

CHAPTER FOUR

FURTHER REFLECTIONS AND RESEARCH POSSIBILITIES REGARDING THE EDUCATIVE TEACHING SITUATION

A. FAMILY HOUSEHOLD/SCHOOL SITUATIONS AS EDUCATIVE TEACHING SITUATIONS

1. INTRODUCTION

In the first three chapters, the authors give attention to an educative teaching situation **in its essence**, to the possibilities of **designing it**, and to the **proper** (didactic-pedagogically accountable) **ways of actualizing** the course of the didactic pedagogic event. It is indicated that an educative teaching situation shows itself to a **phenomenologically attuned** didactic educationist within a **family and/or school situation**. To disclose the essential structure of an educative teaching situation, the **lifeworld** (Husserl), as **humanly experienced reality**, must be the **point of departure** for thinking about an educative teaching situation.

It is the aim in Division A of this chapter, once again, to expound on certain fundamental-didactic concepts, and place them more completely in a didactic-pedagogical perspective. This is a necessary introduction to Division B. In this chapter, a student of didactic pedagogics is encouraged to venture to independent thinking about an educative teaching situation. Therefore, attention now is given to the concepts of **world** (lifeworld), **home**, and **school**.

2. THE CATEGORY “WORLD”

Here, when there is talk of world, this means the lifeworld of persons. The world in which persons dwell, live, and move is a human world. This means that a person is interwoven with world, and world is interwoven with person. This statement means that a person finds him/herself in the world. This obliged the famous German philosopher, Martin Heidegger, to prescribe **being-in-the-**

world the first **category of reality** (ontological category). With this, he proclaims a person cannot deny his/her **presence** in the world. It is a human world because he/she has **language** available, and gives **meaning** to his/her world, by which it becomes inhabitable, and livable **for him/her**. But a person, as initiator of relationships (Buytendijk), does not only attribute verbal meaning to his/her world, he/she proceeds to **create** (by actively being involved with his/her world, and the people and things in it) an inhabitable, understandable, and livable world.

However, a student of didactic education must clearly distinguish between the **phenomenological interpretation** of the **world**, as a **lifeworld**, and the **objectivistic viewing** of the world, as an opposing world. The objectivistic view of the world makes it a world of things. Such a world is a **world of bodies**, and a person makes him/herself part of reality in the same way as does a meteor, or any other body. It is a world of things, and a person also is a thing, or object—a thing among other things. The **method** which gives access to the objective world of things is that of natural science, with all its procedures, and instrumentations (In this regard, see the natural science approach in Division B of this chapter). According to this approach, it is presupposed that things are **countable, predictable, and measurable**. The quantitative (countable) is stressed, and the qualitative (essential) is put aside because it cannot be measured. The implication of this approach is a **person is a thing** (object) which can be measured, and predicted by means of natural science methods.

In contrast are the phenomenologists who, from actuating a phenomenological view of a person, disclose that he/she eludes (Gaus) purely objective describing, labeling, and formulating because his/her existence, as intentionality (directedness to and openness for the world) includes giving and experiencing meaning. Therefore, for a person, the world is a lifeworld, and not a world of things. A further implication of this is that if a scientific investigator wants to understand with what it is that a farmer, a physician, a teacher, a parent, a child, a hunter, and an artist is involved, their world **must be understood, and not defined**. (Read Division B of this chapter about the human science, and the natural science approaches to didactic-pedagogical research).

3. THE CATEGORY “HOME”

When a person uses the category (finding, interpretation, essential description, truism, verbalization) “home”, he/she means a **dwelling, an abode, a safe space** in which he/she can live from day to day. From this dwelling, a person (man, woman, parent, child) makes his/her world inhabitable, i.e., makes it into a **lifeworld-for-him/herself**. In this abode, a person feels that he/she belongs someplace, i.e., there is mention of belongingness. From this safe space, a child can **explore**, and return to the home as a safe place (refuge). Within the home, a **family household** is constituted. In this connection, the word “constitute” means that certain components must be present before there can be a family household. The two constituents (essential components) of a family household are the **parent(s)** and the **child(ren)**. Here it can only be indicated that the word “constitute” is derived from the Latin “constituere”, meaning “essence determining”. The arrival of a child in the home makes a man and woman a father and a mother (parents). It is their task to help their child **design his/her own personal lifeworld**. Later in this chapter (Section 5. The home as lifeworld of the child), a more complete explication is given of the ways of providing help (educative teaching) by a parent(s), and the ways of accepting help (learning) by a child. Before this can be done, attention must be given to the category “school”, which is mentioned in the introduction to this chapter.

4. THE CATEGORY “SCHOOL”

In agreement with the didactic pedagogue, S. J. Gous, the school is not only a building, and school ground bounded by streets. It also is not a complex of objective spatial things such as classrooms with furniture. There can only be real talk of a **school** when a **teacher** and **children encounter each other** inside or outside the building, but in relation to it, and pursue aims for which the school is designed, and which determine why they ought to encounter each other there (Gous). A school is constituted in the purposeful being-together of teachers and children.

Here, in South Africa, the esteemed didactic educationist, F. van der Stoep, has indicated the **pedagogical foundations** of the newer didactic thinking. He shows that **a school situation is a reconstitution (re-design, second order design) of the original, primary educative situation** in the home. This means that, regarding a child's becoming adult, the essential characteristics of the second order design (school) must not differ essentially from the constituents (essential characteristics) of the primary design (home). Teaching and educating are opposite sides of the same matter. (Also see section 2, Reform in didactic thought, in Division B of this chapter).

Now that some fundamental-didactic concepts are broached, i.e., lifeworld, home, and school, there is a discussion of **the home, as lifeworld of a child, and then a school, as lifeworld of a child.**

5. THE HOME AS LIFEWORLD OF A CHILD

5.1 Educative teaching in a family, viewed in terms of its form

To design an educative teaching situation at home, at least two persons must be communicating in each other's presence, i.e., a **parent, as representative of adulthood, and a child, as a person who is on the way to adulthood.** In the being together of parents and children, there are **life** contents, and means of **life** noticeable, in terms of which the world of a family is designed as a **lifeworld**. This means that the parents and children **together** must design a personal world within the generally valid structures of the lifeworld. The structures mentioned here do not exist independent of and objectified from the lives of the parents and the children in the lifeworld. (In this regard, see Section 2 of this Division). In the **informal life of a family**, "subjects" do not exist in terms of which a world is designed (established, constituted). Indeed, there is talk of a fluent transition between the integral lifeworld and the world of the sciences. This fluent transition is sometimes purposefully accelerated in the informal being together of parents and children in the family home. This means that, for short periods, there is **formal teaching, and learning** in the **informal** family situation. Thus, the ground for the educative teaching situation already appears in the family situation and does not arise for the first time in a school situation.

The two fundamental structures in the design of an educative teaching situation mentioned by S. J. Gous are **exploration**, and **emancipation**. These two fundamental structures arise in a primary educative teaching situation (family), and in a second order educative teaching situation (school). This means that these two structures are constitutive (essence determining) of an educative teaching event. This fundamental didactic pronouncement means that educative teaching in family life can only arise directly in the **actual situation where parents and children explore together**. Gradually, a child(ren) in the family situation must become free of the joint exploration of parents and child(ren). A child must be **emancipated** to be able to be an adult in the future. Thus, emancipation refers to the parents increasingly becoming superfluous, and the gradual becoming free of the children in the family situation, as an educative teaching situation. This event of emancipation is a necessary human event to make the possibility of adulthood, as futurity, in the life of the becoming child a reality. Therefore, Gous rightly contends that child emancipation (as a human event), which results in his/her coming of age (becoming adult) is an obvious aim, and criterion in terms of which the progress of the parents, as well as the children on their path of life through the human world can be evaluated (read “tested”), and constituted (established, designed).

5.2 Educative teaching in a family, viewed in terms of its structure-content

If there is mention here of the structure-content of educative teaching in a family, this refers to the meanings and interpretations which the family members give to their own life and reality. This structure-content, as giving content to the formal [school] structure of an educative teaching event, will differ from family to family, and from culture to culture. Among other things, this means that this giving content to the formal structure of an educative teaching situation occurs from a philosophy of life, and the entire cultural framework in which a family finds itself. Because here there is talk of a **philosophy of life** this means that philosophies of life necessarily must differ. It is a **specific matter**, and requires a personal decision to accept it by a family. Now, the question is what philosophy of life must be accepted as the correct one?

Because of the specific nature of a philosophy of life, a variety of answers are given to this question. In this respect, the reader is referred to the work of W. A. Landman, S. G. Roos and C. R. Liebenberg: **Opvoedkund en Opvoedingsleer vir Beginners** (Education and Educational Theory for Beginners. **English translation:** georgeyonge.net). What must be mentioned now is the philosophy of life held by the authors of this work. This philosophy of life is stated as the **Christian philosophy of life**. Now, this immediately means that, as far as the authors are concerned, the structure-content of educative teaching must show and endorse a Christian character. This also necessarily must circumscribe the content of the aim of educative teaching.

The content of **Christian educative teaching** in a family is summarized as follows: **knowledge** regarding the origin, essence, and ultimate destination of a person; **knowledge** regarding the life reality within which a person finds himself; and **knowledge** of the way of life a person must follow in this life to reach his/her ultimate destination. Because an educative teaching situation mentioned here is a Christian one, the imparting of this knowledge must occur out of the Christian philosophy of life. However, imparting this knowledge to a child(ren) by his/her (their) parent(s) in an educative teaching situation, as a family situation, does not occur on the basis of scientifically demonstrable arguments but on the basis of **religious convictions**, and **certainties** as obtained from the Word of God.

6. THE SCHOOL AS LIFEWORLD OF A CHILD

M. J. Langeveld, the esteemed Dutch educationist, has placed the school, on the way to designing a world, in the center of the didactic-pedagogical problematic. In this connection, one thinks of his work, which originally appeared in German as “**Die Schule als Weg des Kindes**”. This work also appeared in Dutch as **Scholen maken mensen**. When there is a question about the structure of a school, as lifeworld of a child, it must be immediately stressed that a school is an **extension, completion, and formalization** of the educative teaching in a family situation, as the primary educative teaching situation. This means that an educative teaching situation

in the school is a re-constitution (Van der Stoep) of a family situation. (Also see Section 4 of this Division).

6.1 A school as extending the home as a child's lifeworld

If the school is an extension of the home lifeworld of a child, this immediately implies that the structure of the educative teaching situation at home does not differ [essentially] from that at school. The school is and must be a **broadening** of the home lifeworld of a child. In school there is a **building on** what is done in a family, as an educative teaching situation. Once again, there is mention of participants in an educative teaching event. At least two persons necessarily must be in each other's presence before there can be an educative teaching situation. Again, it is an adult, responsible person, on the one hand, and a not-yet adult, not-yet responsible person, on the other hand. An adult, responsible person is a **teacher**, and a not-yet adult, not-yet responsible person is the **pupil**. (Read Chapter One again where an essence analysis is made of an educative teaching situation). Because an educative teaching situation in school is a broadening of, and a building on an educative teaching event within a family, necessarily, it must be of a more formal nature than is the case with a family situation. This means that a teacher must have at his/her disposal more **specialized knowledge** regarding the educative teaching situation than is the case, e.g., with the parents. Therefore, students are prepared as teachers in educative institutions such as teacher's colleges, and Faculties of Education at Universities. **Training teachers** implies the immediate **introduction to the essential structures of an educative teaching situation**.

6.2 A school as completing the home as a child's lifeworld

A school is not merely an extension of the home as a child's lifeworld, but also a completing of it. This means that educative teaching in a school situation ought to **link up with** educative teaching at home. Because of the great amount of specialized knowledge which a person must have at his/her disposal today, the parent is committed to the help of other adults e.g., teachers in school, who possess this more specialized knowledge. Thus, a school, as an institution, is called into being to place the **knowledge**

and **skills** (Bijl) which are necessary for designing a personal lifeworld at the disposal of the pupils, as becoming adults. However, the pupils must not be left alone to confront this knowledge and skills without the expert provision of help. Through this expert provision of help (educative teaching), teachers must support the pupils in their **exploration** of new areas of knowledge and skills. Also, in a school situation, just as is the case with the educative teaching event at home, the teachers must increasingly offer the pupils an opportunity for independent involvement with the areas of knowledge and skills. Thus, here there is mention of **learning adulthood** (Landman), where a pupil who is becoming, and is progressing in knowledge and skills eventually becomes **emancipated** from his/her teachers. This emancipating event, which is manifested in learning adulthood, then eventually will result in the pupils being able to study further as independent adults on their own accountability.

6.3 A school as a formalization of the home as a child's lifeworld

To support the pupils in school in their exploration, and eventual emancipation regarding new areas of knowledge and skills, the adults (teachers) must systematically **unlock** the lifeworld for the children. Therefore, Van der Stoep views unlocking-reality as a fundamental didactic category for constructing a fundamental didactic theory. This unlocking-reality will only be possible if the pupils can be confronted with various delimited areas of reality. This entails that the pupils in school be introduced to **various subjects** (areas of reality, and areas of knowledge and skills). Also, now satisfaction no longer can be taken with the informal nature of educative teaching as this clearly shows itself in a family household. Thus, there is a **formalizing** of an educative teaching event. The pupils and teachers come together formally in a school building, and in the different class and subject locales where then, in purposeful and systematic ways, the teachers intervene with the aim of the pupils eventually learning adulthood. In conclusion, once again, it is emphasized that a school situation is not a situation which is different from that of a home, but, at most, it is another kind of situation where there is still educative teaching. Because educative teaching at home and in school are essentially the same

event, attention is given to the relationship between home and school.

7. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HOME AND SCHOOL

In the previous three sections, it is indicated that, in fact, a school, in its **form**, is an extension, completion, and formalization of the home, as a child's lifeworld. If now there is a question of the **content** of this extension, completion, and formalization, ought it not to differ from the contents in terms of which there is educative teaching at home? The norms with which a child is confronted in the family household ought not to differ from the norms and values presented and explicated (clarified and exemplified) in school. This immediately brings to the foreground the entire matter of the philosophy of life held by the parents. The philosophy of life held by the parents and the teachers must agree. Otherwise, this will allow a child to feel confused, and insecure in school (or at home). This means that the parents must have a voice in the educative teaching of their children in school. In this regard, there are some bodies (associations) which can be mentioned here by which the parents can ensure that the relationship between the home and school are good, e.g., **school boards, school committees, and parent-teacher associations.**

Via the school board, and committees, the parents can ensure, as far as possible, that only teachers who hold the same philosophy of life as they do are hired. Via parent-teacher associations, the parents and teachers can encounter each other on a social level, and pleasantly communicate with each other. The relationship between teachers and parents also can be strengthened by holding **parent days, or parent evenings** where the parents have an opportunity to converse about the academic progress of their children. Once again, it is emphasized that for an unhindered, and unrestrained progress of children in school, there must be a very good relationship between home and school.

8. SUMMARY

In this division, attention is given to an educative teaching situation in the family household and a school. Some fundamental concepts,

such as “world”, “home”, “school” and “lifeworld” also are discussed. The discussion of these concepts is a necessary introduction to Division B of this chapter because before independent thinking can be done by a student of didactic education (didactic pedagogics), as a part-discipline of Education, regarding educative teaching, there must be clarity about such fundamental concepts. If this is not the case, the various practitioners of didactic education will talk past each other, and the expansion of didactic education, as an independent part-perspective of education, becomes difficult if not impossible. It is indicated that the world in which a person finds him/herself is a world-filled-with-meaning. It is filled-with-meaning because a person gives meaning to his/her world to make it a habitable, understandable, and safe lifeworld for him/her. It is indicated further that home and school form part of the lifeworld of a child. In the discussions, the essential unity of the educative teaching event at home and at school is emphasized despite their qualitative differences (but not otherness). This textbook now is concluded in the following Division, with a discussion of didactic thinking, and research.

ADDITIONAL READING MATERIAL:

Gous, S. J.: **Die Skool as Weg tot Wereldontwerp**. (Article in South African Journal of Pedagogy, Vol. 2, No. 1, July 1968) English translation: georgeyonge.net

Van der Stoep, F.: **Didaktiese Grondvorme**.

Van der Stoep, F. and Van der Stoep, O. A.: **Didaktiese Orientasie**.

Van der Stoep, F.: **Die Pedagogiese Grondslae van die Nuwere Didaktiek** (Chapter VIII in **Jubileumlesings** (1937-1962) of The Faculty of Education, University of Pretoria).

Sonnekus, M. C. H.: **Die leerwereld van die kind as beleweniswereld**.

B. SOME REMARKS ON DIDACTIC THINKING AND RESEARCH

1. INTRODUCTION

In the first three chapters, a student of didactic education is introduced to **essential characteristics, and structures of a didactic-pedagogical situation** (educative teaching situation). However, a

textbook in didactic education would not be complete without attention also being given to **didactic research**.

Anyone who is introduced to didactic education (didactic pedagogics), and has an interest in this subject area (part-discipline, part-perspective, part-area of knowledge, part-area of science) of pedagogics will want to know what the current state is of didactic thinking to help him/her with his/her further self-study, and self-thinking about an educative teaching situation. A look at the contemporary didactic literature shows a great variety of tendencies of reform which a student of didactic education must consider.

A didactic researcher must have a thorough knowledge of all the **pedagogical** disciplines if he/she wants to make a meaningful contribution in his/her didactic research to the scientific area known as didactic **pedagogics**. The word “pedagogic” is emphasized to indicate that the point of departure of a didactic researcher in didactic education, must be a **pedagogical** situation. As an **educationist**, a didactic pedagogue must search for enlightenment in the various (helping) disciplines of the **didactic**.

That is, a didactic educationist, in his/her didactic research, in addition to his/her thorough knowledge of the part-disciplines of **pedagogics** (such as fundamental pedagogics, psychopedagogics, sociopedagogics, historical and comparative pedagogics, physical pedagogics, vocational orientation pedagogics, and orthopedagogics), also must have thorough knowledge of the helping disciplines of the **didactic** (e.g., general didactics, particular didactics, psychodidactics [didactic psychology], and comparative didactics. In this regard, also read Chapter One).

From the above, in this Division of this concluding chapter, attention is given to **reform in didactic thinking**, and to the **meaning and necessity of didactic research**.

The discussions in this Division are aimed at spurring on a student in didactic education to independent didactic-pedagogical thinking. Extending didactic pedagogics (didactic education) as an autonomous part-science of pedagogics (education) will only be possible if there are students who are interested in didactic

education. Therefore, the authors heartily invite all students of didactic education to venture with them to proceed to **didactic-pedagogical thinking**, i.e., thinking which has an **educative teaching situation** as its point of departure. Consequently, it is the aim of the authors to awaken a **research awareness** in students of didactic education because this is the only way independent scientific contributions can be made to this part-perspective of pedagogics.

2. REFORM IN DIDACTIC THINKING

2.1 Introduction

Reform in didactic thinking means that, on various levels of teaching, there are **tendencies of reform, and change**, that is, **changing approaches**, discernible on the concerned levels of teaching. (In this regard, compare Chapter One, “Didactics (Theory of teaching)”. These tendencies of reform, and change/changing approaches, however, are carried by change, and reform in **didactic thinking as such**.

For a student in didactic education (didactic pedagogics), it is necessary to take note of these tendencies of reform and changed/changing approaches. Thus, now successive attention is given to **reform in didactic thinking as such, reform in nursery school, primary school, secondary school, and tertiary didactic thinking**.

2.2 Reform in didactic thinking

If the pedagogical literature (educational literature) of the past few years is examined, many publications are in the area of didactic pedagogics. For example, in Germany, it is quite impossible to get through the works published yearly in didactic education. The same holds for German pedagogical journals, which are dominated by didactic-pedagogical contributions. This emphasizes the importance of this part-perspective of pedagogics. What is the order of the day in Germany, also is noticeable, to a great degree, in other European countries, and in South Africa. However, a question which must be answered in this section is how does this reform in didactical thinking manifest itself to a didactic researcher?

A study of contemporary didactic-pedagogical literature gives clear evidence that the reform lies in the **elimination** of a **traditional separation** which was made between educating and teaching. According to the traditional view, educating and teaching children are two different matters. Although there is a degree of “affinity” between them, according to the traditional view, they are matters to be studied separately. Then, educating a child is viewed as a task of a family, and teaching a child, as a task of a school. A change occurred in this separation, in the sense that gradually they were seen as two sides of the same matter. This became possible because the idea had broken through that educating and teaching children, indeed, is a **unitary event**. This means that, even when children are taught, the **teaching** is carried by the **aim** of bringing up a child to **adulthood** which, at the same time, is the **aim** of **educating**. Thus, in fact, teaching is one of the ways of educating (Bijl). A child cannot be genuinely educated if teaching (directing) is not put to work. In contemporary (present/current [1978]) didactic thinking, this has led to a situation within which a child finds him/herself in the presence of adults, who try to educate him/her being described as an educative teaching situation (didactic-pedagogic situation) (Gous). [Read Chapter One again].

In the second place, the insight that educating and teaching are a unitary event has provided didactic-pedagogic thinkers with a common point of departure. This point of departure is an **educative teaching situation**. This common point of departure also has brought about a consistency in **didactic-pedagogical terminology** (concepts). In contemporary didactic-pedagogical thinking, use is made only of **didactic concepts** to describe and elucidate what a didactic-pedagogical event essentially is. These didactic concepts (descriptions and interpretations) are known as **didactic categories**, and **criteria**. The didactic categories and criteria are explained fully in Chapter Two. Their application in describing and interpreting the didactic-pedagogical event have resulted, in contemporary didactic thinking, in the practitioners of didactic education no longer talking through and past each other. Thus, reform in **didactic thinking as such**, also has given rise to a reform in didactic thinking on all the various levels of teaching. Now, attention is given to reform in nursery school didactic thinking.

2.3 Reform in Nursery School didactic thinking

Reform in nursery school didactic thinking is the order of the day in the didactic thinking of various countries in Europe. This reform in nursery school didactic thinking, however, also is noticeable here in South Africa. There is not the slightest doubt that nursery school didactics today is in the focus, not only of didactic thinking, but so are the teaching policies in various countries. However, it is not the aim, at this stage, to make a **comparison** among the various teaching policies, and to draw out the emerging systems of educating, since this is the work area of comparative didactics. Later in this chapter, a comparison is made among the **teaching policies and systems of educating** of a few European countries, and South Africa. However, this section is involved with a new approach in didactic **thinking** in nursery school didactics.

The increasing absence of the mother from a home (the so-called working mother) makes it urgently necessary that there be pedagogical (i.e., from the educative situation as point of departure) reflection on teaching, as educatively teaching a toddler. This involves a fathoming of the educative relationship between a toddler, as **educand**, and the **educators** of toddlers. This means that Nursery School didactics can never be practiced as merely nursery school **didactics**, but that didactic insights which a nursery school didactician arrives at in studying a toddler-educator relationship must be **interpreted pedagogically**. This is the task of a nursery school **didactician**, as didactic **educationist**. If it is said that nursery school didactic insights acquired by a didactician studying a toddler-educator relationship must be interpreted pedagogically, this means that he/she must investigate their **pedagogical significance**. Questions which arise in this connection in contemporary nursery school didactics, for example, are the following: what is the significance of language, as an educative means, in educatively teaching a toddler?, what is the significance of stories, as an educative means, in educatively teaching a toddler?, what is the significance of play for an educative teaching situation?, what is the significance of religion for a toddler in an educative teaching situation? And when is a toddler ready to enter school?

From the above questions, reform in nursery school didactic thinking includes a variety of matters. Didactic research regarding these various matters, such as the significance of language, stories, play, and religion in a toddler's lifeworld, however, has only barely begun. In this respect, B. F. Nel, in "Die Opvoeding van die Kleuter" (Educating the Toddler) has done pioneering work. However, this work is written from a psychology of becoming perspective, and its rich content must be interpreted didactic-pedagogically. The fact that this and other areas still lie fallow for didactic thinking, directs a challenge to a student of didactic education to engage in independent research in this connection. Not only in nursery school didactic thinking is reform noticed, but also in primary school didactic thought.

2.4 Reform in Primary School didactic thinking

If the historians of the 21st Century should proceed to write down the most important changes during the second half of the twentieth century, certainly there is one matter which will not be overlooked, and that is the recognition by humankind that educating is extremely important. Then, the most likely question posed by the historians is why, in the second half of the twentieth century was there an interest in educating, in general, and in educative teaching, particularly? Although it is difficult to anticipate a quarter of a century in advance, the answer(s) to this question some of the answers mentioned by the authors possibly are the following two: the populations of the world have arrived at the conclusion that educative teaching is the most important investment for the future of any nation; the world politics of the second half of the twentieth century has required that attention be given to educative teaching to help, as quickly as possible, the great number of developing (underdeveloped) countries reach a contemporary level of civilization. Whatever the answer(s) might be, the fact remains that today the order of the day is reform in didactic thinking on all levels of teaching.

A study of the didactic-pedagogical literature on primary school teaching (primary teaching) reveals that the reform here is carried by **theoretical reflection on primary school practice**. Emanating from this theoretical founding of practice, the **didactics** of various

subjects particularly gave attention to reforming the various subjects in the primary school. In primary school didactic thinking of the past few years, attention also was given to the **ways** the **learning content** must be placed at the disposal of a learning child. This more **accountable methodology** became possible especially because, in addition to the fathoming of their own subject areas by the **didactics** of various **subjects**, they also tried to preserve the unity of the **spiritual forming** of a child becoming adult. Therefore, particularly in the past few years, the concept **totality teaching** emerged in primary school didactic thinking. Hence, there was a striving for a **didactically integrated construction** of all the different subjects in the primary school. Although there also were attempts to apply totality teaching in the secondary school, thus far, it has not been successful because the various subjects in the secondary (high) school are offered by different teachers.

As far as the **theoretical founding** of primary school didactic thinking is concerned, in recent times, a link was sought with **child anthropology***. In his work, “Vernieuwing van het Basisonderwijs” [Reform in Basic Teaching], Van Gelder emphasizes that the didactic is founded on **anthropological insights** which take the unique world of a child as the point of departure for didactic thinking. A child anthropologist emphasizes that the unique world of a child is **affectively lived experienced**. This gives rise to the fact that in the psychology of becoming (child psychology), there is talk of the **experiential world** of a child (Sonnekus, Pretorius). Where an educative teaching situation involves creating **possibilities** for a child to **encounter** an adult structured lifeworld, today primary school didactic thinking takes note of a thorough knowledge of the lifeworld of a child, as an experiential world.

Characteristic of the different subject didactics, indeed, is that they all emanate from a child lifeworld, as experiential world. For example, with respect to **arithmetic** in a primary school, there is talk of **lived experiencing quantity**, as a precondition for **indicating quantity**. In this regard, an important question posed is in what way is the system of arithmetic already prepared for in a child’s world image? Thus, a child experiential world itself is the point of

* Here anthropology = philosophical anthropology.

departure of primary school didactic thinking regarding the subject of arithmetic. The same phenomenon also is observed with all the other subjects in the primary school.

A child lifeworld, as experiential world, also greatly determines the method which must be followed to bring knowledge forward for the children. The teaching form which is in the forefront in the newer primary school didactic thinking is known as **totality teaching**. The following are some characteristics of totality teaching: the unitary learning materials show an inner coherence, the learning materials (learning contents) are derived from directly present, or represented life situations, the learning activity of a child, then, especially is directed to experiencing this inner coherence of the unitary learning materials and acquiring insight into the relations among the data found in life situations. From the above essential characteristics of totality teaching, the teaching activities which flow from this are directed to the **spiritual involvement** of a teacher, as well as the learning child. By means of totality teaching, an educative teaching situation is designed by a teacher to create encountering possibilities to be implemented between a learning child and the learning contents in a concrete life situation.

2.5 Reform in Secondary School didactic thinking

When one looks at the curricula of the various types of secondary schools, an investigator is struck by the enormous scope of knowledge which is offered in the various subjects (areas of knowledge). There is an almost unlimitable, and nearly unwieldy amount of knowledge which must be digested by the pupils, and which must be integrated into their personal lifeworlds. That there now is an overload of content to be found in the secondary schools probably will not be denied by anyone. The fact of learning content overload also is entirely understandable when considering the phenomenal progress that has been made in all areas of science during the past few decades. This has caused the wealth of human knowledge to

expand so greatly that youths as well as adults of tomorrow are under a spontaneous compulsion to be involved with learning more things than was the case with their parents. If this would not be the case the youths would lag in a world of continually growing knowledge. That youths must be confronted with all the latest knowledge which the present and past produces and has produced is a foregone conclusion.

Thus, especially in the didactic thinking of the secondary school, a didactician is faced with the problem of learning content overload. Today, however, this problem is not limited to the secondary school but also is operative in a primary school. If a student of Didactic Education wants to search the contemporary didactic-pedagogical literature for a possible answer(s) offered by didactic researchers on this matter, he/she would be surprised to see that, generally speaking, not many solutions to the problem are offered. The only possible solution to the problem of learning content overload offered originates with German didacticians. In Tübingen (1951), a congress was convened with the sole aim of searching for possible solutions by which the increasing expansion of learning contents could be coped with. Thanks especially to the contributions of the physicist, Martin Wagenschein, and the historian, Herman Heimpel, a possible solution to the

learning content overload was brought up. The teaching form mentioned as a possible solution is known as **exemplary teaching**. After the idea of exemplary teaching arose in the first year of the second half of the 20th century, this revolutionary idea very quickly began to acquire momentum throughout the European continent. Today, the exemplary form of teaching is the order of the day in most European countries. The idea of exemplary teaching also caught on with didactic educationists in South Africa, as a glance at the didactic research of advanced students in Didactic Education shows. Didactic educationists concluded that the learning contents with which the pupils are confronted with daily is and ought to be the **attribution of meaning, via the exemplary**. In this regard, the didactic educationist P. Maree emphasizes that an adult always and necessarily offers an exemplar (example) of the proper attribution of meaning, and that a child can attribute meaning in analogy with an adult's example. From this statement by Maree, it is immediately clear that the exemplar in everyday activities of persons is of importance for a person's understanding of his/her lifeworld, as a meaningful (filled with meaning) lifeworld.

The above reference to the exemplar, as a form of teaching, immediately allows the question to arise: in what forms of expression does an exemplar

(example) manifest itself as a form of **living**, and what are the essential characteristics of the exemplary? (In this connection, also see the exemplar as a didactic-pedagogical ground-form in Chapter Two). Some forms of expression of the example, as a form of living (Van Dyk) are: samples, models, exhibits, exhibition matches, advertisements, demonstrations, fashion shows, and expeditions. Although there are a variety of forms of the exemplar found in everyday life, still there is a commonality which comes to the fore in the structure of each of these forms of expression. The German didactic educationist, W. Klafki, stresses that when there is talk of the exemplary, there is consideration of a **relationship between the general and the specific**. While the specific is mostly a concrete example to which a teaching educator refers, the general is an **abstract version** of the concrete example. Thus, the **specific** is an example of the general. In subject didactic thinking of the past few years, in fact, the exemplary form of teaching has been brought into all subjects in the secondary school. From the subject teaching imported into the primary school, there increasingly must be thought about also bringing about exemplary teaching in the didactic thinking of the nursery school.

2.6 Reform in Didactic Thinking for Tertiary Teaching

There is little doubt that the future of any people depends on the scientifically schooled, and persons trained otherwise as highly as possible, who step into the so-called labor market within society. This entails that didactic thinking for tertiary teaching ought to stand at the forefront of didactic thinking. However, a study of the existing didactic literature indicates that only a few years ago there was a real beginning to try to pursue the Didactic of Tertiary Teaching on a more accountable basis. It was only at the end of the 1960's that there can be mention of reform in the didactic thinking of tertiary teaching (tertiary didactics). For example, in June 1967, for the first time, there is a formal move to establish such a work circle for tertiary didactics in Germany. This work circle of didacticians in West Germany is known as the AHD. AHD is the acronym for "Arbeitskreis für Hochschuldidaktik" [Work Circle for University/College Teaching]. Thus, intensive research in tertiary didactics is of recent origin. Didacticians in the field of tertiary teaching increasingly concluded that, in systematic ways, there must be a move to not only plan **what** must be taught at the tertiary level, but **how** it must be taught. Thus, there is mention of university planning. Today, didacticians are aware that, previously, in countries everywhere, unsystematic tertiary planning of teaching is allowed, which no longer can be tolerated. Among others, this compelled the German didactician, U. Hermann, to write an article in the German pedagogic journal (Zeitschrift für Pädagogik) with the title "Planung der Hochschulreformplanung" [Planning reform in tertiary teaching]. In South Africa, among others, F. van der Stoep, P. van Zyl, and J. R. Pauw gave attention to a possible structure for university didactics. In addition, during 1971, a Congress for Tertiary Didactics and Methodology was held at the Pretoria Teachers College, which was attended by all of the teachers of the various teachers colleges of the Transvaal.

As far as the tendency for reform in didactic thinking in the area of tertiary didactics is concerned, F. van der Stoep indicates ten

aspects which are mentioned here: the societal-didactic aspect, the organizational-administrative didactic aspect, the orientational didactic aspect, the social-didactic aspect, the psycho-didactic level, structural-didactic facets, subject-didactic findings, the evaluation-didactic aspect, research-didactic aspect, and the tertiary-didactic aspect.

By the **societal-didactic aspect** in tertiary teaching is meant that didacticians must reflect on the place which the various tertiary teaching institutions hold in the broader structure of society. This especially is about the **significance** of the various tertiary teaching institutions within the total structure of society. By the **organizational-administrative didactic aspect** is meant that didacticians must reflect on the whole question of **planning, implementing, and administering** all aspects of tertiary teaching activities. For systematic planning, and a planned system, this aspect of didactic thinking on the tertiary level is of greatest importance. By the **orientational didactic aspect** is meant that the reform in didactic thinking on a tertiary level of teaching has brought about the necessity for thinking about student connectedness with the various tertiary teaching institutions. For example, the student must be provided with beacons so that he/she can plan his/her **own participation in the tertiary teaching program** of the involved tertiary teaching institution with the greatest degree of certainty possible. There also must be awareness about how the student can be **linked up** in meaningful and responsible ways with the involved tertiary teaching institution. By the **social-didactic aspect** is meant that the students, during their course of study at a tertiary teaching institution are assembled socially in necessary ways for a few years. Therefore, Van der Stoep emphasizes that, for the good progress of teaching on a tertiary level, the students must be brought together **into groups, classes, courses, seminars, practica, and excursions** so that, in addition to its purely social patterns, the tertiary teaching institution also can show a **social-didactic** aspect.

If it is said that today tertiary didactics also must express itself on a **psycho-didactic level**, this means that the planners of teaching (didacticians) also must continually make the teaching personnel involved in the tertiary teaching institution aware that they must **ascertain the various ways** in which a learning person proceeds to

actualize his/her learning activities. By **structural-didactic facets** of the tertiary didactic program is meant that tertiary didactics, especially in the contemporary situation, must attempt to have a very **clear and accountable formulation** of its **teaching ideal**, and the corresponding planning of its profession of teaching. If there is talk of **subject didactic findings** around tertiary teaching, this means that each separate subject will acquire an **identity** which must now be related to the unique nature of a subject's content, scientific methods, and possibilities of applying insights. By **evaluation-didactic aspect** is meant that today in didactic thinking regarding teaching in all subjects, there must be reflection on **checking the achievement** of the studying person. Especially regarding tertiary teaching, the traditional forms of **examining, testing**, and similar **methods of checking** must be intensively investigated. By the **research-didactic aspect** is meant that, with respect to tertiary teaching, didacticians must think about the possibilities which can be created for the students to direct independent research projects. In this connection, there must be thought about **financing, thorough planning, coordinating efforts, guiding student activities**, and the **determination of findings** of the teaching personnel, as well as the students themselves. This has to do with **forming research awareness** in students on the tertiary level. By the **tertiary-didactic aspect** is meant that, particularly, attention must be given to tertiary teaching in the broadest connection. Reform in tertiary didactic thinking must not merely be introduced in certain subjects, but must be made part of **all of the subjects** offered on the tertiary level.

Attention now has been given to reform in didactic thinking regarding nursery school, primary school, secondary school, and tertiary teaching. As stated in the introduction to this chapter, there now is a discussion of comparative didactics.

3. COMPARATIVE DIDACTICS*

3.1 Introduction

If the didactic and education literature is viewed synoptically, there **still cannot be mention** of a **scientifically accountable point of**

* This entire section reflects the status quo of the early 1970's and is in need of being updated. G.Y.

departure regarding **comparative education**, and the highly related comparative didactics. For the sake of clarity about this, it is mentioned that, following the existing educational literature in comparative education, it is involved with a **comparison** among the various **doctrines of educating** of different countries. According to the existing literature, comparative didactics, on the contrary, is involved mainly with a comparison among the various **teaching policies**, and the **teaching principles** resulting from them in different countries. An additional consequence of comparative didactic thinking then, also is that comparisons can be made regarding the various levels of teaching in different countries. Since this study is merely a textbook in didactic education, the scientific aspect of comparative didactics is not considered further. Therefore, attention is given to comparative didactic thought with respect to the United States of America, some European countries, and South Africa as it has been practiced thus far.

3.2 Theory and Practice in the Didactic Systems of a few countries

According to most American thinkers of education and teaching, the **United States of America (U.S.A.)** finds itself in a serious **cultural crisis**. Mentioned as **symptoms** of this crisis are chronic instability, confusion, ambiguity, uncertainty (Brameld, 1950), the inadaptability of the transmitted image of values for the present time (Broudy, 1954), and the validity of conflicting norms in different areas of society (Bierstedt, 1963). Thus, in general, in the U.S.A., there is mention of a **radical shift in values** (Spindler, 1963). The question now is what influence does this socio-cultural situation in the U.S.A. exercise on **teaching policies, and practices** in American schools? Regarding teaching policies, it is declared that the individual is the center of all values. As a **basic American value**, the optimal personality development of the individual must be guaranteed by teacher preparation. Emphasis is placed on the equality of rights, and opportunities. According to the Educational Policies Commission, one of the central aims of teacher preparation must be the **development of the [pupils'] ability to think**. The mentioned aims, as formulated in the teaching policies, result in a so-called **democratic practice of teaching**. For Americans, **democracy is an entire way of living** (Kilpatrick, 1963), a

constellation of moral principles (Smith, 1957), and a **religion** because there is talk of a **faith in democracy** (McMurrin, 1964).

The teaching policies and practices of the **United Kingdom (England)** show a very great agreement with that of the U.S.A. They are carried by a **fundamental political belief** in an equal opportunity for all (Van der Eyken, 1967). Also in England, the fact of a changing society is emphasized. The same approach to formulating teaching policies also gave rise to an **open, and decentralized structure** in teaching. Thus, for example, decisions in favor of new curricula in the schools are made by so-called Local Educational Authorities. This further results in the fact that, more than is the case in the U.S.A., private institutions, and organizations can participate in formulating teaching policies. In organizations such as, e.g., the **Nuffield Foundation**, and the **National Foundation of Educational Research**, their scientists serve in leading positions. Because the scientists have a research awareness at their disposal, some English authors believe that the administration of teaching by the Local Educational Authorities, together with the various teaching associations, are given a greater opportunity for the development of teaching than is the case in the U.S.A. This decentralized teaching policy in England has a solid effect in the **practice of teaching**. Because there are no national or regional curricula occurring in the English teaching policy, there is no mention of a united development of the practice of teaching.

If the administration and practice of teaching in the **Soviet Union (Communist Republics)** are examined, they show a **centralized structure** in contrast to that of the U.S.A. and England. This results in decisions regarding the formulating of teaching policy, and its application in practice being considerably easier than is the case in the U.S.A. and England. The framework for developing teaching is determined by the **Communist Party**, and **state administration organs**. As far as state administration organs are concerned, particularly, there are two organs which are responsible for formulating teaching policy, i.e., the AN SSSR, and the APN SSSR. AN SSSR is an acronym for the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Socialist Republic and APN SSSR is an acronym for the Academy of Pedagogic Sciences of the Soviet Socialist Republic. All curriculum planning, and development is undertaken directly by these two

Academies. Since 1966, there also has been a so-called **Alunie-Ministerium** for national forming which possesses a controlling and coordinating function in the U.S.S.R. (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). Formulating teaching policy, and the resulting teaching practice is largely carried by the findings of Soviet Psychology, under the lead of contemporary Soviet psychologists such as Leont'ev, Sokolow and Gal'perin. The didactic formulations, thus indeed, are **psychological-didactic** formulations. Because of the centralized structure of teaching policy in the Soviet Union, it is possible to carry the Communist Ideology over into all teaching practice.

The most recent* formulation of teaching policy in **West Germany** dates from 13 February 1970. On this date, recommendations were made by the teaching commission of the West German government, which became known as the "Structureplan fur Bildungswesen" [Plan of structure for the Education System]. In this connection, an additional report was issued on 25 July 1970 which was called "Bericht zur Bildungspolitik" [Report on Teaching Policy]. In these two publications, emphasis is placed on **equal opportunities for all** (Chancengleichheit). The comprehensive aim of teaching is **forming the ability of a person for individual, and social life**. Although it is not said precisely what is meant by the various formulations in the plan of structure—and the entire plan of structure has evoked sharp criticism from various prominent German didacticians—it also was mentioned, e.g., that all **subject matter teaching** in all of the various types of schools must be **scientifically oriented**. If, now, it is asked how this teaching policy is done justice, at this stage not much can be said, since this policy has been in force only since 1970. From the few aims mentioned, however, teaching practice leans greatly on the Anglo-American model of **democratic teaching**. In contrast, teaching in the DDR (Deutsche Demokratische Republic), i.e., East Germany is not as democratic as that name implies. Since East Germany is a communist governed state, teaching policy and practice in the DDR are in close agreement with the formulations laid down for the Soviet Union. Some aims of teaching are expounded in the work "Lehrplanwerk und Unterrichtsgestaltung" (Curriculum formulation and teaching practice) of the DPZI

* As of 1972 when the first edition of this book appeared.

(Deutsches Paedagogisches Zentralinstitut) [German Central Pedagogic Institute]. The central aim of teaching is the **many-sided development of socialistic personalities**. The general forming of the pupils must fulfill the **future concrete demands of society**. Also, the general forming of the pupils must be attuned to **developing and freeing all possible talents, and abilities** of the individual pupils.

From the formulation of teaching policy in the **Netherlands**, the pupils must undergo a thorough **general forming**. The teaching policy also provides the opportunity for **individual differences** among children by a **variety of teaching facilities**. Primary (elementary) teaching is ended after six years. Then pupils can follow further teaching at different schools for two years, which do not belong to secondary school teaching, such as “lower general continuation teaching” (lager algemeen voortgezet onderwijs or l.a.v.o.). Within the framework of the secondary school, there also are a variety of types of schools which are all attuned to bring about as “many-sided a development of the pupils as is possible”. In addition, one also thinks of the introduction of secondary school students to teaching at universities, and colleges. This teaching is known as “preparatory scientific teaching” (“voorbereidende wetenschappelijk onderwijs” or v.w.o.). The teaching in the v.w.o. is aimed at high school graduates learning to “**be able to work independently**”, to “**develop a breadth of view**”, and to “**have an appreciation of the culture**”. Now, the question is how is this Netherlands teaching policy realized in practice? A documentation center which does important work, in this regard, is the “Bureau of Documentation” in The Hague. This bureau helps to support, on various levels, the educational policy followed by the Netherlands government with systematically documented information. In addition, the Netherlands Department of Education also is responsible for the publication of the monthly “Pedagogische Bibliografie voor Onderwijs en Wetenschappen” [Pedagogic Bibliography for Education and the Sciences]. This is a bibliography of titles, new domestic and foreign publication, and it covers the Netherlands publications as thoroughly as possible.

Now that we have looked at the teaching policy, and practice in the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, West and East Germany, and the Netherlands, in concluding this division, we take

a look at the teaching policy, and practice in the **Republic of South Africa**. In formulating teaching policy, a uniform administration of teaching is a necessary requirement. The history of teaching in South Africa indicates a continual back and forth movement between a central, and a local governance of teaching. In 1967, however, the administration of teaching in the Republic of South Africa (R.S.A.) was **placed on a national foundation**. There is no doubt that 1967 was a meaningful year for teaching in the R.S.A. No less than three teaching laws were placed in the law-book by Parliament, i.e., the **Law of Advanced Technical Teaching**, the **Law of Teaching Service**, and the **Law of National Teaching Policy**. Of these three laws, the latter is of cardinal importance for the entire nature of teaching in the R.S.A. The determination of the national teaching policy for South Africa was done by the Minister of National Education, in consultation with the various Administrators of the different provinces in the R.S.A., and the National Advisory Teaching Council (N.A.O.R.). Some of the policy matters embodied in this teaching law are the following: **the teaching must have a Christian character, it must have a national character; teaching must be provided corresponding to the ability, talent, and interest of the pupils, and the needs of the country (differentiated teaching); and the teaching with respect to the syllabuses, courses, and examination standards must be coordinated on a national foundation**. This law No. 39 of 1967 is reaffirmed in law No. 73 of 1969. Concerning the differentiation regarding ability, here it must be mentioned that, since 1957, various courses have been offered, i.e., the **University Entrance Course**, the **Final Examination Course**, and the **Standard Eight [grade ten] Course**.

In the latest laws, this idea of differentiation proceeded to make further differentiations among Junior Primary (grade I through standard I) [in the U.S.A. this is grades 1 through 3], Senior Primary (standard II through standard IV) [U.S.A. grades 4 through 6]; and Junior Secondary (standard V through VII) [U.S.A. grades 7 through 9] and Senior Secondary (standard VIII through X) [U.S.A. grades 10 through 12]. It is very clearly stated that the new system does not mean that standard V pupils of the primary school will be transferred to the secondary school. The teaching of the standard V pupils will still be offered in the primary school, but the curriculum

(syllabuses) of this group of pupils will be brought into congruence with junior secondary school teaching.

Now, attention is given to didactic research, as is proposed in the introduction to this chapter.

4. DIDACTIC RESEARCH

4.1 Methodological accounting

4.1.2 Natural science approach

When there is mention of research in any area of life, a researcher must be able to be accountable to him/herself regarding a method, or methods he/she uses in his/her research. Thus, a didactic researcher also must give evidence of **methodological accounting**. There are two main methodological approaches to didactic research noticeable, i.e., a **natural science**, and a **human science approach**.

Already from the eighteenth century, but particularly during the nineteenth century, the natural sciences entered the foreground. This can be attributed especially to the work of Herbert Spencer, and Charles Darwin. The streams of thought arising from their work were, among others, **pragmatism**, and **evolutionism**. These streams of thought reduced human being to an **object**, to **matter**, to a **bio-psychic being**, and an **extension of the animal**. Because a person is only an extension of the animal, the natural science-oriented research methods amount to applying animal tests to persons. In education and, therefore, also in didactic education, at the beginning of the twentieth century, this gave rise to the so-called **experimental pedagogics** of persons such as Ernst Meumann (Vorlesungen zur Einfuhrung in die Experimentelle Paedagogik und ihre psychologischen Grundlagen, Leipzig, 1907/08) [Introductory Lectures in Experimental Pedagogics and its Psychological Foundations] and Wilhelm August Lay (Experimentelle Didaktik, Leipzig, 1903) [Experimental Didactics]. Gradually, the application of animal tests to persons was gotten away from, but the idea of experimental research continued to exist. In Germany, this was practiced especially by Peter and Else Petersen, with their so-called “pedagogic factuality research”. In the 1950’s and 1960’s, this

pedagogic factuality research acquired the name of **empirical-pedagogic research**. This empirical-pedagogic research acquired its stamp in the didactic-pedagogic research of Heinrich Roth, Erich Hylla, and Wolfgang Brezinka. Such didactic-pedagogic research then was done with the help of **exact, controllable observations** (tape-recorders, and filmstrips), **interviews with teachers** about their attunement to didactic-pedagogic problems, such as school organization, **statistical procedures, carefully designed didactic-pedagogic experiments, development of tests** for determining the teaching results in subjects, and **the statistical determination of the costs** for future school buildings corresponding to the increase in population.

That such a natural science approach to teaching, and its problems is valuable, no one can deny. Even so, such didactic-pedagogic research does not penetrate to the **essence of the teaching and learning activity itself**. The reason it doesn't is because the **natural science methods** are forced on a **person**, and he/she becomes quantified [as a number, score, IQ]. A person then is subjected to the results of **natural** scientific testing, and quantitative results. Then, the person, as a subject, is "objectified" into a score, and placed in a scheme. When a person, as a person, and a child, as a child, are studied in a didactic-pedagogic situation, this necessitates another type of approach. Because this has to do with a **person, as a person**, the research method(s) must consider this and, therefore, the authors present a human science approach to didactic research.

4.1.2 Human science approach

A natural scientist is also known as a naturalist because he/she has at his/her disposal **scientifically acquired knowledge** regarding **nature**, and the phenomena of nature. A scientist of humans is also known as an anthropologist because he/she has at his/her disposal **scientifically acquired knowledge** regarding **persons**, and the phenomena which are given with being a person. This means that a natural scientist, as naturalist, makes use of naturalistic concepts in his/her scientific practice, while a human scientist, as anthropologist, makes use of anthropological concepts in his/her scientific practice.

The person who brought this human science approach into the foreground is Wilhelm Dilthey, the German philosopher. Other human scientists who have especially contributed to a human science pedagogics, and didactic education are Wilhelm Flitner, Erich Weniger, and Otto Friedrich Bollnow. The human science approach in South Africa also is carried on by didactic educationists such as F. van der Stoep, J. R. Pauw, and S. J. Gous.

There are four characteristics which especially are emphasized in a human science pedagogics, and didactic pedagogics, i.e., **the necessary relation between pedagogic theory and pedagogic practice, the relative autonomy, or independence of the pedagogic, the educative reality, and all pedagogic theories are historical phenomena, and texts, and pedagogic theories from the past and present are sources of scientific knowledge.** In contrast to a natural science approach to didactic education, the methods of a human science approach are used not to **explain**, but to **understand** (Verstehen). Precisely this characteristic of understanding in a human science approach relates to a **phenomenologically attuned approach.** This resulted in the **phenomenological method** gradually becoming the research method in the human sciences. Today, the phenomenological method is implemented (applied) by almost all educationists and didactic educationists in the Republic of South Africa. In this regard, only a few educationists are mentioned, i.e., B. F. Nel, C. K. Oberholzer, J. C. G. J. van Vuuren, W. A. Landman, F. van der Stoep, and S. J. Gous.

It is not the aim here to give an explication of the phenomenological method. This has been done by various phenomenologists. In this connection, a student of didactic education is referred to a complete explication of the phenomenological method in the work of W. A. Landman and C. J. G. Kilian: **Leesboek vir die opvoedkundestudent en Onderwyser met Kernaantekeninge** (Chapter Three; Juta and Kie, Johannesburg, 1972).^{*} What the authors emphasize here is that the human science approach to didactic research necessarily brings a student of didactic education to a study of the phenomenon of **teaching-and-learning.** With the help of the phenomenological

^{*} An English translation is available: W.A. Landman, C.J.G. Kilian, E.M. Swanepoel, & H.C.A. Bodenstein; **An introductory reader in FUNDAMENTAL PEDAGOGICS for the student and the teacher.** Johannesburg: Juta & Co., Ltd., 1982.

method, the **essential structures** of an educative teaching situation are verbalized. This verbalization of the essential structures of a didactic-pedagogic event occurs by means of **didactic categories** and **didactic criteria**. Such didactic categories and criteria are human (anthropological) concepts because they describe a (teaching and learning) person with respect to his/her (their) **activities**, i.e., teaching and learning activities, as they are manifested in **real** educative teaching situations. (For an additional explication of didactic categories and criteria the reader is referred to Chapters One and Two of this book).

4.2 Themes in Didactic Education

4.2.1 Introduction

Since it is the aim of the authors to form the research awareness of a student of didactic education, the above section of this chapter is written. The aim is to bring a student to an independent study of this part-perspective of Education, i.e., didactic education (didactic pedagogics). Precisely how such a theme can be dealt with is explicated fully in the work of Landman and Kilian: **Leesboek ...** (Chapter Four). Therefore, now we mention only a few possible themes in didactic education which serve as guides for independent didactic-pedagogical research.

4.2.2 Themes in Didactic Education

- a. The didactic-pedagogic event, as area of investigation in didactic education.
- b. The essential structures of an educative teaching situation.
- c. The didactic-pedagogical requirements for designing curricula, and courses of study.
- d. The lesson structure as a didactic-pedagogical task.
- e. Didactic categories and didactic criteria.
- f. The essential characteristics of exemplary teaching.
- g. The essential characteristics of totality teaching.
- h. Educating a toddler, in didactic-pedagogical perspective.
- i. Educating a primary school child, in didactic-pedagogical perspective.
- j. Educating a secondary school child, in didactic-pedagogical perspective.

- k. The possibility of a structure for university didactics.
- l. Didactic education (pedagogics) as a part-discipline of education (pedagogics).
- m. Formulating, and planning teaching policy.
- n. A teacher and his/her calling.
- o. The exemplar in teaching history.
- p. The exemplar in language teaching.
- q. The exemplar in teaching physical science, and chemistry.
- r. The exemplar in mathematics teaching.

5. SUMMARY

In this Division, some matters regarding didactic thinking and research are handled. The authors have suggested easy activities by which a student in didactic education can consider some of the most important reform tendencies in didactic-pedagogical thinking. As often mentioned, the aim of this chapter is to bring a student of didactic education to an independent study of the problematic of didactic-pedagogics. In Chapter One, the essential structures of an educative teaching situation are considered. In Chapter Two, attention is given to designing an educative teaching situation. In Chapter Three, the course of an educative teaching event is described. Just before this Division, the home and school situations are described as educative teaching situations. At all times, the authors have tried to make this work a **reader or textbook**, in the true sense of the word, in didactic education.

ADDITIONAL READING MATERIAL:

Landman, W, A, and Gous, S. J.: **Inleiding tot Fundamentele Pedagogiek.**

Landman, W. A., Kilian, C. J. G. and Roos, S. G.: **Denkwyses in die Opvoedkunde.**

Landman, W. A. and Kilian, C. J. G.: **Leesboek vir die Opvoedkundigestudent en onderwyser met Kernaantekeninge.**

Van der Stoep, F.: **Didaktiese Grondvorme.**

Van der Stoep, F. and Van der Stoep, O. A.: **Didactiese Orientasie.**

Van Dyk, C. J.: **Vanaf vorming (Bildung) tot Eksemplariese onderrig en leer:**

'n Didacties-Pedagogiese Strukturering.