

## Editorial

Summer is again approaching. This is the first number of *TECHNE* in 2017 but soon after the next number that is devoted to NordFo conference “Make now”, will be appear. The Make Now conference that was held in September 2016 in Rauma, was very successful and we have received many articles to the upcoming special issue. Anyway, we hope that Scandinavian as well as international craft researchers will continue to submit their articles to *TECHNE* in order to publish a steady number of articles in each volume. In this number, we have four interesting articles.

Marléne Johansson´s and Viveca Lindberg´s study ”Att lära sig se trådraken – om tvekan och fokusförskjutning på väg mot förändrat kunnande” focused on differences in craft knowledge between elementary students (8 grades) and more competent students in upper secondary school when they were laying out patterns on a fabric before cutting. Placing pattern parts on fabric before cutting is one of the most critical aspect of textile knowledge that is fundamental to both the work and the finished final product. Using four excerpts of video data of pattern layout on fabric, the authors describe how the knowledge is changing with increasing experience, as well as, what kind of new difficulties students face when they are working on patterns of increasing complexity. The authors explicate how a specific knowledge content and students experience is built on their previous experiences: the upper secondary school students have learnt to adapt and change factory-made patterns, they have experiences to measure themselves, and compare their own measurements and the basic dimensions. These experiences enables the upper secondary school students to understand the meaning of different characters and markings on the pattern in a completely different way than is possible for the pupils in elementary school. The authors wanted to initiate further discussions on how craft learning can be identified and how differences in knowledge can be indicated in sloyd practices.

Ossi Autio, Janez Jamsek and Milan Gaberšek focused on comparing “*Students’ Attitudes towards Craft and Technology in the Context of Finnish and Slovenian Comprehensive Schools*”. The research on students’ attitudes toward technology has a long and stable history. The quantitative survey, consisting of 14 questions, was distributed to 505 school students in Finland and Slovenia. In general, the boys in both countries and in both age groups (11-years old and 13-years-old) had more positive attitude toward technology than girls did. A statistically significant difference between countries was found in older girls group: the average response among Finnish 13-year-old girls was 3.14 and among Slovenian 13-year-old girls 2.73 ( $p=0.003$ ). Further, these older girl students in both countries also considered that they will not likely choose a profession related to technology in the future. Similar way these older girl students do not think technology education is beneficial for them in the future. Boys’ attitude toward future profession and advantage of technology education in their future were much more positive. The authors discussed and concluded that these differences may be explained by differences in the national curriculums, the different pedagogical traditions and cultural differences in the field of technology.

Similar way, Antti Hilmola and Eila Lindfors conducted investigation about “*Pupils’ performance in managing the holistic craft process.*” The empirical research data is based on the national assessment of learning outcomes in the 9th grade of basic education, which the Finnish National Board of Education conducted in 2010. The authors’ revisited the national assessment from a new perspective: to what extent do pupils have the competence to manage holistic craft process (HCP), theoretical knowledge and what stand do they take towards the crafts subject in their attitudes? The research focuses on a sample of pupils ( $n = 661$ ) who participated in all stages of the assessment. The assessment included a design task that involved

testing the management of the holistic craft process (design & make a small container for electric equipment), a test of theoretical knowledge (i.e., tools and materials, methods of making the crafts, understanding the technology of crafts, working safely and sustainable development) and an attitude test. Based on K-cluster means analysis they found three groups: the positive achievers (43 %), the positive underachievers (29 %) and the negative underachievers (28 %). they found that the pupils who have participated in the crafts during three school years take a positive stand towards the crafts than those pupils who have participated in the crafts only one school year. Hilmola and Lindfors concluded that the performance in managing holistic craft processes cannot be determined by the theoretical knowledge and the attitudes in crafts, instead it more related to gender and earlier craft studies.

In her article "*Kulturarvens ulike ansikt*" Else Marie Halvorsen discusses the well-timed topic of cultural heritage in the school. The term cultural heritage faces two complex viewpoints: on the one hand, it holds key values that can create identity and cultural roots, and, on the other hand, it holds multicultural co-existence and flexibility. The article relies on data from Halvorsen's (1996) doctoral thesis concerning three different contexts. According to official school documents, cultural heritage was largely linked to the established and documented culture. The second context showed the cultural heritage understanding of primary school teachers: the interviews revealed the same form of cultural understanding as the school documents, but also illustrated how important cultural heritage was for their practice as teachers. The third context was represented by a cultural elite group consisting of artists, cultural conservationists and academics in the university. The cultural elite group interviews revealed that their concept of cultural heritage is different from school teachers: cultural heritage does not include only the manifested culture, but also the more hidden dimension from our world of life. The cultural heritage was perceived not only as one which is received but also as a living force in society to build on and change. Cultural heritage was seen as part of the concept of creativity. Halvorsen concludes that it is necessary to get a deeper understanding of the term cultural heritage.

I wish you a nice summer holidays and I strongly encourage you to submit your articles in TECHNE journal!

Pirita Seitamaa-Hakkarainen

Editor-in-Chief