THE DEVELOPMENT OF PEDAGOGICAL THINKING IN THE VARIOUS PART-DISCIPLINES OF THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION FROM 1930 TO 1980: FUNDAMENTAL PEDAGOGICS*

S. G. Roos

1. Introduction

The purpose is not to focus on the history of fundamental pedagogics, as such, but to indicate the development of this line of thinking. However, to do this there has to be indirect reference to the historical facts of the department. Since it is extremely difficult to indicate the development of fundamental pedagogical thought as a whole, this is done with reference to certain themes. In this way not only its development but also its tempo is illuminated more clearly.

To trace the early years of the course of this development use is made mostly of student research but after the publication of Prof. C. K. Oberholzer's **Inleiding tot die prinsipiele opvoedkunde** [Introduction to the principles of education] in 1954 more use is made of faculty publications in the department. After 1968 there is less reference to theses and dissertations because the development of fundamental pedagogical thinking is clearly expressed in publications. Appearing in 1968 was **Prolegomena van 'n prinsipiele pedagogiek** [Prolegomena to a principles-based pedagogic] by Prof. C. K. Oberholzer which clearly reflects the progress of thinking since 1954. After that, and in quick succession, there are publications initiated by Prof. Landman and others under his leadership from which the course of the development of thought in the Department of Fundamental Pedagogics is clear.

2. Earlier names of fundamental pedagogics

The development of fundamental pedagogical thought is reflected clearly in the various names it has had. Before the establishment of

* **Pedagogiekjoernaal**, (1980), Vol. 1, No. 2, 101-121.

the Faculty of Education, "History and Principles of Education" was a subject taught to student teachers. From this title it is clear that the theoretical aspects of education already enjoyed attention. After the Faculty was established in 1937, a course called "Educational Philosophy" was developed. As can be deduced from the title, it is viewed as a subdivision of philosophy. Also, Prof. T. J. Hugo from philosophy was then the first department head. In addition, ethics, another subdivision of philosophy, was established in 1941 as "Educational Ethics" and was taught by a philosopher, Prof. C. H. Rautenbach. In 1948 Prof. C. K. Oberhozer taught in the Department of Philosophy, and he also became head of the Department of "Philosophy of Education" and educational ethics was assigned to it. Although the official name of the department was different, he preferred the name "Principles of Education". This preference is clear in the research of students who studied under him although at this time there were a number of other names for indicating this aspect of education.

J. J. Mulder (M. Ed. 1950) calls the Philosophy of Education Theoretical Education, Systematic Education, Normative Pedagogics, Principles of Education, Educational Philosophy, Educational Science, Educational Ideology or the Science of Education. According to him, the subject that contributes to this area of knowledge is philosophy among which are a theory of values or axiology and theology. Two years later (1952) another M. Ed. student, O. C. Erasmus, also uses the same synonyms for the Philosophy of Education but substitutes "education" with "pedagogic". He then continues, "This division of the pedagogic borrows its premises from the normative sciences, e.g., ethics, logic and esthetics as well as the philosophical theory of values, anthropology and theology. These are theoretical sciences for assisting the applied sciences in determining educational aims, educational and formative ideals" (p. 2).

In his **Inleiding tot die prinsipiele opvoedkunde** [Introduction to the principles of education] (1954) Prof. C. K. Oberholzer explains what he means by "principles of education" by saying this also is known as philosophical education or as the philosophy of education. In addition, he mentions that the name "only indicates the task and content of this part of education which considers fully

the phenomenon of education in its rich problematics and tries to critically deduce its **foundations** and **fundamental questions**" (p. 76) (Roos' emphasis).

Prof. W. A. Landman chose the name "Fundamental Pedagogics", and this has been the official name of the department since 1968. In this regard, he expresses himself as follows: "A primary aspect of its task is to search for and describe the grounding or founding fundamental structures. Among others, this is the reason that it now is possible to argue that this scientific area be known as Fundamental Pedagogics. Fundamental pedagogics is grounding pedagogics because its particular task is the grounding of the pedagogic in reality." (**Inleiding tot die fundamentele pedagogiek** [Introduction to fundamental pedagogics], pp. 75-76).

3. Movement away from an initial naturalistic approach

In the early years the direction of educational thought at this university and elsewhere in this country had a strongly pragmatic, naturalistic and evolutionistic orientation. The stamp of such persons as Nunn, McDougall, James, Dewey and Kilpatrick was imprinted clearly on educational thinking. These Anglo-American lines of thought continued to exist even though a number of Afrikaners had studied on the European Continent in countries such as Germany, Holland and Belgium. This is understandable considering the strong English language and English cultural background of South Africa.

After 1937, the Department of Educational Philosophy, which was very continentally oriented, began to object somewhat to this naturalistic influence. Prof. C. H. Rautenbach, who from the founding of the Faculty promoted Educational Ethics and from 1940 to 1948 promoted the Philosophy of Education was influenced by Heymans and especially by Kant. Already before World War II, and before philosophical anthropology had taken its rightful place as a major area of philosophy, as an educator and philosopher, he noticed and emphasized the exceptional position held in the universe by human beings. Initially Rautenbach fought an uphill battle since the majority of students who qualified themselves for

teaching had no philosophical foundation and, in addition, the education literature was mainly in English.

At the post-graduate level, however, the opposition to naturalistically oriented thinking was evident early on. C. K. Oberholzer was the first researcher to usher in this objection in his 1937 M. Ed. thesis. He wrote on the “Character Education of F. W. Foerster” and indicates that Foerster is strongly against a naturalistic ethics "that makes the moral dependent on biological and natural science factors" (p. 23). Also in his D. Ed. dissertation, which dealt with conceptions of freedom in modern education, Oberholzer revolted against viewing a person as a necessity of nature imprisoned by laws of causality. Here he concluded that the highest aim of education is educating to freedom. Human freedom, which resides in a person's responsibility, was emphasized further in later works and shows his sustained opposition to a naturalistic view of persons. In addition, Oberholzer adamantly objected to any comparisons of humans and animals and avoided all concepts borrowed from the realms of plants and animals when he wrote about persons. Later, when some conceptual changes are considered, it will be seen how this opposition increased dramatically.

There were writers who argued the contrary position and who believed that this line of educational thought is characterized by "anti" thinking, namely, anti-naturalism, anti-scientism, anti-pragmatism, anti-evolutionism and more. However, this opposition should be seen against the background of the initial domination of natural science approaches to the pedagogical and the intention to break away from them so that human beings can take their rightful place. Still, even in the 1970's Landman and others took great pains to found the pedagogic anthropologically and there still was reference to an anthropological pedagogics. In a sense this is a tautology because the pedagogic can be nothing other than anthropological. The concept "pedagogic" always means child guidance and excludes the possibility of training animals. Further, it was clearly acknowledged that this school of thought is dead against a "pedagogics" that is built on the results of animal experiments.

In the following section attention is given to a few conceptual changes that clarify further the objections to the naturalistic approaches and that indicate the development of thought in fundamental pedagogics.

4. Development of fundamental pedagogic thought as is evident in the use of a few concepts

Terminological changes and different interpretations of the same terms are closely related to avoiding the ways of naturalism, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, also with the view of the science, terrain and the task of pedagogics.

Comparing the two main works of Prof. Oberholzer, namely, "Inleiding in die prinsipiele opvoedkunde"[Introduction to the principles of education] and "Prolegomena van 'n prinsipiele pedagogiek"[Prolegomena to a principles-based pedagogic], which appeared 14 years apart, it is conspicuous that the second work was written in a more anti-naturalistic idiom. Any concept that might give the impression that persons are described in terms of the being of plants or animals is carefully avoided. This definitely is a step forward in the development of thinking because it forces the reader to think about human beings in accordance with what they really are so that their exceptional positionality also emerges more clearly. Words that are thought of in this connection, among others, are: "cause" which is substituted with various other concepts such as "reason" and "motive". "Process" is substituted with "event" or "occurrence", and "formative processes" with "the course of forming". "Person" is used rather than "organism". In his attempt to get away from process-like concepts such as cause, effect, stimulus-reaction as far as this concerns humans, his use of words was carefully chosen. Instead of "causes", in the later work there is mention of "factors" or "grounds". In addition, "influence" is used in place of "stimuli" and "reaction" is replaced by "answer" or even "response". These are only examples of the change in terminology reflecting the development of his thinking.

The above anthropologically accountable use of language also influenced Oberholzer's students so that even today any of the publications or research reports read, not only in the Department of

Fundamental Pedagogics but in the Faculty of Education as a whole, still do not ignore the anthropological foundation on which they are continually constructed.

In the earlier research and publications there was no distinction between educating and a doctrine of education; indeed it was expressly stated that they are synonymous concepts. This usage is viewed against the background of the number of theses and dissertations that dealt with the educational doctrines of various particular thinkers. Early on, it was very clear that there was a conceptual deficiency that prevented the development of what later would be known as a doctrine of education. Although J. J. Mulder, in his 1950 M. Ed. thesis, did not make a distinction between educating and a doctrine of education, still he talked about an educational ideology that "in the last instance is carried by an axiology and anthropology, either philosophical or Christian" (p. 11). In 1956, S. J. Schoeman wrote about this matter in his M. Ed. thesis as follows: "Educational doctrine is a doctrine or view of a particular appearance or phenomenon, namely, that of educating as a universal matter among persons. Thus, educating and a doctrine of education are synonymous concepts because the term education not only means a doctrine about educating as a phenomenon but also a practice among persons".

P. J. Maree, in his 1968 M. Ed. thesis, first referred to the two-fold meaning of the concept educational doctrine, namely, as a synonym for "principles of pedagogics where the education phenomenon is clearly described phenomenologically against an ontological background" (p. 2). In addition, he indicated that the concept has a strongly prescriptive flavor where life values, as these arise in a person's philosophy of life, predominate. It is this second meaning that became prominent. In 1971 **Opvoedkunde en opvoedingsleer vir beginners** [Education and educational doctrine for beginners] appeared under the pen of W. A. Landman and others. As the title clearly indicates, a distinction is now made between education and a theory of education. In this work, **post-scientific** contents are infused into essentials that have been disclosed in a purely phenomenological way. In this way, the universal essentials are made prescriptive by particular philosophy of life contents in specific educative situations. Consequently, the

last chapter deals with a Christian-Protestant philosophy of life and educational theory.

The concept "post-scientific" also developed. In 1969 in **Inleiding tot die fundamentele pedagogiek** [Introduction to fundamental pedagogics] by W. A. Landman and S. J. Gous, sharp distinctions were made among the concepts pre-scientific, scientific and post-scientific. Pre-scientific refers to the life world point of departure of pedagogical thought, i.e., to the reality of educating itself. Scientific is approximately equivalent to the phenomenological, i.e., to analyzing the essentials of the reality of educating. All thought activities subsequent to this are typified as post-scientific, namely, philosophy of life derived contents.

Later in a 1973 work by Landman and Roos, **Fundamentele pedagogiek en die opvoedingswerklikheid** [Fundamental pedagogics and the reality of education], it was noted that there are specific criteria for scientific practice, namely, that of philosophy of life permissibility as a breaking away from Husserl's rationalism in terms of Heidegger's "Befindlichkeit" (attunement, disposition). In Landman's 1977 work, **Fundamentele pedagogiek en onderwyspraktiek** [Fundamental pedagogics and teaching practice] the matter was more sharply presented with the indication that philosophy of life permissibility is an affective way of acting (Tymienieka, Hengstenberg, Severs, Dupre). With this a choice of a philosophy of life becomes part of what is "scientific" about scientific practice.

As far as philosophy of life derived contents are concerned:

(i) The fact and possibility of philosophy of life enlivenment are universal matters. (W. A. Landman, Van Zyl, M. E. J., and Roos, S. G. (1975). **Fundamenteel pedagogiese essensies: Hulle verskyning, verwerkliking en inhoudgewing**)[Fundamental pedagogic essences: their appearance, actualization and giving them content].

(ii) Life philosophy can claim structural status equivalent to the relationship, sequence, activity and aim structures. (Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Mentz, N. J. (1979). **Fundamentele pedagogiek, leerwyses en vakonderrig**) [Fundamental pedagogics, modes of learning and subject matter teaching].

(iii) The ways the essentials originate in a life philosophy and are synthesized out of the educative reality itself have to meet scientific demands.

From these three points it is deduced that the concept "post-scientific" is equivalent to "practice".

5. Research by students

As indicated in the first paragraph, it is difficult to determine the development of fundamental pedagogical thinking from publications alone. Especially in the years before 1954, student research and a few contributions by C. H. Rautenbach and C. K. Oberholzer are the only sources. The few contributions referred to here are: **Ons lewensopvatting** [Our philosophy of life]. This is a lecture that Rautenbach gave at the opening of the University of Pretoria on 11 March 1940. This talk, which was later published, had a decisive influence on later pedagogical thought. For example, the concept "life philosophy" was readily accepted over the more customary "life view". Small works by C. K. Oberholzer that are mentioned in this connection are **Ons en ons kinders** [We and our children]. This was a series of articles that appeared in a periodical of the Reformed Church between 1943 and 1946 and were published as a compilation in 1956. In addition, in 1945 he wrote an article in a teacher bulletin on the teacher as one who is called. An article that clearly shows the development of Oberholzer's thought and that had an influence on his students is "Die eksistensie filosofie: orienterende opmerkinge" [Existential philosophy: orientational comments] which appeared in Tydskrif vir Wetenskap en Kuns in April of 1949.

After Prof. Oberholzer's **Inleiding in die prinsipiele opvoedkunde** [Introduction to the principles of education]

appeared in 1954, the state of thinking could be clearly determined. Henceforth, this excellent book also influenced post-graduate work by providing a new direction to build on. His progression to an existential-phenomenological foundation was further clarified in his **Prolegomena van 'n prinsipiele pedagogiek** [Prolegomena to a principles-based pedagogic] that appeared 14 years later. Student research should also be viewed as a contributing factor to this development in thinking.

Before 1937 the research had a strong Anglo-American orientation. Then there was a move away from this orientation in the Department of Educational Philosophy. The first M. Ed. thesis that ushered in this direction was that of C. K. Oberholzer who wrote about the character education of F. W. Foerster. In this thesis there was already reference to Husserl and Scheler. Another idea that was clearly emphasized was the connection between ethics and education. Thus, Oberholzer said that there has to be this connection since the "fundamental principle of educational philosophy is that educational theory is a theory of child living. Our understanding of life determines our understanding of educating, our educational and our formative ideal. ... All cultural problems are in their deepest roots educational problems" (p. 30). In addition, he shows that Foerster, regarding his views of applying ethics to education, tried to anchor the ethical in the person as a fundamental principle **founded** on a Christian basis.

Although a Christian foundation was accepted long ago, it was 36 years later that this is described in a scientifically accountable way in **Fundamentele pedagogiek en die opvoedingswerklikheid** [Fundamental pedagogics and the reality of education] by Landman and Roos. The reason this important matter was dropped for so long is found in a number of factors. Perhaps the most important one is the fear of falling into a subjectivism that would replace the scientific nature of pedagogics. Another reason, closely related to the first, is that the ideas, "pre-scientific", "scientific" and "post-scientific" were not yet clearly defined. Especially the idea "post-scientific" was confused with unscientific. In so far as clarity was attained regarding these concepts, more use was made of contents derived from a philosophy of life **along with** scientifically acquired fundamental pedagogic essentials. In this way it is shown that an

educative **practice** can only be founded if it is built on a scientific foundation, on the one hand, and on philosophy of life sources, on the other hand. (Landman and Roos, **Fundamentele pedagogiek en die opvoedingswerklikheid** [Fundamental pedagogics and the reality of education], 1973).

Also, Oberholzer's 1947 D. Ed. dissertation, **Die vryheidsgedagte in die moderne opvoedkunde** [The idea of freedom in modern education] shows a movement away from naturalism and scientism against which he speaks most strongly. In this dissertation he clearly defines educating to freedom as the aim of education. The idea of educating to freedom-in-responsibility is explicated more thoroughly later. For example, in 1968 in his **Prolegomena...** this aim is elevated to a category, thus to an illuminating means of thinking that has ontological-anthropological status. In 1971, this category is described as an activity structure by Landman, Roos and Liebenberg in **Opvoedkunde en opvoedingsleer vir beginners** [Education and educational doctrine for beginners]. Still later it is refined further by disclosing its essentials, namely, acquiring freedom, readiness to freely make an effort, recognition of authority, freedom-as-boundness and being-aware-of-freedom. (Landman and Roos, **Fundamentele pedagogiek en opvoedingswerklikheid** [Fundamental pedagogics and the reality of education], 1973).

In 1949 an M. Ed. thesis with the title **Die sedelike oordeel van die 8-12 jarige kind** [The moral judgment of the 8-12 year old child] was completed by C. F. B. Havenga. Here the autonomy of pedagogics had not yet clearly emerged. For example, the author quotes Rautenbach who contends that "Education has to acquire its values elsewhere; for this reason a theory of values (ethics) is one of the main sciences of a theory of education" (p. 11). Then Havenga concludes that ethics, in collaboration with psychology, can and must bring to light the facts needed for the educator to carry out his work.

In the 1950's and 60's most of the theses and dissertations dealt with the educational doctrines of acknowledged educationists or schools of thought. In this connection, the following are mentioned: Mulder, J. J., **Die opvoedingsleer van H. Horne** [The educational

doctrine of H. Horne], M. Ed., 1950; Erasmus, O. C., **Die opvoedingsleer van E. Spranger** [The educational doctrine of E. Spranger], M. Ed., 1952; Du Plooy, A. D., **Die prinsipieel-pedagogiese beskouinge van J. C. Coetzee** [A fundamental educational view of J. C. Coetzee], M. Ed., 1954; Erasmus, O. C., **Die personalisme van Kohnstamm en die betekenis hiervan vir sy prinsipieel-pedagopgiese denkbeelde** [The personalism of Kohnstamm and its significance for his view of fundamental education], D. Ed., 1955; Schoeman, S. J., **Die opvoedingsleer van W. C. Bagley met spesiale verwysing na sy etiese pedagogiek** [The educational doctrine of W. C. Bagley with special reference to his educational ethics], M. Ed., 1956; Smit, R. J., **Die pedagogiese denkbeelde van J. H. Gunning** [The educational views of J. H. Gunning], M. Ed., 1956; Van Vuuren, J. C., **Die opvoedkundige leer van Ernst Krieck** [The educational doctrine of Ernst Krieck], M. Ed., 1958; Schoeman, S. J., **Die antropologies-personologiese denkbeelde van die derde Weense skool en die betekenis hiervan vir die opvoeding in sedelik verband** [The anthropological-personological views of the third Vienna school and their significance for moral education], D. Ed., 1959; Van Zyl, P., **Die antropologies-pedagogiese denkbeelde van F. W. Foerster met nadruk op die eties pedagogiese moments daarin** [The anthropological-pedagogical views of F. W. Foerster with emphasis on their ethical pedagogical moments], D. Ed., 1963; Maree, P. J., **Die opvoedingsleer van W. H. Kilpatrick** [The educational doctrine of W. H. Kilpatrick], M. Ed., 1968.

The research mentioned above contributed to the development of thinking in the Faculty of Education not only by introducing the thinking of other scientists but especially by explicating the research methods they used and how to apply them. An additional contribution of this research was in the careful examination of pedagogical bottlenecks, usually in the first chapter.

A contribution of an entirely different nature was made in the dissertation by N. S. Botes titled **Die fenomenologies-georienteerde antropologie en psigologie en die betekenis hiervan vir die opvoeding** [The significance of a phenomenolgically oriented anthropology and psychology for

education] that was completed in 1964. The phenomenological method, already mentioned by Oberholzer in 1937 and later described and used by him, was now brought strongly to the fore and its significance for pedagogic thought clearly emerged. For the first time in a dissertation pedagogic **criteria** were mentioned and Botes then distinguished five criteria in terms of which the **essentials** of the idea of the pedagogical and the distinctiveness of pedagogical thinking are indicated.

6. Methodological development

Where in the beginning years of the department there still was uncertainty about the appropriate point of departure for educational philosophy and it often was viewed as a kind of applied philosophy, Oberholzer states in his **Inleiding in die prinsipiele opvoedkunde** [Introduction to the principles of education] that the point of departure must be the educative reality itself in its empirical indisputability. In this way the investigator insures that the results of his science will be generally valid and, therefore, scientifically acceptable. In this connection, he writes, "The fundamental questions have to do with the universality of the problem". In his 1968 **Prolegomena ...** he talks of an ontic-ontological founding and indicates that if one doesn't do this only two possibilities remain, a founding in one or another subject science (e.g., psychology) or in a metaphysics (e.g., pragmatism).

As already mentioned, one of Oberholzer's doctoral students, N. S. Botes, made an important contribution to establishing and expanding the phenomenological method here. He searched for fundamental pedagogical essentials and in purely phenomenological ways separated the essentials from non-essentials. "The pedagogical has to be distinguished from the non-pedagogical and this distinction occurs in terms of particular **criteria**. Before these criteria can be pointed out, the **essences** of educating have to be outlined. These essences [of educating] clearly are in the idea of supporting one who seeks support on his way to adulthood" (p. 25 Roos' emphasis). He distinguishes five criteria, namely: (i) acceptance; (ii) awareness of responsibility; (iii) the normative; (iv) sympathetic, authoritative guidance; and (v) the idea of adulthood. His last criterion was later fully elaborated on and refined as a

pedagogic aim structure by Landman and others by particularizing additional essentials, all of which can also be used as criteria.

Clearly, even before 1954, Oberholzer had an intense interest in the phenomenological method that he then also later applied in his **Inleiding in die prinsipiele opvoedkunde** [Introduction to the principles of education]. He applied the method, as he says, to characterize the phenomenon of educating as an educative action and to disclose its essential moments (p. 12). He believes the essence of a phenomenon will be expressed in its definition. He then makes a first and particularly successful attempt to disclose the origin and course of the **structure** of educating in its essentials. He does this by describing the structure in terms of twenty-three essential characteristics. Later, this structure is refined by Landman and others as the sequence structure of the pedagogic situation.

Oberholzer wanted to ground the pedagogical ontologically. He did this by particularizing a number of ontological categories. In **Prolegomena ...** he listed a large number such as "becoming, freedom, person, subject, task, existence, being ethical, eccentricity, self-conscious, awareness of propriety, responsibility, temporality and world" (p. 159). With these ontic categories Oberholzer wanted to characterize the **primordial ground** [of the pedagogical] as being **ontically openness** or as **openness to being**. It is quite clear that later a somewhat different meaning is given to the concept "ontological". In an article appearing in the journal **Paedagogische Studien** Landman clearly states that the only ontological category is “Da-sein (openness, being-in-the-world)" (p. 465). The shift in emphasis is clear. Oberholzer founded the pedagogical in **openness to being** while Landman sought its ground in the being-there of a person in the world, which indeed is characterized by openness as a way of his being in the world but which, as such, cannot be viewed as the first precondition. In other words, Oberholzer sought the foundation of the pedagogical in a person's openness to the world while Landman merely sought it in the fact **that** a person is being-in-the-world.

Where initially Oberholzer had strongly supported Langeveld, in his **Prolegomena ...** he went well beyond him and designed an expanded set of pedagogical categories and later also criteria that

are grounded in the primordial foundation of ontic openness. Regarding the founding of these categories, he says "This has to do purely with thinking about ontic structuredness and when this ontic structure-in-function occurs pedagogically, then this thinking has to occur in terms of **pedagogical categories**. Now an extremely important observation: there also truly are judgments evaluating this pedagogic event. These judgments occur, however, in terms of "**pedagogical criteria that do not arise at all from a philosophy of life but that have to conform to the demands rooted in the primordial [pedagogical] structure as an activity structure**" (p. 26). The pedagogical categories revealed by Oberholzer are: giving assistance; futurity; expectation; encounter; normativity; open situatedness; safe space; exploration; sympathetic, authoritative guidance; freedom-in-responsibility and adulthood.

After 1968 the use of categories and the entire phenomenological approach quickly developed further. As did Oberholzer, Landman also viewed categories as ontologically founded sketches that are means **for** thinking (Heidegger) and not means **of** thinking as does Kant. The categories, as illuminating means for thinking, were refined further by Landman and his co-workers to disclose and describe the pedagogical in its essentials and show the interrelations among the essentials.

In **Inleiding tot die fundamentele pedagogiek** [Introduction to fundamental pedagogics] by Landman and Gous (1969) a summary is given of Oberholzer's categories, and they are further supplemented and ordered under the anthropological categories of being-in-a-meaningful-world, being-with, temporality and being-someone-oneself from which the pedagogical categories stem. Also in this work, a strong Husserlian explanation is given of the phenomenological method where reasoning is in the foreground. The Husserlian reductions are discussed. The concept of essence does not come to the foreground and for that reason other descriptions are given such as fundamental components, moments, structures and essential characteristics.

In **Denkwyses in die opvoedkunde** [Ways of thinking in education] by Landman, Kilian and Roos (1971) the pedagogic

categories are described with examples of their practical application. As far as applying and designing categories are concerned, there is now a departure from Oberholzer's standpoint. Here it is clarified that in reality criteria are categories in the form of questions. Thus, now use no longer is made of one set of categories and another set of criteria. Also in this work the phenomenological method is described more broadly while there also is a clear swing away from following a methodological monism. This occurs by making room for the contradictory and dialectic methods. The dialectic method is described here in terms of thesis, antithesis and synthesis, thus, as two contradictory poles that are united in a synthesis that goes beyond both.

In **Opvoeding en opvoedingsleer vir beginners** [Education and educational theory for beginners] by Landman, Roos and Liebenberg (1971) the concept of essence is placed clearly in the foreground. To clearly show that essences are not Platonic ideas use is made of the concept "real essentials", especially in the sense of preconditions. There also is an explanation given of ways of thinking for designing a fundamental pedagogics.

In **Fundamentele pedagogiek en die opvoedingswerklikheid** [Fundamental pedagogics and the reality of education] by Landman and Roos (1973), the ontological-anthropological grounding of the pedagogic categories (and criteria) is indicated clearly. In this way, the pedagogical categories also are justified epistemologically. The significance of taking the reality of educating as the point of departure for thinking and for verification by application comes to the foreground. It also is clearly stated that in the search for knowledge there are only two ways possible: either it has to do with the essentials of the reality of educating or it has to do with non-essentials. This view is used as a grounding view. Further, as far as the phenomenological method is concerned, the idea of the necessity of life philosophy permissibility of disclosing activities in addition to their scientific necessity, is scientifically justified. The dialectic method is also described in detail with examples. Here there also is a deviation from the strong dialectic method where a thesis is posed in opposition to an antithesis as two poles. Instead there is reference to "first preconditions" and "second preconditions", or to "first way of being" and "second way of being".

Another name for the synthesis that is mentioned here is "integrated way of being". The dialectic powers of movement such as design, tension and intensification are also discussed in this work. In addition, the value of the hermeneutic method is indicated as a means to bring more clearly to light the unifying bonds among the essences by continually asking what function each serves.

In **Die praktykwording van die fundamentele pedagogiek** [The practical application of fundamental pedagogics] by Landman, Roos and Van Rooyen (1973) the concept "category" is analyzed etymologically and phenomenologically and its application in the light of fundamental pedagogical essences is demonstrated. In addition, it also is indicated that for something to really be an essence, it has to have categorical status.

In **Fundamenteel-pedagogiese essensies: Hulle verskying, verwerkliking en inhoudgewing** [Fundamental pedagogic essences: Their appearance, actualization and giving them contents] by Landman, Van Zyl and Roos (1975) it is strongly advocated that the abolishment of essence-blindness is a necessary scientific criterion. Further, that pedagogical thinking not only involves disclosing essentials but also their **meaningful connections** are given particular attention.

In **Fundamentele pedagogiek en onderwyspraktyk: Metodology, fundamentele pedagogiek en lesstruktuur** [Fundamental pedagogics and teaching practice: Methodology, fundamental pedagogics and the lesson structure] by Landman (1977) methodological activities that have significance for disclosing essentials and for implementing essences are clearly brought to light. The message of this book is clearly stated in its subtitle.

In **Fundamentele pedagogiek, leerwyses en vakonderrig** [Fundamental pedagogics, modes of learning and teaching subject matter] by Landman, Roos and Mentz (1979), the phenomenological acts of disclosing [essentials] are interpreted further in the form of questions to be asked by the pedagogician. The current pedagogical discussion of phenomenology is explicated further.

Inleiding tot die opvoedkundige navorsingspraktyk [Introduction to the practice of educational research] (1980) is the last work to be mentioned. Here the particular phenomenological method, as it has developed over the years at this university, is seen in action. This work, edited by Landman, shows the development of pedagogical thinking not only in the Department of Fundamental Pedagogics but in the Faculty of Education as a whole because, from their particular perspectives, the other departments contributed to its emergence. (This fact underlines the unification of the pedagogical, which is discussed in the next section). Personnel from other places such as the Transvaal Department of Education and the Human Sciences Research Council have also made contributions from which it is clear that the development in thinking has not remained limited to the University of Pretoria. Also in this book the significance of phenomenology for research is clarified, especially regarding the following: the research proposal, preparation for research, verification of the research results and their interpretation. In addition, it is indicated that in reality educational research has to do with applying research procedures with the aim of disclosing, clarifying and verifying essentials.

7. The unification of the pedagogic

Initially the different departments in the Faculty of Education functioned without any connection among them. For example, educational philosophy and educational ethics, and later the philosophy of education were taught by persons connected with another faculty (philosophy). In this regard, Nel correctly asserts that at that time the Faculty of Education was really a conglomerate of separate subjects.

In the late 1940's, especially in the Department of Philosophy of Education, a clear unification of thinking arose. This has to be seen in light of the Dutch thinkers Hoogveld, Kohnstamm, Waterink and Langeveld who had shown the unity of the pedagogical. It is especially the phenomenological pedagogics of Langeveld, in his work **Beknopte theoretische paedagogiek** [Concise theoretical pedagogics] (1944), that had a significant influence in this regard. The educative situation, as such, and no longer different sciences, was now clearly seen as the area of study of pedagogics. This

uniting point of departure became the bond that would closely tie the different areas of pedagogics to each other. Another uniting bond, closely related to the first, is the phenomenological method that was already embraced by the Department of the Philosophy of Education.

In the publications after 1968, the meaningful relations among Fundamental Pedagogics and the other pedagogic disciplines was also demonstrated. In **Die praktykwording van die fundamentele pedagogiek** [The practical application of fundamental pedagogics] the meaningful relations among fundamental pedagogical essences and particular didactic pedagogical essences, as well as among psychopedagogical essences, are demonstrated. The essentials of the lesson structure are viewed as a synthesis of these essences.

In **Fundamentele pedagogiek en die onderwyspraktyk** [Fundamental pedagogics and teaching practice] the educative reality is delimited to the practice of teaching and the relations among the fundamental pedagogical essences and activities and the lesson structure are explicated.

In **Fundamentele pedagogiek, leerwyses en vakonderrig** [Fundamental pedagogics, modes of learning and subject matter teaching] the relations among fundamental pedagogical essences (essences of the modes of learning and the essences of relationships to reality) are described and their significance for meaningful subject matter teaching are explicated. In the last chapter a unity also is shown with school guidance as a subject. From a fundamental pedagogical perspective particular preconditions for a guidance conversation are indicated and discussed.

The various areas of the science of pedagogics that have relevance for each other are further clarified and relationships between fundamental pedagogics and youth preparedness are looked for. In "Spiritual preparedness against ideological terrorism", Roos (1979) looked at youth preparedness from a fundamental pedagogical perspective where the philosophical background of spiritual threats is considered.

8. Practical application of fundamental pedagogics

The idea that pedagogics as a science could be used to improve the practice it reflects on was recognized in the earliest years of fundamental pedagogics. However, it was first in 1968 that the ways fundamental pedagogics could improve practice were indicated.

The reason this was not done earlier is because of the fear of being unscientific. The idea was that the task of a science was to practice that science for the sake of science and to seek knowledge for the sake of knowledge. Only after clarity was attained regarding the concepts pre-scientific, scientific and post-scientific was attention given to the view of applying scientific results to practice.

Already in his **Inleiding tot die prinsipiele opvoedkunde** [Introduction to the principles of education] (1954) Oberholzer stated that the study of education or educational theory can be described as "a theory about educating with the aim of improving it" (p. 54). He then concluded that the study of "education is a form of science with possibilities of application" (p. 54).

In 1964 N. S. Botes asks the following question in his dissertation "What preconditions have to be met to express the **essentials** of the pedagogical and to **put them to practice**" (p. 33, Roos' emphasis). It is clear that the need for a scientifically accountable improvement of practice has long existed. As indicated above, in **Fundamentele pedagogiek en die opvoedingswerklikheid** [Fundamental pedagogics and the reality of education], guidelines are given for the ways in which educative practice can be grounded in the reality of educating, on the one hand, and in philosophy of life sources, on the other hand. In this book it also is explained how a pedagogue can methodically apply the pedagogical perspective to better illuminate his philosophy of life sources for contents that can be made particularly prescriptive so that the universal essentials of educating can be enlivened within a founded educative practice.

In **Die praktykwording van die fundamentele pedagogiek** [The practical application of fundamental pedagogics] the notion of science pursuing knowledge for the sake of knowledge is abandoned

and the idea of knowledge also for the sake of improving practice begins to clearly emerge. The notion of practical application also is strongly presented in a dissertation, **'n Ondersoek na die praktykwording van jeugweerbaarheid-essensies aan die hand van besondere pedagogiese bedrywighede in die primere skool** [An investigation of the practical application of essentials of youth readiness in terms of particular pedagogic activities in the primary school], (1978) by D. J. P. Koekemoer.

In **Fundamenteel-pedagogiese essensies: Hulle verskyning, verwerkliking en inhoudgewing** [Fundamental pedagogic essences; Their appearance, actualization and giving them content] the particular preconditions for meaningfully improving practice, namely, co-existentiality, co-essentiality, overcoming essence blindness, awakening to life [enlivenment] and actualization are discussed.

9. Consideration of the significance of a philosophy of life.

A consideration of a philosophy of life as far as it is concerned with the practice of fundamental pedagogics is closely related to the matter concerning the practical application that has been discussed. This is a matter that has been treated with the greatest caution since the department was established. It is clearly recognized that a philosophy of life is inseparably bound to theorizing about the reality of educating but that it is only in the 1970's that the significance of a philosophy of life for fundamental pedagogics is first described.

In his M. Ed. thesis (1954) A. D. Du Plooy views the matter so: "The fundamental part of pedagogics has such a strong contemplative tendency that its opposition to questions of a life-view nature are stronger than those of a newly prescribed framework" (p. 18). Prof. Oberholzer also states clearly that fundamental education does not only live and work with the facts of a knowing awareness: "One who believes a theoretical education only involves itself with facts of a knowing awareness does not see the greatest and most important part of human existence, as determined by education. Fundamental education can never separate itself from world-view thinking. The

notion that it can be is unusually irrational or a-theoretically colored" (**Inleiding in prinsipiele opvoedkunde** [Introduction to the principles of education], p. 75).

In **Inleiding tot die fundamentele pedagogiek** [Introduction to fundamental pedagogics] Landman and Gouws are still cautious that life philosophy can perhaps obstruct scientific thinking and life philosophy is bracketed and then is post-scientifically unbracketed for the sake of the practice of educating.

In **Leesboek vir die opvoedkunde student en onderwyser** [Textbook for the education student and teacher] by Landman and Kilian (1972) there is an awareness that the education student also has to take account of the risks that their philosophy of life poses. This is dealt with in a chapter titled "The teacher and obscuring educational relations".

The relationship of life philosophy to educating is described in detail in **Opvoedkunde en opvoedingsleer vir beginners** [Education and educational doctrine for beginners]. This is followed by an explanation of the significance of a Christian-Protestant philosophy of life and an educational theory. From the title of another publication **Leesboek vir die Christenopvoeder** [Textbook for Christian educators] (1972) by Landman it remains clear that the essentials of educating also are of particular significance for a philosophy of life.

That life philosophy choices have relevance for the ways of practicing education are strongly stated in **Fundamentele Pedagogiek en die opvoedingswerklikheid** [Fundamental pedagogics and the reality of education]. Life philosophy permissibility of acts of thinking acquires equal status to scientific necessity.

In **Die praktykwording van die fundamentele pedagogiek** [The practical application of fundamental pedagogics] the Marxist threat to Christian education is explained in detail. The significance of this for being a Christian educator is also explicated.

In **Fundamenteel pedagogiese essensies: Hulle verskyning, verwerkliking en inhoudgewing** [Fundamental pedagogic essences: Their appearance, actualization and giving them content], the meaning of the historicity of a life philosophy, as a matter of enlivenment, is interpreted. In addition, the significance of biblical hermeneutics and religiosity for educative contents are clarified.

In **Fundamentele pedagogiek en die onderwyspraktyk** [Fundamental pedagogics and teaching practice], the philosophy of life sources of fundamental pedagogical essentials are unveiled. The specific philosophy of life as an act of reduction is put in the spotlight.

For the first time, in **Fundamentele pedagogiek, leerwyses en vakonderrig** [Fundamental pedagogics, modes of learning and subject matter teaching], it is noted and explained that life philosophy not only has an enlivening function because of its essential nature but that it has a structural status just as does the relationship, sequence, activity and aim structures. Subject teaching that is accountable to a philosophy of life is demonstrated in terms of particular school subjects.

In **Inleiding tot die opvoedkundige navorsingspraktyk** [Introduction to the practice of educational research] it is clearly indicated that philosophy of life permissibility also is a significant research criterion; however, this idea was not developed. In a dissertation by P. C. van Zyl, particular attention is given to this matter (**Wetenskaplike noodwendigheid en lewensopvatlike toelaatbaarheid as kriteria vir die opvoedkundige navorsing** [Scientific necessity and life philosophy permissibility as criteria for educational research], 1980).

In the book, **Geestelike weerbaarheid teen ideologiese terrorisme** [Spiritual preparedness against ideological terrorism], the importance of Christian-National education for spiritual defense is pointed out. Also referred to are specific knowledge for a Christian defense against ideological terrorism as well as for the task of the Christian educator in this regard.

SUMMARY

In this article the development of fundamental pedagogic thinking at the University of Pretoria during the last fifty years is viewed in broad outline.

Initially the local pedagogic school of thinking was pragmatic, naturalistic and evolutionist in its approach. After 1937 there was opposition to this way of thinking, especially in the Department of Educational Philosophy. This was because lecturers of this department were Continentally oriented. The opposition increased so that all pedagogical concepts were purified of any naturalistic meaning. It was also explicitly declared that the pedagogical should be ontologically-anthropologically founded.

A considerable advancement was also noted in methodology. Already in 1937 there was reference to the phenomenological method in an M. Ed. thesis. This method was to become the basis for the development of thinking in the Faculty of Education as a whole. The method itself has also undergone quite a few changes. Especially the design of criteria and categories has changed. Before 1969 a large number of ontological categories were detailed; later anthropologically founded categories and criteria were also disclosed. Since 1969 this view has undergone rapid change. It was indicated that there could be only one ontological category, namely, being-in-the-world. From this, anthropological categories were detailed. Concerning criteria, earlier they differed from categories but later it was indicated that criteria (as categories in the form of questions) could also be applied as means of evaluating. Later, the dialectic and hermeneutic methods were increasingly used along with the phenomenological method to indicate the meaningful relationships among fundamental pedagogical essentials.

Initially the different departments of the Faculty of Education functioned without any links among them. In the late forties a strong unity of thinking developed, especially in the Department of the Philosophy of Education. This was because of the phenomenological method where the reality of educating was stated as the point of departure for pedagogics, in general, and for fundamental pedagogics, in particular. Members of the Department

of Fundamental Pedagogics published a number of works that demonstrated the unity of pedagogics (as a science of educating).

Views concerning the meaning of a philosophy of life have also undergone change. It was realized that a philosophy of life had to be linked to all pedagogical thinking. Only in 1968, however, was the importance of a philosophy of life for pedagogical thinking described. Subsequently, it was also indicated that what was permissible according to a philosophy of life is equal in status to that of scientific necessity.

Another aspect that has undergone considerable change is the practical application of theory. The possibility of doing this was demonstrated in a number of publications during the seventies by indicating that a philosophy of life could be applied to fundamental pedagogical contents. This was done after more clarity was obtained regarding the meaning of the concept "post-scientific".