
UDK 821.09:37.091.3

Boža Krakar Vogel

Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SLOVENE DIDACTICS OF LITERATURE

During the last quarter of a century the didactics of literature has become a formal subject in higher education at the University of Ljubljana's Filozofska fakulteta. This article contains a brief overview of epistemological and content questions in the subject from its beginnings to the present, as well as the kinds of problems researchers in the department have dealt with in their publications. The discipline of teaching literature had a pre-academic phase in the theoretical and applied reflections of practitioners in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Contemporary didactics of literature as a research discipline has been able to make use of these since the 1980s.

Key words: teaching literature, goals, content, methods, applied principles

1 Introductory notes

Contemporary didactics of literature is defined as “the science of teaching literature, factors in it, goals, content, methods, and organizational questions. The didactics of literature, like all specialized didactics, is interdisciplinary and applied (Krakar Vogel 2004: 10–11).¹ In view of the latter, we speak about teaching literature as theoretical research and an applied sphere. The first encompasses empirical and rational research and supplies general principles for application. The second makes them operational and transfers them into the curriculum (i.e., lesson plans, teaching materials, professional development).

This definition covers activities in the discipline and in its pre-academic phase, as well as in the contemporary area of developing the research and applied segment with the framework of the university subject in the Slovene Program at Ljubljana University and at other Slovene universities.²

2 The first phase of development of the study of teaching literature³

We can trace the development of the didactics of teaching literature for a good century, from the founding of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy to the disappearance of specialized secondary education in the 1980s, by analyzing readings, individual

¹ Cf. Kreft (1982) and Rosandić (1986).

² The didactics of literature has also become stronger since the 1980s at the universities in Maribor and Koper, and at the Pedagogical Institute in Ljubljana. The researchers at these institutions (e.g., Metka Kordigel Aberšek, Vida Medved Udovič, Igor Saksida, Milena Mileva Blažič) are most interested in the didactics of literature for young adults. This article will limit itself to the collective in the Slovene program at Ljubljana University.

³ For more about these authors, see Božič (2010).

articles in pedagogical and popular periodicals (before WW II primarily in *Učiteljski tovariš*, *Popotnik*, and *Ljubljanski zvon*), and in quite rare book publications.⁴

After WW II, views of teaching literature were mostly presented in the journal *Jezik in slovsstvo*.⁵ The only book publication of note before 1991 was Gustav Šilih's *Metodiko slovenskega jezikovnega pouka* (Methods of teaching Slovene language arts 1955). There were also some unpublished M.A. and doctoral theses.⁶

3 The didactics of literature for teaching Slovene literature as a university subject at the Filozofska fakulteta, University of Ljubljana

There are two reasons for this overview to focus on the didactics of Slovene literature teaching as a university subject within the Slovene program at the Filozofska fakulteta, University of Ljubljana: First, that is where the first program for literary didactics was established. Second is the fact that there teacher education is intended for both the grade-school and secondary levels and includes the pedagogy of young adult literature, although scholars at other institutions of higher education are more specialized in this.

A look at the more than quarter-century period allows us to identify the following chief research, pedagogical, and applied scholarly goals, which have been set and to a certain extent realized:

- outline the epistemological frame—form an integrated definition of the discipline and its academic foundations and list its proper areas of inquiry, as they appear from the pre-academic tradition, in contemporary foreign research, and in the expectations stated by the Slovene scholarly community;
- research the current state and contemporary challenges of teaching literature within Slovene language arts and propose guidelines for meeting them;
- educate future teachers, teachers in the field, and researchers;
- cooperate on implementing findings in the field, in academic planning, materials, and instruction.

In this article I will deal mostly with research. There are many plans, reports, and results of analyses pertaining to the other areas of activity in scholarly and administrative records.

⁴ They are: Vladimir Ilešič, *O pouku slovenskega jezika* (On the teaching of Slovene language 1902); Janko Bezjak, *Posebno ukoslovje slovenskega jezika v ljudski šoli* (A special method of teaching Slovene language in grade school 1906); Karel Ozvald, *Kulturna pedagogika* (Cultural pedagogy 1927).

⁵ Boža Krakar Vogel wrote about this in her doctoral dissertation, *Novejši slovenski pogledi na pouk književnosti kot izhodišče za oblikovanje njegovih smotrov, metod in vsebin* (Recent Slovene views of the teaching of literature as a basis for determining its directions, methods, and content 1992).

⁶ Breda Rant, *Stopnja učenčeve sprejemljivosti za nekatera klasična slovenska literarna dela, magistrsko delo* (Stages of pupils' receptivity to several classic works of Slovene literature) (M.A. thesis; Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, 1977); Metka Kordigel, *Veda o mladem bralcu* (A study of the young reader), (M.A. thesis, Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, 1989); Vinko Cuderman, *Interpretacija sodobne slovenske lirike v srednji šoli, doktorska disertacija* (The interpretation of contemporary Slovene lyric poetry in high school) (Ph.D. diss.; Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, 1991).

3.1 The discipline known as the literary didactics and since the 1990s as the didactics of literature (on analogy with the names of other special areas of didactics, such as of English), began to develop as a university subject that includes systematic research and pedagogical dimensions after 1986 with the appointment of the first teaching assistant. After 2003, the Department of Teaching Slovene Language and Literature as formed with additional appointments. There have been three members since then: Boža Krakar Vogel and Alenka Žbogar specializing in the didactics of literature, and Jerca Vogel in the didactics of Slovene language.

The first research steps were devoted to epistemological questions. At the beginning, didactics and other disciplines connected with education were viewed in academic circles as but a sort of instruction in practical teaching skills that a good scholar naturally possesses and with no special “training.”⁷ A large part of the research effort in the first years was therefore directed at overcoming these stereotypes while searching for answers to the fundamental questions of whether teaching literature is really only a “practical” extension of literary studies, whether and under what circumstances the teaching of literature is a subject of scholarly research, on what to base research, and in what areas to search for answers in order to achieve theoretical weight and practical applications. These questions were addressed by consulting the available Slovene and foreign sources (e.g., Bezjak 1906, Kreft 1982, Rosandič 1986), and led to the conclusion that the field of research does not match the subject of literary or pedagogical disciplines. The field of research of the didactics of literature is teaching as a process of active discovering of literature, in which, besides literature, it is necessary to understand the receiver’s (student’s) cognitive processes and the pedagogical function of the interpreter (teacher). In order to research the dynamics of this process it is necessary to look at the instrumentation of the pedagogical disciplines that explain cognitive processes and the social factors in education. (e.g., Kolb 1984, Marentič Požarnik 2000), as well as in those disciplines that deal with the essence, state, categorization, and reception of literature (among the more recent, for example, Virk 1991, Juvan 2000, 2006, Dovič 2004, Perenič 2010, Grosman 2004). With that it is possible to approach the research field of the didactics of literature in an interdisciplinary fashion. On the one hand, this makes the discipline independent; on the other, it makes it in many ways dependent upon both basic groups in the scholarly disciplines, due to which there are often differences in evaluating the “fundamental” field.⁸

Another important question in need of research was the applicability of the didactics of literature. The expectations of the scholarly and cultural communities, which polemics revealed quite intensively after the university course of study was established, were that the “method” (as it was then called) should become a disci-

⁷ See Barica Marentič Požarnik’s book, *Nova pota v izobraževanju učiteljev* (New directions in teacher education 1987).

⁸ It arose as an independent academic field with the “hybridization (blending) of disciplines” (ROSANDIČ 2005: 17). Siegfried Schmidt, for example, also understands the didactics of literature in this way: “First it is necessary to distinguish between literary studies and literary didactics... which on the theoretical level as well must develop its own concept of literary socialization (SCHMIDT, in: Dovič 2004: 85). Z. Božič, however, understands the didactics of literature as a part of literary studies (Božič 2010: 24).

pline and offer quick and clear solutions for improving the teaching of literature.⁹ Here it turned out that there were considerable differences between tried educational “recipes” for the concrete handling of given teaching materials by those in the field¹⁰ and the models or didactic guidelines for treating a given broad array of questions that had grown out of implementation of previous rational and empirical research. The path to wider or more generalized and longlasting applicability leads through research that demands people and time. Therefore, at least at the beginning, it was impossible to meet all such expectations.¹¹

3.1.1 The awareness of the interdisciplinarity and applicability of the didactics of literature, which led to defining the discipline as in the introduction to this article, was formed in parallel with outlining the main research areas—the didactic structure and factors of teaching literature.¹² Here again we oriented ourselves according to the tradition in Slovenia, contemporary foreign research, and current publications in scholarly journals¹³ in order to shape the chief principles of applying didactic structure and factors in teaching literature.

3.1.1.1 The main components of the didactic structure of teaching literature are arranged hierarchically and with interdependence of aims, methods, and content:

The **basic goal** of teaching literature is “the preparation of pupils for productive contact with literature” of different genres, sub-genres, and periods. We are gradually approaching this long-term goal by realizing the educational, functional, and all manner of preparatory goals at the individual stages of different kinds of schooling (KRAKAR VOGEL 2004: 56).

- The main **method** in schools is interpretation—“group reading and study of literary texts with challenging and creative interaction” (64). In addition to this constructively based method, transmission teaching—the teacher’s (interactive) communication of didactically structured, meaningful content blocks that form an integrated system of information—preserves its role.
- “The **main content** of teaching literature (learning material) is literary works and the contents of literary studies, including as well the contents of “helping” disciplines, for the most part in the humanities (68). “Recognized, artistically quality (canonized, re-

⁹ The topic of publicly articulated expectations and views of the teaching of literature in the second half of the twentieth century were the topic of my dissertation.

¹⁰ Many of them are collected in special handbooks for teachers—for example, “Slovenščina v prvem, drugem, tretjem, četrtem letniku srednje šole” (Slovene in the first, second, third, and fourth years of high school), edited by Vinko Cuderman et al. (Ljubljana: ZRSŠ, 1993–1996).

¹¹ I recall the negative feeling when, because of the lack of personnel resources, it was necessary to submit unfinished work—e.g., *Učni načrt za pouk književnosti v 1., 2. in 3. razredu srednje šole: Delovno gradivo* [An academic plan for teaching literature at levels 1, 2, and 3 in high school: Working materials] Ljubljana: ZRSŠ, 1992, 34

¹² At first this was a matter of outlining, as can be seen in the title of Bože Krakar Vogel’s first publication, *Skice za književno didaktiko* [Outlines for didactics of literature], Ljubljana: ZRSŠ, 1991

¹³ For example: Boris Paternu, “Kaj hočemo s poukom književnosti?” [What do we expect from the teaching of literature?] *Jezik in slovstvo* 29/5 (1983/84); Cuderman’s dissertation (1991).

presentative) literary texts are preferred because of their greater potential for providing a comprehensive idea of the nature of literature. An appropriate number of works of popular literature are also included. Explanations from literary studies cover the basic, contemporary, demonstrated, and accepted knowledge from literary studies (and other, related disciplines) about texts and their extratextual circumstances. The content must fit the instructional goals in terms of breadth and depth.

3.1.1.2 Among the communicative factors of teaching literature, I will mention the teacher's role. The teacher is a professional with three dimensions of competency: First, he or she must be a university education expert on literature and literary studies, and a competent reader. The second sphere of teacher qualifications covers pedagogical knowledge. He or she must know teaching as a process of the pupil's active learning and strategies of pedagogical communication. The third dimension of a teacher's professional qualifications for teaching literature is competence in the didactics of literature: the teacher must know the factors and didactic structure of teaching literature, employ that knowledge as a contemplative practitioner, and critically reflect on it in practice (KRAKAR VOGEL 2004: 36). An important condition for pedagogical success is a positive attitude towards teaching the subject.

Further research grew from these bases; academic plans, materials, teaching practice, and external assessment were among practical activities.

3.1.2 Before attempting to enumerate the main emphases of further research, it should be noted that the uneven development of the didactics of literature over the past three decades in Slovenia has caused an internal division into two predominant directions. They long competed but are more recently complementary. The research and applications of each target a certain area (e.g., psycho-social, reading) of the developmental models of pupils.

Competition was most evident when changes in schooling, or curricular reforms were being prepared in the 1990s. There was the question of whether communication through literature would be planned for all grades based on the same principles, or the didactic structures would differ by curriculum.

We termed the first position reception didactic because of the governing reliance on processes of pupils' literary reception. The teaching of literature is "student centered" (Grosman 2004) and understood primarily as developing the reading reception abilities on selected literary texts suitable for the pupil. This approach to teaching is "simply a matter of making a person glad to read, to like literature, and derive aesthetic and general pleasure from reading—in short, that involvement with literature be a source of enjoyment" (KORDIGEL 1995/96: 27). Contextual reality is undesired factography: "The selection of texts is thus no longer based on literary historical determinations of importance... and the teacher no longer conveys *others' learning*, desiring that the pupils attain the highest possible literary sophistication" (SAKSIDA 2003: 104). In other words, "teaching reading, and actual advancement in reading ability require unusually intensive work with texts over time... and therefore in such teaching we should not usually waste time on an excess of data from literary history and the names of authors" (GROSMAN 2004: 136). Thus, in the system of

school interpretation, effective motivation was emphasized, along with conversation about experiences and other forms of descriptive and creative expression on the part of the pupil (writing, pictorial creations, dramatization, putting to music, multi-media projects with digital technologies).

On the other hand, these didactic approaches were accompanied by continual doubt as to whether that sort of communication based on literature was on the whole satisfactory, even while it corresponded to contemporary pedagogical trends. The question was whether it would furnish the maturing receiver, in particular one in an academic track and a future intellectual, the opportunity to apprehend literature as a force that shapes an individual's social identity, as grounds for understanding "a series of important markers" of cultural history, cultural capital, etc.¹⁴ Therefore, another direction in teaching literature gradually formed. It was named the systemic didactics of literature after its reliance on systemic theories of literature. According to it, the teaching of literature is understood as apprehension of a text in context¹⁵ in order for "the pupil to like reading and also be able to read different genres and kinds of fiction, and to have a positive attitude towards this kind of artistic creation" (KRAKAR VOGEL 1995/96: 52). Literary sophistication is therefore a condition for mature reading and literary acculturation on a high level, and upbringing in literature at the same time systematically contributes to the development of a broad, cross-disciplinary cultural consciousness¹⁶ (Krakar Vogel 2004). This sophistication grows from the motivated reading of individual literary texts as well as from acquaintance with and understanding of contextual factors. It offers the pupil a referential frame for forming ideas about connecting the particular to an array of wider literary, social, cultural, and historical events, and a way to recall information in further reading and reflection on new literary-cultural phenomena (Krakar Vogel, Blažič 2012). Thus interpretation in school is carried out in such a way that subject matter is treated through experiences of individual texts (what and how is written) then the pupil is led to place texts in contexts or the literary system.

Based on the foregoing description, we can conclude that the teaching of literature ought not to take place in all grades according to one didactic paradigm. Progress in reading abilities and reading and literary acculturation, as well as the view of literature as a special form of social activity, must be made incrementally in the school system. For this reason it is more sensible to constitute differentiated applied goals, something that has been partially instituted in practice: the teaching of literature in academic high schools is closest to a systemic didactic paradigm; in grade schools, to the reception paradigm. In other programs there are suitable combinations (Krakar Vogel, Blažič 2012).

¹⁴ Marko Juvan lists these and other tasks of literary socialization in his commentary, "Predmetni kurikularni komisiji za slovenščino k osnutku učnega načrta za gimnazije" (To the curricular commission on Slovene language for charting an academic plan for academic high schools 30 November 1997).

¹⁵ As Siegfried J. Schmidt writes, "Instead of only interpreting texts, it makes sense to study all four active skills" (SCHMIDT, in: Dovič 2004: 86).

¹⁶ Cultural consciousness is one of the eight key competencies that, according to recent pedagogical theories, is based on the cross-disciplinary goal of general education (Krakar Vogel 2011).

3.2 Research projects by doctoral students¹⁷ fall within the research topics on teaching literature mentioned above. If the conclusions I have presented are predominantly the result of analyzing written sources with occasional forays into quality empirical research, the majority of publications I will briefly present have a large empirical component consisting of both qualitative and quantitative research methods. I will look at what elements of the didactic structure the researchers deal with, what their chief findings are, and what applied principles they offer for teaching literature.

3.2.1 The topics of doctoral dissertations include all of the main components of the didactic structure of teaching literature, it being difficult to isolate one from the entire process. It appears, nonetheless, that the most intriguing and the longest time neglected question is that of **method**, which is manageable only with interdisciplinary research approaches. Attracting interest are didactic approaches that facilitate effective consideration of literature that is interesting to today's pupils, and challenge creativity. As per the methodology of research on pedagogy, the authors append their models of applicable principles derived from the research.

3.2.1.1 Milena Mileva Blažić (The role and meaning of creative writing in teaching literature in grade school 2000) devoted her research to creative and post-creative writing, which in teaching literature is either an independent activity or an experiential aid in teaching how to read literature. The main contributions to the didactics of literature are in the depictions of cognitive features and phases of the writing process (for the most part using Bereiter, Scardamalia 1987), which must be familiar when teaching (creative) writing. In light of these findings, the author suggests guidelines for teaching creative writing as a supplement to the ninth-grade academic plan.

3.2.1.2 Communicating the aesthetic effects that interpretive reading aloud provides is very important for the pupil's experiencing of literature. In this activity, the teacher has a role similar to that of an actor, yet he or she is less prepared than an actor for performing or even for grasping the importance of reading aloud. Therefore, in her dissertation on "The oral interpretation of literary texts in pedagogical and artistic communication" (2004), Katarina Podbevšek casts a theoretical basis for the oral interpretation of literary texts. She analyses recordings for differences between actors' and teachers' interpretations, and supplies a model for preparing for reading aloud that can be utilized by all who professionally or occasionally deal with the oral interpretation of literary texts.

¹⁷ I will only present doctoral research projects, which have for the most part also appeared in monograph form. So far, eight people have received doctorates in the didactics of literature in the Slovene program at the Filozofska fakulteta, University of Ljubljana. Three projects are now in progress, parts of which have been published. It is not possible to discuss M.A. theses in this regard. To date there have been twenty-two (under the mentorship of Bože Krakar Vogel and Alenke Žbogar). They are available in the library of the Department of Slovene and the Department of Slavic Studies at the Filozofska fakulteta, University of Ljubljana.

3.2.1.3 Information technology is rapidly entering cotemporary pedagogical theory and teaching practice. Marija Žvegljč, in her dissertation on “The Use of information technology for achieving the goals of teaching Slovene in grade school” (2010) empirically demonstrates that hypothesis that the use of information technology in teaching Slovene (and other subjects) is “unsystematic, unplanned, and interrupted” (ŽVEGLIČ 2010 7). It is not only a matter of teachers’ lack of technical abilities, but also that, pedagogically, information technology is not connected to instructional goals. In her dissertation, the author identified twelve principles for using information technology in teaching Slovene, and a model for realizing them.

3.2.1.4 While Marija Žvegljč investigates the use of information technology from the teacher’s perspective, Renata Čampelj Jurečič considers the prospects for using it from the standpoint of results in an academic high school (Attaining goals in the teaching of literature by using new methods assisted by information technology in an academic high school 2012). The author interprets the results of a two-year experiment, having changed traditional methods and used information technology, she tested the effects of both approaches in two academic high schools in parallel. The students’ views and the results of assessing their knowledge show that the attitude towards information technology and knowledge improve along with the students’ familiarity with it, and as a function of the teacher’s increased experience. It is possible to achieve the goals of teaching literature with such instruction to the same or (sometimes) even greater degree than with a traditional approach. As an example of how to compose teaching units, the author gives a model of how to treat literature of the Romantic period with the assistance of information technology.

3.2.2 Two research projects based on high school content relate to approaches and the need for modifications, and the more precise articulation of operative goals in curricular practice.

3.2.2.1 In the didactic part of her interdisciplinary dissertation informed by literary studies and the didactics of literature (The contemporary Slovene short story and novel in literary studies and school practice 2002), Alenka Žbogar recommends increasing the amount of short prose in high school, while taking into consideration student differences so that the selection of texts and manner of treatment suit the reception skills of students in academic high schools and four-year high schools. A valuable part of the dissertation is an experiment in which the author uses for recordings of class periods to show how the reception abilities of the two student profiles differ. This is wise to consider when choosing the number and kinds of texts, as well as how to interpret them.

3.2.2.2 Zoran Božič takes up differences in content in his over 700-page dissertation on The Poetry of France Prešern in high school textbooks and its reception (2010). The author observes that Prešern’s poetry is made more difficult for students by its metaphors, inversions, and archaicisms. He thus offers a unique approach that involves parallel reading of a prose translation (prosification) and the original. A large

experiment proved the approach effective. Students' understanding of Prešern's poems and their opinion of them significantly improved. In addition to this application, Božič's dissertation makes numerous other contributions to teaching literature—for instance, it analyses all compilations of high school readers, from the earliest (Macun 1850) to today's, and provides information about the antecedents of the contemporary didactics of literature. All this comes with other literary and cultural history information on the processes of Prešern's canonization in schools and academe, and interpretations of various sources, making it a rich contribution to interdisciplinary research into Slovene studies' past.

3.2.3 Current research in the context of graduate studies in the department is also devoted to carrying out and applying disciplinary and cross-disciplinary goals of teaching literature.

3.2.3.1 In her dissertation on "Education for developing consciousness of national affiliation in the teaching of literature in the twentieth century" (2005), Petra Kodre analyses the changes in this educational goal undergone in academic plans and textbooks in the senior year of high school during the past century. The author concludes that "reading and interpreting texts of a thematically patriotic kind are among the most effective ways of strengthening the consciousness of national affiliation" (KODRE 2005: 311). The analyses of previous textbooks supports this for the past. That this is true today, the author confirms with an empirical study of current tenth graders, who think that consciousness of national affiliation is engendered most in the study of Slovene.

3.2.3.2 Research on the realization of goals is most revealing when it shows how effective either a doctrine or teaching practice is as compared with student learning results. Tanja Jelenko analyzed the matriculation essays of students of four-year technical schools in her dissertation on the Written interpretations of literary texts as an indicator of realizing educational goals for a vocational diploma (2008). She finds how through verbalizing interpretations, students show achievement of the fundamental functional goal, the development of reading abilities. The analysis showed that the "reading abilities of students in occupational and technical high schools are poorly developed; the students recognize few elements of a literary text, and mainly evaluate it on the basis of their own emotional experiences, not resorting to arguments based on the text, and reading carelessly instead of in depth" (JELENKO 2008: 157–58). Teachers believe that the greatest impediment is students' low motivation to read fiction. Therefore, the author theoretically ponders and with footage of class hours observes how motivation can be increased in text selection and appropriate direction of interpretation.

4 Conclusion

This article is intended to show that the goals of the didactics of Slovene literature are being met, and that the research-based foundations in solid content and

methodology support further investigations and practical applications. Researchers cooperate intensively on academic plans, textbooks and handbooks, and professional development for teachers. The latter are probably most competent to critically reflect on their own work and broader curricular solutions with increased professional qualifications.

Many years of deliberate observation of teaching literature in grade and high schools indicate that teachers are also capable of and enjoy quality teaching. They successfully motivate their pupils to be open to literature and inspire in them satisfactory engagement. At the same time, observations¹⁸ as a kind of supplemental research suggests that the effects of teachers' work do not extend far beyond the classroom. Students' classroom engagement seldom transfers to long term, professed interest in, for example, reading (artistically demanding works) for pleasure, or following literary and cultural events outside of literature class. The public is inclined to assign the reasons for low reading and literary culture to the teaching of literature. Yet it seems that the reasons are not simple, otherwise motivated teachers and research could deal with them directly. The reasons are certainly in "the spirit of the age" as well, as Marko Juvan admits when he says that "new forms of communication have sprung up besides literature... that have not replaced it but have taken a multitude of its addressees," and that the reading of elite, canonical literature has for a good while been but a "part of academic requirements," while "in developed Western societies, too, literature is losing its function as 'cultural capital'" (JUVAN 2006: 14). People need only to prove practical knowledge in order to demonstrate their fitness for advancement in society and competitiveness, and this has a result the "marginalization of the teaching of literature in favor of functional linguistic literacy" (ibid.: 15).

Yet despite the general social marginalization of literature, researchers find that experiential abilities, such as empathy, sensibility, and creative imagining significantly decrease when students do not take part in the study of literature (Krakar Vogel 2004). Even today literature is an important source for personal and societal development (Grosman 2004). Therefore, those of us who are involved in teaching it are convinced that every individual must have the opportunity to encounter its challenges in professionally conducted communication while in school, and recall them later, more or less frequently. The task of the didactics of literature is precisely the development of activities that lead to the professionally guided communication by using literature in education.

WORKS CITED

Janko BEZJAK, 1906: *Posebno ukoslovje slovenskega jezika v ljudski šoli* (A special method of teaching Slovene language in grade school). Ljubljana: Slovenska šolska matica.

Zoran BOŽIČ, 2010: *Slovenska literatura v šoli in Prešeren* (Slovene literature in school and Prešeren). Ljubljana: Tangram.

¹⁸ Mojca Poznanovič Jezeršek presents them in her M.A. thesis, *Načrtovanje in spremljava pouka književnosti v gimnazijah* (Planning for and the teaching of literature in academic high schools 2012).

- Marjan DOVIČ, 2004: *Sistemske in empirične obravnave literature* (Systemic and empirical treatments of literature). Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU.
- Meta GROSMAN, 2004: *Zagovor branja* (A defense of reading). Ljubljana: Sophia.
- Marko JUVAN, 2000: *Vezi besedila* [Textual ties]. Ljubljana: LUD Literatura.
- , 2006: *Literarna veda v rekonstrukciji* (Literary studies in reconstruction: An introduction to literature). Ljubljana: Literarno-umetniško društvo Literatura.
- David KOLB, 1984: *Experiential learning*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Metka KORDIGEL, 1995/96: O oblikovanju kurikula namesto učnega načrta za šolsko srečevanje s književnostjo ali Problem literarnega scientizma (On forming a curriculum in place of an academic plan for acquaintance with literature in school, or the problem of literary scientism). *Jezik in slovstvo* 41/1–2. 17–30.
- Metka KORDIGEL ABERŠEK, 2008: *Didaktika mladinske književnosti* (The didactics of literature for children). Ljubljana: Zavod RS za šolstvo.
- Boža KRAKAR VOGEL, 1995/96: Pouk književnosti v srednji šoli (Teaching literature in high school). *Jezik in slovstvo* 41/1–2. 51–60.
- , 2004: *Poglavja iz didaktike književnosti* (Chapters from the didactics of literature). Ljubljana: DZS.
- , 2011: Razvijanje kulturne zmožnosti pri pouku slovenščine (Developing cultural competence in teaching Slovene). *Meddisciplinarnost v slovenistiki*. Ed. Simona Kranjc. Ljubljana: ZIFF (Obdobja, 30). 271–77.
- Boža KRAKAR VOGEL, Milena Mileva BLAŽIČ, 2012: *Sistemska didaktika književnosti v teoriji in praksi* [Systemic didactics of literature in theory and practice]. Ljubljana: Pedagoški inštitut.
- Jurgen KREFT, 1982: *Grundprobleme der Literaturdidaktik*. Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer.
- Barica MARENTIČ POŽARNIK, 2000: *Psihologija učenja in pouka* (The psychology of teaching and learning). Ljubljana: DZS.
- Urška PERENIČ, 2010: *Empirično sistemsko raziskovanje literature: Konceptualne podlage, teoretski modeli in uporabni primeri* (Empirical-systemic literary studies: Conceptual framework, theoretical models, and applications). Ljubljana: Zveza društev Slavistično društvo Slovenije (Slavistična knjižnica, 16).
- Dragutin ROSANDIČ, 1986: *Metodika književnog odgoja i obrazovanja* (The methodology of literature teaching). Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- , 2005: *Metodika književnoga odgoja* (Methodology for teaching literature). Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Igor SAKSIDA, 2003: Komunikacijski pouk književnosti v osnovni šoli (Communicative teaching of literature in grade school). *Slovenski jezik, literatura in kultura v izobraževanju: 39. seminar slovenskega jezika, literatura in kulture*. Ed. Boža Krakar Vogel. Ljubljana: FF. 93–108.

Tomo VIRK, 1999: *Moderne metode literarne vede in njihove filozofsko-teoretske osnove* (Modern methods of literary studies and their philosophical and theoretical bases). Ljubljana: FF.

V ang. prevedel Timothy Pogačar.