

THE RELATION BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE IN THE WRITINGS OF W. A. LANDMAN*

R. P. van Rooyen

University of Fort Hare

1. Introduction to and an illumination of the concepts of “relation”, “theory”, and “practice”

1.1 Introduction

With reference to being human, according to Kockelmans, Heidegger states, “The essence of this being (Dasein) lies in its existence” (Kockelmans, 1964: 126), and Hengstenberg postulates, “Being and essentiality are connected in an ontological sense” (Hengstenberg, 1961: 185).

If these two statements are accepted, following Heidegger, essence refers to essentiality (Hengstenberg), that through human “being”, as acting being, validates the sense of existence. In this light, the essence and sense of the human way of being are viewed as synonyms. The figuring forth of human sense (implied by his reflecting on his existence) through making his essentiality become practice by means of his being, as acting being, immediately testifies to the practical and theoretical nature of human existence.

1.2 Relation

As a matter of intentionality, relation is described in the following ways, which also are necessary when considering the relation between theory and practice for Landman.

1.2.1 Relation in a “dynamic” context

* *Pedagogiekjoernaal*, 1988, Vol. 9, No. 1, 114-153. English translation by George D. Yomge, October 2002. Edited April 2025.

For Landman, when there is mention of the “relation between theory and practice”, the concept “relation” refers to relating as a dynamic existential matter which proclaims consciousness as intentionality. To relate himself to the pedagogical and/or theory—as practice—reveals the practitioner’s inquiring character and that he objectify, identify, anticipate, synthesize, connect, unite, associate and constitute. By relating to himself, he also proclaims a future perspective and he becomes directed to encountering and acquiring knowledge. His relating also reflects his view of life as is grounded in his religious convictions.

1.2.2 Relation in a “static” context

Conceptually, relation refers to a more static matter, in the sense that one finds oneself in a particular constituted condition or state in which the “finding” already testifies to an existential acting.

1.2.3 Relation as “proportionality”

In this sense, relation refers to a comparison between one matter and another in terms of size, quantity, quality, or grade, etc.

Regarding the relation between theory and practice, for Landman, the relation is considered to be a matter of relating in a static context rather than one of proportionality, but before preceding to this, the concepts “theory” and “practice” require closer illumination.

1.3 “Theory” and “practice”

1.3.1 Theory

The word ‘theory’ is derived from the Greek word “Theoria”, meaning a “looking for”, and “Theoreo”, meaning “to view”. Among other things, theory means a hypothesis, an exploration of the general or abstract categories of a science; science, or rules of a matter, in distinction from a practice, a philosophical explanation of phenomena (Oxford English Dictionary, 1970).

Now the question is, how does theory arise in the reality of practice? Heitger explains that, as soon as one reflects on pedagogical questions and makes judgments about them, as soon as they surface only as questions, one necessarily is a theoretician (Landman, Roos, and Van Rooyen, 1973: 132). According to H. Roth, questions posed in terms of reflection on the pedagogical already are elevated above the empirical as such. They imply a view of reality (Landman *et al.*, 1973: 134). The meaning of a theory is found in its possibilities of application because pedagogical activity is an active relationship between two persons (Elzer, 1968: 85). In theory forming, as a relation- and constituting-matter, the following aspects are identified:

a) Pre-scientific theory forming

According to the above pronouncements by Heitger, Roth, and Elzer, a person is an ontological being and, hence, is also theoretical in nature. From the beginning of human existence, parents and children have found themselves in pedagogic situations. If all existential action refers to an aim (or setting an aim), then from the beginning pedagogic actions have been a purposeful matter and its aim can be described as a particular form of theory because no aim can be realized without reflecting on actualizing it.

The initial and intuitive knowledge arising therefrom implies an implicit or verbally explicit “theory” regarding the pedagogic and is clearly and exclusively a matter of values, a hierarchy of values on which are founded the life views of educators in their relations with educands.

The pre-scientific nature of life view theory forming in no way is a sanction for the absence of possibilities which are relevant to the practitioner of the pedagogical as a science. Pre-scientific pedagogics with its implicit theories encompasses each structure and essence which can be disclosed by the scientist. This is confirmed by Landman when, in his reflections, he continually reaches back to the pre-scientific lifeworld.

b) “Expert” dogmas as theories

With the thriving of the educative practice of schools, general rules for a more uniform pedagogic course became necessary. H. Roth explains that doctrines of education, as a half-scientific literature and as emanating from practitioners must be described. Notwithstanding the “half-scientific” nature of this literature, nonetheless, it is invaluable because, as Landman says, it is “close to practice” (Landman *et al*, 1973: 134).

Indeed, these expert dogmas are prescriptive in nature and are not immune to a scientific analysis of pedagogic reality, and they provide little or no room for educator tact or personal decisions or choices by the co-constituents of the pedagogic situation.

But what formerly was described as educating should not merely be rejected under whatever circumstances. The value of the existing literature on pedagogics as a science, is described by Landman in his “Inleiding tot die Opvoedkundige Navorsing” [Introduction to Educational Research] and is made more explicit later in this article.

c) Science as theory

In section 1.3.1, it is noted that a theory implies “abstract categories” as well as “a philosophical explanation of phenomena”, thus, also of educative or pedagogic phenomena. “Explanation (of phenomena)” is connected with disclosing categories, essences, *existentialia*, being-structures, their hermeneutic interpretation and, on the other hand, is connected with the life view foundation on the basis of which the pedagogical phenomenon, as a pre-scientific matter, is constituted and, as a scientific field of reflection, can be structured and restructured in terms of these prereflective experiences of educating which have already been described. In this sense, Pedagogics, as a science (theory), is grounded in pre-scientific knowledge. “The latter comprises the pre-scientific view of life and of world, including religious beliefs” (Stoker, 1970: 184, in English). Stoker explains further, “In a

fundamental respect as well as in general outlines science is co-determined by pre-scientific knowledge, the latter having greater depth and being more comprehensive than the former” (Stoker, 1970: 184, in English). In distinctive ways, Oberholzer does not deny the above statements when he writes, “The theoretical (scientific) and the ideological (life view) are interwoven in a human’s way of being, but he stresses, “As a science which has possibilities of application he also is concerned with a reality which must be” (Oberholzer, 1968: 221).

The relation between value free theory (pedagogics), co-determined by pre-scientific knowledge, and his ideology, as reflected by his Christian-Calvinistic oriented hierarchy of preferred values, which unambiguously determine his choices and decisions are disclosed in excellent ways in Landman’s writings, also in the sense that theoretical structures (science) are asked to accommodate his ideological and life view essences. This also must be so. If “theory” cannot accommodate “ideology”, it is not the “ideology” but the “theory” which is wrong.

1.3.2 Practice

In terms of the ontological sense which a person encounters in his life reality in his factual presence, he is personally involved in working at bringing forth and fulfilling his own ontological sense by receiving, giving and creating meaning.

Merleau-Ponty refers to this practical life of receiving, creating, and fulfilling meaning as “praxis”. He also asserts, “Praxis means the movement of human existence as creative of meaning, the creation of meaning in dialogue with the world” (Kwant, 1962: 93)/[Kwant, 1963: 76 in English]. The concept “praxis” is formulated as follows by Runes, “Activity that has its goal within itself; conduct; distinguished from *poiesis*, or production, which aims at bringing into existence something distinct from the activity itself” (Runes, 1962: 248 in English). Further, “praxis” is described as answering a calling (Kritzinger, *et al*, 1985). In terms of the above, Landman’s pedagogics (science-theory), within which his explication of it’s

possibilities of application are included, can be described as “praxis”—as answering his calling. But, out of this broader meaning structure within which is included, the concepts “praxis” and “answering a calling”, the term “practice” is differentiated from “theory” in light of Runes’ statement regarding “practice”: “The deliberate application of a theory ... the organization of actuality according to some general principle. Sometimes opposed to, sometimes correlative with theory” (Runes, 1962: 245 in English). In this connection, “... the deliberate application ... of a theory and the ... organization of actuality ...”. according to generally valid categorical structures, does not necessarily or exclusively mean a purposeful application of Landman’s pedagogics as theory to, or a structuring or re-structuring the pedagogic by this, but rather a description of the application, structuring, and re-structuring possibilities of the theory which, if it occurs, will make a positive contribution to the pedagogic as an aspect of life reality of practice.

2. A more complete explanation of “theory” and “practice” according to W. A. Landman

In the scope of this article, only a few of Landman’s works are looked at with respect to Didactics, Psychopedagogics, Curriculum Studies, Research Methodology and Practice, Philosophy of Life, and the Course of a Lesson, and his popular scientific writings (for parents). His theory, called matters in collectivity, and his practice, in differentiated connections, is looked at. Before beginning to describe his theory and practice, the following matters must be illuminated in terms of his theory: Pre-scientific practice and Landman’s attunement to his life task as a scientist.

2.1 pre-scientific practice

Everything which “originates” in terms of human initiative, one knows that God is the Creator, the Source, the origin of everything. When someone is involved in practicing science, this is only a minimally adequate attempt to use what God has created as well as what is humanly possible to disclose, describe, formulate, and bring to light to “acquire” already existing “knowledge” and to structure and re-structure it and to place it at one’s own and other’s disposal for applying it and putting it to practice. Such human “originality”

depends on whether new connections or relations are laid among *universalia* or already existing relations or relationships are raised or reconstrued as no one ever has done before. Bringing these relations to light and the structuring and re-structuring of them is discussed by Landman as follows, “The attentive conversationalist with reality lets it be (places it in the present in its real essentiality) and the ‘letting be’ is what is meant by interpretation” (Landman *et al*, 1973: 6). The universality of the reality of educating is emphasized by Landman when he refers to it as a “... particular reality ... with its ... own structures ...” which can be distinguished by the thinking conscience of the critical viewer, but which can never be separated from each other in concrete educative situations” (Landman *et al*, 1973: 20).

An educative reality is life reality. Educative activities are matters of real life in which one receives, gives and constitutes meaning so that meaning fulfillment continually prospers. The concept “continually” indicates that, even with respect to scientifically supported and fortified “formal” educating, its pre-scientific nature will continually crop up because the scientist cannot put into words everything which is presupposed in terms of which educating is actualized and grounded. Thus, Landman writes, “When there is mention of a fundamental grounding of pedagogically founded lesson presentations, this means there is a question of their **origin** (or source)” (Landman, Mentz, Roos and Moller, 1982: 3). “This means that these essences must be seen as fundamental ways of being human (ways of living)” (Landman *et al*, 1982: 4). By “ways of being human”, the completion and consummation of his essences (onticities) with which he is created are presupposed. The meaning of his humanness evolves in terms of the ways in which he embodies his essences. Through his being, as being-activities, he can bring his essences to scientific expression. But it is just the co-determined impossibility of a human being to actualize the perfection (ontic) with which he is created, and which sanctions the continual search for the grounding of pedagogic situations.

The being aware of the orderly pre-scientific reality created by God is a philosophy of life matter. In this light, the following statements by Landman are quoted: “... in compliance with the fact that

- (a) educating is a philosophy of life reality, and
- (b) can not exist as a philosophy of life-free way of being a proper adult,

the fundamental pedagogical perspective must be accountable to philosophy of life meanings in situations of giving lessons” (Landman *et al*, 1983: 5). The fact that **educating** (i.e., an adult giving support to a non-adult with the aim of the latter’s becoming a proper adult) is **real** cannot be denied. “Educating really exists” (Landman, Roos and Mentz, 1979: 1). The places where the reality of educating appear for study are:

- (i) the everyday reality of educating
- (ii) literature
- (iii) the social sciences
- (iv) philosophical anthropology
- (v) life philosophy sources
 - (a) The Bible
 - (b) Christening ritual
 - (c) Marriage ritual
 - (d) Heidelberg Catechism
 - (e) The Netherland Creed
 - (f) The Dordrecht Cannons” (Landman *et al*, 1979: 5).

It is emphasized that the mentioned differentiated places where the reality of educating occurs do not presume different realities of educating but a meaningfully related unity, such as pre-scientific educating, because the totality of the meaningful purview of the pedagogic event is already present pre-scientifically. Making the evident, the ontic, verbally available in his writings is testimony to Landman’s “... scientific involvement with the reality of educating” (Landman, 1980: 1) as a pre-scientific life world practice.

2.2 W. A. Landman’s attunement (orientation) as scientist

In this connection, “attunement” is evaluated as conscious-acting intentionality. “Orientation” is derived from the Latin “oriens”, meaning to arise and, in this sense, is rooted in order. “Order” is derived from the Latin “Ordo” which, among other meanings, refers to origin, source (Oxford English Dictionary, 1970). In this light,

“orientation” is a matter of personal sense and “Personal sense is a creative innovation” (Hengstenberg, 1961: 185 in German) which has its point of origin in the person of the establisher of sense as a “condition” and not as a “cause”. In the case of Landman, his “attunement” is differentiated into the theoretical, the practical and the ideological. Because his sense of being is anchored in his attunement and by his ways of being, he gives evidence of it, these particularizations of his orientation are seemingly only “Theoretical” in nature. In each of his ways of being, the full range of the orientation of his personal being is expressed.

2.2.1 Theoretical attunement

Landman’s view and interpretation of science is well known by the majority of pedagogicians in South Africa. Thus, only the following few observations regarding his theoretical attunement suffice.

a) Phenomenology as a way of thinking

When Landman refers to the phenomenological method as one of the ways of thinking in terms of which the pedagogic can be described, there is mention of essences (Landman *et al*, 1979: 4). These essences are onticities, pre-conditions, possible conditions for constituting pedagogics as a science. Essences, as possible conditions, are purely rational constructions co-determined by the onticities of the pedagogic as a concrete, life reality and refer to pre-scientific, intuitive structuring of human being-in-the-world as a unity-in-function. In this light, essences are the being-thereness of and ways of meaning, as dynamic matters which appear to the thinker as possible conditions. Essences do not emerge by induction, deduction, metaphysical conviction, or rigid methods. The dynamic which is peculiar to disclosing essences is a primordial way of approaching essences as possible conditions which motivate the scientist-in-relation-to-the-pedagogic to actualize these preconditions.

For this reason, Landman’s phenomenological way of approaching the reality of educating is described as an attunement rather than a method. In this connection,

Landman explains himself, “The researcher who has practiced the phenomenological and eidetic reductions ought to have a worthwhile and worthy investigative attunement at his disposal” (Landman, 1980: 25).

That phenomenology is not a rigid method but points to an attunement by the scientist and that his attunement is subject to change because of shifting norms, values, and even hierarchies of values and other expansions of experience is emphasized further by Landman when he writes, “Because the phenomenological method can change from time to time, it is an enduring possibility of thinking ...” (Landman, 1980: 30).

To further emphasize Landman’s phenomenological attunement, his critical-careful pronouncements of five functions of fundamental pedagogics are only mentioned.

- “1.1 First function: Bringing fundamental preconditions to light
- 1.2 Second function: Describing and explaining the fundamental ways of thinking
- 1.3 Third function: Describing and explaining the fundamental grounding of the pedagogic
- 1.4 Fourth function: Describing and explaining criteria for being scientific
- 1.5 Fifth function: Describing and explaining the structural status of a philosophy of life” (Landman *et al*, 1979: 1-16).

Ontology is only possible as phenomenology (Heidegger), and phenomenology is only meaningful as ontology (Landman). Ontology, as the study of Being, implies a verification of its own methodology, i.e., phenomenology, although the latter does not produce an ontology, “... phenomenology is not merely useful but, indeed, is necessary for ontology” (Kwant, 1950: 289, in Dutch). Conversely, “... ontology is characterized precisely by its phenomenological ... orientation” (Strasser, 1967: 342, in English), and “Apparently, ... ontology is characterized by the fact that problems which used to be considered ‘solved’ in the light of logic,

are now treated within the framework of a ... phenomenology ...” (Strasser, 1967: 342-343, in English).

Expressions such as, “phenomenological ... *orientation*” and “now *treated* within the framework of a ... phenomenology”, are additional arguments that phenomenology is an attitude by which we enter an immediate, intuitive relationship with things (Spiegelberg, 1965: 241) that, by virtue of its ontological character, is anti-dualist, anti-constructivist, and anti-naturalist, and the phenomenologist is compelled to leave out of account [i.e., bracket] all co-determining subjectivities, hypotheses, and non-accountable traditional contingencies to make authentic ontological pronouncements possible.

The above pronouncements are also in evidence when a study is made of Landman’s constituted pedagogical structures and their essences which, at the same time, reflect his way of being, as a return “to the things themselves”, which in no sense presupposes an empiricist doctrine, but rather is a “matter of fact” (Van Peursen, 1967: 185 in German) as a particular attunement.

In this sense, we speak of a phenomenological accounting of “the *fundamental pedagogical*, which unfolds in the form of very general judgments regarding educating in general” (Strasser, 1967: 75 in Dutch). These “general judgments”, essences, or categorical structures, constituted in terms of a phenomenological way of thinking, are further tested, verified, and purposefully refined by means of the contradictory and dialectic ways of thinking.

b) The contradictory way of thinking

This way of thinking is explained by Landman as follows, “... to further verify the essence-status of what is seen as essential ... one meaningful way of dealing with them is to pose for each essence its contradiction as a possibility ... the presence of the contradiction ... means that it “ ... has reality-status ... , but the question is whether it has a right to exist in an authentic pedagogic situation. If ... it does ... “this means that the essence ... , does not have a right to exist and, thus, cannot be an educative essence. Then the essence and its contradiction are in conflict with each other. If elimination

is not possible because the contradiction, indeed, has a right to exist in an educative situation, the essence of which it is a contradiction is not a real essence but is its contradiction. “Not having the right to exist of the one, confirms the right of the other to exist”. A meaningful method is “... to place an educative essence against its negation. If such an essence can be arbitrarily replaced by its contradiction, it cannot have ontological status. The ontological principle of contradiction is stated as follows by Hessen, “a being cannot simultaneously be and not be, or the being and non-being of the same being exclude each other ... The pedagogical meaninglessness of a contradiction lies in the fact that the pedagogic not only is more obscured, altered, and concealed by this contradiction but is even nullified by it. Hence, the pedagogician looks for essences, i.e., for the non-contradictory, for the generally valid and what cannot be thought away” (Landman *et al*, 1979: 8). In addition, Landman asserts that “meaningful ways of living have the right and necessity to exist in the educative event. Their contrasts (contradictions) do not, since they have a paralytic effect on a child’s becoming adult” (Landman, 1980: 16).

His pedagogical structures and essences are further refined by means of the dialectic way of thinking.

c) The dialectic way of thinking

According to Landman, fundamental pedagogics is essence pedagogics, and he explains, “To be pedagogically meaningful, an essence must be actualizable in pedagogic situations. It must fit meaningfully into a way of actualizing which is triadic in nature” (Landman *et al*, 1979: 9). “Triadic” refers to three essences: A first, a second, and a third where, in terms of a Kirkegaardian dialectic, there is mention of a movement between two possibilities which evolve into a third, but not in reality itself, where movement (consciousness) is presupposed: “Consciousness (*bewussyn*) is an awareness of being (*bewus-van-syn*), and this refers to being conscious of two ways of being (first and second possibility) which must be united (synthesized). The synthesis, then, really is a joining together” (Landman *et al*, 1973: 34-36) and “the sense of a particular essence is that it makes possible the actualization of another essence. Thus, there is a meaningful relationship between

the two essences. The meaning of pedagogical (educative) association, with its **being-by** each other of child and adult, is that it is a precondition for their **being-with** each other in pedagogical encounter; persons first must be by each other before they can deepen their relationship to the intimacy of being-with each other. Thus, the significance of a pedagogical encounter is that it makes possible the emergence of educative matters (an adult notices a reason why he must intervene with a child) on the basis of which the educating adult assumes responsibility to intervene pedagogically (interfere or approve), followed by the intervention itself” (Landman, 1979: 10).

The pedagogical structures, as described by Landman, not only figure forth from his phenomenological attunement, but also from a dialectic way of thinking within which his synthesizing thinking is expressed. In this sense, his structures are evidence of ordered changes in ways of being, from a one-sided, attenuated antinomic vision to a systematic elevation to form a synthesis.

Brief reference to the Hegelian dialectic follows because, on the one hand, it has a particular relationship to the Kirkegaardian dialectic and, on the other hand, because of Cohn’s statement regarding the Hegelian vision (Landman *et al*, 1973: 28). In the Hegelian dialectic, a thesis and an antithesis (not a real contradiction) are reconciled into a synthesis. The synthesis “... is a unity within which both the thesis’ and antithesis’ moments of truth are preserved and both are synthesized” (Landman *et al*, 1973: 31-33), for example, where the actualization of the educator’s responsibility (anthropological category) [thesis], and the lesser, even non-responsibility of the child (anthropological category) [antithesis], are reconciled into the synthesis “pedagogical responsibility” through the intervention of the educator paired with the complementary activities of the child, in which the moments of truth of both the thesis and antithesis are preserved.

With respect to the Hegelian dialectic, Cohn writes, “Thesis and hetero-thesis ... cannot be elevated to a synthesis” (Landman *et al*, 1973: 34). This “can mean that a contradiction of an essence of educating must first disappear through giving real pedagogic support before the dialectic movement can again proceed

authentically” (Landman *et al*, 1973: 34); for example, no pedagogic attentiveness between educator and child can come to a synthesis if the child is “complimented, in the total absence of support from the educator. By giving real pedagogic support, the absence of the child’s attentiveness must be restored to its opposite before the dialectic movement can again proceed authentically.

Mentioned below are Landman’s phenomenological-contradictory and -dialectically constituted pedagogical structures but which, by implication, presuppose their essences:

“A. Pedagogical relationship structures

- 1) Relationship of understanding
- 2) Relationship of trust
- 3) Relationship of authority

B. Pedagogical sequence structures

- 1) Association
- 2) Encounter
- 3) Engagement
- 4) pedagogical intervention
 - a) educative intervention
 - b) educative approval
- 5) Return to association
- 6) Periodic breaking away

C. Pedagogical activity structures

- 1) Giving meaning
- 2) Exerting
- 3) Exemplifying norms
- 4) Venturing
- 5) Gratitude
- 6) Accountability
- 7) Hope
- 8) Design
- 9) Realization
- 10) Human dignity
- 11) Self-knowledge
- 12) Freedom

D. Pedagogical aim structures

- 1) Meaningful existence
- 2) Self-judgment and understanding
- 3) Human dignity
- 4) Morally independent choosing and acting
- 5) Responsibility
- 6) Norm-identification
- 7) Philosophy of life” (Landman *et al*, 1982: 6.1 Scheme A).

“... a phenomenological accounting of fundamental pedagogics” can result in “... content being poor” (Strasser, 1967: 74-75 in Dutch) if these pedagogicalians do not engage in the hermeneutic way of thinking and invoke their philosophy of life regarding what is proper in their practice of science.

c) The hermeneutic way of thinking

In this context, Landman writes, “When a matter is interpreted to show what it serves, what its function and meaning are, is to engage in hermeneutics... The hermeneutic question is, what is served by this real pedagogical essence which has been disclosed phenomenologically? Thus, what is its function and significance? From this, the use of the hermeneutic method can be typified as ‘further thinking’ about the essence”. In terms of the above statements, Landman describes the relatedness among the phenomenological, the contradictory, the dialectic, and the hermeneutic ways of thinking for disclosing pedagogical structures, their essences, and their significance as follows: “The purpose of the hermeneutic is *understanding* the ... meaning of ways of being for educative practice ...; of the *pedagogic task* of actualizing each way of being ...; and ... of understanding the pedagogical terms which must be used in their actualization”. “A meaningful hermeneutic rule is that the whole can be understood from its parts and each part from the whole ... Interpretation is the task of hermeneutics ...” (Landman *et al*, 1973: 158-161).

In elucidating and verifying the above, he writes, “Because he has gone through all the foregoing steps of thinking, he already understands a great deal about what educating essentially is and its

significance ... What must now follow is an *amplification of the interpretation*. The amplification of the interpretation lies in the pedagogician giving a description of what is served by the real essences ... In the reality of educating itself, it must be established what is served by such essences ... The actualization of each possible essence must serve to promote the aim of educating and be interpreted in connection with the aim of educating” (Landman *et al*, 1982: 91).

The verification and conviction of Landman’s hermeneutic attunement are sanctioned by the following quotations: By going through the preceding steps of thinking, “... He already understands a great deal about what educating essentially is and its significance”. This also presupposes that, in the use of each of the mentioned ways of thinking, the hermeneutic is implicitly present in an integrated capacity. “What must now follow is an amplification of the interpretation” by which the hermeneutic is given an explicit role.

When there is mention of steps and ways of thinking in Landman’s pedagogics (theory), this should not be interpreted as having a factual, phase like nature, as though each step or way of thinking functions as a compartmentalized, exclusive singularity in his practice of science. The integrated nature of his thinking also forms the unitary ground in terms of which his steps of thinking are realized and are developed in logically interlinked successive steps to constitute his science as a unity. In this regard, Landman himself writes, “In the above, it is indicated how the contradictory, ... the hermeneutic, ... and the dialectic ... methods can be used as steps of the phenomenological method” (Landman *et al*, 1979: 11).

The particularization of his mutually complementary ways and steps of thinking is constitutive of the unitary ways he practices science, and which finally is defined by his philosophy of life.

2.2.2 Philosophy of life

Philosophy of life is a matter of values and their hierarchies. In this regard, Oberholzer explains, “Each person possesses such a hierarchy of preferred values of which he himself is not always aware or can give an account of but which, in unconscious and

unambiguous ways, determine his life of choices and decisions” (Oberholzer, 1968: 201). A life view, being anchored in values, is expressed by the same author as follows, “The concept of life view, then, also is described as the totality of beliefs regarding what is life valuable as the enduring and highly valued, and thereby as what is life obligatory and demanding” (Oberholzer, 1968: 203).

Persons live their philosophy of life. Landman writes, “It is the case that to live in the light of a philosophy of life is a demand for propriety to which obedience by an adult is expected. Thus, the aim of educating is to help a child in continually increasing degrees to live in accordance with the philosophy of life of the educators” (Landman, 1972: 88). He emphasizes this when he writes that “... all educating is realizing a philosophy of life” (Landman et al, 1979: 84).

The fact that in section 2.2.1(c) D “Philosophy of life” is listed as the last and final pedagogical aim structure is an affirmation that each of the previous aim structures is determined by and, at the same time, corroborative of his statement that all educating is realizing a philosophy of life.

The pedagogical structure of a philosophy of life is explained by Landman in terms of the following:

- “1. Particularity
2. Demanding
3. Historicity
4. Non-hereditary
5. Constancy (stabilizing)
6. Identity
7. Meta-scientific
8. Answerable to the demands of full humanness” (Landman et al. 1982: 6.6, Scheme F).

But the question is, on what philosophy of life does the above structure owe thanks for its right and necessity to exist? The unambiguous answer is contained in Landman’s following statement: “The Christian-Protestant view of the aim of educating as spiritual adulthood” (Landman, 1972: 102); the Calvinist realization

of “the teaching aim” which is “... Christ-centered” (Landman et al. 1979: 94): “Each person is part of a people. This also means that each people have the right (and the duty) to preserve, protect, ,and allow the development of that which is valuable to them, e.g., their own culture” (Landman et al, 1979:186); and “Just as with any other people, Afrikaaners lay claim to their own character as a people, and they are proud and have a right to be proud of what is their own. Some essences which fundamentally characterize the Afrikaans national philosophy of life are their own:

- (i) faith
- (ii) native country
- (iii) community
- (iv) ideology
- (v) history and tradition
- (vi) mother tongue, and
- (vii) educational policy” (Landman et al, 1979: 179).

His description of the Christian Calvinist view of life and his few mentioned essences of the Afrikaans national view of life are presupposed by him and interlaced with his pedagogical structures, with their implied essences, and confirm his own Christian national view of life and find additional expression in his practical [post-scientific, post-phenomenological] attunement.

2.2.3 Practical attunement

Here the concern is with the possibilities of actualizing his pedagogical structures and with respect to the following disciplines (part-perspectives) and matters:

a) The didactic

If theoretical views and concepts are not demonstrable in practice, it is not the practice but the theory which is amiss. Conversely, Dorpfeld explains that there is nothing more practical than a good theory (Saylor, 1968: 184).

In the light of the the above, Landman has provided irrefutable evidence that his theoretical groundings are not only demonstrable

in practice but, indeed, illuminate practice and that especially by effectively implementing them, practice is enriched and improved.

In his article, “The scientific attunement of the teacher”, Landman clearly describes why a teacher’s scientific attunement not only can make a meaningful contribution to practical understanding, but especially to improving the practice in which he finds himself as a pedagogue. He describes scientific attunement as: being faithful to reality; critical method application; keen collection of knowledge; and attributing meaning so that it is anchored in his fundamental pedagogical methodology. With reference, e.g., to the section “Scientific attunement as faithfulness to reality”, the following scientific demands are posed: “Sharpening attending; rejecting superficiality; eliminating naïve prejudices; and conquering timid thinking, deficient light and lack of vigilance”, the presence of phenomenological, dialectic, contradictory and hermeneutic ways of thinking, as fixed by his philosophy of life attunement are evident (Landman, 1982: 6-16).

In terms of Van der Stoep and Louw’s views, “The theory of teaching or the scientific analysis of the teaching activity is called ‘didactics’ ... To explain briefly, one can say that the word ‘didactics’ embraces the entire activity of teaching and of being taught ... For these reasons, the educational and teaching situations cannot be divorced from each other; one is the obverse of the other” (Van der Stoep and Louw, 1984: 28-29 in English), it is evident that didactic matters lays claim to fundamental pedagogical findings. The book, “Fundamental Pedagogics and Giving a Lesson”, is a direct result of these findings. In this connection, Landman writes, “If fundamental pedagogics is to contribute to the preparation for giving an effective lesson, the following two aspects must be attended to:

- a) fundamental pedagogics must make a meaningful contribution to the understanding of giving a lesson; and
- b) fundamental pedagogics must disclose ‘new’ knowledge about giving a lesson, i.e., provide knowledge which is not established by other disciplines” (Landman *et al*, 1982: 1)

To be able thereby to improve the practice of presenting a lesson.

Landman also writes, “Essences, whose actualization in the school situation of giving a lesson is indispensable for a child’s becoming a proper adult are the following:

- School essences
- The lesson-giving situation: educative field for the teacher
- Fundamental pedagogical structures
- Fundamental pedagogical essences and school essences: a synthesis
- Essences of the modes of learning and school essences: a synthesis
- Essences of the course of a lesson and school essences” (Landman *et al*, 1982: 6).

In terms of the above, Landman goes further and indicates the practical outcomes of the mentioned complex of interwoven structures in the context of school practice, as a matter of giving a lesson.

Because the following chapter in the book mentioned deals with the aims of giving a lesson from a fundamental pedagogical view (Landman *et al*, 1982: 76) and then, within the light of school essences, it is necessary for one to refer to pages 11-12 of this work where Landman has made his mentioned school essences explicit.

The description of these aims is a further indication of the masterful way in which he brings forth his fundamental pedagogical structures and essences in meaningfully related and mutually supportive connections with the essentials of the didactic.

In the last chapter of this book, his didactic aims culminate, in a masterful way, in an image of adulthood (Landman *et al* 1982: 139) in which also all his mentioned essences of the sequence of a lesson are intercepted. In his description of this, his own attunement is shown when he prescriptively holds before the Christian educator the nature and essence of propriety [for a believer]: “An adult is

someone who ... does what is proper for the sake of the proper ... The Christian adult knows of the pleasure of God in the proper (good work). I know your labors and your work and your meekness and that you cannot tolerate evil men” (Landman *et al*, 1982: 145).

In the third chapter of the book under consideration, Landman discusses “Giving a lesson: Philosophy of life permissibility”, in which he analyzes the following philosophy of life matters which have significance for giving a lesson:

- a) A philosophy of life permissible course of a lesson
- b) The equipment the Christian teacher must have at his disposal (Landman *et al*, 1982: 150).

In the matter of (a), among other things, he refers to and describes what is life valuable, life obligatory, and life demanding (Landman *et al*, 1982: 153), i.e., “... life principles” (Landman *et al*, 1982: 153) that in the school “... certainly have a necessary place in giving a lesson”. For life principles to acquire “practical significance, ... the school needs particular means ... the means which is most prominent... is ... the lesson...”. The aim of the course of a lesson and of teaching itself, once again is a confirmation of Landman’s own life actualization, i.e., “The glory of God is the highest final aim of educative teaching” [for a believer]. For a Calvinist, “The teaching aim ... then in its deepest essence is Christ-centric” (Landman *et al*, 1982: 155-156).

With reference to the chapter, “A fundamental pedagogical view of class discipline”, Landman writes, “From a fundamental pedagogical view, this has to do with maintaining class discipline by satisfying those essences described as “ways of teacher and pupil living together with demands of propriety in orderly ways” (Landman *et al*, 1982: 174). These essences are emphatically brought to the fore in section 4.4 “Class discipline: practical points which demonstrate its pedagogical grounding (Landman *et al*, 1982: 191-204.

This grounding reflects the total comprehensiveness of its fundamental pedagogical structures and essences, i.e., the pedagogical relationship, sequence, activity, and aim structures. This chapter is ended with explicit practical advice to teachers, on

the one hand, regarding conduct which is conducive to maintaining class discipline and, on the other hand, a decent teaching style in which “consistency” is emphasized and the risks of “excesses” are indicated (Landman *et al*, 1982: 210-214).

2.2 Psychopedagogics

Landman’s attunement as a practitioner is described in a better way by himself as follows, “Since fundamental pedagogics also has the task of expressing itself about its own practical application, it is interested in such possibilities”, and further, with respect to psychopedagogics, “one matter which has a particular influence on making fundamental-pedagogical essences practical is LEARNING. In the chapter following this one, educative learning and the modes of learning, as disclosed by psychopedagogics, are viewed fundamental-pedagogically. As already stated, learning is a necessary didactic matter, and, hence, Landman purports that “Because educative learning occurs, among other times, during the course of a lesson, there also is reference to this particular mode of didactic life ... as founded in the philosophy of life of the educator” (Landman *et al*, 1979: 18).

The convergent nature of fundamental pedagogics is disclosed in a radically effective way by Landman in his tabular structure “Educational Field” (Landman *et al*, 1979: 81) in which the union of fundamental-, didactic- and psycho-pedagogical essences, by making practical the fundamental-pedagogical, confirms that pedagogics is an undivided, indivisible unitary construction. The fundamental pedagogical relationship, sequence, activity, and philosophy of life structures integrate with and form the means of convergence among the modes of learning, as particular activities, relationships with reality and the essences of the sequence of a lesson for practice to culminate in the pedagogical aim structure. How this is realized in practice is shown by Landman in an immediately preceding table (Landman *et al*, 1979: 58-80).

In practice, *learning* is an anthropological category, but also a pedagogical one in the pedagogic situation where the adult leads a child on the course to proper adulthood and is described by Landman as follows: “Educative learning occurs ... when the joint

actualization of the modes of learning and their accompanying fundamental pedagogical essences lead to change in world relationships in the direction of proper adulthood; ... Question: With what reality are relationships established and improved in school? Answer: With the reality which is represented in the form of school subjects divided into lessons” (Landman, 1983: 16-17). Landman the practitioner is understood further by his quotation that “ ... The effect ... of actualizing teaching, learning, the anthropological, the fundamental pedagogical, in compliance with meaningful subject contents, is that the child’s relationships to reality are actualized on continually higher levels until the level of adequate proper adulthood is reached” (Landman, 1983: 19-20)—a quotation which refers to the attempt to continually refine and improve practice. With respect to the guidance program and the improvement of practice by using it, Landman suggests the following preconditions for the guidance conversation:

- “(a) Gratitude for security ...
- (b) venturing with the guide,
- (c) self understanding,
- (d) hope in the future” (Landman *et al*, 1979: 90).

Also improving cultural relationships by the teacher requires mention of the following statement about this: “A scientifically founded attitude with respect to cultural relationships, thus, will rest on manifesting essences of human relationships and on the effective actualization of these essences in practice” (Landman *et al*, 1979: 184).

Landman’s practical attunement is further expressed in his curriculum studies.

c) Curriculum studies

In his article, “A few meanings of the concept “philosophy” and their implications for curriculum study”, Landman discusses the contributions which philosophy can make to curriculum study in terms of radical criticism, epistemology, and the clarification of paradigms on the basis of which one can think through to a number of fundamental aspects of curriculum building and their practical

significance. Regarding his “philosophy as a radical criticism”, he refers to “Re-conceptualizing curriculum thinking”, which points to a position against the domination of contemporary curriculum theory by a technological establishment and way of thinking: “One of the various directions of thought within the re-conceptualization movement is the stream of existential phenomenology ... where there is a search for... the person in the curriculum” (Landman, 1985: 122). “Emphasis on personal experience, the personal attribution of meaning, and personal dignity are unique to existential thinking” (Landman, 1985: 123).

Curriculum constitution refers to its epistemological nature by which, on the one hand, the essences are an accurate description of practice and, on the other hand, must be made demonstrable in practice if it is to make pronouncements about authentic practice. This knowledge must give evidence of:

- (a) Lifeworld significant as experientiable facts with lifeworld meaning.
- (b) Thoughtful perceiving directed to essences.
- (c) Attentive actualization which must result in meaningful activity.

As Landman states, what is meaningful is “valuable for me”, which refers to what is permissible by one’s philosophy of life. His practical ways of being, founded in his philosophy of life are confirmed in the following quotation: “Selection of curriculum content and the establishment of aims for the Christian educator must be synchronized with the central thoughts of Christian and national education” (Landman, 1985: 124).

A paradigm, as an axiomatic system of assumptions, also regarding curriculum thought, must be reliable, i.e., useable, it must not only have possibilities of application but really be put into practice. Landman refers to the following criteria of reliability: “Credibility, transferability, stability, and validity” (Landman, 1985: 125).

Finally, Landman refers to the practical involvement of parents and teachers when curriculum planning is for implementation in pedagogic practice.

(d) Research methodology and practice

This is yet another field of thought to which Landman certainly has contributed to the improvement of the practice of bringing up a child. Research is “creative and systematic investigative work which requires increasing scientific and technological knowledge, but its primary characteristic is designing specific applications for this”, writes Landman and also, “The aim is to improve the practice of schooling and, at the same time, to form the involved teacher(s)” (Landman, 1980: 4-5). Educational research methodology “... must be interpreted in terms of educative aims. In this way, practical significance is emphasized” (Landman, 1980: 7). Additional quotations which emphasize his practical concerns are: “... the researcher is on the path to improving practice with his program of research” (Landman, 1984: 9). With reference to the *principle of contradiction* Landman declares: “Only one of these two activities can lead to the genuine improvement of practice” (Landman, 1984: 11). “Meaningful replication in the research summary, conclusions, and recommendations is one way in which a future is designed and a future in which meanings are acquired by research and which can be applied to improve practice” (Landman, 1981: 13). “Open methods refer to a flexible ... program of research ... which can make a contribution to expanding knowledge and eventually to improving practice” (Landman, 1986: 2).

An additional reflection of Landman’s practical orientation is his awareness that others before him have in all probability already covered in one way or another the reality in which he involves himself. In this light, he makes the following statement: “Evaluating meaningful and relevant knowledge contained in the literature must occur: The most effective way to do this (i.e., test its essentiality) is by studying the literature ... educative situations. By studying the literature, the researcher must determine the quality of the research; answering the question of what is the point, can only occur against the background of an intensive study of the literature” (Landman, 1980: 33). “When there is mention of the effective study of the literature”, Landman writes, “effective” actually means “phenomenologically confirmed” (Landman, 1980: 37). For this reason, Landman uses his practical phenomenological steps of

thinking, i.e., thinking away, acting away, separating, contradicting and the hermeneutic as criteria for studying the literature (Landman, 1980: 37-38).

It also seems clear from Landman's work that, in addition to literature studies, conversations with experts, conversations with teachers and also knowledge from one's own experience can provide valuable practical contributions to the course of the research. Knowledge acquired in these ways must be reduced "... to certain criteria (for example, the phenomenological steps of thinking used categorically) ... "This categorically selected knowledge must meet the following demands:

- (i) be free of errors and mistakes;
- (ii) be free of preconceptions; and
- (iii) be verifiable (testable)" (Landman, 1980: 43-44).

With respect to the "Educational experiment", Landman writes: "The aim is to disclose by methodically accountable work meaningful relations and principles which can contribute to the solution of practical problems. However, the research must be organized in such a way that the conclusions to which it leads also can be generalized so that the practice of teaching in its totality can be benefited by them" (Landman, 1980: 82).

It is evident that, by Landman's actualization of his own life praxis, he interweaves a variety of methods and methodologies with his phenomenological attunement which, conversely gives evidence of his phenomenological attunement and is reflected in the chapter which deals with "Description as a research methodology" (Landman, 1980: 105). That one cannot do "everything" with phenomenology is true—but Landman has confirmed repeatedly and in irrefutable ways that a phenomenological attunement is a precondition of all research methods for their results regarding pedagogy as practice to be meaningful.

e) Popular science (for parents)

Knowledge is generally valid factual structures, rationally-constituted-in relation with reality and the peculiarity of the

possessor of it, by which such phenomena, in their pre-scientific quality, are intuitively implemented to bring them forth. In this light, knowledge must be of such a nature that it not only can be used in the situations in which it is constituted and obtained, or even in post-scientific ways, but the criterion of knowledge is found in its pre-scientific essentialities for the prescientific practitioner of the practice, to disclose as criteria with the aim of improving his pedagogy. Landman also succeeds in achieving this in his “Textbook for the Christian Educator”.

In the first chapter, he provides an overview of the task of the educator regarding what educating, preconditions for educating, and educative aims include (Landman, 1972: 13-20) and are dealt with separately in the subsequent three chapters.

Already in the first chapter, it is evident (as it is in all the previously mentioned works of Landman), which his constituted pedagogical structures, is not only theoretical but also has practical value. It is always the case that the theoretical value is sanctioned by its practically valid usability.

In chapter two of the mentioned work on educating, it is described how his pedagogical activity phenomena, put into practice, are illuminative of the pedagogic event as a co-existential matter between educator and child—a practical matter in which the validity of his pedagogical activity structures are vouched for.

The obviousness and ease with which he interweaves his philosophy of life with discussions of his pedagogical activity structures (and other pedagogic structures) and allows them to merge, provide evidence of the authentic nature of his pedagogical structures, but especially of the genuineness of his Christian-National philosophy of life. With respect to the pedagogical activity structure “Meaning”, Landman signifies for the Christian educator the meaning by which the child is helped must be the meaning of the glory of God. The teacher must help the child see that history ... is an event willed by God. The child must know of the guiding Hand of God in the unique history of a people” (Landman, 1972 34, 35).

In the following chapter, he converges his pedagogical relationship and sequence structures to once again turn them over to their practical nature, as rooted in the life view of the pedagogical as life reality. With respect to pedagogic intervention, as a matter of understanding, trust, and especially authority, Landman writes, “Educative understanding is actualized when the educator disapproves of the not valued (anti-life philosophy) way the child is following or will follow” (Landman, 1972: 79).

With respect to the aim of educating, Landman asserts, “Therefore, it also can be said that the aim of educating is to help a child to increasingly and gradually live in accordance with the life philosophy of the educators” (Landman, 1972: 88).

The meaning of Landman’s pedagogical structures lies especially in their significance for embodying one’s own philosophy of life in pedagogic practice. This holds for the pedagogical structures of meaning in their entire purpose or in terms of the to be distinguished nature of each. For example, on the one hand, “... all educating ... is ... actualizing a philosophy of life” (Landman, 1979: 84) and, on the other hand, “The spiritually adult Christian’s life of choices and actions then are characterized by:

- a Christian acceptance and bestowal of trust ...
- a Christian involvement and encounter with persons, ...
- a Christian hope for the future ...
- a Christian freedom to responsibility” (Landman, 1972: 103).

3. In closing

His fundamental pedagogical structures, his theory then culminates in his following statement about the Christian educator: “This means that his educative activities will be so saturated with his Christian philosophy of life that, indeed, it will be Christian educative activities in a Christian educative situation” (Landman, 1972: 100) as a matter of Landman’s practical thinking and practice-directed attunement.

With Landman, theory and practice provide evidence that ontological sense does not originate through human being alone. If all consciousness-transcending data were dependent on human being for their force of being, they could not hold as a measure of the human creation of meaning. But in his initiative to establish relationships with his Creator, with others, with himself, and with things in his world, ontological meaning is “encountered” by which he establishes “personal sense” in correlation with the ontological measure of meaning by which such a personal meaning is accomplished.

Ontological and personal meaning are reciprocally related matters of relationships and when a study is made of Landman’s work, it becomes clear how the synchronized categorical structures of the scientist arise in a complementary relationship with the ontological meaning of the pedagogical reality, which gives rise to the scientist constituting a pedagogical reality.

AUTHOR’S ENGLISH SUMMARY

THE RELATION BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE IN THE WRITINGS OF W. A. LANDMAN

In accordance with the relation between theory and practice in the writings of W. A. Landman, it is evident that the concepts of relation, theory, and practice are to be illuminated. In this context “relation” must be seen as acts between theory and practice. The interrelated, mutually determined acts between theory and practice become evident. Theory, as a contemplation about real life issues implies a transcending of those issues, which means constituting phenomena by means of experiences collected about those cases. These cases refer to the practice, a relationship constituted by means of the ways the human being exists in a reality. Thus, a description of a reality, a theory, can also be seen as the practice of that human being who devotes his life to describing phenomena.

However, there is a distinction made between Landman’s theory and practice. His “theory” is his description of the pedagogical phenomenon from a fundamental point of view. The authenticity of his theory is proved by revealing the possibilities of his harmonious

integration of his theory with the practical actualizations of the following pedagogical fields and relevant matters: didactics, psychopedagogics, curriculum studies, research methodology, and research practice, one's philosophy of life, the progress of a lesson in school, and his popular scientific description of pedagogy (to parents).

The phenomenological method, which Landman applies to describe his constituted pedagogical phenomena, should be seen as a flexible inclination which changes in accordance with the expansion of his experience about pedagogical phenomena and the altering of his life's point of view in accordance with the convergence of emphases on issues like norms and values, rather than a rigid unbendable naturalistic method. In all his writings, his methodological attitude is sanctioned as an inclination, by the fact that his phenomenological method is entwined and intertwined with other methods, such as the dialectic, contradictory, and hermeneutic methods.

The practical existence of Landman is seen in his descriptions of the ways his fundamental pedagogical theory can be implemented in the above-mentioned pedagogical perspectives. An authentic scientific description (theory) must be demonstrable in real life situations (practice) otherwise, not the practice but the theory is wrong. In these description, he also proved that his theory is not only demonstrable in practice but, in fact, is a necessity for the improvement of the practice in pedagogic situations.

Since, in pedagogic situations, the adult is confronted by the child as he is, but also as he should be, scientific descriptions of pedagogical structures and essences must inevitably include the essentials of one's life point of view, as prescriptions to those who actualize the same hierarchy of norms and values determining their lives. In this context, the unmistakable Christian-national outlook on life is exposed in all Landman's books and articles, as part of his theoretical descriptions to be realized in practice.

REFERENCES

- Elzer, H. M. (1968). **Einführung in die Paedagogik**. Frankfurt am Main: Moritz Diesterweg.
- Hengstenberg, H. (1961). **Freiheit und Seinsordnung**. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- Kockelmans, A. (1964). **Martin Heidegger**. The Hague: Lannoo, Second edition.
- Kritzinger, M. S. B. et al. (1972). **Verklarende Afrikaanse Woordeboek**. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Kwant, R. C. (1962). **De Fenomenologie van Merleau-Ponty**. Utrecht: Aula Boeken. Kwant, R. C. (1963). **The Phenomenology of Merleau-Ponty**. Pittsburg: Duquesne University Press. [My addition—G.D.Y.]
- Kwant, R. C. (1950). Fenomenologie en Ontologie. In **Annalen van het Thijmgenootschap** number III.
- Landman, W. A. (1985). Enkele betekenis van die begrip filosofie en die implikasies daarvan vir kurrimumstudie. **Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Opvoedkunde** 5 (3).
- Landman, W. A. (1984). **Fenomenologiese begronding van die Navorsingsprogram**. Article: Department of Fundamental Pedagogics, University of Pretoria.
- Landman, W. A. (1983). Leer, gesien vanuit Fundamenteel-pedagogiese perspektief. **Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Opvoedkunde** 3 (1).
- Landman, W. A. (1982). Wetenskapliheid van die Onderwyser. **Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Opvoedkunde** 2 (1/2).
- Landman, W. A. (1986). **Die Fenomenologies-verantwoorde Navorsingsprogram**. Department of Fundamental Pedagogics, University of Pretoria.
- Landman, W. A. (Ed.) (1980). **Inleiding tot die opvoedkundige Navorsingspraktyk**. Durban: Butterworth.
- Landman, W. A. (1972). **Leessboek vir die Christen-opvoeder**. Pretoria: NG Kerkboekhandel.

- Landman, W. A. and Roos, S. G. (1973). **Fundamentele Pedagogiek en die Opvoedingswerklikheid.** Durban: Butterworth.
- Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Mentz, N. J. (1979). **Fundamentele Pedagogiek, Leerwyses en vakonderrig.** Durban: Butterworth.
- Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Van Rooyen, R. P. (1973). **Die Praktykwording van die Fundamentele Pedagogiek.** Pretoria: Perskor.
- Landman, W. A., Kilian, C. J. G., Swanepoel, M. E. and Bodenstein, H. C. A. (1982). **Fundamentele Pedagogiek.** Cape Town: Juta and Kie.
- Landman, W. A., Mentz, N. J., Roos, S. G., and Moller, T. (1982). **Fundamentele Pedagogiek en Lesgee.** Durban: Butterworth.
- OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY (The). (1970). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Oberholzer, C. K. (1968). **Prolegomena van 'n Prinsipiele Pedagogiek.** Cape Town: HAUM.
- Runes, D. D. (1968). **Dictionary of Philosophy.** Littlefield: Adams and Co.
- Sayler, W. M. (1968). **Das Verhaltnis von Theorie und Praxis in der Pedagogik.** Munich: Ernst Reinhart.
- Spiegelberg, H. (1965). **The Phenomenological Movement.** Second Edition, Volume 1. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Stoker, H. G. (1970). **Oorsprong en rigting.** Volume II. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Strasser, S. (1967). **Opvoedingswetenskap en Opvoedingswijsheid.** Fourth Edition. Hertogenbosch: LCG Malberg's.
- Strasser, S. (1967). Phenomenologies and Psychologies. In Lawrence, N. et al. **Readings in Existential Phenomenology.** Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Van der Stoep, F. and Louw, W. J. (1984). **Didactics.** Pretoria: Academica.

Van Peursen, C. A. (1967). **Fenomenologie en Werklijkheid.**
Utrecht: Aula.