from my experience as a person teaching and researching ‘curriculum’ in Cyprus over the last two decades. Having studied in Cyprus, Australia and the UK, ‘returning’ to Cyprus to teach and conduct research in the field of ‘Curriculum Studies’ I faced several issues which have been familiar to the field, as well as some new ones which derived from moving between particular languages and cultures. Expanding on work conducted analyzing school curricula and textbooks as official texts in Cyprus (e.g. Philippou & Klerides, 2010; Philippou, 2009; Philippou, 2012), as well as on work exploring the directions of the field in teacher education
programmes and in key publications in academic journals in Greek (Christodoulou & Philippou, 2009a; 2009b; 2008), this paper looks at the use and translation of ‘curriculum’ and ‘bildung-influenced didaktik’ in key official curricular documents in Cyprus during the colonial and independence periods.

Though just a beginning of a long and ongoing study, writing such a paper in the context of the first issue of the European Journal of Curriculum Studies (which comprises of a selection of papers from the first European Association of Curriculum Studies Conference) seems particularly timely, as the field seems to be in a process of re-constituting itself in a European context (through the European Association of Curriculum Studies (Euro-ACS), its conferences and its journal), thus generating discussions over the geographical and other borders between and across (with-in and with-out) curricular intellectual inquiry. A paper on Cyprus also seems especially interesting in the context of such discussions, as an island lying on the borders of (traditional geographical definitions of) Europe and the European Union; a Mediterranean country with an old Ottoman (1571-1878) and a recent colonial past as part of the British Empire (1878-1960) administered at times as an eastern and at others as a western colony; a young democracy and one of EU’s most recent member-states since 2004; known for hosting an intractable socio-political problem rooted in a 60-year-old intercommunal between and within the two larger groups, Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots, but also between Greece and Turkey as respective ‘motherlands’; divided since the inter-ethnic hostilities of 1963-1967, a division consolidated in 1974 when the Greek-led coup led to the Turkish invasion which separated the island into two ethnically distinctive areas (Greek-Cypriots in the south and Turkish-Cypriots in the north); yet also a (less visible) example of peaceful co-existence and cross-cultural interaction across the centuries; in search for a solution to the political problem within the framework of the United Nations and the European Union at a time when energy routes and the economic crisis seem to re-locate it at the centre of European and international attention. This context has historically held a firm grip on schooling, as formal state education has been segregated between the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot sub-systems, with Greek and Turkish as the official state languages and languages of instruction respectively since 1960, a distinction mirrored and reproduced in the current respective teacher education programmes as well. This paper focuses on the Greek-Cypriot sub-system administered by the Republic of Cyprus and thus the focus on the translation of ‘curriculum’ and ‘bildung and didaktik’ in Greek, though obviously a comparative study of their translation in Turkish is necessary in the future to fully portray Cyprus as a case-study. The paper comprises of four parts; the first part comprises a brief account of how the concept has been conceptualised in the international literature, an account which serves as an analytical pool for the exploration of meanings ascribed to curriculum, bildung and didaktik in key curricular documents for elementary education during the colonial and independence periods in the second and third part of the paper respectively. The fourth part concludes the paper and discusses key issues and implications of the arguments put forth in the paper for the field of ‘Curriculum Studies’ in the Republic of Cyprus.
To explore these meanings in curricular documents in Greek and English, the study draws analytically from the sociology of curriculum and comparative education. Firstly, ‘context’ is seen as a field of Bernstein’s (1990) pedagogic device, as the study involves an exploration of the use of terms and concepts in the field of recontextualisation, which lies and mediates between the field of production of knowledge (university, academic disciplines) to the field of reproduction of knowledge (school, school subjects). From this perspective, recontextualisation occurs both within the official recontextualising field (ORF) of policy making, curriculum development and so on and within the pedagogical recontextualising field (PRF) of teacher education and research institutions. These distinctions are mobilized in this study to acknowledge how ‘curriculum’ is a fluid notion as it is contextualised and recontextualised from one field to another and how educational phenomena are complex, meaning-making interactions of the people involved as active agents: thus ORF is viewed as the field wherein the curriculum documents analysed in this paper are produced; and the PRF as the field wherein ‘Curriculum Studies’ is shaped and re-shaped in a number of ways, including through the publication of the academic books (a strand of the broader study not presented in this paper, please see the Discussion section). Secondly, ‘context’ is seen as sociocultural and spatial from a comparative education perspective and its description and interpretation of the transfer, translation and transformation of education and educational ideas, institutions or phenomena across local, national, international and global levels. This analytical take was considered necessary in addition to the first one, because the concepts of curriculum, bildung and didaktik as well as curriculum studies as a distinct academic field (as well as the modern school and university institutions themselves) emerged as such outside Cyprus and not in the Greek language. Accounting, therefore, for how ‘as these move, they morph’, to paraphrase Cowen (2009) on his shape-shifting theory, seems particularly important, because the re-conceptualization of Curriculum Studies since the 1970s and the ensuing effort to internationalise it has brought about challenges of exploring meanings and translations of ‘curriculum’, ‘bildung and didaktik’ as well as genealogies of the field in various contexts around the world. For example, in the Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies (Kridel, 2010) there are distinct ‘continental overviews’ for African, Asian and European Curriculum Studies as well entries for American, Canadian, International and World organisations or associations devoted to the study of curriculum, instruction, teaching and pedagogy. In the International Handbook of Curriculum Research there are 34 studies for 28 countries (Pinar, 2003) and 39 studies for 34 countries (Pinar, 2013a). Hudson (2007) notes how comparison of its meaning across linguistic boundaries is fraught with a variety of difficulties, especially since curriculum is not a common word in any of the European continental languages and there is no exact translation (Gundem, 2010) and since its translations may be seen as carrying imperialist nuances (Baker, 2010). In this study, I focus on the curriculum and didaktik traditions in Angloamerican and continental European literature (e.g. Schubert, 2008; Westbury et al., 2000; Autio, 2006; Gundem & Hopmann, 2002) as these seem to have been more influential for the case of Cyprus, the Greek language and the texts analysed.
1. Curriculum and Bildung-influenced Didaktik traditions: an overview

These two traditions have already attracted considerable comparative attention together. Gundem and Hopmann (2002), for example, compared them to argue how at the heart of the field for the Angloamerican tradition has been the question of ‘Which (and for some whose) knowledge is of most worth’ [and thus the question of what must be taught], whereas for the European Bildung-influenced Didaktik tradition the question of ‘What will the pupil become’ [and thus how should the pupil be shaped] has been most influential. Bildung, which lies at the heart of the Didaktik tradition, has been seen as an elusive concept to capture in English: ‘formation’, ‘education’ and ‘erudition’ are some of terms proposed, though no single one captures the meanings of bildung, especially as they did not remain unchanged over time (see Pinar, 2009 on its historicity): “Bildung can be seen to be a state of being that can be characterised by a cluster of attributes described by terms such as ‘educated’, ‘knowledgeable’, ‘learned’, ‘literary’, ‘philosophical’, ‘scholarly’, and ‘wise’” (Hudson, 2007, p.136). Gundem (2010) points out how the terms stresses ‘the importance of educating for life and the whole person than educating for certain standards that can be measured individually’ (p.355). Hopmann (2007) suggests that a commitment to bildung (along with the educative difference of matter and meaning, and an autonomy of teaching and learning) are the three elements which characterise didaktik, an invention of 19th century teacher education in Germany (though with a past extending to ancient Greece and Rome; see Hopmann, 2007 for an overview) tackling with how teaching can be restrained in the sense of being reduced to the least necessary intervention to instigate learning, the latter understood as ‘a content based student activity, not as swallowing a sermon or a monologue or otherwise one-sided knowledge distribution by a teacher’ (Hopmann, 2007, p. 113). As this conceptualization of didaktik was prominent in the early 19th century, when emerging national school systems sought to govern schooling, the Prussian invention of Lehrpläne (separate syllabi) as a rough curriculum outline of what to teach and what not, which entailed pedagogical freedom to the teacher as to how to enact it locally, spread (though not unchallenged) to the German states and throughout Europe (Hopmann, 2007). As different schools of thought over bildung and didaktik were shaping over time and as the angloamerican curriculum tradition had been imported in Germany in the 1960s (Westbury et al., 2000), bildung’s vagueness fuelled at some point arguments that it was replaced with ‘curriculum’ when it came to teaching (e.g. Robinson, 1967 as cited in Hopmann, 2007).

However, ‘curriculum’ can be viewed as similarly elusive when used in English, since numerous characterizations or images for the concept, rather than definitions (Schubert, 1986), have been proposed, acknowledging and highlighting the intricacies and complexities of its shifting and contingent content as a dynamic concept ascribed different meanings in different contexts. This fluidity of meaning also resonates with the changing ways in which it has been theorized over time, the genealogy of the field itself. Explorations of the meanings of curriculum in English often start with its literal meaning in latin from ancient Greece and Rome of ‘the race track’ or ‘running course’ or ‘circus maximus’ (e.g.
Marsh & Willis, 2007), soon after also problematising and unpacking the multiple interpretations as well as constraints of such a metaphor [and of any single preferred definition] (e.g. Lovat & Smith, 1995) and at times suggesting other metaphors as means of further delving into the meanings of curriculum and their implications for involved social actors (e.g. Kliebard’s production, growth and travel metaphors, 1975). However, as a term linked to education beyond its literal meaning, the term appeared relatively recently in university texts in Europe (e.g. University of Leiden in 1582, University of Glasgow, 1633) and was taken up as a term (along with class) to organize the whole multi-year course (in all years and subjects) by the principles of disciplina (a sense of structural coherence) and ordo (a sense of structural sequencing) (Hamilton, 1989/2009; see Baker, 2010). This conceptualization was established with the later spread of mandatory public schooling through which school curricula were mobilized as a mechanism of governance of (especially urban) populations by states (see Ball, 2013), a process closely associated with a modernist understanding of national school education as a means to form ideal, governable subjects, national citizens, disciplined and skilled workers who would support and legitimise nation-states, an understanding emerging from, as well as contributing to, social, economic, political and cultural changes such as the Enlightenment, the Industrial Revolution, the bloody dismembering of European empires through national and nation-building wars including World War I (see, for example, Green, 1997; Nóvoa, 2000; Coulby & Jones, 1995) and changing constructions of childhood (see Baker, 2001). In this context of administration and governance which prioritized the ‘order’ of classes and the ‘development’ of curricula so that they were later implemented, evaluated and so on, ‘curriculum’ has been conceptualised as institutionalized text and has frequently been used as a synonym to (largely academic and gradually beyond classical) ‘content’ or ‘subject-matter’, the material manifestations of which included official curricular documents, syllabi, plans, course outlines, programmes of instruction, timetables for any or all (school or university) subjects (to be observed more or less closely). These were in many ways manifestations of modernist approaches of, for example, Bobbit and Tyler, which fuelled the emergence and growth of the field in the early 20th century in the USA and which conceptualised ‘curriculum’ as a social engineering device for the ‘correction’ of problems and the achievement of political and social (measurable) objectives of ‘development’ and ‘progress’ (Pinar, 2011; Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998).

Such use has been repeatedly challenged by scholars of the field, who proposed instead a number of conceptualizations suggesting that curriculum is not an inert content which remains the same under any circumstances, but that it is also the interpretation or theory over the content; from such perspectives, creating curriculum means inventing meanings over content as an educative medium (Doyle & Carter, 2003). Such perspectives also are in opposition to those who ‘see’ a ‘deterioration’ from formal, official or ideal curricula created by ‘experts’ to what happens in the classroom. Conceiving ‘curriculum’ as in ‘levels’ is usually driven by a ‘fidelity perspective’, which considers curriculum as something to be implemented or at least ‘mutually adapted’ when negotiated by ‘experts’ and teachers in particular contexts; others warn not to privilege an ideal but rather consider curriculum as an enactment, a process of interaction of
teachers, pupils, materials and the official context in class, thus suggesting that curriculum is the construction of personal meaning by the participants to this process (see Snyder et al., 1992), the latter conceptualization resonating in some ways with that of bildung-influenced didaktik (see Hopmann, 2007). Examples of such research include Goodlad's (1984) distinction between an ideal, formal, perceived, operational, experiential curriculum, a strong conceptualization of curriculum as a hierarchy of levels to date, building on which van den Akker et al. (2013) point to the differences between intended (ideal and formal/written, the world of policy and design), implemented (perceived and operational, the world of the school and teachers) and attained (experiential and learned, the world of the students) curriculum. Relatedly, curriculum has been conceptualised as in ‘levels’ (supra, macro, meso, micro, nano) to explore curriculum as of supranational, national, school, classroom and individual relevance respectively (van den Akker et al., 2013). As Cohen & Harrison (1982) make the distinction between curriculum as intention (as a plan comprising of objectives, content, activities and evaluation techniques) as opposed to curriculum as reality (as that which emerges during the complex interaction of people responding to diverse influences, be they direct or indirect, human or physical); as curriculum characterizations broaden to include all lived experience and biographies of the social actors involved in such interactions as embodied curriculum (e.g. Schubert, 2008); as distinctions between informal, hidden, outside, null and extra-curricular as opposed to formal, taught and tested curricula are suggested (e.g. see Kridel, 2010); as it is conceptualised as the questioning of authority and the searching for complex views of human situations, a postmodern definition encouraging the constant question of, usually, the modern (Marsh & Willis, 2007), one can consider the complex problematique of curriculum studies as indicative of the reconceptualisation of the field since the early 1970s in North America. Pinar's currere became a reminder of how the racecourse is not linear, but circular: as the original metaphor is re-tooled to stress how the end keeps meeting the start, the emphasis of the field is re-located towards the study of the journey, of the personal experience of that route within and beyond the school (Pinar et al., 2008) and to bildung as a possible response to the recurring question of the subject (see Pinar, 2009; 2011). Discussions de-centred from, or to be more accurate, veered between, ‘improving’ to ‘understanding’ curriculum as political, racial, gender, phenomenological, poststructuralist, autobiographical, aesthetic, theological and, perhaps more relatedly to this paper, historical and institutionalized text, (Pinar et al., 2008). What follows is an endeavor to ‘understand’ ‘curriculum’ in its use in curricular documents written in Greek and English in Cyprus between 1878 and 2010. These documents can be distinguished into two categories by 1960, the landmark year of transition from a British Colony (1878-1960) to an independent state, the Republic of Cyprus (1960-to date); thus the government authority producing or legitimizing these documents is different for each period. Though the Greek language is used for these documents during both periods, during the colonial one they were also often written in English and/or were framed by colonial documents written in English reporting on education to London.

2. ‘Curriculum’ in official curricular documents in Cyprus: 1878-1960
To explore the colonial period, Said’s (1978) concept of Orientalism will be used as an analytical tool, since the East-West binary played a key role in the ways in which the colonial administration made decisions on how to administer Cyprus, including in the field of education. Varnava (2009) argues that, during the first 40 years of their rule, the British saw Cyprus between two contrasting imaginaries: the Oriental and the Occidental. The former was supported by visitors and administrators who clearly located the island and its inhabitants in the Levant, in the Middle East, not only because of the physical appearance of Cypriots, but also because of their ways-as ‘chaotic Orientals’ who ‘necessitated’ British rule for their own good, as Given (1998) notes. The latter was maintained by official policy-makers, politicians, civil servants, and journalists in London: Cyprus, unlike other possessions, was inhabited mainly by Christians and its landscape was scattered with Greek-Roman antiquities. The Christian Cypriots were therefore considered as Europeans whose ancestors (ancient Greeks) lay at the heart of modern British intellectual and political culture; this was the time when Europe, according to Herzfeld (1987), claimed ancient Greece as its spiritual ancestor and created a single ideal of both ancient and modern Greece. Though Orientalism and Occidentalism were in constant interplay in varying ways later during British rule, the impact over curriculum as institutionalised text was grave. The use of imported liberal Greek curricula and textbooks, with their classical orientation, often written in ancient Greek and their emphasis on ancient Greek literature was initially commended by British officials as a sign of intellectual superiority of the Christian (as opposed to the Muslim-Oriental) locals (e.g. by Talbot & Cape, 1913; see Gregoriou, 2004 on how the colonial discourse of the race was re-inscribed in local politics of the time and in history of education studies on that time). For example, on these grounds, the Earl of Kimberley (Secretary of State for the Colonies) rejected Sir R. Biddulph’s (the High Commissioner of Cyprus) proposal that English became a ‘general vehicle of education’ in 1880 (see Persianis, 1996). As the 1878-1931 period was a relatively laisser-faire one and as Cyprus was being perceived as an unredeemed part of the imagined community of Hellenism, it experienced the penetration of Greek irredentist discourses of identity, education being a key mechanism through which these discourses were transferred from Greece to Cyprus (Klerides, 2009). Thus, school curricula which were modeled after the Greek ones, as well as textbooks, teaching materials and wall maps imported from Greece fuelled the construction of a Greek national identity, an adherence to Greco-Christian culture and claims of Enosis (Union with Greece). Such transfer of education ideas and practices from Greece were already translations and transformations of many European ideas and practices, predominant amongst which were some Prussian ones: as Greece became a republic and a monarchy in 1832 with Bavarian prince Otto as its first king, education was influenced or modeled after practices in Bavaria especially for the 1833-1862 period, but also later through the ideas of Herbart in teacher education (on teaching structure and on the moral formation of pupils), which were transferred through educators studying in German states, later to be translated and transformed in a number of ways in Greece (see e.g. Katsikas & Therianos, 2004).
for the year 1886, under a section entitled ‘The Character of Instruction’, the English Inspector of Schools J. Spencer laments how ‘each master arranges now his classes and the lessons to be given to them according to his own fancy, and no general system has yet been adopted. […] I have now prepared a programme of daily lessons based upon that which is in use in the elementary schools of Greece, together with a list of books arranged in the order in which they should be read’ (Her Majesty’s High Commissioner, 1887, p.47). When the Inspector’s gaze returned a year later, he reports that the programme of daily lessons ‘has been sent to every elementary Greek school and has been more or less generally adopted’, (Her Majesty’s Acting High Commissioner, 1888, p. 49), though he complains that overdue emphasis is paid to the teaching of ancient Greek grammar rather reading and writing in the language of daily life, a remark resonating with concurrent debates in England on the purposes of elementary education (see Alexander, 2000). Soon after, a regulation and a curriculum were published in 1898; the regulation was entitled on the cover ‘Κανονισμός των Ελληνικών Δημοτικών Σχολείων της Νήσου Κύπρου’ [Regulation of the Greek elementary schools of the island of Cyprus], whereas the term ‘analytical programme’ was used in the body of the main text to refer to one of the documents that should be kept in each school in along with the ‘βιβλίο διδασκόμενης ύλης’ [book of taught subject-matter] (e.g. p. 13) and to be closely followed by teachers (e.g. p. 19). The curricular document which accompanied the regulation was entitled ‘Αναλυτικόν Πρόγραμμα των Μαθημάτων του Εξάτακτου Μονοδιδάσκαλου Δημοτικού Σχολείου’ [Analytical Programme of the Subjects of the Six-grade Single-Teacher Elementary School] and was comprised of a delineation of content per subject-area, a terminology and structure that was maintained in the 1912 curriculum which was published more than a decade later (Government of Cyprus, 1912). In their Report on Education in Cyprus Talbot & Cape (1913) used the terms ‘analytical programme’, ‘curriculum’ and ‘course of studies’ or ‘programme of studies’; the first is explained as ‘uniform course of studies’ (p. 13) and is used when they refer specifically to the Greek Christian elementary schools and especially to comment on how the analytical programme’s ‘rigid requirements’ (p.13) for organizing each school in six classes is rendered difficult by the huge number of pupils taught by each teacher. The second is used, often along references to books and timetables, when they refer in a more generic manner to both ‘Greek’ and ‘Muslim’ schools (e.g. p. 15). The third is used to refer to higher education and teacher training institutions on the island (e.g. pp.26-27).

However, during the 1920s and early 1930s education was gradually castigated by the British as a driver of nationalism, which had begun to fuel both communities’s claims over the island towards the end of the 19th and first decades of the 20th century (see, e.g. Bryant 2004; Varnava 2009). The colonial government thus sought to increase its control on education, including through the replacement of Greek curricula with ones produced in Cyprus in 1935; the latter introduced English as a subject for the last two grades of elementary education and focused on Cypriot and imperial history and geography rather than that of Greece. Unsurprisingly, curricula and textbooks became a site of intense struggle and the 1935 elementary curriculum, along with any subsequent proposal or initiative by the colonial government, was reacted against as an
imperialist attempt of ‘de-Hellenisation’ throughout the rest of the period (e.g. Gregoriou, 2004; Persianis, 2006, 2010). The 1935 elementary curriculum was followed until 1949, when it was replaced by an almost identical curriculum in which the teaching of the Geography and History of Greece was restored (Persianis & Polyviou, 1992). The 1935 and 1949 curricular documents were entitled as ‘Programme of Instruction for Elementary Schools’ in English; in the Greek edition this is translated as ‘πρόγραμμα’ throughout the main text, though in the 1949 edition the title is also translated as ‘Αναλυτικόν πρόγραμμα διά τα Δημοτικά Σχολεία’ [Analytical Programme for Elementary Schools]; each document is comprised by a short introduction and then a number of subjects [referred to as ‘μαθήματα’ in’ Greek], each comprised of a general subject aim and lists of topics per grade and/or unit as their content. In the introduction of the 1935 document, the programme is construed as a framework to the teachers’ obligation to prepare weekly work plans, expected to feed into monthly and annual work plans (‘ετήσια σχέδια εργασίας’) kept by the school administration. As the first manifestations of ‘analytical programmes’ or ‘programmes of instruction’ are construed as tools for managing teacher work, especially sequencing, structuring and organizing teaching in terms of classes throughout the school year; they can also be seen as tools of rendering their work visible, by reporting it on a trimester, monthly or even weekly basis. Such control can be seen with additional lenses when one considers that elementary school teachers became ‘public servants’ in 1929, a title which paradoxically recognised their profession whilst at the same time further subjectivated them to the colonial government.

3. ‘Curriculum’ in official curricular documents in Cyprus: 1960-2010

Similarly to the colonial period, the question of which identity to be pursued through curricula after independence has not been straightforward one. Though the tension was not between national/Greek and imperial/colonial/Cypriot identities anymore, new tensions were created and the new state veered between hellenocentrism, cypriocentrism and hellenocypriocentrism as conflicting narratives for national and/or state identities which education was given a major role to restructure, reaffirm or sustain (cf. Philippou & Klerides, 2010). Though the identity question is beyond the scope of this paper, suffice to say that, from this perspective, this period can, for the time being, be distinguished by four different historical moments for Greek-Cypriot education i.e. the first years of Independence (1960-1974), the early post-74 period (1974-1994), the period between 1994-2003, and, the period between 2004-2010 (Philippou & Klerides, 2010; see also Koutselini-loanidou, 1997; Christodoulou, 2013). In each of these periods there have been publications of curriculum documents for elementary education. The 1960 Constitution allocated educational matters not to the Central Government but instead to the Greek and Turkish chambers; in 1959-60 the Greek curriculum was endorsed for elementary education provided to Greek-Cypriots. A new curriculum was thus sent to elementary schools entitled ‘Το Νέον Αναλυτικόν Πρόγραμμα των Δημοτικών Σχολείων’ [The New Analytical Programme of Elementary Schools], a preamble to which in a circular asked teachers to diagnose the ‘condition’ of their class and having the subject matter of the analytical programme as a ‘general guide’ to prepare a work plan for the first
trimester (Office of Greek Education, 7.9. 1959, Circular No. 314, 97/47). The length and detail provided under each subject area renders this document different to the previous ones, since in addition to a general aim and list of contents, topics of units per grade, each subject area also included in many cases methodological suggestions, principles of teaching, samples of worksheets, ways for lesson preparation, suggestions for the use of teaching materials and fieldwork appropriate per subject-area. This change in length and structure suggests a move from old- to new-type of curricula, as the latter comprised of aims, objectives, content, methodology and evaluation rather than solely aims and content. However, in 1973 a newly published and much shorter curriculum document was sent to all elementary schools; the document was entitled ‘Νέον Αναλυτικόν Πρόγραμμα Σχολείων Στοιχείωδους Εκπαιδεύσεως’ [New Analytical Programme of Elementary Schools], was comprised of several subjects under which subject-matter was structured by themes for all the first three grades together (the first cycle of elementary education), and not each year separately. It was accompanied by a circular which explained that for the last three grades (named as second cycle) of elementary school the old curriculum would continue to apply with the exception of the subject of History, for which some subject-matter re-adjustment was listed. The circular highlighted that ‘the new element of this Programme is that [..] by listing all subject-matter for the whole [first] cycle rather [than for each grade], the teacher chooses that which is more appropriate for serving the specific aims of his (sic) particular grade’ (Ministry of Education, 1973, Y.Π.223/68/3).

The production of curricula and textbooks in Cyprus was introduced and institutionally supported by the foundation of a ‘Curriculum Development Service’ in 1979, one of a number of reforms between 1976 to 1980 with Chrysostomos Sofianos as Minister of Education (see Sofianos, 1986), who also pursued the development of a new curriculum for elementary education; this was published in 1981 and was quite a voluminous document of 326 pages entitled ‘Αναλυτικό Πρόγραμμα των Σχολείων Στοιχείωδους Εκπαιδεύσεως’ (Analytical Programme of the Schools of Elementary Education). Apart from chapters for the various subject areas, it also included a general introduction of the general aims of elementary education; a chapter presenting some key developmental characteristics of the kindergarten and elementary school-aged children; and a chapter on pre-elementary education. The chapters for each subject-area were quite extensive, now comprised of an introduction; a general aim and specific goals; subject matter broken down units, themes or concepts in great detail per grade; means and materials of teaching; activities and methodological suggestions; evaluation techniques and pupils’ work appraisal suggestions for the subject (Ministry of Education, 1981). This document was succeeded in 1994 with ‘Αναλυτικά Προγράμματα Δημοτικής Εκπαίδευσης, στο πλαίσιο της εννιάχρονης εκπαίδευσης’ [Analytical Programmes of Elementary Education in the framework of nine-year education], which was slightly revised in 1996. Notably, it is the first time the plural number is used on the cover of the document (even though the singular ‘analytical programme’ prevails in the main text) and the first time the subtitle suggests an effort to look at elementary education as continuous with lower secondary education. Both of the 1994 and 1996 versions were much more concise than the 1981 one, and even though the generic
introductory chapters were kept (introduction describing the philosophical orientations and general aim of elementary education; basic principles of learning and development), each subject-area’s chapter was shorter and comprised of a short general aim, specific goals and subject matter broken down in units, themes or concepts per grade. No teaching methodology suggestions or evaluation techniques were offered per subject-area, but rather two generic introductory chapters entitled ‘General Methodological Suggestions’ and ‘Evaluation’ referred to all subjects included in the document (Ministry of Education and Culture, 1996).

The most recent publication of curricular documents took place in 2010 and they were placed, in official discourse (e.g. Curriculum Review Committee (CRC), 2008), as at the centre of the education reform launched in 2004 and as the main driver of change (cf. Klerides & Philippou, forthcoming 2014). The 2010 curriculum documents are entitled ‘Αναλυτικά Προγράμματα Προδημοτικής, Δημοτικής και Μέσης Εκπαίδευσης’ [Analytical Programmes of Pre-elementary, Elementary and Secondary Education’; this the first time that they refer to three levels of schooling, as opposed to the separate curriculum documents for elementary (which in 1981 and 1994 included a chapter on pre-elementary education) and secondary education published so far. They are comprised of two volumes, each volume comprised of lengthy syllabi for each subject referred to in official discourse as ‘προγράμματα σπουδών’ [programmes of study]. Each syllabus includes a rationale, aims and objectives, content, methodology, evaluation sections and, in some syllabi, standards and success indicators. Each syllabus was developed by subject-area committees i.e. groups of academics, ministry technocrats and (volunteer) teachers; each group worked independently, though expected to consult a document published in 2008 by the CRC entitled ‘Analytical Programme for the Public Schools of the Republic of Cyprus’, which outlined the general rationale and foundations of this new curriculum. This document also characterized the curriculum review process as ‘progressive’ in, for example, allowing democratic participation by various stakeholders (especially volunteer teachers); in upholding ‘a unified and coherent curriculum from preprimary education to the lyceum’ as one of its principles (CRC, 2008, p.28); and in avoiding to ‘overload’ the envisioned curriculum with subject-matter, the latter construed as a constraint to teacher ‘pedagogical autonomy’ (CRC, 2008, p. 29). The withdrawal of the textbook state monopoly policy (which for more than a century prescribed the use of a single textbook by all teachers to implement the curriculum), was also discursively linked to teacher professional autonomy during the reform, a link to which teachers positioned themselves in a number of ways (Philippou, Kontouvakiki & Theodorou, 2013). However, since the dissemination of the new curriculum texts to schools in September 2010 and ensuing professional development seminars for teachers, the reform has been epitomized by the production of teaching materials or teacher guides available in an online material depository administered by the Ministry. This is an example of a key characteristic of the independence period, since the curricular documents analysed indicate that new-type curricula seem to become the norm, as analytical programmes indeed seem to become very analytical with greater volume and details to guide, manage and control teacher work. This is somewhat paradoxical, considering that elementary teachers in Cyprus have enjoyed increasingly longer
and since 1992, university-based education, the lack of which was mobilized at the end of the 19th century to argue for the necessity of curricula.

4. Discussion and Implications

The broader study from which this paper is drawn responds to Pinar’s (2013b) call for a professional morality against presentism, against an a-theoretical and a-historical empiricism which underpins neoliberal ‘evidence-based’ agendas in education and in favour of a historicality which pays attention to the history of the field instead, thus also hopefully producing intellectual content for the concept of ‘post-reconceptualisation’ (see Pinar, 2011). Located in the recent reading of the Greek-Cypriot system as a mélange (Klerides, 2011; Philippou & Klerides, 2010; Gregoriou, 2004), this paper is an initial note of my exploration of how the curriculum and didaktik traditions were transferred, translated and transformed in Cyprus, especially as mediated via the Greek language, in the official and pedagogic recontextualisation fields. In the curricular documents for elementary education in the colonial and independence periods analysed in this paper (as examples from the official recontextualisation field), the term ‘curriculum’ has been mainly translated in Greek as ‘(Αναλυτικό) Πρόγραμμα’ [(Analytical) programme (of instruction)], which in its most literal translation means detailed or extended programme; as ‘Πρόγραμμα Σπουδών’ (Programme of Study); or as ‘σχολικό πρόγραμμα’ (school programme); in English the term (Analytical) programme (of instruction) prevails. Though with varying characteristics, a common thread across many of the documents analyzed, even across the colonial and independence periods, has been their use to govern teachers and their work in the school and the classroom through instructions, recommendations or suggestions; though obviously such governance (and surveillance) needs to be explored in relation to, for example, teacher evaluation, teacher education, teacher salaries, teacher selection, pupil testing and so on, we may begin to appreciate the manifold materializations of state power/knowledge in Cyprus. From this perspective, analytical programmes as lists of contents (which prevailed in the colonial period), though often castigated as encouraging (academic) subject-matter transmission from the teacher to the pupils, can also be seen as (and were intended as such with Lehrpläne) less constraining to teacher professional autonomy, the latter lying at the heart of the didaktik tradition. On the other hand, new-type curricula as official texts (comprised of aims, content, methodology and evaluation often in Tylerian terms) amplify the constraints teachers are expected to adhere to as employees, though obviously this has been immensely challenged by reconceptualist perspectives within the angloamerican curriculum tradition. What is more, and as ‘context’ may also be theorized from a sociolinguistic perspective, future explorations of ‘curriculum’ as official text in Greece, England and Germany in the 19th and 20th centuries can enrich the understanding pursued in this paper, as intratextual and intertextual links between curricular documents in these countries may be sought. Moving beyond the official to the pedagogic recontextualisation field, academic writing on ‘curriculum’ written in Greek and used in teacher education programmes in Cyprus and Greece are yet another comparative challenge, as academics have been translating ‘curriculum’ and ‘didaktik’ in different ways in Greek (see, for example, Vrettos & Kapsalis, 2011;
Matsaggouras, 1999) which relate, have perhaps influenced, but also move beyond the translations encountered in the official curricular texts analysed in this paper (e.g. Koutselini, 2013). Thus the ‘conversations’ between official and academic texts, but more importantly, of their authors and their biographies, provide further ample ground for historicizing curriculum. Finally, and as a common characteristic of all curricular documents analysed in this paper has been their structuring into subjects, questions arise as to which subjects were present in each document, why and how they emerged, and how this compares to secondary education, in line with Goodson’s (1987) historical work on the genealogies of subjects.

Amidst the diversity of discourses within curriculum studies and across settings wherein it is constantly enacted outlined in the first part of the paper, the field in Cyprus is amidst the challenges of diverse directions and possibilities. The title of the 1st European Conference on Curriculum Studies was ‘Future Directions: Uncertainty and Possibility’. As what is reported in this paper is just the beginning of an ongoing study of tracing an emerging field in Cyprus, I would like to conclude by noting that future directions are indeed uncertain; yet this is an uncertainty pregnant with potential meanings and numerous possibilities of taking different future directions. A research agenda of studying the genealogies of both the term ‘curriculum’ and the field in Cyprus becomes all the more relevant as Cyprus yet again finds itself today at the intersection of Greek, Turkish, British, European (e.g. European Union and Council of Europe), as well international and global (e.g. the World Bank, OECD) influences at, for example, the school curriculum and higher education levels (see Klerides & Philippou, forthcoming 2014). After the Cypriot banking crash in March 2013, there has been increasing national, European and international pressure for both school curriculum and teacher education to fuel the economy and improve society towards useful ends and away from the economic crisis; against this background, a history of the present of ‘curriculum’ emerges as an attractive, perhaps necessary, endeavor against presentism.
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