PEDAGOGICAL PART-DISCIPLINES:
THEIR BASIS AND MUTUAL RELATIONS*

W. A. Landman
University of Pretoria

1. INTRODUCTION

The practitioner of Science attentively proceeds to what reality itself has to say to him (Marcel). Such a scientific surrender to the totality of reality is not possible and it is necessary that a slice of it be taken. The scientist makes that aspect of reality about which he wonders intensely (Plato, Aristotle, Merleau-Ponty, Marcel) and which he most admires (Marcel) a theme for himself. This means that he wants to view a particular facet of reality as it allows itself to be seen (Heidegger) without searching for confirmation of his already held opinions, preconceptions and particular view of being human. By "attentively proceeds" is meant that the observing scientist wants to think about the sphere of reality that he will explore in order to disclose which fundamental structures are found in that reality. This means that he will illuminate which structures make a particular reality possible[1] and without which it cannot be imagined. These fundamental structures are meaning-structures because they make that reality understandable and determine its significance. In addition, it is structures that make this reality what it essentially is. Consequently, fundamental structures are essence-structures (Husserl) that indicate they are indispensable features of that reality.

2. REALITY AND ITS STRUCTURES

The above description raises at least two questions: first, the question of a further description of what is meant by "reality" and, second, the question of naming the fundamental structures.

   (a)   When there is talk of reality this means that reality in which a person is, lives and acts. It is the reality in which

he gives meaning to everything he comes across, to which he is directed in his total being a person, for which he is open, of which he has a part and in which he participates. In this reality, he designs his own ways of existing and, therefore, this reality is known as his life world. The scientific world is built on this life world and finds its basis in it. This means that the pre-scientific life world can be made into a theme for scientific reflection; an involvement in the life world precedes each reflective attunement to it because existence is more original than reflecting on existence (Merleau-Ponty).

(b) Now the scientist can take an aspect of the life world to further reflect on it with the aim of illuminating or disclosing its fundamental structures. Assume that the scientist decides to apply himself, via observing and thinking, to **human relationships** in the life world. Then he will ask himself questions such as: What is it that makes human relationships possible? Are there structures without which human relationships cannot be imagined? Which structures make human relationships meaningful and significant? Can structures be particularized that hold as indispensable features of human relationships?

These questions only can be answered accountably from a phenomenological attunement[2] because phenomenology is the only science of the living confirmation of reality[3] within a world-experiencing-life[4]. Through the phenomenological approach the following fundamental structures, among others, regarding human relationships in the life world are uncovered:

(i) **The relationship of understanding**: understanding the humanness of a fellow person and the structure of his life world make human relationships possible;

(ii) **The relationship of trust**: human relationships require a sphere of trust in which the other is accepted as a person and his equal dignity is respected;

(iii) **The relationship of authority**: authority is indispensable where persons become involved in relationships in which one guides and cares for another and takes responsibility for another;

(iv)   **Association**: existence is co-existence: the other simply cannot be thought away from our field of existence;

(v)   **Encounter**: the encounter of person and person, as an intensification of association, is a basic precondition for existence. Indispensable in human relationships is that the participants in the encounter accept responsibility for whatever the outcome of such a relationship might be;

(vi)   **Aim-setting**: in essence a person is an aim-setting being and meaningful being-together necessitate respect for the other's aim-setting.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THESE FUNDAMENTAL STRUCTURES:

3. 1 Introduction:

As soon as structures-in-life-reality are shown they must be described. The scientific description is aimed at disclosing the essentials, the meaningfulness, the fundamentals of these structures, in order to unveil, to uncover them so that these structures and their mutual relationships can be illuminated **as they really are**. This illuminative describing requires that the concepts used meet certain requirements. Namely, through reflection and observation, they must be critically accountable essence-establishing pronouncements, sayings[5], indications[6], expressions. Such means of description are known as **categories**. The categories are grammatical forms by which these structures disclose themselves as realities in the life reality. The categories are ground-clarifying that, regarding the mentioned fundamental structures, describe being-human-in-being-together. This means that it will be meaningless to describe human-being-together by implementing categories from the animal order of being such as, e.g., stimulus-response, adaptation, organism, process.

3.2 The categories:

The first question the scientist must ask is: How is the uncovering and describing of the mentioned fundamental structures possible? These structures are nothing more than particular ways of existence of persons. Consequently, the question also can be stated as: What is the **first** fundamental precondition that makes possible being human and all of his

ways of being in life reality? Only one answer is possible:
Being-in-the-world is the original characteristic of being-
human and refers to the whole of relationships designed by
him in his life reality (Heidegger). Being-in-the-world or
Dasein is the **general** possible precondition for all human-
being-in-reality. Consequently, each description that does not
take this into account is unauthentic and untrue. Dasein-**in-
general** with its meaning-giving directedness to and
openness for the world (intentionality-existence) is the **first
category of reality** or basic [ontological] category. This
means that no description in which a person is viewed as a
world-less subject can be valid.

The fundamental structures mentioned as different ways in
which a person is-in-the-world now must be described further
so it can be determined how they show themselves and hold
true for Dasein-**in-general**, the Anthropos. The real concrete
person's (Anthropos) being-there in reality is describable by
implementing categories by which he is presented in his total
world-experiencing-life **as he is**. These categories that are
rooted in the first [ontological] category of reality can be
called anthropological categories. It is possible that a whole
series of anthropological categories can be distinguished but
it especially is the categories of being-in-a-meaningful-world,
being-with and temporality (historicity) that can be of
fundamental significance. The following is an example of
implementing anthropological categories in describing, e.g.,
the **relationship of understanding**:

Fundamental Structure	Anthropological category	Example of implementing
Relationship of understanding	Temporality	The consitution of a relationship of understanding requires observance of the past, present and future of the person to be understood
	Being-with	The thriving of a relationship of understanding requires physical presence of the understander and understood
	Being-in-a-meaningful world	To consititue a relationship of understanding means a being-aware of the ways the understood person "means" his world

The anthropological categories, as essence-determining expressions of being human, can disclose themselves in many ways according to the ways they are interrogated. Such ways of disclosure and interrogation can be called **perspectives**. Each possible perspective, then, is both an interrogation regarding the further meaning of the anthropological categories and their further disclosure. Thus, e.g., anthropological categories are viewed from Pedagogics with its pedagogical perspective on life reality and then the categories can manifest themselves as pedagogical categories. This is an interrogation of the anthropological from the pedagogical situation and then the anthropological manifests itself in the pedagogical situation. In other words, each science with its particular perspective has at its disposal its own categories that are grounded in the anthropological categories. Thus, a pedagogical perspective used by Pedagogics, a psychological perspective used by Psychology, etc. can be distinguished. Pedagogics is a Science that views life reality from a pedagogical perspective, a viewing from the pedagogical situation. From this particular perspective on life reality pedagogical categories are brought to light.

The following is an example of how the **relationship of understanding** can be described by implementing a triad of pedagogical categories:

Anthropological category	Pedagogical category	Example of implementing
Temporality	Anticipation:	The child is a **potentiality**-in-dependence on an adult who has a need to be **understood** in his being a child (Here: knowledge of his potentialities. Whoever says potentiality gives evidence of anticipation).
	Futurity:	To provide meaningful support it is necessary that the educator has knowledge of the ways the child takes up and accepts his future.
	Becoming[8]:	The child's becoming is a progressive understanding of how he properly should take his place in life reality and this only is possible there where the educator with his knowing being-there influences him.

Here it only can be mentioned that the anthropological category of being-in-a-meaningful-world allows itself to be expressed in the form of the pedagogical categories of a safe space, open situatedness[9] and addressing-listening to.[10] From the anthropological category of being-with, the pedagogical categories of normativity, sympathetic authoritative guidance, freedom-to-responsibility, adulthood[11] and face-to-face-relationships[12] can be particularized.

4. JOINT PERSPECTIVES

Now it is possible that from a pedagogical situation, a conversation can be held with phenomenological psychologists with their psychological perspective on life reality. Such a conversation can result in viewing that reality from a psychological-pedagogical perspective, a perspective on reality that then is the responsibility of Psychological Pedagogics. Also possible is a didactical-pedagogical perspective that is practiced by Didactic Pedagogics, etc. Additional possibilities are a Socio-pedagogics with its socio-pedagogical perspective on life reality as well as Vocational

Pedagogical, Historical Pedagogical and Orthopedagogical perspectives.

In this combination the emphasis always falls on the second conceptual component, namely, the Pedagogic, to indicate under whose jurisdiction of knowledge and responsibility the conversation with the practitioners of other sciences occur. By jurisdiction is meant the perspective from which the conversation is initiated; such a conversation occurs in preservation of its own autonomy. Here, responsibility refers to the fact that in scientifically responsible ways questions must be asked and, in addition, that there must be responsible action regarding the answers obtained from the interrogation.

This in no sense indicates that the scientific activity of an area such as Psychological Pedagogics only should exist in conversing with phenomenological psychology from the pedagogical situation. The pedagogical conversation also occurs with other pedagogical part-disciplines. Therefore, these conversations with each other keep the separate pedagogical part-disciplines busy with their own research area because each is an autonomous reality with its own questions.

5. THE PEDAGOGICAL PART-DISCIPLINES AND THEIR MUTUAL CONNECTION:

The following two questions now are raised by the critical reader:

1. What is the task of the pedagogical part-discipline usually called Theoretical Pedagogics, Fundamental Pedagogics or Philosophy of Education?
2. How must the mutual relations and interactions among the pedagogic part-disciplines be viewed?

As an answer to the first question it must be indicated that Theoretical Pedagogics has a particular task that already has been clarified by the author in the first issue of this journal. As also appears in the preceding pages, a fundamental aspect of this task is the search for, grounding or founding and description of fundamental structures. It is for this reason, among others, that now it must be stated as a possibility that this pedagogical part-

discipline must be called Fundamental Pedagogics. Fundamental Pedagogics is a founding/grounding pedagogics because it has as a particular task the grounding of the Pedagogical in reality.

With this, one arrives at the second question regarding their pedagogical interactions. The problem is what role each pedagogical part-disciplines has with its own perspective on life reality in its own grounding (founding) in reality and the disclosure of its own founded categories. It is clear that each pedagogical perspective on life reality must proceed from its unique question and must itself acquire clarity regarding what this question is but it is very clear that these questions are embedded in the pedagogical question such as constructed, asked, reflected on and expressed by Fundamental Pedagogics. This fundamental pedagogical question can provisionally be formulated as follows: How must the knowing educator, as authoritative, trusting person and representative of the norm-image of adulthood, support the child through his association and encounter with the authority-seeking child, who is possibility-in-becoming, who wants to be someone himself, and who is entrusted to him, so that the child progressively can be considered as an adult?

From this general question, Fundamental Pedagogics[13] calls into existence pedagogical categories. The various pedagogical part-disciplines with their own questions thus allow their own categories to be disclosed. More precisely, the question now is how each pedagogical part-discipline, with its own perspective on life reality, grounds itself and arrives at its own categories. There are three possibilities:

First possibility: Each part-discipline grounds and designs categories on its own, independently and in isolation from the others. One cannot agree with this because each of the pedagogical part-disciplines with its own perspective on reality jointly practices the work of pedagogical thinking. The mutual questioning and conversing also are impeded by this and the temptation can arise with the practitioners of the pedagogical part-disciplines to proclaim the autonomy of their own area or even to try to show that their own area in reality is primary and fundamental.

Second possibility: Fundamental Pedagogics designs and grounds categories and then the other part-disciplines implement these categories in light of their own perspective on life reality. By this, two things occur, namely, first, that depth and scope are attributed to the perceptive thinking of Fundamental Pedagogics that it does not possess. Then Fundamental Pedagogics must carry the entire foundational burden and definitely there is the danger that fundamental aspects and facets can be ignored. Second, this possibility reduces the other part-disciplines to applied Fundamental Pedagogics. The **independence** these part-disciplines possess within an **autonomous** Pedagogics with its pedagogical perspective then is violated.

Third possibility: Fundamental Pedagogics ACCOMPANIES the other pedagogical part-disciplines in the design and grounding of their own categories in light of their own questions as embedded in the pedagogical question, thus in the pedagogical situation. This accompaniment ensures that by a joint focus on the life reality (of educating) a radical fathoming of it becomes possible. Additional contributions made by the accompaniment are that by this the pedagogical conversation is promoted and there can be a vigil against trespassing on the terrain of co-practitioners of Pedagogics, although a degree of overlapping cannot be and also should not be eliminated. Further, this means that each pedagogue must have a thorough knowledge of Fundamental Pedagogics.

6. FUTURE TASK OF THE PEDAGOGICAL PART-DISCIPLINES

6.1 Task with respect to pedagogical categories: Each part-discipline has as a task the clarification and construction of its own terrain of research, but from the above it now can be inferred that one of the future tasks must be, with the accompaniment by fundamental pedagogics, to particularize its own categories that spring from its own perspective on and grounding in life reality. After this particularization there is a move to implement these unique categories from the pedagogical situation to more closely describe the fundamental structures (relationships of understanding, trust, etc.) that already were described through applying the first (ontological) category of reality, the anthropological categories and the pedagogical categories, and in doing so to disclose their essence and significance for and in the

involved part-discipline with its particular perspective on life reality.

6.2 Task with respect to pedagogical criteria: The pedagogical categories that the fundamental-pedagogical has disclosed also can be implemented as **criteria** or gauges for judging pedagogical thinking, actions and events. It is obvious that the evaluative significance of these categories must be brought to light as a condition for their validity as criteria for evaluating what is pedagogically permissible. This means that, just as in the case of pedagogical categories, a grounding of pedagogical criteria must be sought and indeed in life reality (educating).

In this connection, a **first criterion of reality** can manifest itself, namely, Da-sein. The first evaluative question, then, is whether, regarding a person (Da-sein), there is reflection and action in compliance with the fact that he never is a subject without a world and that there is no mention of a world without a subject.

Concerning a person as a particular Da-sein (Anthropos), the criterion for thinking and acting regarding him is if his particular ways of showing himself in his being-a-person-in-life-reality are taken into account. Thus, anthropological **criteria** such as being-in-a-meaningful-world, being-with and temporality must be applied.

Now, Pedagogics must particularize, from a pedagogical perspective, these anthropological criteria with reality-status in the same way as was done with the pedagogical categories.

Once again, the various pedagogical part-perspectives, each with a particular perspective on life reality and accompanied by Fundamental Pedagogics, will disclose and apply its own criteria.

6.3 Task with respect to practice: It is obvious that none of the pedagogical part-disciplines limits its own activities only to grounding and constructing categorical and criterial systems. In addition, while the grounded thinking occurs in terms of already acquired insights there is a move to the post-scientific application[14] of them.

By implementing founded pedagogical categories in practice:

(a) after a personal decision to implement them; and
(b) after giving them specific contents from his own philosophy of life, experiences, studies, dialogue with others, etc., the pedagogue now proceeds to RECONQUERING the pedagogical life world (situation, space) through his conscious participation in it. This participation is **possible** because in his totality of being a person the educator is involved in the educative event and it is **necessary** because an appeal is directed to him to participate. Now he has transcended his reflective thinking by becoming involved in the educative reality. Through implementing pedagogical **criteria** he continually evaluates his reconquering and creations, he explores his involvement in the pedagogical reality, and he can determine if his actions are pedagogically accountable.

In summary:

1. He begins with his educative experiencing, his life in the world in order to
2. be true to this experiencing in verbalizing it (as categories), and
3. to be accountable (criteria).

REFERENCES

[1] Edie, J. M. (Ed.): **What is Phenomenology?** Four Basic Essays by Pierre Thevenaz. Qudrangle Books, 20.
[2] See: Oberholzer, C. K.: "Die betekenis van die fenomenologie vir pedagogiese denke" **South African Journal of Pedagogy**, Vol. 1, no. 1, July 1967, 85-97.
[3] Luijpen, W.: **Fenomenologie en Atheisme**. Het Spectrum, Utrecht, 239.
[4] Kockelmans, A.: **Phenomenologie en Natuurwetenschap**. E. F. Bohn, Haarlem, 41.
[5] Oberholzer, C. K.: "Pedagogiese kategoriee: Hulle fundering en ontwerp" **South African Journal of Pedagogy**, Vol. 1, no. 2, December 1967, 58-59.
[6] Van Peursen, C. A.: **Filosofische Orientatie**. Kampen, 182.
[7] Edie, J. M.: op cit., 261.
[8] (a) Landman, W. A., op. cit., Chapter 5.
    (b) Landman, W. A.: "Die Menswording van die Kind" **Tydskrif vir Middelbare Onderwys**, March, 1968.
[9] Oberholzer, C. K.: op. cit., 65-66.
[10] Landman, W. A.: Enkele Antropologies-ontologiese momente van die eerste lewensjaar. **Publication Series** No. 2, University of Port Elizabeth, 1966, 35-39.
[11] Oberholzer, C. K.: op. cit., 63-64, 67-71.
[12] Landman, W. A.: op. cit., 24-25.
[13] See: (a) Landman, W. A.: Die Fundamentele Pedagogiek as Wetenskap van die Pedagogiese Perspectief. Lecture, University of Pretoria, 1968. (b) Landman, W. A. and

Gous, S. J.: **Inleiding tot die Fundamentele Pedagogiek as vorm van Wetenskap**. (In preparation).
[14] See: Landman, W. A.: "Enkele opmerkings aangaande die Wetenskaplikheid van die Pedagogiek" in **Pedagogische Studien**, December, 1967.

SUMMARY
(Author's English Summary)

1. Introduction:

The scientist aims at studying a particular aspect of reality as his theme of study. He wants to view a particular facet of reality as it reveals itself (Heidegger) and wants to reflect upon and consider this selected aspect of reality to reveal its fundamental structures. This means that he wants to reveal those structures that make a particular reality possible, i.e., without which such reality cannot be imagined.

2. Reality and its structures:

By reality is meant here that reality in which the human being exists, finds himself, in which he lives, acts gives meaning to and constitutes his existence, viz., his living world (or field of existence). The scientific world is built and based upon this world. The scientist attends to an aspect of this world and tries to reveal the fundamental structures thereof. Suppose that he cognitively considers human relationships in this world. From a phenomenological approach he may reveal, inter alia, the following fundamental structures: A cognitive relationship [relationship of understanding], a relationship of confidence [relationship of trust] and an authority-relationship, the relationship of communication, the encounter, the pedagogical aim.

3. Description of these fundamental structures:

3.1 Introductory remarks:
After these structures have been indicated, they must be described in terms of critically accountable descriptions, verdicts, sayings, explications, that define the essence of reality, known as categories.

3.2 The Categories:

The following question is first asked by the scientist. What is the first basic condition that makes possible being-human and all its modes of existence in reality? The answer is that being-in-the-world or Dasein, world-relatedness is the general condition that makes being-human in reality possible. Consequently no description is valid in which the human being is regarded as a subject without a world. Therefore Dasein is the **first category of reality**. Based upon this category and the further **anthropological categories** that describe the real, concrete being-there-in-reality of a human being, three such categories are distinguished, viz., being-in-a-world of meaning, togetherness and temporality. These anthropological categories can be viewed from different perspectives, or viewpoints; e.g., pedagogical, psychological, sociological, didactic, etc., perspectives can be distinguished. This results in the bringing about of pedagogical, psychological, sociological, didactical, etc., categories.

4. Joint perspectives:

The interaction between the abovementioned sciences with their different perspectives on reality, gives rise to so-called **joint** perspectives, e.g., the psychological-pedagogical perspective, didactical-pedagogical perspective, etc., practiced by Psychological Pedagogy (Psychopedagogy), Sociological Pedagogy, (Socio-pedagogy), Didactic Pedagogy, etc.

5. The Pedagogical disciplines and their mutual connection:

The different possible perspectives that can be consolidated with the pedagogical perspective are regarded as part-perspectives of the pedagogical perspective. The following pedagogical part-disciplines are distinguished: Psychological Pedagogy, Sociological Pedagogy, Didactic Pedagogy, Vocational Pedagogy, Historical Pedagogy, Orthopedagogy, and Fundamental Pedagogy, which particularly deals with that aspect of the reality-basis called the pedagogical situation. Fundamental Pedagogy reveals pedagogical categories as viewed from the pedagogical situation. The pedagogical part-disciplines give rise to the formulation of further pedagogical categories. This formulation takes place within the framework of Fundamental Pedagogy because accountably:

(i)	The part-disciplines cannot apply categories to particular circumstances in an accountable way if they are separated and isolated from fundamental pedagogy and from each other;
(ii)	Such formulation of categories for any pedagogical part-discipline cannot be undertaken by fundamental pedagogy, without the co-operation of such discipline;
(iii)	In this way pedagogical dialogue is promoted and unnecessary overlapping between the part-disciplines is avoided.

6. Future task of the pedagogical part-disciplines:

The part-disciplines, aided by fundamental pedagogy, must particularize and descriptively implement their own categories. This also includes an implementation of categories in practice:

(a)	after a personal decision to implement them, and;
(b)	after giving them one's own signifcance according to one's own view of life, etc. In this way the pedagogue is recreating and reconquering pedagogical reality.

Through the implementation of pedagogical **criteria**, that have the same basis as the pedagogical categories, the pedagogue continuously evaluates his re-conquest and creations; he reconnoiters his being-concerned with pedagogical reality—in this way he is able to determine whether his actions are pedagogically accountable.