

CHAPTER FOUR

FURTHER REFLECTIONS AND RESEARCH POSSIBILITIES REGARDING THE EDUCATIVE TEACHING SITUATION

A. THE FAMILY HOUSEHOLD/SCHOOL SITUATIONS AS EDUCATIVE TEACHING SITUATIONS

1. INTRODUCTION

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

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

2. THE CATEGORY “WORLD”

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

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

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

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

3. THE CATEGORY “HOME”

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

4. THE CATEGORY “SCHOOL”

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

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

Now that some fundamental-didactic concepts briefly have been broached, namely, lifeworld, home and school, there is a discussion of **the home as lifeworld of a child** and then **the school as lifeworld of the child**.

5. THE HOME AS LIFEWORLD OF A CHILD

5.1 Educative teaching in the family viewed in terms of its form

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

teaching situation already appears in the family situation and does not arise for the first time in the school situation.

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

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

If there is mention here of the structure-content of educative teaching in the family, this refers to the meanings and interpretations that the family members give to their own life and reality. This structure-content, as particular giving of content to the formal structure of the educative teaching event, will differ from family to family and from culture to culture. Among other things, this means that this giving of content to the formal structure of the educative teaching situation occurs from the particular philosophy of life and the entire cultural framework in which the family finds itself. Because here there is talk of a **particular philosophy of life** this means that philosophies of life necessarily must differ. It is

a **particular matter** and requires a personal decision to accept it by the family. Now the question is what philosophy of life must be accepted as the correct one?

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

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

6. THE SCHOOL AS LIFEWORLD OF A CHILD

M. J. Langeveld, the esteemed Dutch educationist, has placed the school, as a particular way to designing a world, in the center of the didactic-pedagogic problematic. In this connection one thinks of his work that originally appeared in German as “**Die Schule als Weg des Kindes**”. This work also appeared in Dutch as **Scholen maken mensen**. When there is a question about the structure of

the school as lifeworld of a child it must be immediately stressed that the school, in reality, is an **extension, completion and formalization** of the educative teaching in the family situation, as the primary educative teaching situation. This means that the educative teaching situation in the school is a re-constitution (Van der Stoep) of the family situation. (Also see Section 4 of this Division).

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

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

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

The school is not merely an extension of the home as a child's lifeworld but also a completing of it. This means that educative teaching in a school situation ought to **link up with** educative teaching at home. Because of the great amount of specialized knowledge that a person must have at his disposal today, the parent is committed to the help of other adults e.g., teachers in school, who possess this more specialized knowledge. Thus, the school as an institute is called into being in order to place the **knowledge and skills** (Bijl) that are necessary for designing a personal lifeworld at the disposal of the pupils, as becoming adults. However, the pupils must not be left alone to confront this knowledge and skills without the expert provision of help. Through this expert provision of help (educative teaching), teachers must support the pupils in their **exploration** of new areas of knowledge and skills. Also, in the school situation, just as is the case with the educative teaching event at home, the teachers must increasingly offer the pupils the opportunity for independent involvement with the areas of knowledge and skills. Thus, here there is mention of **learning adulthood** (Landman) where the pupil who is becoming and is progressing in knowledge and skills ultimately becomes **emancipated** from the teachers. This emancipating event that ultimately is manifested in learning adulthood, then eventually will result in the pupils being able to study further as independent adults on their own accountability.

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

In order to support the pupils in school in their exploration and eventual (ultimate) emancipation regarding new areas of knowledge and skills, the adults (teachers) must systematically **unlock** the lifeworld for the children. Therefore, Van der Stoep views unlocking-reality as a fundamental didactic category for constructing a fundamental didactic theory. This unlocking-reality only will be possible if the pupils can be confronted with various delimited areas of reality. This entails that the pupils in school be introduced to **various subjects** (areas of reality and areas of knowledge and skills). Also, now satisfaction no longer can be taken with the informal nature of educative teaching as this clearly shows itself in the family household. Thus there is a **formalizing** of the

educative teaching event. The pupils and teachers come together formally in the school building and in the different class and subject locales where then, in purposeful and systematic ways, the teachers intervene with the aim of the pupils eventually learning adulthood. In conclusion, once again it must be emphasized that the school situation is not a situation that is different from that of the home but at most it is another kind of situation where there still is educative teaching. Because educative teaching at home and in school essentially are the same event, brief attention is given to the relationship between the home and the school.

7. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HOME AND SCHOOL

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

Via the school board and committees, the parents are in a position to insure, as far as possible, that only teachers who hold the same philosophy of life as they do are hired. Via parent-teacher associations the parents and teachers can encounter each other on a social level and pleasantly communicate with each other. The relationship between teachers and parents also can be strengthened by holding **parent days** or **parent evenings** where the parents have the opportunity to converse about the academic progress of

their children. Once again it is emphasized that for an unhindered and unrestrained progress of children in school there must be a very good relationship between home and school.

8. SUMMARY

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

ADDITIONAL READING MATERIAL:

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

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

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

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

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

B. SOME REMARKS ON DIDACTIC THINKING AND RESEARCH

1. INTRODUCTION

In the first three chapters of this textbook the student of didactic education is introduced to **essential characteristics and structures of the didactic-pedagogic situation** (educative teaching situation). However, a textbook in didactic education would not be complete without attention also being given to **didactic research**.

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

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

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

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

The discussions in this Division are aimed at spurring on the student in didactic education to independent didactic-pedagogic thinking. Extending didactic pedagogics (didactic education) as an autonomous part-science of pedagogics (education) only will be possible if there are students who really are interested in didactic education. Therefore, the authors heartily invite all students of didactic education to venture with them in order to proceed to **didactic-pedagogic thinking**, i.e., thinking that has the **educative teaching situation** as its point of departure. Consequently, it is the aim of the authors to awaken a **research awareness** in the students of didactic education because this is the only way that independent scientific contributions can be made to this part-perspective of pedagogics.

2. REFORM IN DIDACTIC THINKING

2.1 Introduction

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

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

2.2 Reform in didactic thinking

If the pedagogic literature (educational literature) of the past few years is examined it is clear that many publications are in the area of didactic pedagogics. For example, in Germany it is quite impossible to get through the works published yearly in didactic

education. The same also holds for German pedagogic journals that are dominated by didactic-pedagogic contributions. This certainly emphasizes the importance of this part-perspective of pedagogics. What is the order of the day in Germany also is noticeable to a great degree in other European countries and also in South Africa. However, the question that must be answered in this section is how does this reform in didactic thinking manifest itself to the didactic researcher?

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

In the second place, the insight that educating and teaching are a unitary event has provided didactic-pedagogic thinkers with a common point of departure. This point of departure is the **educative teaching situation**. This common point of departure also has brought about a consistency in **didactic-pedagogic terminology** (concepts). In contemporary didactic-pedagogic thinking use is made only of **didactic concepts** to describe and elucidate what the didactic-pedagogic event essentially is. These didactic concepts (descriptions and interpretations) are known as

didactic categories and criteria. The didactic categories and criteria are explained fully in Chapter Two. Their application in describing and interpreting the didactic-pedagogic event have resulted, in contemporary didactic thinking, in the practitioners of didactic education no longer talk through and past each other. Thus, reform in **didactic thinking as such** also has given rise to a reform in didactic thinking on all of the various levels of teaching. Now attention is given to reform in nursery school didactic thinking.

2.3 Reform in Nursery School didactic thinking

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

The increasing absence of the mother from the home (the so-called working mother) makes it urgently necessary that there be pedagogic (i.e., from the educative situation as point of departure) reflection on teaching as educatively teaching the toddler. This involves a fathoming of the educative relationship between the toddler as **educand** and the **educators** of toddlers. This means that Nursery School didactics never can be practiced as merely nursery school **didactics**, but that didactic insights that the nursery school didactician arrives at in studying the toddler-educator-relationship must be **interpreted pedagogically**. This is the task of the nursery school **didactician** as didactic **educationist**. If it is said that nursery school didactic insights acquired by the didactician studying the toddler-educator-relationship must be interpreted pedagogically, this means that he must investigate their **pedagogic significance**. Questions that

arise in this connection in contemporary nursery school didactics, for example, are the following: what is the significance of language as an educative means in educatively teaching the toddler?, what is the significance of stories as an educative means in educatively teaching the toddler?, what is the significance of play for the educative teaching situation?, what is the significance of religion for the toddler in the educative teaching situation? And when is the toddler ready to enter school?

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

2.4 Reform in Primary School didactic thinking

If the historians of the 21st Century should proceed to write down the most important changes during the second half of the twentieth century, certainly there is one matter that will not be overlooked and that is the recognition by humankind that educating is extremely important. Then, the most likely question posed by the historians is why in the second half of the twentieth century was there a particular interest in educating in general and in educative teaching in particular? Although it is difficult to anticipate a quarter of a century in advance the answer(s) to this question some of the answers mentioned by the authors possibly are the following two: the populations of the world have arrived at the conclusion that educative teaching is the most important investment for the future of any nation; the world politics of the second half of the twentieth century has rrequired that particular attention be given to educative teaching in order to help as quickly as possible the great

number of developing (underdeveloped) countries reach a contemporary level of civilization. Whatever the answer(s) might be the fact remains that today the order of the day is reform in didactic thinking on all levels of teaching.

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

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

* Here anthropology = philosophical anthropology.

lifeworld, today primary school didactic thinking takes note of a thorough knowledge of the lifeworld of the child as an experiential world.

Characteristic of the different subject didactics is indeed that they all emanate from the childlike lifeworld as experiential world. For example, with respect to **arithmetic** in the primary school there is talk of **lived-experiencing quantity** as a precondition for **indicating quantity**. In this regard, an important question posed is in what way is the system of arithmetic already prepared for in the childlike world image? Thus, the childlike experiential world itself is the point of departure of primary school didactic thinking regarding the subject of arithmetic. The same phenomenon also can be observed with all of the other subjects in the primary school.

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

2.5 Reform in Secondary School didactic thinking

When one looks at the curricula of the various types of secondary schools the investigator is struck by the enormous scope of knowledge that is offered in the various subjects (areas of knowledge). There is an almost unsurveyable and nearly unwieldy

amount of knowledge that has to be digested by the pupils and that must be integrated into their personal lifeworlds. That there now is an overload of content to be found in the secondary schools probably will not be denied by anyone. The fact of learning content overload also is entirely understandable when viewed in light of the phenomenal progress that has been made in all areas of science during the past few decades. This has caused the wealth of human knowledge to expand so greatly that the youth as well as the adults of tomorrow are under a spontaneous compulsion to be involved with learning more things than was the case with their parents. If this would not be the case the youths would lag behind in a world of continually growing knowledge. That youths must be confronted with all of the latest knowledge that the present and past produces and has produced is a foregone conclusion.

Thus, especially in the didactic thinking of the secondary school, the didactician is faced with the problem of learning content overload. Today, however, this problem is not limited to the secondary school but also is operative in the primary school. If the student of Didactic Education wants to search the contemporary didactic-pedagogic literature for a possible answer(s) offered by didactic researchers on this matter, he would be surprised to see that generally speaking not many solutions to the problem are offered. The only possible solution to the problem of learning content overload offered at the moment originates with German didacticians. In Tübingen (1951) a congress was convened with the sole aim of searching for possible solutions by which the increasing expansion of learning contents could be coped with. Thanks especially to the contributions of the physicist Martin Wagenschein and the historian Herman Heimpel a possible solution to the learning content overload was brought up. The particular teaching form mentioned as a possible solution is known as **exemplary teaching**. After the idea of exemplary teaching arose in the first year of the second half of the 20th century, this revolutionary idea very quickly began to acquire momentum throughout the European continent. Today the exemplary form of teaching is the order of the day in most European countries. The idea of exemplary teaching also caught on with didactic educationists in South Africa as a glance at the didactic research of advanced students in Didactic Education shows. Didactic educationists came to the conclusion that

the learning contents with which the pupils becoming adults are confronted with daily is and ought to be the **attribution of meaning via the exemplary**. In this regard, the didactic educationist P. Maree emphasizes that the adult always and necessarily offers an exemplar (example) of the proper attribution of meaning and that the child can implement his attributing meaning in analogy with the adult's example. From this statement by Maree immediately it is clear that the exemplar in everyday activities of persons is of particular importance for a person's understanding of his lifeworld as a meaningful (filled with meaning) lifeworld.

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

2.6 Reform in Didactic Thinking for Tertiary Teaching

There is little doubt that the future of any people depends on the scientifically schooled and persons trained otherwise as highly as

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

As far as the tendency for reform in didactic thinking in the area of tertiary didactics is concerned, F. van der Stoep indicates ten aspects that are mentioned here: the societal-didactic aspect, the organizational-administrative didactic aspect, the orientational didactic aspect, the social-didactic aspect, the psycho-didactic level, structural-didactic facets, subject-didactic findings, the evaluation-didactic aspect, research-didactic aspect and the tertiary-didactic aspect.

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

If it is said that today tertiary didactics also must express itself on a **psycho-didactic level** this means that the planners of teaching (didacticians) also must continually make the teaching personnel involved in the tertiary teaching institution aware that they must **ascertain the various ways** in which the learning person proceeds to **actualize** his learning activities. By **structural-didactic facets** of the tertiary didactic program is meant that tertiary didactics, especially in the contemporary situation, must attempt to have a very **clear and accountable formulation** of its **teaching ideal** and the corresponding planning of its profession of teaching. If there is talk of **subject didactic findings** in the area

of tertiary teaching this means that each separate subject will acquire an **identity** that now must be related to the unique nature of the particular subject's content, scientific methods and possibilities of applying insights. By **evaluation-didactic aspect** is meant that today in didactic thinking regarding teaching in all subjects there must be reflection on **checking the achievement** of the studying person. Especially regarding tertiary teaching, the traditional forms of **examining, testing** and similar **methods of checking** must be intensively investigated. By the **research-didactic aspect** is meant that with respect to tertiary teaching, didacticians must think about the possibilities that can be created for the students to direct independent research projects. In this connection, there must be thought about **financing, thorough planning, coordinating efforts, guiding student activities** and the **determination of findings** of the teaching personnel as well as the students themselves. This has to do with **forming research awareness** in students on the tertiary level. By the **tertiary-didactic aspect** is meant that, in particular, attention must be given to tertiary teaching in the broadest connection. Reform in tertiary didactic thinking must not merely be introduced in certain subjects but must be made part of **all of the subjects** offered on the tertiary level.

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

3. COMPARATIVE DIDACTICS*

3.1 Introduction

If the didactic and education literature is viewed synoptically it is clear that there **still cannot be mention** of a **scientifically accountable point of departure** regarding **comparative education** and the highly related comparative didactics. For the sake of clarity about this, it is mentioned that, following the existing educational literature in comparative education, it is involved with a

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

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

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

According to most American thinkers of education and teaching, the **United States of America (U.S.A.)** finds itself in a serious **cultural crisis**. Mentioned as **symptoms** of this crisis are chronic instability, confusion, ambiguity, uncertainty (Brameld, 1950), the inadaptability of the transmitted image of values for the present time (Broudy, 1954) and the validity of conflicting norms in different areas of society (Bierstedt, 1963). Thus, in general, in the U.S.A. there is mention of a **radical shift in values** (Spindler, 1963). The question now is what influence does this socio-cultural situation in the U.S.A. exercise on **teaching policies and practices** in American schools? With regard to teaching policies, it is declared that the individual is the center of all values. As a **basic American value** the optimal personality development of the individual must be guaranteed by teacher preparation. Emphasis is placed on the equality of rights and opportunities. According to the Educational Policies Commission one of the central aims of teacher preparation must be the **development of the [pupils'] ability to think**. The mentioned aims as formulated in the teaching policies result in a so-called **democratic practice of teaching**. For **Americans democracy is an entire way of living** (Kilpatrick, 1963), a **constellation of moral principles** (Smith, 1957) and a **religion** because there is talk of a **faith in democracy** (McMurrin, 1964).

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

If the administration and practice of teaching in the **Soviet Union (Communist Republics)** are examined they show a **centralized structure** in contrast to that of the U.S.A. and England. This results in decisions regarding the formulating of teaching policy and its application in practice being considerably easier than is the case in the U.S.A. and England. The framework for developing teaching is determined by the **Communist Party and state administration organs**. As far as state administration organs are concerned, in particular there are two organs that are responsible for formulating teaching policy, namely, the AN SSSR and the APN SSSR. AN SSSR is an acronym for the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Socialist Republic and APN SSSR is an acronym for the Academy of Pedagogic Sciences of the Soviet Socialist Republic. All curriculum planning and development is undertaken directly by these two Academies. Since 1966 there also has been a so-called **Alunie-Ministerium** for national forming that possesses a

controlling and coordinating function in the U.S.S.R. (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). Formulating teaching policy and the resulting teaching practice largely is carried by the findings of Soviet Psychology under the lead of contemporary Soviet psychologists such as Leont'ev, Sokolow and Gal'perin. The didactic formulations thus indeed are **psychological-didactic** formulations. Because of the centralized structure of teaching policy in the Soviet Union it is possible to carry the Communist Ideology over into all teaching practice.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

pupils will still be offered in the primary school but the curriculum (syllabuses) of this group of pupils will be brought into congruence with junior secondary school teaching.

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

4. DIDACTIC RESEARCH

4.1 Methodological accounting

4.1.2 Natural science approach

When there is mention of research in any area of life the researcher must be able to be accountable to himself regarding the particular method or methods he uses in his research. Thus, the didactic researcher also must give evidence of **methodological accounting**. There mainly are two methodological approaches to didactic research noticeable, namely the **natural science** and the **human science approach**.

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

practiced especially by Peter and Else Petersen with their so-called “pedagogic factuality research”. In the 1950’s and 1960’s this pedagogic factuality research acquired the name of **empirical-pedagogic research**. This empirical-pedagogic research acquired its stamp in the didactic-pedagogic research of Heinrich Roth, Erich Hylla and Wolfgang Brezinka. Such didactic-pedagogic research then was done with the help of **exact, controllable observations** (tape-recorders and film-strips), **interviews with teachers** about their attunement to didactic-pedagogic problems such as school organization, **statistical procedures, carefully designed didactic-pedagogic experiments, development of tests** for the determination of the real teaching results in particular subjects and **the statistical determination of the costs** for future school buildings corresponding to the increase in population.

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

4.1.2 Human science approach

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.2 Themes in Didactic Education

4.2.1 Introduction

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

4.2.2 Themes in Didactic Education

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

- i. Educating the primary school child in didactic-pedagogic perspective.
- j. Educating the secondary school child in didactic-pedagogic perspective.
- k. The possibility of a structure for university didactics.
- l. Didactic education (pedagogics) as a part-discipline of education (pedagogics).
- m. Formulating and planning teaching policy.
- n. The teacher and his calling.
- o. The exemplar in teaching history.
- p. The exemplar in language teaching.
- q. The exemplar in teaching physicalscience and chemistry.
- r. The exemplar in mathematics teaching.

5. SUMMARY

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

ADDITIONAL READING MATERIAL:

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

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

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

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

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

Van Dyk, C. J.: **Vanaf vorming (Bildung) tot Eksemplariese onderrig en leer: 'n Didakties-Pedagogiese Strukturering.**