

## CHAPTER 3

### SOME CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT DESIGNING AN ORTHODIDACTIC LESSON

In the previous chapter a number of constituents of a disharmonious teaching situation were disclosed. To eliminate this disharmony, it is obvious that the orthodidactician would have to focus on them to establish a harmonious lesson design. Each of the constituents must be discussed in such a way that particularized orthodidactic activities can arise from them.

Superficially, it appears as if the constituents of a disharmonious teaching situation and particularized orthodidactic activities are poles apart and have nothing in common. Indeed, this is so. Yet both play a cardinal role in a didactic lesson design. Thus, particularized teaching activities cannot be devised without a penetrating analysis of the constituents of what is disharmonious. In other words, if the disturbed essences of a lesson structure are not placed under a magnifying glass and thoroughly analyzed accountable steps cannot be taken to eliminate them.

This points the way for an orthodidactician to correctly attend to the constituents of a disharmonious teaching situation. In practice this amounts, among other things, to an analysis of the data from the orthodidactic diagnostics in order to determine a beginning situation. In other words, all of the personal, social, situational and school data must be considered in formulating the teaching aim.<sup>1)</sup>

It has been emphasized repeatedly that an orthodidactic lesson, in its essential structure, does not differ from an ordinary lesson. Consequently, the educative event progresses by means of a lesson situation,<sup>2)</sup> and because any orthodidactic intervention can be nothing more than educating, an orthodidactic event is a lesson in the true sense of the word. However, the orthodidactic nature of such a lesson is in its different approaches, nuances and particularizations.

In order to better illuminate the similarities and differences between an orthodidactic and an ordinary didactic lesson, what follows refers briefly to the differences and correspondences between subject didactics and orthodidactics that parallel taking into account an ordinary and an orthodidactic event, respectively.

## 1. SUBJECT DIDACTICS AND ORTHODIDACTICS

In chapter one (3.5.1) detailed arguments were made to show that disclosing ontically given structures is beyond the scope of orthopedagogics (respectively orthodidactics). Its questions are *directed to the ways of setting in motion* the pedagogical constituents in an orthodidactic lesson situation.

Similarly, subject didactics is confronted with the same task. Its questions center on theorizing about the formal practice of teaching in general, and, in particular, about particularizing a specific subject for a specific group of children with a specific level of readiness and with specific potentialities.<sup>3)</sup> Thus, in its scientific acts it is attuned to an adequately actualized lesson situation. An adequate learning effect is anticipated in its designs, i.e., its designs presume a guided actualization that, in usual ways, will harmonize with the actualization of the psychic life of the children.

In contrast to this, orthodidactics is focused on thinking about ways by which a disharmonious teaching situation can be eliminated.

Hence, both subject didactics and orthodidactics form a bridgehead between pedagogical theory and practice in a second-order [formal] teaching situation because, in their descriptions, both perspectives particularize pedagogical realities to practically applicable essences. Among other things, particularizing means that the lifeless<sup>4)</sup> pedagogical essences are explicated in greater details so they can be more finely integrated with other pedagogical essence and, in doing so, to create a harmonious practice. The subject didactic and orthodidactic formulations lend a suppleness and mobility to the concisely described pedagogical essences that are taken into account along with the unique nature of the lesson contents, the readiness and potentialities of the pupils and also the particular potentialities and teaching style of the teacher.

Since a lesson structure embraces the basic data that clarify a particular plan or design for teaching a lesson,<sup>5)</sup> it is necessary that the subject didactic and orthodidactic particularizations continually refine the essences of a lesson structure. The lesson structure, as encompassing synoptic, general pronouncements, is transformed by the particularizations of subject didactics and orthodidactics from a macrostructure to microstructures. The microstructures are evidence of particular refinements and nuances by which part-functions and aims, execution and management functions, etc. of those involved in the practice are made clearer.

The above discussions must not give the impression that subject didactics and orthodidactics are equivalent. It cannot and must not be denied that there are a number of intersecting points between the two. However, it is equally true that each has a unique identity, task and area of study. The context in which orthodidactic data appear is totally different. Therefore, this uniquely determines its emphases, priorities, pronouncements about particularizing modes of action, etc. Naturally this also implies that it engages in its own research with its own methods.

Consequently, both part-perspectives show their own specialized character with their own frames of reference.

It deserves to be mentioned that orthodidactic findings and designs also can have subject didactic relevance, especially with respect to those helping situations where children “exclusively” experience problems with the subject matter contents. Such children are not regarded as being blocked, as being involved in a situation of educative distress, and thus they do not belong under the label “learning difficult” (as described in chapter two). Therefore, this type of child does not qualify as an area of orthodidactic intervention. The provider of help, usually the subject matter teacher, is not necessarily an authority in orthodidactics. On the basis of his subject matter knowledge, he is in a position to analyze the child’s particular subject matter problems and, on the basis of his didactic-pedagogic insights, to express his designs for providing help so that they harmonize with the child’s actualization of learning.

Should an inadequate learning effect remain in spite of intensive teaching and learning attempts, this obviously will lead to a child increasingly experiencing his situation as one of educative distress. Then he is in need of professional orthodidactic help. Among other things, this involves a complete exploration of his life world as an experiential world in order to determine possible causative moments of restrained learning.

In passing, it must be mentioned that the teaching help given to a “learning difficult” child is currently also known as “remedial teaching”, and that, in practice, there is no difference between the more specialized, professional remedial teaching and the individual help by a subject matter teacher to his pupil.

Because these two types of situation are not equivalent and the use of the same label often leads to confusion, the author pleads for different names for each. Mention has already been made of the unacceptable content connotation of symptom treatment, functionalistic treatment programs, etc. that are expressed by the term “remedial teaching”. Because these unacceptable approaches do at least appear, the author proposes the term “providing orthodidactic help” or “re-teaching” in place of “remedial teaching” that then refers to the professional, accountable practice of providing help. The usual, everyday practice of providing help by a subject matter teacher to his pupil, regarding particular subject deficit, can be called “corrective teaching” for the sake of distinction.

If an orthodidactic lesson differs from an ordinary lesson only in emphases and nuances, then the question arises about whether the aim of an orthodidactic lesson can be the same as the teaching aim of an ordinary didactic lesson.

## **2. THE TEACHING AIM IN AN ORTHODIDACTIC LESSON**

Van der Stoep<sup>6)</sup> asserts that the teaching aim shows itself as a synthesis of a lesson and a learning aim and as the result of a balance between form and contents; he also asserts that the teaching and lesson aims are definite preconditions for a lesson structure.<sup>7)</sup>

In light of these pronouncements, the formulation of a teaching aim is considered to be of decisive significance to the nature of the lesson activity. In truth it serves as a norm in terms of which the different possibilities for designing a lesson can be counterbalanced against each other.<sup>8)</sup> This implies that each of the phases of the course/sequence of a lesson is planned in light of the teaching aim. Stated more specifically, during each phase of the course of a lesson there will be a shift or change in aim.<sup>9)</sup>

## 2.1 General educative aims

Because educating is actualized in teaching and the meaning of teaching is in educating,<sup>10)</sup> it is logical that educative aims are continually included in teaching aims. An educative aim is formulated by Landman<sup>11)</sup> in saying that an educand must gradually and progressively live the norm-image of adulthood. This implies value-possibilities that can and must be unlocked by pedagogical intervention.

As a child appropriates the values for himself through the act of learning, he is involved in realizing his own positive potentialities and in progressively meeting the criteria for adulthood. In this regard, Landman<sup>12)</sup> lists: meaningfulness of existence, self-judgment and self-understanding, respect for human dignity, morally independent choosing and responsible acting, norm identification and philosophy of life, as ideas of adulthood worth striving for. Although it is not humanly possible to entirely meet the criteria of adulthood, in each case, these are the normative possibilities that are continually presented and exemplified in educating.

The educative aims are thoroughly broached in formal teaching and from a subject didactic perspective they are particularized and more finely nuanced into teaching aims that necessarily result in a more specific refinement of the teaching of a particular school subject.<sup>13)</sup>

Orthodidactic assistance also can have nothing more in view than the child's becoming adult. Also its teaching aim has eventual adulthood in view as an overarching quality, but with this difference: its immediate aim is to bring about an adequate

learning effect that assumes the elimination of a child's educative distress and under-actualization of his psychic life so that once again he can receive teaching in the usual ways. For this, it is necessary that its pedagogic aim be nuanced to such a degree that it is directly focused *on what is achievable for a particular child with learning difficulties*. Van Gelder<sup>14)</sup> declares [in Dutch], in this respect: "The general aim of pedagogical action, of its guidance to independence, to self-decision, to life proficiency, to adulthood must, for the deviant child, be viewed in relation to the achievable, by which some aims must be said to be unachievable or not yet achievable".

However, Van Gelder warns that aims must be viewed within the total image of educating and not as aims in themselves. In this connection, the statements by Vliegthart<sup>15)</sup> carry particular weight when, in following Langeveld, he makes a distinction between educative aids and educative factors. He indicates that, orthopedagogically, children often are dependent on pedagogic aids for reaching particular educative aims. Where normally the same educative aim is brought about by educative factors, i.e., in the ordinary course of educating, in orthopedagogic situations this often must occur by means of purposeful pedagogic intervention.<sup>16)</sup>

Vliegthart's statements affirm in almost irrefutable ways that educative aims are necessary in orthopedagogics and therefore also in an orthodidactic lesson and not only are taken thoroughly into account but also are particularized for a specific child.

Thus, research has brought to light that, e.g., the experiential world of a child with learning difficulties gives evidence of an obscured future perspective.<sup>17)</sup> Engelbrecht<sup>18)</sup> has found that the obscured future perspective has an impact on a child's learning intention; and further, his experiential world is characterized by a devaluation in giving and experiencing meaning: "A child who estimates the life world as less valuable, or who considers it as beyond his abilities is also often inclined to experiences himself as insignificant or of less value ... As an existential being each person strives for self-realization and self-fulfillment that are now thwarted by his learning impotence".<sup>19)</sup> Thus, this is a clear indication that particular essences of adulthood fall beyond the reach of a child

with learning problems—or at least for the time being. The deficient understanding of himself and the false notion of his learning potentialities are all manifestations of a deficient self-concept that deserves the closest attention of the orthodidactician because its neglect can allow any form of orthodidactic help to miscarry.

In a normal didactic lesson it seldom occurs that meaningfulness of existence, self-judgment and self-understanding, etc. are explicitly listed in the lesson aim simply because in the everyday, normal course of educating they are arrived at as “educative factors”.

However, the orthodidactician must allow this matter to figure within the teaching aim as a relevant educative aim. In other words, he will purposefully direct himself to the [child’s] realization of an adequate self-concept, and this represents nothing more than a pedotherapeutic aspect of the lesson design.

At the same time the orthodidactician is also aware that the development of an adequate self-concept presupposes a basically sound body-image;<sup>20)</sup> and further that this body-image can again be related to the child’s perceptual-motor development.<sup>21)</sup> Depending on the diagnostic data, the ultimate educative aim (of clarifying the future) can thus be so particularized that it can be included in or handled in a lesson on laterality orientation or on knowledge of bodily relations.

As can be inferred from this example, in an orthodidactic lesson, the educative aim often has the character of coming to a close in the near future. It must always be remembered that achieving a particularized educative aim, in many respects, is considered to be a precondition for eliminating the child’s problematic teaching situation. On the other hand, the educative aim guarantees that the child is not surrendered to all kinds of techniques and procedures but that the intervention at all times will be of a pedagogical nature.

A precondition for eliminating educative distress is the adequate actualization of the essences of educating. Since a child with learning difficulties lacks their adequate actualization this requires that the orthodidactician, on the basis of a structural plan, must purposefully try to actualize the educative structures. Once again it

must be emphasized that an orthodidactic situation of providing help is also a pedotherapeutic situation because, on the one hand, it aims at eliminating the educative distress and, on the other hand, because the identical educative event must occur more explicitly, intensely and emphatically.

The above implies a purposeful planning that necessarily must be assimilated into the formulation of the lesson aim. Planning for this can only happen after an accurate analysis of the child's disharmonious educative relationships, of the under-actualization of his psychic life, etc. in which there must be an attempt to determine the reasons for the miscarriages.

For example, are the parents too strict? Are they approachable? Are they available and accessible to their child? Is there a harmonious marital relationship? Do the parents understand their responsibilities, also with respect to the demands of propriety they are placed under?

To what extent does the subject matter teacher accept the child with learning difficulties? In spite of the child's problems, does he try to establish a relationship of knowing (understanding)? How does the relationship of authority seem to be? Is it consistent? Sympathetic?

On the basis of these and other questions the orthodidactician is faced with the task of designing a unique educative strategy. The worthiness of his own trust, authority and understanding are placed under a magnifying glass and, in light of the child's experiential world, these relationships are refined and particularized. Thus, an orthodidactician is compelled to find an answer to the following questions: How must a child be approached so that he can understand my respect for him as a person? What must be the quality of my encounter with him so that he can confidently venture with the learning contents? How can I best display my conduct so that he will accept me as an authority figure? Is my authority firm, flexible and pliable enough? Do I really understand the "otherness" of the child's psychic life? Do I understand his being-concerned with the demands of propriety that the learning contents also must express?



These and similar questions can lead the orthodidactician to insights that will contribute to refining and particularizing the fundamental educative relationships that then are planned and must be purposefully actualized in the orthodidactic lesson.

The orthodidactician is faced with the task of not only taking into account the reduced subject matter contents but also the reduced “experiential world contents” of the child, the form of which must be allowed to harmonize with these contents. The lesson and learning aims show particular nuances because they also incorporate pedotherapeutic aims such as guiding the child to learning readiness with the implicit imperative of stabilizing his emotional life.

## **2.2 THE ORTHODIDACTIC TEACHING AIM**

The above discussion of the educative aim must be read in context with the orthodidactic teaching aim. It must be kept in mind that a child with learning difficulties in a formal didactic situation is conspicuous because for him the learning effect has been inadequate. Therefore, the event of rectifying [the problem] also occurs of necessity in a formal orthodidactic situation and this means that the formulated orthodidactic aim will indicate the aim and direction of the help provided. It is indisputable that an orthodidactic program of giving help (as a linkage of helping lessons with an overarching and ultimate teaching aim) can also include moments when the emphasis falls more on the pedotherapeutic facet. It is even possible that particular behavioral restraints must be eliminated through prior pedotherapeutic intervention because they stand in the way of effectively providing orthodidactic help.

From this it is concluded that the orthodidactic teaching aim does not have in view only the elimination of a child’s deficient subject matter knowledge or deficient learning outcome. It involves the elimination of the deficient actualization of his learning, and this implies making him learning-ready, so that once again his teaching can be resumed in an ordinary didactic situation.

In contrast to an ordinary didactic lesson, the teaching aim of an orthodidactic program is largely determined by the data from the

orthodidactic diagnostic. According to Van Niekerk<sup>22)</sup> such a diagnostic reveals the nature, scope and underlying reasons for a child's inadequate learning. And this happens in terms of a comprehensive image of his life world, as his experiential-, willing-, behaving-world on the basis of which an indication is obtained of his attainable level of learning with the help of pedagogical criteria and learning norms derived from the curricula.<sup>23)</sup>

From a vast amount of data, the orthodidactician must focus on the analyzed data of the learning outcome. That is, he must ascertain from those aspects of the learning material what the child adequately commands and also those aspects with which he experiences problems. Both are of great importance in an orthodidactic lesson design: the first-mentioned, as a starting point, linking up point or point of departure for orthodidactic help; the second-mentioned, as an area of focus for providing that help. All rendering of help must finally be aimed at the specific difficulties of a child with learning problems.<sup>24)</sup>

For example, it is good and well to approach a child with reading and spelling problems with pedotherapeutic measures, particular function-exercises, etc. but in the long run he must necessarily be confronted with his *errors*. It is only in the act of reading where such a child's problems can be finally conjured up. In this respect Van der Spuy, Nel and O'Brien<sup>25)</sup> meaningfully observe [in English]: "... we should attempt to *learn* an activity by *doing* that activity, or, when that fails, by performing an activity as closely related as possible to that which we hope to master. This conventional wisdom might be regarded as so self-evident that it hardly needs stating". And yet today there are a number of practices of perceptual and visual-motor exercises that are nowhere brought into a connection with the act of reading.

Secondly, the orthodidactician must also take stock of the specific learning restraints, especially to the extent that they are interpreted in terms of an inadequate actualization of the various modes of learning-in-education.<sup>26)</sup> This not only implies a pedagogic observation of the childlike learning behaviors but also a search for the relations among the inadequately actualized modes of learning, functions and other problems, and the quality of the actualization

of the educative and teaching structures that are at the foundation of the inadequate learning.<sup>27)</sup> In other words, it is not sufficient to ascertain that there is a particular learning restraint and on that basis to plan a teaching aim. A learning restraint such as, e.g., inadequate attending must continually be brought into relationship with a child's entire personal being-situated. For example, to what extent is inadequate attending attributable to educative distress? Or again, in its turn, what visual-motor problems are related to one or another organic disturbance? If there is educative distress, what role do his parents or teachers play in it? What is the quality of the fundamental educative relationships, etc.?

An accountable formulation of an orthodidactic teaching aim is also directly related to the learning world of a child with learning difficulties, as his experiential world. Disharmonious educative relationships, affective distress, the experience of being different and the inadequate actualization of cognitive potentialities [and inadequate learning effects], as constituents of a disharmonious teaching situation, must thus be particularized in detail according to their nature, scope and origin.

Naturally, a learning image presumes a qualitative evaluation of the child's under-actualized psychic life—also, and especially in terms of exploring, emancipating, distantiating, differentiating and objectifying.\* And these data are of essential importance because they indicate the [attained] level of becoming of a child with learning difficulties. Without these data the orthodidactician is not in a position to determine the child's so-called "former" ["Einstig"] state. (Where normally it is an intuitive matter to determine the beginning level, in this respect the orthodidactician must work accurately because too high or too low a level can allow the whole program of providing help to miscarry).

It is known, e.g., that a child with learning difficulties, as one in need, objectifies inadequately.<sup>28)</sup> Basically inadequate objectifying means the inability to take an objective position because of an inadequate

---

\* Because of the particular connections among these forms of actualization, the inadequate actualization of one implies the inadequate actualization of another. However, in light of the aim of the present example, this will not be pursued here.

distancing from the self. In other words, the child is not ready to take a perspective with respect to the essentials of a matter (See chapter one, 3.1). Instead, he maintains a **perspectivistic** position because he only judges life from his own standpoint.<sup>29)</sup>

At the basis of inadequate objectifying is a labile emotionality and a deficient quest for knowing,<sup>30)</sup> while Sonnekus<sup>31)</sup> considers the association between adults and child as a precondition for the actualization of "objectifying-as-experience-becoming". The latter is closely linked to Van Peursen's statement<sup>32)</sup> that inter-subjective communication allows knowing to flourish into real relationals, thus to true, universally valid knowledge. This implies that a child with learning difficulties possibly can objectify only inadequately because of inadequate communication that, again, can result in a poor vocabulary.

This example provides clear evidence of the complicated orthodidactic task of arriving at an accountable teaching aim. Factors and data presented appear to be comprehensive and each deserves the closest attention of the orthodidactician.

In the present example he must consider, e.g., if his teaching aim must be focused on cognitive challenges, and if so, how "easy" or "difficult" must they be? Does the child's labile affective structure allow any room for a cognitive approach or must the aim be directed rather at pedotherapeutic accompaniment in order to stabilize the child's emotions? Must there now be an attempt in the orthodidactic lesson to guide the child to adequate objectification? Or must the teaching aim rather be directed to instilling an adequate vocabulary so that he is in a position to arrive at a higher level of objectification through communication?

If questions such as these are co-determinants for the formulation of an orthodidactic teaching aim, it ought to be clear that pedodiagnostic data play an indispensable role in this connection.

On close examination, the constituents of a disharmonious teaching situation (as described in chapter two) appear to disintegrate into moments that have relevance for the teacher, the contents and the child. Although the latter reasons have already been broached in

incidental ways, the three moments [teacher, contents, child] must be put under the magnifying glass in order to determine those factors that must be taken into consideration in designing an orthodidactic lesson. Since the three factors are closely interwoven and show particular relations with each other, the lesson structure will serve as the basis for reflection.

### 2.2.1 Orthodidactic reduction of learning material

With the diagnostic data at his disposal, the orthodidactician must turn himself to the contents. In contrast to normal practice, where the didactician reduces the learning material to its essences in order to plan his own presentation of a slice of reality in accordance with these essences,<sup>33)</sup> an orthodidactician must *once again reduce an already unlocked slice of reality*, but now in light of the following:

- a) *The deficiencies or gaps that a child shows regarding his possessed knowledge of the subject matter.* From the nature of the matter, the orthodidactic diagnostic has largely throw open the gaps, but this presents the orthodidactician with the task of further analyzing the gaps up to the original, “first” gap. It is known that learning difficulties have a cumulative effect and, therefore, it is understandable why the original gaps in knowledge are of great importance for designing an orthodidactic lesson. Knowledge of the gap(s) will be relevant in determining the course of learning for a particular child with learning difficulties. On the other hand, this also carries great weight in determining the level of entry.\*
  
- b) *The psychic under-actualization of the child with learning difficulties.* Irrespective of the data regarding the nature and scope of the labile affectivity and cognitive under-actualization, the reduction of the

---

\* However, the determination of the level of entry cannot be considered apart from the ultimate formulation of the teaching aim, that in its turn is co-defined by the diagnostic data. De Corte<sup>34)</sup> mentions the following in this connection [In Dutch]: “When a teaching aim is not attuned to the beginning situation, the teacher perhaps proceeds too high or too low [for the child to understand”.

contents must also occur in light of the child's under-actualized volitional life, or his inadequate readiness to participate in the didactic event, and his behavioral and experiential world.

- c) *The resistance that the child has built up against the subject matter contents.* Already in the act of reduction, the orthodidactician must keep in mind that a child with learning problems possibly has rejected the learning material, not only on the basis of his own psychic under-actualization or labile emotionality, but also on the basis of a possible inadequate accompanied actualization [See chapter one, 2.3.3].

Although in the reduction of the orthodidactic learning material there continues to be a reduction of the contents to their essentials, it appears that the reduction also must occur by means of additional considerations. The generally acceptable structures on the basis of which anticipations are normally entertained in a didactic situation do not hold in all respects for an orthodidactic situation. Anticipations are based on the situational data as acquired from the orthodidactic diagnostic.

For example, when particular learning material is reduced for a neurologically handicapped child, the orthodidactician must take into consideration that such a child has a vague, diffuse grip on reality and thus on the subject matter contents. This is reflected in his possessed experiences that fall short of the mark in scope and contents.

Hence, the question arises about whether, e.g., the neurologically handicapped child can handle the above-mentioned matter of the elemental, as the verbalized essence of the learning material. His being-in-the-world-differently always evidences an inadequate penetration to the essentials. And this leaves the orthodidactician with the imperative of a qualified or modified approach to the

elemental as such, and that can include, e.g., a step-wise introduction to the elemental.\*

Thus, the reduction must be such that the learning material holds good only as an “elemental” in so far as it can fall within the potential grasp of a neurologically handicapped child.<sup>36)</sup> Thus it must take into account the child’s inadequate actualization of his psychic life that includes matters such as the inadequate actualization of the modes of learning, labile emotionality, inconsistent intentional directedness, impoverished use of language, etc.. Consequently, the subject matter contents must be analyzed in terms of amount, type, nature and structure so that they can be presented in the correct context for a child with learning problems.

Thus, it seems clear that the essential aspects of the orthodidactic lesson and learning aims, at the very least, can be inferred from the general curriculum. In the act of reducing the learning material, the orthodidactician must delimit [the contents] anew in light of the child’s deficient actualization of his learning and the disclosed deficient learning results. This also must be done against the background of the accepted fact that a child with learning problems is not ready and willing to learn. Therefore, the orthodidactician must, e.g., keep an eye out in order to identify possible affective points of support and/or hindrance in order to emphasize or avoid them, respectively.

It cannot be denied that the reduction of the learning material constitutes an important aspect of the orthodidactic lesson design. Finally, in the words of Van Goor and Den Dulk,<sup>(37)</sup> [In Dutch] this involves the “... design of an individual plan of learning (orthopedagogic-orthodidactic plan of action) by which all of the components of the teaching-learning process become attuned to the specific constellation of potentialities and difficulties of a child ...”

## 2.2.2 Orthodidactic statement of the [lesson] problem

---

\* In this connection, the pronouncement by Klafki<sup>35)</sup> has particular relevance: “Wenn die Wirklichkeit vom jungen Menschen auf jeder Stufe in andere Sinnhaltung erlebt wird, dann muss sich auch der Sinn der erschließenden elementaren Bildungsinhalte und Bildungsformen und der in ihnen beschlossenen pädagogischen Vorwegnahmen wandeln”.

By the orthodidactic act of reduction, the learning aim, as the essence of the matter,<sup>38)</sup> is analyzed and assimilated into the lesson aim. However, when the lesson aim concerns both the *what* and the *how* of the teaching event,<sup>39)</sup> it now becomes important to look for ways that must be followed to change the learning aim into a problem for the child.

Oosthuizen<sup>40)</sup> contends that the learning aim alone can turn into a problem for a child if, on the basis of his ready knowledge and familiarity, he is already in a position to give meaning to it. Sonnekus<sup>41)</sup> qualifies this more closely by contending that the anticipation of a lesson problem originates in the child's experiencing-being-in-the-world, in other words, in a child's self-initiative as turning to and reaching reality. In an ordinary didactic lesson a pupil becomes involved in the stated problem because of a readiness and willingness to learn. Among other things, a readiness to learn implies a willingness to learn on the basis of an adequately actualized childlike willing that, in its turn, is dependent on stable affective and cognitive lived experiencing.<sup>42)</sup> With actualized foreknowledge as a point of entry, he takes up the problem by stating it as a question-for-himself. This is accomplished by the pupil recognizing, identifying and naming certain part-aspects or moments [of the problem] in light of his foreknowledge. Through what is known to him, he tentatively makes connections' with the unknown and organizes it into a "structure", and in doing so he discovers the incompleteness of his knowledge. Out of this a meaningful question arises for him as a lived experienced problem.<sup>44)</sup>

In contrast to this, an orthodidactician is involved with a child who, because of the inadequate actualization of his psychic life and his educative distress, is painfully aware of the gaps in knowledge with which he will soon be confronted once again. His labile-pathic lived experiencing can lead him to a negative, aggressive or uneasy stance toward the learning material. The appealing character of the

---

\* Sonnekus,<sup>43)</sup> following Straus, views the search for an anticipated order as the first sign of a gnostic lived experiencing of the childlike question and he views this as the origin of thinking as a gnostic form of lived experiencing.



learning material dwindles and related to this, asking cognitive questions figures inadequately on the landscape of a child with learning difficulties. A labile sensing and attending are closely related and, consequently, it is urgently necessary to take into account the child's level of readiness in light of his orthodidactic tasks.

It is possible that a child finds himself on an impulsive-pathic level<sup>45)</sup> of lived experiencing such that orthodidactic intervention will have little value, and he first must be guided by means of pedotherapy to a more stable level of lived experiencing.

In either case, the orthodidactician must take into account the fact that a change from the stated problem to an experienced problem will occur by means of clarifying [a child's] intentionality, by emotional stabilization and by an appeal to ask cognitive questions. Thus he must try to guide a child with learning difficulties to experience a problem by means of "eye-catchers". In this regard, Ross<sup>46)</sup> mentions novelty, complexity, uncertainty, surprise, conflict and change as aids, while Oosthuizen<sup>47)</sup> mentions sensing something as unfamiliar, strange, surprising or even amusing.

It must be continually kept in mind that an orthodidactic learning aim is to eliminate and/or avoid under-actualized learning potentialities as they are disclosed in the inadequate mastery of subject matter contents. The formulation of the orthodidactic learning aim, in which the content-like lesson problem is included, thus must not only verbalize the essences of the child's still inadequate mastery: It must also be designed so that the learning material will appealingly address the child in such a way that it will be meaningful in his landscape and that his learning intention will be awakened. Stating such a problem includes the following:

- a) An accurate analysis of the foreknowledge that a child must have available in order to eliminate the gaps in his possessed learning. Foreknowledge serves not only as a starting point for the contents to be unlocked (see reference 43), but also as stability for the child. The known offers him a foothold, especially in terms of stable

emotionality, or rather, this works against a further labilizing during the lesson presentation.

- b) A meaningful lesson problem presumes that it falls within the potential grasp of a child, i.e., within his under-actualized psychic life. Therefore, the formulation must take into account the inadequately actualized modes of learning and, all the more, it should avoid vagueness, ambiguity or the injudicious use of concepts.

### 2.2.3 Orthodidactic ordering of the learning material

It is a known didactic fact that the contents cannot function meaningfully in planning a lesson aim if there is not a meaningful ordering of the learning material. In the case of a child with learning problems this is all the more important especially when it is taken into account that his experiential world gives evidence of an unordered, often chaotic lifestyle. A negative lived experiencing of self, a labilized emotionality and an inadequate realization of his cognitive learning potentialities are all indications of an unordered lifestyle.

It must also be remembered that the meaning of ordering the learning material also is that it serves as an indicator of direction in the event of double unlocking. Therefore, it is especially urgently necessary for a child that the learning material, as such, is ordered, that he will experience a course and security in the contents.

Den Dulk and Van Goor,<sup>48)</sup> Kalverboer,<sup>49)</sup> Birch,<sup>50)</sup> Redl,<sup>51)</sup> and Dumont,<sup>52)</sup> mention “structuring” as a pedotherapeutic method of treatment. Although in general this has a connection with the pedotherapeutic aspect, in the judgment of the author, it also has consequences for an orthodidactic lesson. Basically, structuring means the establishment of a structured environment with consistently handled rules of behavior that are planned from one fundamental idea.<sup>53)</sup> Dumont clarifies further [in Dutch]: “The aim and way are discussed with the child and together the way that must be traveled is outlined. Between where a child stands and where he must arrive, a staircase is built and he is helped step by

step to climb it. Where a step is too large for him, an intermediate step is constructed; each step is evaluated and rewarded because this allays his anxiety, the adaptation is improved and the results increase".<sup>54)</sup>

From this it is concluded that the structuring method is in agreement with pedagogically accountable pronouncements; in truth it is a summary of what in fact already occurs in educating, re-educating and therapy.<sup>55)</sup> In this connection, Dumont [in Dutch] observes: “.. it is, as a whole, nothing but trust in the growing power of a child, in his possibilities of doing things for himself, and an acceptance of the factual level on which he stands each moment, but also trust in his progressing further with real help”.<sup>56)</sup>

Thus, the structuring method must also be interpreted as an overarching or underlying principle of ordering for the total orthopedagogic plan of providing help. Obviously, orthodidactic assistance constitutes a very important aspect of this plan. Therefore, its forms of ordering must occur in close connection with the overarching structuring.

Without wanting to be prescriptive--after all, a variety of factors determine the choice of the forms of ordering—it will appear as if particular forms of ordering will be more preferable in so far as they can be complementary to the overarching structuring. In this connection, one especially thinks of the symbiotic, linear and concentric principles of ordering. However, it is emphasized that other forms of ordering can figure very fruitfully in orthodidactic lessons:

It is almost obvious that the symbiotic form of ordering cannot be ignored in designing an orthodidactic lesson, especially if it is kept in mind that the demands of educative relevance and faithfulness to reality ought to be even more pronounced in an orthodidactic lesson.

A linear ordering also deserves careful consideration. Thus, an orthodidactician can find it necessary to systematically analyze into details contents with which a child experiences problems and then unite them into a whole.

A linear form of ordering plays an important role with children who experience reading and spelling problems because it helps them acquire insight into the language structure. The language is analyzed to its simplest elements [elementals, essences], and with the help of well-chosen examples it is reconstructed into a whole. In this way a child discovers his own errors and, with the help of his insight into the language structure, they are gradually eliminated.

Judging from the life world, as experiential world, of a child with learning problems, a concentric ordering should also deserve strong consideration. An ordering from easy to difficult has particular advantages, especially keeping in mind that such an ordering offers the child stability in terms of which the accompanying modes of learning [sensing and attending] increasingly become stabilized. Besides this it also provides the opportunity for the adequate actualization of the child's cognitive potentialities because this is in agreement with the accepted layered ways of the development of thinking.<sup>57)</sup>

The reduction of learning contents, stating the problem and ordering the learning material thus do not seem to differ essentially from ordinary didactics. However, an orthodidactician must take into consideration a multitude of additional factors that lead to different emphases and nuances in an orthodidactic lesson.

#### **2.2.4 Orthodidactic lesson form**

Earlier it was mentioned that an adequate learning effect can only result when the forms of teaching and learning harmonize (see chapter one, 2.4.1.1). Thus, if an orthodidactician wants to eliminate a disharmonious teaching situation, he must try to allow the essence of teaching to blend with the essences of the contents such that they will harmonize with the child's actualization of the modes of learning.

An orthodidactic lesson form cannot differ essentially from ordinary didactics. Therefore, the same considerations hold true for an orthodidactic lesson design. The difference is only in the fact that

an orthodidactic lesson design carefully takes into account the modes of actualizing the psychic life.

Therefore, it is not the intention to discuss in detail all of the lesson form considerations. Only a few aspects will be broached in order to illustrate the supplementary considerations regarding their choice:

Although not the only one, the unique nature of the learning material is certainly the most important single factor that determines the didactic ground forms. This also holds true for an orthodidactic lesson. In order to meaningfully place the contents in the landscape of a child with learning problems, however, an orthodidactician must necessarily take into consideration an additional important factor, namely, the image of the child's actualization of learning. Since all teaching is directed to the actualization of learning, and the orthodidactician is involved with its under-actualization, it is almost inevitable that the modes of actualizing learning will play a decisive role in the eventual lesson design.

In this connection, once again it must be kept in mind that orthodidactic assistance will realize two kinds of aims that in all respects serve as opposite sides of each other. On the one hand, this involves the elimination and/or narrowing of the child's gaps in knowledge or deficient learning results, and, on the other hand, this involves making him learning-ready which implies the elimination and/or the avoidance of the under-actualized modes of learning.

If the orthodidactician is focused on the first aim, he will appeal to those modes of learning that can be "optimally" actualized by the child in the lesson situation. At the same time, he will try to avoid blocked or restrained modes of learning. If the emphasis falls on the aspect of making the child learning-ready, he will try to involve the less adequately actualized modes of learning with an eye to practicing **to** their adequate actualization. In the latter case he can consider it necessary to obtain specialized assistance from auxiliary disciplines such as optometry, speech therapy, occupational therapy, etc.

Whatever the case might be, the orthodidactician must be thoroughly cognizant of the learning potentialities and difficulties of a particular child in order to be able to make an accountable choice of ground forms. Thus, e.g., conversation, as a ground form, will be avoided with a child who experiences auditory-perceptual problems because, among other things, he can have difficulty in distinguishing between the spoken word and environmental sounds. Such children are dependent on visual and tactile learning modalities and this means that ground forms such as example and assignment are more appropriate than, e.g., play and conversation.

However, the avoidance of ground forms is not always possible. In practice this amounts to the fact that a choice from all of the ground forms is made and is particularized for a specific lesson and child. In the case of a neurologically handicapped child, e.g., experts such as Strauss and Lethinen,<sup>58)</sup> Hewett,<sup>59)</sup> Cruickshank<sup>60)</sup> and others stress the desirability of motor activities in a lesson "... to engage the child directly in his task and to hold his attention..."<sup>61)</sup> [In English]. In this respect play deserves serious consideration as a possible ground form. But at the same time Strauss and Lethinen caution "... that while materials provide manipulative activity, they are not games to increase motivation or to teach through play".<sup>62)</sup> [In English]. This means that play as a ground form must be particularized to a form in which the moments of competition, excitement, etc. are held to a minimum and rather a structured form of play will take priority. Obviously, the particularization of a ground form will give rise to the particularization of all of the other lesson form aspects.

After careful consideration, conversation, example and assignment must similarly be subjected to particularization so that they can be in agreement with the potentialities and difficulties of a particular child. For example, it is known that a neurologically handicapped child has difficulty handling abstract concepts, that he shows a labile sensing and attending and that he has particular perceptual disturbances. Thus, if the choice should fall on the example as a ground form, this means that the orthodidactician must assure himself of precisely how he will present the example to such a child. Consequently, he must particularize the example such that it will

allow for factors such as figure-ground disturbances, dissociations, perseverations, etc.

Other aspects of the lesson form such as methodological principles, methods of unlocking, etc. are subject to the same demands of particularization. However, it must be emphasized that the choice of ground form, of method possibilities, of methodological principles, of principles of ordering the learning material do not represent unconnected, independent choices but they form an integral unity.

### 2.2.5 Orthodidactic modalities

The question of learning and teaching aids, (ortho)didactic principles and the modes of learning must be discussed next. The purpose is not to give a complete explication of the modality problematic in its entirety but rather to present orthodidactically relevant examples.

Because the orthodidactician often considers ways of avoiding uneliminatable learning restraints or eliminating particular blockages, *learning and teaching aids* play a very important role in an orthodidactic lesson. In some circles there is even an inclination to elevate learning and teaching aids to methods in themselves.<sup>63)</sup> However, such a standpoint cannot be endorsed.

The familiar Kantian pronouncement, namely, "... understanding needs observing, not to be pure thinking, but to acquire knowledge",<sup>64)</sup> [in Dutch] undoubtedly holds true to a large degree for a child with learning difficulties. If it is kept in mind that he shows an under-actualized thinking, which implies a deficient schematizing, ordering, making connections, abstracting, etc., the particular value of observational teaching and learning aids will be realized immediately. In this light there thus must be an attempt to allow the learning and teaching aids to at least fulfill the demand of [disclosing] the "absolute essentials". This means that the learning aid will disclose the basic structure or structures of the learning material and that it will be stripped of all irrelevancies.<sup>65)</sup> In this respect, it is especially the textbook that does not fulfill all of the demands for use in an orthodidactic lesson. It falls short with

respect to quantity, letter font, abstract words and illustrations.<sup>66)</sup> The size of the pages and the complex activities depicted in the illustrations contribute to the “attenuated” course of learning in an orthodidactic program.

From this it is concluded that the orthodidactic learning and teaching aids must also be designed in light of the specific potentialities and difficulties of a child with learning problems. Additionally, it must be kept in mind that the orthodidactic teaching and learning aids also must be chosen in each of the phases of the course of the lesson, *and indeed on the basis of the help that they can offer to the actualization of the modes of learning.*<sup>67)</sup> Consequently, they cannot be elevated to a method. In this connection, Strauss and Lethinen make the following observation [In English]: “Although it is true that the materials are used extensively, they are but one means of reaching the child and, as such, represent the externalization of the method. Without knowledge of the method as a whole, the materials are merely static devices”.<sup>68)</sup>

The orthodidactician thus must not over- or under-estimate the importance of the learning and teaching aids. He must continually hold in view that they constitute a part of an ordered lesson structure and that they must be implemented in responsible ways with respect to place, time and modus in the course of the lesson.

In regard to *(ortho)didactic principles of actualization*, the question of *tempo variation* must enjoy a high priority in planning an orthodidactic lesson. First it must be acknowledged that the learning tempo of a child with learning problems in general is slow. It is only logical that someone who does not have a firm grip on the learning material, who shows a historicity of failures with respect to the learning material, and who, as a consequence of educative distress, cannot let the actualization of his learning occur adequately, will show a slow learning tempo. Therefore, an orthodidactician will anticipate a slow lesson tempo as a general guideline in his lesson planning. And this does not mean that a uniform lesson tempo must be maintained throughout the course of the lesson but rather the tempo is varied in accordance with the learning tempo that the child displays. Thus the orthodidactician



must closely evaluate and even anticipate the learning tempo throughout the course of the lesson in order to maintain a harmonious lesson tempo. It is obvious that a too hurried or a too slow lesson tempo can contribute greatly to the failure of an orthodidactician's giving help.

The above considerations presume that an orthodidactic program of providing help is designed for a specific child with a specific learning problem. It must be remembered that any such program has in mind the elimination of a disharmonious teaching situation. Therefore, the lesson designs are directed to the specific learning problems and learning potentialities of a specific child. Seen in this light, it is confidently asserted that the principle of individualization constitutes one of the cornerstones of each orthodidactic program.

Orthodidactic assistance is indeed possible in a class context provided the pupils involved form a homogeneous group with respect to their learning potentialities and learning difficulties as well as the content problem area. It must be emphasized that this does not involve specialized or unusual teaching but revolves around a program of providing help that lasts for a short or a medium period of time. However, such classes must remain limited to a maximum of from six to eight pupils in order to best use the principle of individualization. Only by individualizing can an orthodidactician accompany a child with learning problems to an adequate openness to the learning contents presented. And perhaps even more important: By individualizing he can accompany the child to intra-communication, i.e., to a self-discussion during which he can orient himself to the learning material and can change an elemental into a fundamental.<sup>69)</sup>

If the principles of socialization and activity are not discussed in detail this is not because they are slighted as orthodidactic principles but rather because the same considerations that hold for the above also are applicable to them. Both deserve the same consideration, anticipation and eventual use for a specific lesson situation. Thus, the principle of socialization can be implemented for the one child with an eye to strengthening his grasp of the learning material; for another child with the aim of carrying on a

dialogue by which he can reach an adequate self-image or self-concept.

Anticipation of the *modes of learning* and the ensuing means for actualizing them in all respects forms the pivotal point around which the course of a lesson revolves. A teaching effect is only read off of a learning effect,<sup>70)</sup> and, by implication, this means that an adequate teaching effect can only be ascertained when the anticipated modes of learning are guided to adequate actualization. The advanced planning of these modes of learning that are deemed to be necessary for reaching a teaching aim thus is of cardinal importance for any lesson.

Normally, the anticipation of the modes of learning does not present great problems for a normal didactic lesson design. Both teaching and learning are matters of Dasein [being-in-the-world] in so far as they are part of a human being's going out to reality.<sup>71)</sup> Besides, teaching and learning are attuned to each other and thus they are in a complementary relationship with each other.<sup>72)</sup> If this were not the case there could not be a harmonious lesson, and the teacher also would not be in a position to anticipate particular modes of learning.

In the case of a child with learning problems, an orthodidactician is confronted with a more complicated task. In the first place he must take into account that such a child does not proceed to adequately actualize his learning. Therefore, he is forced into analyzing in detailed the child's modes of actualizing his learning in order to disclose an image of those modes that are inadequately actualized and of those that are less adequately or even adequately actualized. Obviously, he will then try to plan his lesson in accordance with those modes of learning that are more adequately actualizable. However, at the same time he will also try to "train" the inadequately actualized modes of learning to their adequate actualization.

But in the second place, the orthodidactician must thoroughly acquaint himself with deficiencies, disturbances, restraints, even the preference for or rejection of particular modes of learning that a child shows. For example, it is of essential importance to know, in

the anticipation of perceiving, that the auditory reception of information can have a more adequate learning effect than a predominantly visual reception.

Thus, it seems that an orthodidactician must have a lot of data at his disposal before he can anticipate a particularized mode of learning for a particular lesson. The more data at his disposal the more particularized the anticipated modes of learning will appear in the lesson. Here, among other things, particularization means [disclosing] a detailed image of the potentialities and difficulties regarding the [child's] modes of learning and in terms of which an appeal to actualize learning is made in such a way that a maximal learning effect can be obtained.

It must be stressed that the modes of learning can only be taken into account and anticipated at a certain stage of designing a lesson, *but, taken as a whole, the design of an orthodidactic lesson must be built on the child's modes of actualizing learning.* An orthodidactic lesson must be in harmony with the *learning style* of a child with learning problems because only then is there a possibility for a harmonious event of double unlocking.

Finally, it must be indicated that no mode of learning acquires substantive status when its actualization is anticipated in a lesson. A child is in the world as a learning being and, as such, he is involved in the act of learning as a person, as a totality-in-communication [with his world]. The act of learning is only one of the modes of actualizing the psychic life of a child-in-education, and therefore a teacher must, in anticipating the modes of learning, continually keep in view the mutual interdependence of the modes of learning as well as the relationships they have with the other essences of the psychic life.<sup>73)</sup> Finally, the actualization of the modes of learning can never be an orthodidactic aim in itself. This aim always involves the elimination of a distorted learning event, which means bringing forward elemental contents that the child must change into fundamental contents. Therefore, this always involves a child as a person during which the anticipated modes of learning are in the service of eliminating the event [of distorted learning].

## 2.2.6 Orthodidactic lesson sequence/course

To begin, it must be emphasized that an orthodidactic lesson takes the same course as an ordinary didactic lesson. Since giving orthodidactic help is “concentrated educating” (Dumont) the lesson will show different emphases. These emphases are largely determined by the state of the child’s becoming as well as by the gaps he shows in the learning content.

In an orthodidactic lesson greater emphasis is placed on particular phases of the course of the lesson. Thus, for example, an orthodidactic lesson differentiates itself in that many more repetitions occur than in an ordinary didactic lesson and paired with this there also is mention of a continual control and evaluation.

However, it is not the intention to broach all of the considerations regarding each phase of the course of a lesson. Only a few other general considerations that are closely connected with the course of a lesson will be discussed briefly:

### 2.2.6.1 Content as aim and content as means

It is known that in the course of an ordinary didactic lesson a changeover occurs from the aim “content as aim” to “content as means”. According to Van der Stoep and Van Dyk,<sup>74)</sup> there is a clear phase-change in unlocking reality that is based on a change in aim that necessarily results in a functional change because now a child must do something with the content. A lesson aim is only attained when the content appears as a means, thus when a child applies the content as a means in order to arrive at his own achievement or to give form to it.<sup>75)</sup>

Normally there is a delicate balance in a lesson with respect to these two clearly distinguishable phases of the course of a lesson, the balance of which can shift from one side to the other on the basis of various factors and by the skill of the teacher.

Then the question arises if both aims figure in an orthodidactic program of providing help. Does the content ever come forth as an aim in itself or is there only mention of content that is applied as a

means? If providing orthodidactic help is pedotherapy and if pedotherapy primarily involves giving support to a child to re-lived experience [content] as a re-defining of it,<sup>76)</sup> must an orthodidactic lesson also be involved in redefining the learning content that was already unlocked for the child? Re-lived experiencing as redefining implies changing structure, new constructing and building up new relationships and not so much bringing new content forward. On the basis of this logical reasoning, in some circles it is contended that the content cannot appear as an aim in an orthodidactic lesson.

However, this author bluntly states that standpoints of this nature do not reflect very accurately the ins and outs of orthodidactic practice. In truth, both aims figure prominently in an orthodidactic lesson: It is indisputably so that a child with learning difficulties has previously been confronted with learning material, perhaps repeated times, without being able to acquire an adequate grasp and mastery of it. From this one can conclude that the elemental-content either has itself not been realized and thus is not changed over to a fundamental or that the elemental-content indeed has been (partially) actualized but not yet on a level where the fundamental has broken through.

With the first possibility, the child does not yet have at his disposal the basic contents that must be on hand for the independent mastery of them. With the latter possibility, the child has acquired an insightful grasp of the basic contents but is not yet able to independently and accountably make new constructions and build up new relationships with their help.

Hence, the orthodidactician is confronted with the task, in his orthodidactic diagnostic, of making a penetrating analysis of the deficiencies that child shows regarding the learning content. In terms of these data he will then be in a position to subtly differentiate his stated aim, especially as to its type and nature. In other words, this puts him in a position to determine where the emphasis must fall in his presentation.

Still, it is stressed that both aims will continually be present. Moreover it must be remembered that the lesson content of the orthodidactic program is reduced from the school curriculum to

those aspects with which the child experiences difficulty. Because of the particular aims in an orthodidactic lesson and thus because of a different reduction, the elemental will also appear in another attire. In addition it must be kept in mind that the elemental carries the implicit meaning of making a child ready to learn.<sup>77)</sup> As such, the elemental must be directed to his experiential world. Thus, the elemental is teleological and, therefore, to a greater or lesser extent, the content will appear as aim, even if the child gives evidence of an insightful grasp of the learning material.

It is obvious that the differentiation of aims in terms of content as aim and content as means plays a definite and decisive role in the course of a lesson. Therefore, the orthodidactician is confronted with the task of accurately attending to the diagnostic data with a view to determining where the emphasis should fall in terms of the two differentiated aims.

#### **2.2.6.2 Functional possibilities in an orthodidactic lesson situation**

In relation to the issue of content as aim and content as means, the orthodidactician must also reflect on the functional possibilities that can be taken up in an orthodidactic lesson. Although the position he can take up with respect to a child and the contents is determined by a variety of factors, according to Van der Stoep and Van Dyk,<sup>78)</sup> it remains a teaching art that can be acquired by training and schooling. As such, the orthodidactician must, on the basis of available theoretical findings, be able to make an accountable choice, especially if it is kept in mind that his position influences the nature and effect his lesson design.<sup>79)</sup>

It was mentioned that an orthodidactician incorporates the two-fold function of providing pedotherapy and orthodidactic assistance. This two-fold function will greatly influence his position in a lesson.

With respect to the ortho-educative or pedotherapeutic function, it is important that the orthodidactician take a position *by* the child

with the aim of adequately actualizing the pedagogical essences.\* It must be kept in mind that a child with learning difficulties is in need of trust, understanding and authority, and that their adequate actualization by means of intervening and agreeing presume a pedagogical nearness to him. Van der Stoep and Van Dyk<sup>80)</sup> also mention a position *in front of*, *behind* and *along side of* a child. Although each of these positions also has particular relevance for an orthodidactic lesson, even so they will be interpreted from an orthopedagogic perspective as differentiations and particularizations of the position of nearness. Naturally the position of the orthodidactician can change during the different phases of the course of a lesson but, in general, this amounts to him wanting to take a fixed position by a child "...with the aim of *temporarily* taking over the tasks of a child".<sup>81)</sup>

Regarding the teaching function of the orthodidactician, it is directly related to the teaching aim that is striven for. In the case of content as an aim, Van der Stoep and Van Dyk point out three functional possibilities, namely a position in front of, along side of and behind the contents:

- a) In front of the content, during which the content, as such, disappears and appears in the representation of the teacher.
- b) Along side of the content, during which content and teacher, as it were, become one or show an identity.
- c) Behind the content, during which he, as it were, hides behind the contents and his own judgment or position is never clearly spelled out.<sup>82)</sup>

With respect to the teaching function with the aim of linking up with content as means, they distinguish two possibilities, namely a micro-attunement and a macro-attunement: "In the case of a micro-attunement, a teacher anticipates the need for help and support by a pupil. In his lesson design, he anticipates that he will move closer to a child in order to provide greater safety and security. In this case he is prepared to temporarily take over, in part or entirely, the

---

\* In this connection see the various structure models of "ortho-subject-didactic" lesson situations as discussed by Erasmus. (Erasmus, M. M.: Die posisie vsn die leerling in die junior primere lessituasie, pp. 235-237).

tasks that confront a child, to stabilize the child's affective and cognitive lived experiencing and to guide him as quickly as possible to again proceed to a desirable venturing attitude and a turning to the new learning contents without help".<sup>83)</sup>

In the case of a macro-attunement these authors indicate that a teacher anticipates a different kind of emphasis in the course of a lesson: "In this case, he presumes that at a particular period of time the learning activity can be advanced especially on the basis of clarifying the subject matter content. Therefore, the teacher moves closer to the content with respect to which he then carries out the following functions, among others: refining the selection, more appropriately order the content, purposeful actualization of foreknowledge, stating the problem within the experiential knowledge of the pupil, more intensive exemplary unlocking, refining the controlling [verifying], additional practice and application, (and) detailed evaluating".<sup>84)</sup>

If the above discussions are interpreted from an orthodidactic perspective, it is clear that each of the functional possibilities has particular relevance for orthodidactic practice. Orthodidactic lesson situations show no essential difference from ordinary lesson situations.<sup>85)</sup> That decisive refinements and nuances will occur is equally true, especially when it is taken into consideration that providing orthodidactic help:

- occurs in a strongly individualized connection:
- the content is attenuated and limited to that with which a child experiences problems; and
- the child is dealing with pedagogic distress and as a consequence he shows an under-actualization of his psychic life.

Finally, once again it must be emphasized that providing orthodidactic help can never be separated from providing orthopedagogic help and that the nature of the orthodidactic aims will move between these two poles.

### 3. SYNTHESIS



The considerations about an orthodidactic lesson design that were dealt with in the present chapter are an essential aspect of orthodidactic practice. Yet these data are not the only ones that the orthodidactician must have at his disposal in order to call an accountable practice into being: The previous discussions continually gave evidence that the potentialities must be interpreted in the light of the deficiencies and problems of a child with learning difficulties. The eventual choice out of the present lesson structure data necessarily will be made on the basis of the data from the learning image. What data and how they can be acquired are discussed in chapter four. And only when he also has these data at his disposal will he be able to act accountably with respect to his practice of providing help. Finally, an orthodidactic lesson distinguishes itself precisely because it represents the result of a synthesis of the lesson structure data with the data from a child's learning image.

## REFERENCES

1. See: DE CORTE, E. (Ed.): *Beknopte Didaxologie*, p. 68.
2. See: VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaskein*, p. 131.
3. See: VAN DER STOEP, F. and VAN DYK, C. J.: *Inleiding tot die Vakdidaktiek*, p. 34.
4. LANDMAN, W. A.: *Die praktykwording van die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, p. 25.
5. VAN DER STOEP, F. (Ed.): *Die Lesstruktuur*, p. 5. [English translation: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/43> ]
6. VAN DER STOEP, F. and VAN DYK, C. J.: op. cit., p. 35.  
See: VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Wie is die kind met leerprobleme?* in: Van Niekerk, P. A. (Ed.): *Hulpverlening aan kinders met Leerprobleme*, p. 54. [English translation: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/73> ]
7. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaskein*, p. 38.
8. VAN DER STOEP, F. and VAN DYK, C. J.: op. cit., p.152.
9. Ibid., p. 157,
10. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaktiese grondvorme*, p. 7.
11. LANDMAN, W. A.: *Leesboek vir die Christen-opvoeder*, Chapter 4.
12. Ibid, Chapter 4.
13. See: VAN DER STOEP, F. and VAN DYK, C. J.: op. cit., p. 156.
14. VAN GELDER, L.: *Een orientatie in de Orthopedagogiek*, p. 49.
15. VLIEGENTHART, W. E.: *Algemene Orthopedagogiek*, p. 78.
16. Ibid, p. 78.
17. See: GOUWS, S. J. L.: *Pedagogiese diagnostisering van kinders met leermoeilikhede*. NEL, B. F. and SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Psigiese beelde van kinders met leermoeilikhede*. TER HORST, W.: *Proeve van een orthopedagogisch teorie-concept*.
18. ENGELBRECHT, C. S.: *Die samehang tussen liggaambeewing en leerprobleme by die kind: 'n Ortopedagogiese studie*, p. 148.
19. Ibid, p. 150.
20. VAN ZYL, D. A.: *Liggaamsbeeld as factor by selfkonsep en aspekte van verbale kommunikasie*, in: *Savlom-bulletin 1975, No. 2*, p. 29.
21. Ibid, p. 30.
22. VAN NIEKERK, P. A.: *Die verband tussen opvoedings- en leerprobleme en die ortopedagogiese opgawe wat dit inhou*, in: Van Niekerk, P. A. (Ed.): *Hulpverlening aan kinders met leerprobleme*, p. 68. [English translation: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/73> ]
23. Ibid, 68.
24. See: VAN GELDER, L.: *Een orientatie in de orthopedagogiek*, op. cit., p. 82. DEN DULK, C. and VAN GOOR, R.: *Inleiding in de orthodidactiek en in remedial teaching van het dyslectieche kind*, p. 100.
25. VAN DER SPUIY, H. I. J.; NEL, V. and O'BRIEN, M.: *Quo Vadis Remedial education? A reassessment of perceptual training and learning disabilities*, in: *Savlom-bulletin, 1975-1*, p. 20.
26. See: VAN NIEKERK, P. A. (Ed.): *Hulpverlening aan kinders met leerprobleme*, op. cit., p. 79.

27. See: Ibid, p. 69.
28. VAN NIEKERK, P. A.: *Die onderwyser en die kind met leerprobleme*, p. 23.
29. See: VAN NIEKERK, P. A.: Ibid, p. 24.
30. Ibid, p. 24.
31. SONNEKUS, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psigopedagogiek: 'n Inleidende oriëntering*, p. 54.
32. VAN PEURSEN, C. A.: *Fenomenologie en werkliheid*, p. 18.
33. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Die onderwysdoel*, in: Van der Stoep, F. (Ed.): *Die lesstruktuur*, p. 48. [English translation: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/43> ]
34. DE CORTE, E. (Ed.): *Beknopte didaxologie*, op. cit., p. 69.
35. KLAFKI, W.: *Das Paedagogische Problem den elementaren und die Theorie der Kategorialen Bildung*, p. 393.
36. See the pronouncement by Pestalozzi about the elemental in: Heafford, M.: *Pestalozzi, his thought and its relevance today*, p. 86.
37. DEN DULK, C. and VAN GOOR, R.: op. cit., p. 37.
38. See: VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Die onderwysdoel*, op. cit., p. 34.
39. OOSTHUIZEN W. L.: *Die plek en betekenis van leerstof reduksie in die ontwerp van die Wiskundeles*, p. 33.  
[English translation of published version of this M. Ed. thesis: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/94> ]
40. Ibid, p. 33.
41. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Onderwyser, les en kind*, p.29.
42. See: Ibid, p. 29.
43. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Die kindevraag as wordingspsigologiese verskynsel*, in: Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psychologia pedagogica Sursum*, p. 173.
44. See: OOSTHUIZEN, W. L.: op. cit., p. 34.
45. See: SONNEKUS, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psigopedagogiek: 'n Inleidende oriëntering*, op. cit., p. 22.
46. ROSS, A. O.: *Psychological aspects of learning disabilities and reading disorders*, p. 42.
47. OOSTHUIZEN, W. L.: op. cit., p. 33.
48. DEN DULK, C. and VAN GOOR, R.: op. cit., p. 113.
49. KALVERBOER, A. F.: *Over de relatie tussen neurologiese dysfuncties en gedrag bij kinderen*, in: De Wit, J. (Ed.): *Psychologen over het kind*, p. 165.
50. BIRCH, H. G.: *The problem of brain damage in children*, in: Birch, H. G. (Ed.): *Brain damage in children*, p. 70.
51. REDL, F.: *When we deal with children*, p. 35.
52. DUMONT, J. J.: op. cit., pp. 52-55.
53. See: KWAKKEL-SCHEFFER, J. J. C.: *Orthopedagogiese behandelingsmetodes*, in: Van Berckelaerones, I. A. (Ed.): *Verduisterd Perspektief*, pp. 69 et seq.
54. DUMONT, J. J.: op. cit., p. 53.
55. See: Ibid, p. 55.
56. Ibid, p. 55.
57. See: PIAGET, J.: *The psychology of intelligence*. NEL, B. F., SONNEKUS, M. C. H. and GARBERS, J. G.: *Grondslae van die Psigologie*, pp. 249 et seq.
58. STRAUSS, A. A. and LETHINEN, L. E.: *General principles in the*

- education of the brain-injured child*, in: Frierson, E. C. and Barbe, W. B. (Eds.): *Educating children with learning Disabilities: Selected readings*, op. cit., p. 379.
59. HEWETT, F. M.: *Emotionele stoornissen. Behandeling van kinderen met onaangepast gedrag op school*, op. cit.
  60. CRUICKSHANK, W. M.: *Buitenbeentjes*, op. cit.
  61. STRAUSS, A. A. and LETHINEN, L. E.: op. cit., p. 379.
  62. Ibid, p. 132.
  63. See: Ibid, p. 379.
  64. KANT, I., as cited by Jaspers, K.: *Kant*, p. 44.
  65. STRAUSS, A. A. and LETHINEN, L. E.: op. cit., p. 379.
  66. See: FRIERSON, E. C.: *Clinical education procedures in the treatment of learning disabilities*, in: Frierson, E. C. and Barbe, W. B. (Eds.): op. cit., p. 480. STRAUSS, A. A. and LETHINEN, L. E.: op. cit., p. 381.
  67. See: VAN DYK, C. J.: *Die didactiese modaliteite*, in: Van der Stoep, F. (Ed.): *Die lesstruktuur*, p. 130. [**English translation:** <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/43> ]
  68. STRAUSS, A. A. and LETHINEN, L. E.: op. cit., p. 379.
  69. See: VAN DYK, C. J.: op. cit., p. 114.
  70. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaskein*, op. cit., pp. 138 et seq.
  71. See: VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Die betekenis van 'n kategoriale struktuur vir die didaktiese pedagogiek*, in: Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psychologia Pedagogica Sursum*, op. cit., pp 203 et seq.
  72. See: VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaktiese grondvorme*, p. 51. VAN DYK, C. J.: *Didaktiese modaliteite*, in: Van der Stoep, F. (Ed.): op. cit., p. 106.
  73. See: SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Onderwyser, les en kind*, op. cit., p. 49.
  74. VAN DER STOEP, F. and VAN DYK, C. J.: op. cit., p. 177.
  75. Ibid, p. 102.
  76. PRETORIUS, J. M. W.: *Grondslae van die pedoterapie*, p. 40. [**English translation:** <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/81> ]
  77. KRUGER, R. A.: *Die betekenis van die begrippe elementare en fundamentele in die didaktiese teorie en praktyk*, p. 68. [**English translation** of published version of this M. Ed. thesis in the form of a published journal article: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/84> ]
  78. VAN DER STOEP, F. and VAN DYK, C. J.: op. cit., pp. 279 et seq.
  79. See: Ibid, p. 287.
  80. Ibid, p. 286,
  81. Ibid, p. 286.
  82. Ibid. p. 290.
  83. Ibid. pp. 292-293.
  84. Ibid, p. 293.
  85. See: ERASMUS, M. M.: *Die posisie van die leerling in die junior primere lessituasie*, p. 238. [**English translation** of a journal article based on this D. Ed. Dissertation: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/58> ]