

- Campbell, E. (2011). "Teacher Education as a Missed Opportunity in the Professional Preparation of Ethical Practitioners." In Bondi, L., Carr, D., Clark, C. and Clegg, C. (eds.). *Towards Professional Wisdom: Practical Deliberation in the 'People Professions'*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 81-95.
- Darnell, C., B. J. Fowers, K. Kristjánsson. (2022). "A multifunction approach to assessing Aristotelian *phronesis* (practical wisdom)." *Personality and Individual Differences*. Volume 196, 111684.
- Донев, Д., Ј. Поповска, М. Тодоровска, И. Џепароски, А. Димишковска. (2019) *Филозофијата во образованието: Теориска и практична награда на предметните програми од филозофскиот корпус предметни (Филозофија, Лоџика, Етика и Естетика) за средно образование (сџудија)*. Скопје: Филозофски факултет – Скопје.
- Dunne, J. (2011). "'Professional' wisdom in 'Practice'" In Bondi, L., Carr, D., Clark, C. and Clegg, C. (eds.). *Towards Professional Wisdom: Practical Deliberation in the 'People Professions'*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 13-27.
- Dunne, J. (1993). *Back to the Rough Ground: Practical Judgement and the Lure of Technique*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Fenstermacher, G. (1987). "A reply to my critics." *Educational Theory*. 37, 413-421.
- Jope, G. (2014). *Grasping Phronesis: The Fabric of Discernment in Becoming an Ethical Teacher*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Kinsella, E. A., A. Pitman. (eds.). (2012). *Phronesis as Professional Knowledge: Practical Wisdom in the Professions*. Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: Sense Publications.
- Kristjánsson, K. (2014). "Phronesis and Moral Education: Treading Beyond Truisms." *Theory and Research in Education*. 12(2), 151-171.
- Kristjánsson, K. (2016). *Aristotle, Emotions and Education*. London and New York: Routledge.
- NE. Aristotle. (2009). *Nicomachean Ethics*. Trans. David Ross. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Noel, J. (1999). "On the Varieties of Phronesis." *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. 31, 3, 273-290.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2001). *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peterson, A., B. Bentley. (2015). "Exploring the connections between Philosophy for Children and character education: Some implications for moral education?" *Journal of Philosophy in Schools* 2(2).
- Поповска, Ј. (2018). „Аристотеловиот концепт φρόνησις и етичкото образование и воспитание./Aristotle's concept φρόνησις and Moral Education.“ *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет – Скопје* 71: 55-76.
- Rajský, A., Wiesenganger, M. (eds.) (2021). *Relationality in Education of Morality*. Berlin/Bratislava: Peter Lang/VEDA.
- Sagner, M. N., R. D. Osguthorpe. (eds.) (2013). *The Moral Work of Teaching and Teacher Education: Preparing and Supporting Practitioners*. New York and London: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Schuchman, P. (1980). *Aristotle and the Problem of Moral Discernment*. Berne: Peter Lang.
- Sherman, N. (1989). *The Fabric of Character: Aristotle's theory of virtue*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Van Manen, M. (1991). *The Tact of Pedagogy: The Meaning of Pedagogical Thoughtfulness*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Walker, R. L. and Ivanhoe, P. J. (eds.). (2009). *Working Virtue: Virtue Ethics and Contemporary Moral Problems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---

**PROTNER Edvard**

*University of Maribor, Faculty of Arts, Slovenia*

## EMPIRICAL PEDAGOGICAL RESEARCH BETWEEN THE TWO WARS – THE CASE OF SLOVENIA

**Abstract:** The influence of socioeconomic factors on children's development and school performance is a field of research that is receiving increasing attention in the international and national environment. Addressing inequalities resulting from the child's environment is directly related to the issue of the fairness of the school system. This article investigates the beginnings of empirical research on this topic in Slovenia between the two world wars. Along with the methodology,

we are mainly interested in the theoretical paradigmatic and political context in which the initiatives for this type of research were formed. The first empirical pedagogical-sociological research was conducted in 1926 by dr. Franjo Žgeč. Two years later, he upgraded the study and carried it out within the Pedagogical Center in Maribor. This first wave was followed by a second wave of empirical research a decade later. To the extent that the motives for research in the first wave were still tied to the paradigm of reform (progressive) pedagogy, the actors of this research in the second wave were already more politically motivated. It is a group of young left-wing teachers who have joined the “Teachers’ Movement” group. Their activity in the article is reconstructed based on their publications and memoirs. We especially emphasize the statistics course organized in 1939 and 1940 for teachers from all parts of Yugoslavia by the School of National Health in Zagreb, where the organizers systematically selected left-wing teachers who already had experience with empirical data collection.

**Keywords:** Empirical research, Pedagogy, History, Slovenia

## Introduction

Although equity in education cannot be unambiguously defined, it is one of the central themes of school policy at the global level and a challenge to the constitution of national school systems. Regardless of differences in perceptions of equity, the background to the problem is the generally accepted realization that the socioeconomic status of students (as well as their gender and immigrant background) is an essential predictor of learning success in terms of learning motivation and professional ambitions. In recent years, this fact has been most strongly confirmed by PISA research (OECD, 2017), which points out that some children have an advantage in achieving school success simply because they were born in a favorable socioeconomic environment that offers them higher emotional support, provides more favorable learning resources and is generally more encouraging. A school that ensures school success regardless of the child’s socioeconomic status would therefore be fair, so its task is to mitigate differences resulting from reasons beyond the child’s control.

In Slovenia, the thesis on the connection between socioeconomic status and students’ learning achievements (and the related choice of secondary school after completing compulsory primary education) has recently been unequivocally confirmed by research by the National Examination Center (Cankar, G., Bren, M. & Zupanc, D., 2017), which linked data on student achievement in various external knowledge tests (national knowledge test in sixth and ninth grade and general and vocational matura) and data on education, occupation, income, the value of real estate owned by them, etc. It is research based on a sophisticated methodological approach that manages to avoid some disadvantages of other research of this kind. The source of data on children’s school achievement and socioeconomic status of their families is not the children themselves or their teachers but databases collected and maintained by the RIC based on the annual national test of children in 6th and 9th grade and general and vocational matura after graduating from high school. As the RIC has the identification number of each child, it was able to connect this data (of course anonymously) with the data on the child’s family kept by the Statistical Office of Slovenia. Thus, this research is based on valid and reliable data on how, according to the socioeconomic status of families, children in Slovenia enroll in different types of secondary schools after finishing primary school, what are the real family income (in EUR), what are the differences in income and the wealth of high school students’ families compared to vocational high school students, and the connection between students’ achievements and their parents’ education.

Research on the impact of social origin on children’s development and school performance has a long tradition in Slovenia. Among the more high-profile study of this kind are the research of Ivan Toličič and Leon Zorman (1977) in the late 1970s and the research of Jan Makarovič

(1984) in the 1980s, in which he proved the connection between intelligence results and social background. Almost unknown to the Slovene professional public is the research entitled *Environment and Development of the Slovene Child*, conducted in 1957 by Milica Bergant (Bergant, Bonač, Glonar & Kmet, 1962), the founder of pedagogical sociology as a subject in pedagogy at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana. It is a groundbreaking study in the development of post-war socialist pedagogical doctrine, as it established a paradigmatic shift from the deductive to the inductive approach to pedagogical research announced and advocated in 1952 by Vlado Schmidt (1982), one of the leading ideologues of socialist pedagogical thought in the post-war period in Slovenia and the then Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

In the introduction to this research, Milica Bergant (Bergant, Bonač, Glonar & Kmet, 1962) pointed out that the tradition of researching Slovenian children's social, cultural, and economic situation dates back to the period between the two world wars. Franjo Žgeč and his book *Problems of Education of the Broadest Layers of Our Nation* from 1923 were the first to introduce empirical pedagogical sociological research. She emphasized the presence of a clear Marxist analysis of pedagogical goals, as Žgeč "harmoniously connected the educational interests of the individual at that time with the progressive social aspirations and benefits of the oppressed Slovene working classes." (p. 6)

The emphasis that the beginnings of empirical research on the social position of children in Slovenia are linked to the Marxist analysis of pedagogical goals puts this topic in a specific epistemological context. It helps us to reconstruct the pronounced pluralism of pedagogical concepts that were established in the period between the two world wars. Previous research on pedagogical theory at that time showed the presence of five pedagogical paradigms: in addition to Herbartianistic pedagogy, Catholic pedagogy was traditionally present, which derived educational goals from theological foundations; reform pedagogy, which derived educational goals from children's nature and relied on psychology; spiritual (cultural) pedagogy, which derived the educational goal from culture and relied on the philosophy of life; and socially critical pedagogy, which derived the educational goal from the child's environment and relied on sociology. (see Protner, 2000) In the classification of pedagogical paradigms, it makes sense to rely on the classification offered by Zdenko Medveš (2015), who, as a common denominator for labeling pedagogical scientific paradigms, introduced the logic of understanding the educational process derived from factors known in teaching theory as a didactic triangle (teacher, student, learning content). He added a well-known fourth factor in educational approaches, namely the living environment. All the above factors are present in every educational process. Still, in defining the pedagogical paradigm, it is necessary to determine which factor is at the forefront – it has the most significant role. Medveš understands this factor as a *pedagogical medium*. Based on the medium of education as a criterion for classifying pedagogical fields, Zdenko Medveš offers us four:

- reform or autopoietic pedagogy – the medium is the child;
- Herbartianism – the medium is the teacher;
- spiritual or cultural pedagogy – the medium is the content (teaching material) and
- socially critical pedagogy – the medium is the social environment (see also Protner, 2020).

The aim of our paper is to reconstruct the beginnings of the constitution of a socially critical pedagogical paradigm in Slovenia. In doing so, we will pay special attention to the origins of empirical pedagogical research that has established itself within this paradigm. In analyzing the published texts from this period, we will also use commemorative records created after the Second World War and help us understand the ideological and professional motives of the main actors. In the first part of the article, we will highlight the work of Fran Žgeč, considered the pioneer of empirical pedagogical and sociological research in Slovenia. In the second part of the article, we will outline the activities of the younger generation of teachers who initiated the second wave of this research in the late 1930s. In conclusion, we will evaluate their contribution to pedagogical science.

## The First Wave of Empirical Pedagogical and Sociological Research in Slovenia

The first person in Slovenia to draw attention to the close connection between a child's mental and physical development and the environment in which he lives was dr. Fran Žgeč. In addition to being socially critical, Žgeč was a typical reform pedagogy representative. This duality in pedagogical views can be explained by the various influences that shaped his pedagogical views. As a prisoner of war, Žgeč experienced the October Socialist Revolution in Russia. Apart from the ideas of socialism, during this time, he also became acquainted with the pedagogical concept of a *productive school* (one of the concepts of reform pedagogy) developed by the Russian pedagogue Blonsky. Shortly after returning to his homeland, in early 1919, he sought contact with the Communist Party in Ljubljana and established a party cell in his home village. He also continued his party activities illegally as a student at the University of Ljubljana. (Žgeč, 1991)

These political and pedagogical influences are present in the book *Problems of Education of the Broadest Layers of Our Nation* from 1923 (Žgeč, 1923). It is his doctoral dissertation, which was awarded the Saint Sava Prize of His Majesty the King, which enabled him a one-year study stay (1923/24) and further training at the Sorbonne in Paris with prof. Simon (Laboratory for Experimental Pedagogy). On his way back from Paris, he also spent some time at the Rousseau Institute in Geneva and personally met some of the leading representatives of reform pedagogy (Claparède, Dottrens, Ferrier) and their views (Tancer, 1991, p. 10), which strongly marked Žgeč's reformist pedagogical design, and it is very likely that he also became acquainted with the possibilities of empirical research.

In the book mentioned above, Žgeč (1923) analyzed the social situation of proletarian and peasant youth. Regarding the lives of proletarian children, he referred to the statistics of the German Marxist-oriented politician and pedagogue Edwin Hoernle and the liberal-oriented and socially engaged politician and pedagogue Johannes Tews. He developed the thesis that social circumstances determine a child's development. To enable proletarian children to develop healthily "requires ambitious social reform, a change in the social position of children and parents, and the education of the proletariat, especially proletarian mothers." (p. 45). He strongly condemned the existing capitalist social system: "This evil [general misery and poverty – E.P.] cannot be eliminated by today's social order at all because the capitalist mode of production is based on the difference between possessors, exploiters, and exploited, and because all capital development goes in the direction of expropriating mass and wealth passes into the hands of individuals. Poverty, on the one hand, is today a condition for wealth, luxury, and enjoyment on the other." (p. 46-47)

Despite the clear Marxist diagnosis of the existing social system, its political and pedagogical ideas cannot be attributed to revolutionaryism. Žgeč (1923) explicitly writes that in this discussion, there is no room for finding a "final solution" but is satisfied with how "already in this social order, which is based on such differences and which he does not like to give up, but we find the possibility for the education of the proletariat, or at least in part." (p. 47) A fundamental feature of Slovene socially critical pedagogy is already present here: the focus was not on class struggle but on the position of the proletarian and peasant child and the appropriate didactic form of schooling that would enable the child to emancipate himself in capitalist exploitation. In Žgeč's work, we do not find those emphases formed in the left wing of German social democracy and later embodied in communist doctrine, which understood socialist education as the direct introduction of children into economic and political class struggle in accordance with party guidelines. Žgeč seems to derive from the doctrine of the right pole, which consistently avoids indoctrinating children with political goals. However, we must know that the Communist Party of Yugoslavia was banned (announced) in December 1920. Six months later, the State

Protection Act also banned all communist activity that had moved illegally (Dimitrijević, 1963). For this reason, we can assume that Marxist teachers self-censored the public publication of their texts, as otherwise, they would be exposed to police persecution.

In the book in question, Žgeč illustrated his theses with his own observation of individual cases of the miserable social situation of children in the most backward environments in Slovenia. He took the first concrete steps toward empirical research into the development of the child in the context of the environment in which he grew up in 1925 when the Pedagogical Didactic Circle (later the Pedagogical Center /Pedagoška centrala/) in Maribor published a *Questionnaire on Child Development* on his initiative which covered questions on the social situation, physical development and mental developmental stage of children. About forty schools were asked to participate, selected in such a way as to adequately reflect the differences between bourgeois, proletarian, and peasant children (Žgeč, 1926). Based on the collected data, Žgeč (1962a) published a study in which he used the standards of normal development of Western European children, set by C. H. Stratz, as a criterion for comparing the physical development of Slovene children. He acknowledged the purpose of the research: "I admit that I would like to prove the difference in the physical and mental development of our child in the different milieu and also justify the freedom of the school in its operation – the widest and deepest autonomy of the school. But this requires extensive study. It would be too early to draw far-reaching conclusions from our data!" (Žgeč, 1926a, pp. 56-57). The statistical processing of data in his study is too modest to draw any relevant conclusions (according to today's criteria of empirical scientific research). The results are presented unsystematically, but in general, it is possible to recognize certain deviations from Stratz's norms and a certain interdependence between the social environment and the weight and height of children. It seems that Žgeč is more about arguing for the need for school autonomy, which he understands in the spirit of the new pedagogical movements of reform pedagogy. In this context, Žgeč devotes the last chapter to analyzing the *working school* as a new didactic form based on the child's interests. Concluding the tasks for the future, he says that it is necessary to continue "systematic observation and study of the child in all strata of our nation, its interest and its needs for mental and physical development. Propaganda must be carried out to understand the child better." (Žgeč, 1926a, p. 110)

His initiative to explore the interdependence between a child's development and his social environment seems to be more aimed at getting to know the child than at analyzing the social situation in the context of social criticism. But this dimension has always been implicitly present in the empirical pedagogical sociological research he encouraged. In 1928, Žgeč (1928) wrote the Work Program of the Pedagogical Center and announced, among other things, "deepening and studying the child's mentality and social, economical, hygienic and cultural circumstances in which the child develops" and "scientific work and research, which is essential for the development of our education" (p. 149). Empirical studies have been developed within this program guideline, in which the socially critical dimension was more pronounced than in Žgeč. These are mainly articles by A. Šuligoj's (1928 and 1929) *The impact of economic and housing conditions on child development* and *Housing conditions and their impact on children*, the book by K. Doberšek (1929) *The Influence of Social Conditions on Children in Prevalje* and the book by J. Jurančič (1930) *From the School for the Nation*. Their work was created during the growing economic crisis and a tense political situation. The fact that they were all members or sympathizers of the Communist Party speaks volumes in this regard (cf. Protner, 2000, p. 73). Their ideological definition strongly influenced the younger left-wing teachers united in the *Teachers' Movement* (Učiteljski pokret – UP). Their activity represents the second wave of organized empirical research on the development of Slovenian children depending on the social environment.

## The Second Wave of Empirical Pedagogical and Sociological Research in Slovenia

The first program guidelines for the work of the Teachers' Movement began in 1936 when the authorities banned the activities of the *Association of Young Intellectuals* in Maribor, where the most numerous and most active left-wing unemployed young teachers were. These teachers began to look for ways to legalize their activities in the aggravated political situation. Paradoxically, they succeeded in this by referring to the depoliticization of the umbrella association of Yugoslav teachers (JUU – Yugoslav Teachers' Association) and highlighting the need for didactic modernization of the Slovenian school or, as F. Strmčnik (1980) wrote: “[...] the UP's actions were mainly socio-political, which their ideologues cleverly covered up with pedagogical arguments.” (p. 84) The *Teachers' movement* was officially confirmed on October 11, 1936, when the administrative and supervisory board of JUU – section Ljubljana established it as one of the autonomous organizational units of the association for “sociological and pedagogical study and practical application of results in school and extracurricular activities.” (Delo in položaj /.../, 1937). The conceptual management of the entire project was taken over by the Maribor *Working Community of the Teachers' Movement*, established on January 5, 1937, which summarized the program at the inaugural meeting in the following points:

1. *We urgently need independence from political parties and a closer reliance on a professional organization.*
2. *A more detailed study of where the teacher works is needed because only after a thorough knowledge of the area's economic situation will the teacher properly direct his school and extracurricular work.*
3. *Closer contacts between school and home are needed.”* (Božični /.../, 1937)

At this meeting, the organizational structure of the *Teachers' Movement* was presented, which proved highly effective in the following years. They provided a network of clubs and organizational units in smaller towns, which systematically encouraged teachers to participate and collect empirical data based on questionnaires on children's development and their social environment. Until 1941, the *Teachers' Companion* (Učiteljski tovariš), the central bulletin of the JUU – Ljubljana section (where they managed to hire their section), reported weekly on their activities and promoted cooperation. Soon they could present concrete results of field data collection in which many teachers were involved voluntarily.

The results of the first research, which dealt with the socio-cultural living conditions of children in rural, semi-industrial, and industrial environments, were published in the supplement of the *Teachers' Companion* in 1938. At the same time, they set up a new survey on how Slovenian children dress, depending on the social environment. (Bergant, 1962)

In 1939, they began researching the physical development of Slovenian children. This was a time when the activity of the Teachers' Movement had already attracted attention in other parts of Yugoslavia, especially in Croatia. As early as 1937, the *Teachers' Comrade* reported that Croatian teachers were sympathetically following the work of the Slovenian Teachers' Movement and called for cooperation. (Hudales, 1937) In the same year, calls for empirical pedagogical and sociological research of villages based on the Slovene model appeared in Croatia. (Odnos hrvaških tovarišev /.../, 1937) In 1938, the *Teachers' Comrade* had already reported on the *Cultural Cooperative “Ivan Filipović,”* which organized an exhaustive empirical study of the Croatian countryside in Croatia. (Hudales, 1938) At the same time, Slovenian teachers began to learn about the lack of statistical knowledge and began to look at the literature, which in Croatia was already aimed at raising the scientific level of such research. When they started researching the nutrition of Slovenian children

in 1938, they translated and published an article by Kamil Bresler entitled *How I will Scientifically and Easily Research the Nutrition of my School Youth*. (Naša nova anketa, 1938)

Professional cooperation culminated in 1939 when the management of the *School of National Health* in Zagreb organized a one-month course in *vital statistics* during the summer holidays. The course was organized with the aim of “teachers getting acquainted theoretically and practically with some statistical methods to be able to continue their research work more successfully.” (M.M., 1939) Teachers from all parts of Yugoslavia attended the course. The condition was that they already had experience in collecting material and prepared data, which were here under the leadership of prof. Fedor Mikić statistically processed. Participants from Slovenia, with expert guidance, statistically processed already collected data on the physical development of a Slovenian child. Undoubtedly, the statistical knowledge acquired here has significantly raised the scientific level of research. When the research results were published, one of the researchers was proud to say that for the first time, Slovenians have received “mathematically reliable data for typing, or, if we want to call it that, the normal physical development of our children.” (Debevc, 1939, p.2) This research attracted the attention of the broader professional community. Thus, Božo Škerlj, a private assistant professor of anthropology at the University of Ljubljana in 1940, estimated that the research on a sample of 6,000 children was representative and that the results were methodologically well processed and concluded: “It is a great and unique merit of the teachers united in the ‘Movement’ if we have norm tables today for our growing youth. Therefore, special thanks should be given to them here!” (Čuček, 1940, p.4)

The research results on the physical development of Slovenian children were the starting point for the research on their diet, which was conducted in 1940. They were based on the finding that “for those sections of the people who are economically and socially weaker, the percentage of physical backwardness is growing in parallel, which is largely due to a deficient and improper diet.” (M.M., 1941, p.3) These data were also statistically processed in the second course of *vital statistics* in the summer of 1940 in Zagreb, but the outbreak of World War II prevented their publication.

Undoubtedly, the primary motive for the empirical research organized by the *Teachers' Movement* was pedagogical. Knowledge of the social situation of the Slovene child and their dependence on the socioeconomic circumstances in which they grew up was an argument for the didactic reform of the school, in which the concepts of reform (progressive) pedagogy prevailed. On the other hand, one cannot overlook the ideological and political motives that the leading ideologues of this movement sought in the Marxist theory of society. These motifs cannot be reconstructed based on written sources from the period between the two wars but only based on the memories of the participants. Thus in the Slovenian press from that time, we find the only emphasis on the importance of statistical knowledge that the participants gained at both courses in Zagreb. But we get entirely different information when we read their memoirs. Thus, for example, in her memoirs, the Croatian participant in both courses pointed out that the organizers had made sure that the course included “the most advanced teachers /... / members of the CPY [Communist Party of Yugoslavia] or at least experienced sympathizers – activists” (Babić-Weiner, 1974, p. 288) a Slovenian participant, however, the benefits of the course summarized as follows: “It was this kind of study and working together that gave me the strength to understand better the need for a revolutionary struggle for the final liberation of the working people.” (Špindler, 1974, p. 174)

## Conclusions

We find that the beginnings of organized empirical sociological pedagogical research in Slovenia are undoubtedly connected with the activity of left-wing teachers. In doing so, however, we encounter the methodological problem of resource interpretation. On the one hand, in the pre-war pedagogical press, we can follow a series of publications of their theoretical and empirical

studies, which were created under the pressure of self-censorship. Due to the political ban on communist activity, their theoretical derivations may have less political recognition and ideological sharpness than they would have if they could have publicly defended their Marxist views. On the other hand, we have at their disposal memoirs in which they interpreted their pre-war “progressive” pedagogical activity after the war. Following the prevailing socialist doctrine, they may have emphasized their Marxist pre-war ideological orientation more than it was in their pre-war pedagogical activities. Given this dilemma, it is possible to confirm at least the thesis that this pedagogical movement relied on independent theoretical thinking that did not follow party instructions, as the Slovene leadership of the Communist Party showed no interest in the activities of left-wing teachers (see Protner, 2000, p. 77).

Regardless of the political and ideological basis of their activity, we can say that these teachers are the pioneers of empirical sociological pedagogical research in Slovenia and that, in parallel with the development of the dominant university pedagogical doctrine, they formed a legitimate social critical pedagogical paradigm which has its firm position in the epistemological structure of pedagogical science even today. It should be pointed out that their research has made the pedagogical public aware of the impact of the child’s environment on his school success and thus paved the way for a modern understanding of school justice. It should also be pointed out that the initiative for this type of research came from the teaching staff and that teachers participated in data collection voluntarily, which is an ideal concept of scientific-pedagogical research even today. However, future research will need to pay more attention to their idea of didactic reform of primary school, as they seem to have neglected efforts to make education accessible to children from disadvantaged social backgrounds at all levels of schooling.

## References

- Babić-Weiner, V. (1974). Drugi tečaj vitalne statistike. In O. Cicmil, M. Dimitrijeviški, 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. 287-289). Beograd: Društvo za izučavanje delatnosti naprednog učiteljstva Jugoslavije.
- Bergant, M., Bonač, V., I. Golnar & J. Kmet (1962). *Okolje in razvoj slovenskega otroka*. Ljubljana: DZS.
- Božični sestanek “Učiteljskega pokreta” (1937, January). *Učiteljski tovariš*, 24, 2-3.
- Cankar, G., Bren, M. & Zupanc, D., (2017). *Za večjo pravičnost šolskega sistema v Sloveniji*. Ljubljana: Državni izpitni center.
- Čuček, J. (1940, July). Telesni razvoj slovenskega ljudskošolskega otroka. *Učiteljski tovariš*, 1, 4.
- Debevc, B. (1940, February). Raziskavanje telesnega razvoja naših šolskih otrok. *Učiteljski tovariš*, 27, 2.
- Delo in položaj JUU sekcije Ljubljana v poslovnem letu 1936./37. Poročilo tajnika za banovinsko skupščino. (1937, July). *Učiteljski tovariš*, 1 & 2, 1-7.
- Dimitrijević, S. (1963). Nastajanje in razvoj Komunistične partije Jugoslavije v legalnem obdobju njenega obstoja (1919-avgust 1921). In R. Čolaković, D. Jankovič & P. Morača (Eds.), *Pregled zgodovine Zveze komunistov Jugoslavije* (pp. 25-63). Beograd, Ljubljana: Inštitut za proučevanje delavskega gibanja Beograd, Inštitut za zgodovino delavskega gibanja Ljubljana.
- Doberšek, K. (1929). *Vpliv socialnih razmer na otroka v Prevaljah*. Ljubljana: Slovenska šolska matica.
- Hudales, O. (1937, Mart). Hrvatski tovariši in naš pokret. *Učiteljski tovariš*, 32, 2-3.
- Hudales, O. (1938, February). Delo in uspehi hrvaških pokretašev. *Učiteljski tovariš*, 29, 2.
- Jurančič, J. (1930). *Iz šole za narod*. Ljubljana: Slovenska šolska matica.
- M. M. (1939, September). Slovenski učitelji – pokretaši na tečaju za vitalno statistiko v Zagrebu. *Učiteljski tovariš*, 7, 3.
- M.M. (1941, January). Problem prehrane pri delovnem ljudstvu in še posebej pri mladini. *Učiteljski tovariš*, 20, 3.
- Makarovič, J. (1984): *Družbena neenakost, šolanje in talenti*. Maribor: Založba Obzorja.
- Medveš, Z. (2015). Spopadi paradigem v razvoju slovenske pedagogike. *Sodobna pedagogika*, 66(3), 10-35.
- Naša nova anketa. (1938, April). *Učiteljski tovariš*, 37, 2-3.
- Odnos hrvaških tovarišev [...] (1937, April). *Učiteljski tovariš*, 35, 3.



- 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: Dopsna 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. Dimitrijeviški, 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, Ptuju 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.