

CHAPTER 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM, AIM AND PLAN OF STUDY

1. INTRODUCTORY ORIENTATION

World-involvement is the undeniable point of departure for reflecting on the real essentials of being human in all of its modes of being. This proclaims a person as an initiator of relationships by which human “being-in” [the world] is not merely limited to a spatial relationship but indeed is qualified as an anthropological “life space”. Such a primordial relatedness to being implies a continual breaking through from an ontic “being-ness” to an ontological “ought-ness”: What is always on-hand is changed by human involvement into a personal world of sense and meaning as a realization of the human *fait primitif*, namely, wanting to be familiar with the world.

Still a child is not thrown into the world as a thing-in-itself but arrives in a verbally expressed reality as a cultural world.¹⁾ This cultural world is the sedimentation of humanly initiated world relationships. On the one hand, verbalized reality is the illumination of the ontological sense of being (In Heidegger’s²⁾ words: “Im Wort, in der sprache werden und sind erst die Dinge”) and on the other hand, it reflects a philosophy of life. As Merleau-Ponty³⁾ contends, words are the way through which the world is experienced and this implies that it is necessary to recognize the role of a philosophy of life in the act of verbalizing. Landman⁴⁾ states its role even more strongly when he contends that the essentiality of what is named *appears more clearly* because essence naming is colored by a philosophy of life. In the same vein, Van der Stoep⁵⁾ asserts that the interpretation of the sense of “being” is in the interpretation of the “should”.

Thus human participation in reality involves transforming its ontological sense into personal meaning through the act of giving and receiving meaning. However, establishing personal meaning is

also a matter of valuing⁶⁾ and, therefore, verbalized reality is saturated with the normative. Hence, knowledge is also knowledge of values.⁷⁾ (In this connection also see the familiar pronouncement by Nohl:⁸⁾ “...die ubliche Trennung von geistigend Leben und Kentnissen ist falsch, weil geistiges Leben seine Realitat nur in den gehalte hat...”).

This fact forces the educative imperative to the fore because knowledge with its omnipresent axiological side obviously is not available to a child. On the other hand, reality is given as partially hidden and there always is a more complete magnitude that is becoming visible,⁹⁾ and that only can be unlocked for the child. Knowledge of reality falls within the frame of meaning of adults and because proper adulthood, as educative aim, implies a synthesis of forms of living and life contents, reality must be brought closer to the child, presented to him. Making life contents available to a child cannot occur outside of the original act of teaching. The educative event, therefore, is carried structurally by the act of teaching while the meaning of teaching is in educating.¹⁰⁾

According to Van der Stoep¹¹⁾ the relief that an adult acquires by commanding life reality implies an ordering—or a categorical becoming visible—of the life contents that make forming decisions about educative aims possible. These decisions guarantee the nearness to life of the contents and should the teaching moreover be involved in educating¹²⁾, as far as this concerns the adult, it can be expected with a reasonable amount of certainty that the child will enter the situation by learning.

The meaning of teaching always lies in the fact that a child can change and therefore it is directed to the learning activity by which the change (more specifically: the actualization of becoming) can occur.

Although the learning activity guarantees the meaningfulness of teaching and also serves as a mode of actualizing childlike Dasein, the impression that learning is causally related to teaching is not valid: Teaching, as an original experience, appears on the horizon of human life without reason and so does learning¹³⁾, and thus teaching is nothing more than an original form of living.

Obviously, educating does not progress in isolation from a social community, which implies that the community has joint authority in formulating the aim of educating.¹⁴⁾ Where Botha¹⁵⁾ formulates the aim of educating as the image of an adult person that is held by a particular cultural group, it is obvious that a joint attempt will be exercised in stating the educative aim.

The school's appearance on the child's path of becoming is, therefore, unavoidable and if the increasing complexity of the social lifestyle and the almost endless explosion of knowledge are taken into consideration, a proper grasp of the reality of life without schooling is unthinkable.¹⁶⁾ According to Van der Stoep¹⁷⁾ the task of the school is to make selected knowledge and skills available by which a practice-ground is created to give a child the opportunity to orient himself to social matters. Therefore, schooling is a way of designing life (Gous) where becoming substantiates itself in all of the modes of learning.

Schooling counts especially because of its immediate and independent character in a childlike landscape: An aim-directed presentation of contents takes place with the expectation of effective learning, that in itself must find its result in a thriving and deepening participation in reality. Without learning dividends, going to school is a meaningless activity.¹⁸⁾

The activities of teaching and learning can only result in effective learning if they function in harmony with the learning contents. However, it is important to understand that for various and sundry reasons this harmony often is not realized. Even so, sometimes these gaps are eliminated by a sharpened learning intention, on the one hand, and didactic measures, on the other hand.

However, the fact remains that an adequate learning effect, in spite of a variety of measures, simply does not break through for some children. For such a child, the experience of being-blocked is almost inevitable. Feelings of desperation, being threatened and a diminished self-confidence are characteristics of such a child that, from the nature of the matter, result in an obscured intentionality as an obscured future.¹⁹⁾ His dialogue with the world of meaning

appears to be restricted and attenuated; in truth, he is “Dasein ohne Existenz” (Jaspers) because he cannot adequately answer to his being called to being.²⁰⁾ At best, possibly such a child’s teaching situation can be described as disharmonious because the activities of teaching and learning do not occur in harmony with each other.

This somewhat cursory explication of human participation in reality as an answer to his being called to being, and, correspondingly, a child’s being-addressed to adequately achieve in the school-didactic situation in order to be a full-fledged carrier of the image of being human in the light of the cultural demands within which he finds himself, underline the importance of specialized, accountable intervention with children who themselves are blocked to such an extent in a formal-didactic situation that they find themselves in existential distress.

The initial disregard of the pedagogical in being accountable for children with learning difficulties has not prevented particular practices of providing help from arising. A number of interventions and applications from other subject-specialist directions nowadays are common that do not take into consideration the complicated disharmonious teaching situation. In addition, one-sided and often superficial research is carried out that does not establish a founded practice of providing help.

In light of the above, the question arises about whether a reflection on the disharmonious teaching situation can possibly throw new light on the problem of learning difficulties.

The present study attempts to specify precisely the event of disharmonious teaching. *Next there is reflection on the extent to which particular pedagogic perspectives stand in the service of the orthodidactic, as well as in further understanding and illuminating the disharmonious teaching situation in addition to designing programs for providing help to children who have become blocked in a teaching event.* The status of orthodidactics as an autonomous part-perspective of pedagogics will be dealt with, especially in light of the previously mentioned interpretation of the scientific judgments of other pedagogical perspectives for an authentic orthodidactic practice.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

2.1 Review of the current view of learning difficulties

The present problem will perhaps be better understood if the reader is oriented to the current, often unacceptable approach to learning difficulties. It is by no means the intention to give a thorough explication of the practice of current Remedial Teaching. It will also not disparage its comprehensive and informative contributions to children with learning difficulties. The fact is that since the pedagogic has been able to take responsibility for a child with learning difficulties, criticism of the current practice has not been lacking. The author identifies himself with the points of criticism of pedagogues such as Sonnekus,²¹⁾ Gouws²²⁾ and Stander²³⁾. However, it is appropriate to touch lightly and briefly on a few objections:

Because the entanglement of pedagogics with philosophy had delayed until recently its essential contributions to the problem of learning difficulties, it was especially psychiatry and, in later years, psychology—both already established empirical sciences—that had taken the lead regarding the fallow field of learning difficulties. Assembling psychiatric clinical images, etiologies, symptoms and therapies²⁴⁾ also allowed insight into children with learning difficulties to thrive. For obvious reasons, the application of psychiatric and psychological insights to the teaching of children with learning difficulties was called Remedial Teaching. Still later, insights from a variety of sciences would find their application in practice so that Remedial Teaching quickly became a potpourri of often one-sided and even contradictory practices.

True to its origin, Remedial Teaching gives evidence of an underlying naturalistic (philosophical) anthropology that possibly is best brought to light in its almost feverish subjection of a child with learning problems to a so-called objective testing with the help of an “arsenal of scientific apparatuses or techniques of measurement”.²⁵⁾ In itself, there is no fault in striving for objectivity. The proposition that objectivity can be accomplished in diagnostics in the same way as in a natural science experiment, however, is not only a reflection of an unfounded anthropological view but also shows a naïveté

about existence.²⁶⁾ Within a typical objectivistic relationship of knowing, a child is robbed of his existential landscape and, in addition, he is reduced to an object. *Ipsa facto*, there can be no mention of an encounter with a child-in-distress, and, thus, of a pedagogic penetration of his experiential world. The high premium placed on exact, verifiable data makes a subjective involvement impossible. Ironically enough, authentic objectivity is only accessible via inter-subjectivity and whoever denies this logical fact will find, in his search for objectivity, that he necessarily falls into either subjectivism or objectivism.²⁷⁾

An objectivistic relationship of knowing [a child] is clearly reflected in the way psychological instrumentation is implemented and interpreted. Standardized tests, justified and designed on the basis of naturalistic principles, namely that an activated function provides a corresponding external achievement,²⁸⁾ implies, e.g., that what is presumed to be measured becomes isolated by measuring it. The measured function, then, acquires autonomous status and “operates”, as such, in the human psyche by virtue of the fact that it has become verifiable and comparable. When a naturalistically oriented psychologist limits himself almost exclusively to the quantified results of standardized tests, this means an implicit acceptance of an atomistic anthropology where being human is seen as a “cabinet of curios” (Van den Berg), as the sum-total of just as many functions and facets as there are standardized tests to measure them.

On the basis of these results—the sum-total of which are assumed to be knowledge of a child with learning difficulties—a program of remedial teaching is planned, that amounts to nothing more than remedying the defective functional aspects should these appear in the tests as symptom-images.

Certainly one of the most important indictments of this approach is that a child with learning difficulties can scarcely be understood in his essence, that he thus is not viewed as a child-in-education but is seen as an automaton of a constantly repetitive nature. Therefore, such an approach all too often results in a diagnosis and treatment of symptoms. Theoretically, the pedagogical indeed is recognized as a causative factor among numerous exogenous ones, but practice

shows a disconcerting absence of the pedagogical. Indeed, in such cases “pedagogical” is equated with “teaching” (educating) that, in its turn, is degraded to methods, techniques and artificial recipes. If it seems necessary from the diagnosis, this is supplemented with a psychotherapeutic program for treating feelings of inferiority, diminished self-confidence, apathy and weakened interest.²⁹⁾

2.2 Review of contemporary pedagogical thought on learning difficulties

Since pedagogics has assumed responsibility for [a child with] learning difficulties an entirely new approach to the problem has been followed and advocated. In contrast to an atomistic-mechanistic plan of action, a child now is approached in his individuality as a situated person: In agreement with the [philosophical] anthropological fact of being that the pedagogical event is an undeniable experiential fact,³⁰⁾ a child’s experiential world is explored in terms of pedagogic criteria with the aim of maximally understanding it. In contrast to a functional-remedial approach, the educability of a child with learning difficulties is made primary so that learning difficulties are viewed as ways in which deeper causes manifest themselves and not as causes in themselves.

On the basis of this approach, orthodidactics, under whose jurisdiction the problem falls, has provided interesting research results on a theoretical and practical level.³¹⁾ Despite this there were still problematic areas of a highly contentious nature into which orthodidactics was not able to venture until recently. Perhaps because of a one-sided and truncated view of the practice of providing help, it did not succeed in establishing an accountable theory for designing programs for giving help. The dilemma it found itself in is directly related to the local [University of Pretoria] historical development of pedagogical thought, in general, and, in particular, to the “dependence” of orthodidactics on psychopedagogics and didactic pedagogics.

2.2.1 The role of the psychopedagogical

In the Republic of South Africa, the Faculty of Education at the University of Pretoria took the lead in practicing and developing pedagogics as an autonomous science. Especially psychopedagogics had engaged in the arduous struggle to emancipate itself from psychology. Highpoints of this struggle are aptly described by the various labels by which this perspective was known: from *educational psychology*, as an area of psychology applied to education, via *psychological pedagogics* (Nel), now acknowledged as a pedagogical discipline but still clearly functioning with psychological insights; *psychopedagogics* (Sonnekus) was crystallized into an autonomous pedagogic part-perspective on the reality of educating. According to Sonnekus, the proclaimed area of study of psychopedagogics is “the totality of everything that appears regarding the psychic life of a child as they are actualized in a child’s pedagogic situation”.³²⁾

Under the regime of psychological pedagogics, viewed as an autonomous part-discipline of pedagogics, the traditional master-slave bond between psychology and educational psychology (along with remedial teaching) continued to a large degree. Still, an important difference was that the idea gradually began to take root that reflections on children with learning and behavioral problems are a distinctly unique terrain that justifies a specialized part-theory under the roof of the pedagogical. Consequently, orthopedagogics and orthodidactics were proclaimed to be part-disciplines of pedagogics,³³⁾ and research was pursued in this terrain, but it still occurred under the jurisdiction of psychological pedagogics. It is contended that exclusively psychological pedagogical insights were used to interpret and assimilate the orthopedagogic-orthodidactic situation.

Not for a moment are the particular contributions of psychological pedagogics to orthodidactics denied or called into question. Still, the monopolization of the problem of learning difficulties by psychological pedagogics had the additional effect of *limiting learning difficulties to inadequate acts of learning as a result of “somatic or psychic or spiritual deviations”*. (Nel) *In other words,*

· For example, Van Parreren’s learning theory and Frankl’s Logotherapy, with a few changes, were transformed into psychological pedagogical pronouncements.

learning difficulties were not studied in the context of a disharmonious teaching situation but rather as isolated learning problems. Obviously, based on such a one-sided approach, orthodidactics could not arrive at an accountable design of orthodidactic programs for providing help.

2.2.2 The role of the didactic pedagogical

According to Nel's³⁴⁾ description of orthodidactics as that aspect of orthopedagogics that reflects on re-educating a didactically derailed child by means of specialized, corrective didactic measures, the emphasis is on "re-educating" rather than on the "didactic measures".

Viewed against this background, Van der Stoep³⁵⁾ accomplished an important breakthrough when he proclaimed that orthodidactics is an aspect of didactic pedagogics and that its task is to investigate and describe the nature, essences and problems of teaching situations that have a corrective or exceptional character. In this way he tried to shift the focus from the *learning restrained child to the teaching event as a juncture between the events of teaching and learning.*

Unfortunately, at this stage orthodidactics was not yet in a position to make such a shift in emphasis. The most important reasons for this are that neither psychological pedagogics nor didactic pedagogics had at their disposal categorical structures that could serve as structures for reflecting on learning difficulties.³⁶⁾ In addition, the insights of didactic pedagogics on teaching and of psychopedagogics on the learning phenomenon had not yet been built into an integrated structure and any intersecting planes that existed between them were merely haphazard. Only after the lesson structure was described by didactic pedagogics, in which the scientific findings of the other part-perspectives of pedagogics had been blended into a unitary structure, was orthodidactics able to make this necessary shift in emphasis regarding the problem of learning difficulties. This establishment of a lesson structure is implicit evidence of the progress that pedagogical thought in South Africa had made toward categorical thinking.

2.3 The rise of a categorical pedagogical structure

2.3.1 The fundamental pedagogical

With the rise of fundamental pedagogics, proposed by Oberholzer and established by Landman, long considered to be the doyen of South African fundamental pedagogues, the possibility emerged for meaningfully coordinating the explanations and interpretations of the different areas of [pedagogics as a] science. Thanks to the phenomenological method, Landman indisputably shows the autonomy of pedagogics as a " ... pedagogics with a distinct and unique perspective on the lifeworld from a pedagogic situation and that is not reducible to anything else".³⁷⁾ By pedagogical perspective is meant an "engagement" with the reality of educating that asks it to show itself as it essentially and universally is, as viewed from this particular [i.e., pedagogical] standpoint.³⁸⁾ [From this perspective] the disclosed real essences are then expressed as scientific judgments or categories. The complexity of the reality of educating makes part-perspectives possible [and necessary] as focal points within the pedagogical perspective.³⁹⁾ The categorical structures illuminated in this way are intertwined with each other in the reality of life,⁴⁰⁾ and this insures that the different pedagogic part-perspectives cannot degenerate into compartmentalized findings without doing violence to the pedagogical.

A categorical pedagogical structure thus seems to be a necessity for a meaningful scientific practice. The following quotation acknowledges this fact: "Pedagogics has to be a pedagogics of essences, otherwise it is not a pedagogics that can claim to be scientific".⁴¹⁾

Clearly, the categorical pedagogical structure, viewed as an overarching concept for the various categorical structures of the different part-perspectives, has far-reaching implications for orthopedagogics (respectively orthodidactics) because the question of an accountable approach to a child with learning difficulties in a teaching situation necessarily has to be aligned with these structures.

2.3.2 The didactic pedagogical

Closely following the lead of fundamental pedagogics, Van der Stoep in his accounting of the real essences of didactic-pedagogics, designed its own categorical structure.⁴²⁾ He succeeded in creatively describing the real essences of teaching and eliminated the unwholesome separation between educating and teaching. Indirectly, this dealt a blow to those who wanted to describe the didactic in terms of things other than teaching itself, and in doing so they undermined the autonomy of didactic-pedagogics.

As an essence-revealing thinker, Van der Stoep propounds didactic-pedagogical categories as disclosing the universal forms of “didaskhein” and, at the same time, he proposes didactic-pedagogical criteria by which the didactic-pedagogic event can be made testable with respect to whether or not its real essences appear. Research was also done on the particular relationships between the contents and the forms of teaching. Convinced that an accountable didactical-pedagogical theory, in practice, results in a lesson,⁴³⁾ Van der Stoep and co-workers such as Van Dyk, Swart, Louw and others turned to the lesson situation, as an original experiential datum, with the consequence that they elucidate constructing a lesson structure, as encompassing these basic data⁴⁴⁾ for planning or designing the teaching of a lesson. Obviously, the importance of the lesson structure for orthodidactics cannot be stressed enough.

2.3.3 The psychopedagogical

As already mentioned in 2.2.1, psychopedagogics laboriously liberated itself from the domination of psychology. Thanks especially to Sonnekus, with the establishment of its own categorical structure, psychopedagogics acquired an independent status as a part-perspective within an autonomous pedagogics. Also the new title of “psychopedagogics” strikingly symbolizes its final “breaking free from being an applied psychology” (Landman).

Sonnekus⁴⁵⁾ proposes the psychic life of the child-in-education as the area of study of psychopedagogics. However, the emphasis falls clearly on the psychic life as an event of actualization that occurs by means of “becoming” and “learning” as equally primordial structures of the psychic life of a child. As potentialities, becoming

and learning are actualized in terms of a stream of “actualizations” that, on closer analysis, presume a subtle nuance between self-actualization and guided actualization. To show how a child actualizes “becoming” and “learning”, Sonnekus has identified modes of being in the psychic life of a child, namely, lived experiencing, experiencing, willing, knowing and behaving that, in their meaningful interrelationships represent the modes for actualizing “becoming” and “learning”. On this basis, self-actualization and guided actualization of the psychic life are possible and arise in an educative situation.

2.3.4 Synthesis

An attempt has not been made to fully discuss the categorical structure of pedagogics but to provide an overview of contemporary pedagogical thinking in terms of a few moments of its relevant part-perspectives. Although separate part-perspectives are a scientific necessity for a more penetrating investigation of the educative event, Landman⁴⁶⁾ stresses that the disclosed essences (being-structures) are intertwined in life reality; in addition, the actualization of the essences disclosed by one part-perspective are a precondition for actualizing the essences disclosed by another. As is evident in section 2.4.1, in many respects, the lesson structure reveals the subtle interplay among fundamental-, didactic- and psycho-pedagogical [and other part-perspective] essences. In truth, a functioning lesson is the juncture for actualizing pedagogical essences.⁴⁷⁾

In light of these results, the question arises about whether considering learning difficulties from a single perspective can be accountable. Should not an accountable view of learning difficulties be sought in the interpretation and elucidation of the categorical structure of pedagogics for the orthodidactic situation? This requires that the concept “learning difficulties” be placed under the microscope in order to evaluate its contents from a collective [pedagogical] perspective. If necessary, new contents must be added. And on this basis it will be possible to draw up clearer guidelines for orthodidactic practice. Should such an approach be followed, the question also arises about the scientific status of orthodidactics. The first question is dealt with below while the

status of orthodidactics as a science is discussed in section 3.5.

2.4 The problem of the disharmonious teaching situation*

2.4.1 The harmonious lesson situation

The primary experience, as the original involvement of being a person in reality, shows unambiguously that the educative event takes its course by means of lesson situations. Thus, educating occurs by means of lessons as a necessary form of actualizing a particular sequence structure. In addition, this implies that educating is actualized in teaching and that the meaning of teaching is rooted in educating,⁴⁸⁾ because giving a lesson presents life contents in terms of which a child is guided to proper adulthood.

A harmonious lesson situation means there is harmony between form and contents, as set in motion by the didactic modalities. This implies that guided- and self-actualization [of the psychic life] will harmonize with the lesson contents, and this is only possible if there is a balanced interplay among the lesson- and learning-aims, the principles of actualization, the teaching- and learning-aids, etc. Then a child gains access to an elemental** in such a way that it changes into a fundamental, i.e., there is an adequate learning effect. This also implies that fundamental pedagogical, didactic pedagogical and psychopedagogical essences are harmoniously actualized in the lesson situation.

* Page 16 of the dissertation is missing. The above underlined entry is my best guess about what might be on page 16. The table of contents of this study indicates that headings 2.4 and 2.4.1 appeared on page 16. In “Leermoeilikhede: ‘n Posing tot herformulering en ‘n daaruit voortvloeiende toekomstaak vir die ortodidaktiek (Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek, Volume 12, No. 1, 1978), based on the present chapter, Du Toit discusses the harmonious lesson situation, and the above underlined entry is my translation of this section of his article. Even so, there is no guarantee that what I have presented here is an accurate approximation of what indeed appears on the missing page 16. Accept with caution. (G.D.Y.)

** Elemental means contents reduced to their essentials by a teacher; fundamental means those reduced contents that have been learned, assimilated by a child and made his own in a functional, usable way in everyday life. These concepts are part of Klafki’s theory of categorical forming, or double unlocking. See Kruger⁵¹. (G.Y.)

However, a child also shows his own participation in the lesson event by a willingness to learn the life contents presented. Thus, the teaching event progresses by means of two clearly distinguishable acts, namely a guided actualization and a self-actualization [of the psychic life] with which the life contents (now learning contents) coincide. If it is remembered that pedagogical essences are constitutive of the educative reality,⁴⁹⁾ it is necessary that the lesson structure not only makes it possible to implement [actualize] these essences—as disclosed by the different part-perspectives—but that their implementation indicates that there are particular relationships among them. The relationships among the various pedagogical essences, as shown through the essences of the contents, are thus preconditions for a harmonious lesson situation. A more penetrating analysis, however, seems to be necessary and this will occur by means of a few aspects of the lesson structure:

2.4.1.1 Teaching-contents-learning

The origin of a lesson manifests itself structurally in two aspects, namely, form and content both of which are brought into harmonious movement by a third component, the didactic modalities. Teaching, as one of the activities that occurs in a teaching situation, gives shape to the aspect of form:

The first ontological category posits an active involvement of a person with his world, being an initiative to establish relationships with reality. Thus, involvement with the world is disclosed in different forms of living of which educating and, with it, *teaching* undeniably figure forth on the human horizon. In truth, the activity of teaching implies a Dasein-imperative because being-there [Dasein] without teaching is unthinkable.⁵⁰⁾ Consequently, a form of teaching is a form of living.

In addition to this, being-in-the-world also stresses *life contents*. The original experience shows precisely that there is an association with reality by means of attributing sense and meaning to contents. Without contents human existence is not possible because they are what guarantee human openness and thus they also advance the possibility of human forming.

Because forms of living without contents are meaningless as well as impossible and because reality without life form cannot be changed into life contents, the first ontological category necessarily implies a synthesis, a connection, a harmony with respect to life form and life contents. Thus, this statement also has relevance for educating that always becomes functional via a lesson because the form of teaching and the form of learning harmonize with the contents. Because the form of teaching serves as a mould for the learning contents, the structure of a lesson is possible. And when a lesson is offered in accountable ways in school practice, this means that the details of the form and contents of the lesson must be correctly taken into account in order to bring about equilibrium between them.

To do this, the learning contents must be reduced to their essentials. It is known that life reality shows a categorical structure which means that it is made accessible or knowable in terms of or in accordance with its essences.⁵¹⁾ Thus, a teacher necessarily must reduce the learning contents to their basic, simple and authentic elementals. If the form is selected in light of the teaching aim and in accordance with the elemental-contents, and harmoniously put into function, it is reasonable to expect that adequate learning will occur. On the one hand, this means that the modes of learning anticipated by a teacher are harmonized with the realization of teaching. On the other hand, this means that the act of learning is also harmonized with the elemental-contents by which there is a change over to fundamental-contents. Kruger⁵²⁾ describes the fundamental as “what a child in the didactic situation has made his own and that allows him to meaningfully participate in reality and to understand his own world”.

So far, in a harmonious teaching event there is mention of a balanced interplay of the essences of teaching and the essences of the contents. The significant didactical-pedagogic pronouncement that educating realizes itself in teaching and that the meaning of teaching is in educating⁵³⁾ is confirmation of the fact that educative essences are realized in a harmonious lesson event. Landman⁵⁴⁾ states that the realization of fundamental-pedagogical essences functions as a precondition for realizing the essences of the lesson structure. In a harmonious lesson situation, thus in its form,

teaching will then be of educative relevance,⁵⁵⁾ but then this also implies that the contents satisfy the criterion of being near to life.⁵⁶⁾

With respect to the *phenomenon of learning* in a teaching situation, since Bollinger, Hillebrand, Van der Stoep, Sonnekus and others, the time has finally passed when pronouncements from non-reality grounded perspectives on the phenomenon of learning were accepted as true and seen as binding. The naturalistic description of the act of learning, as merely a stimulus-response process, is evidence not only of a naiveté about the existential but, beyond any doubt, conceals and veils the real essences of the phenomenon of learning. Because authentic findings about the humanness of a person are only possible on the basis of three foundation stones--phenomenology is meaningful only as ontology, ontology is only possible as phenomenology (Heidegger), and phenomenological thinking can only be implemented as categorical thinking (Landman)--the above-mentioned phenomenologically oriented scientists were led to a way of thinking about the phenomenon of learning in its essential nature.

Sonnekus⁵⁷⁾ interprets the phenomenon of learning in terms of its ontological givens, i.e., as a primordial mode of Dasein. In other words, learning is a phenomenon that, in its essence, is a primary form of living of a human's being-in-the-world.⁵⁸⁾ Thus, learning is an act of establishing relationships, carrying on dialogues with the world, an intentional going out to reality with the aim of constituting, exploring, mastering and changing that reality into a personal reality. Giving sense and meaning do not appear to be possible without actualizing the act of learning.

A child's learning going out to reality is not governed by a rigid law of nature. His going out to reality occurs by means of different modes of learning that show a conspicuous correspondence with ways or modes of teaching.⁵⁹⁾ This implies that planning a lesson must be directed to correlating the forms of teaching and the modes of learning. Sonnekus⁶⁰⁾ views this harmony in a broader sense when he indicates that a harmony must be established between guided- and self-actualization *of the entire psychic life of a child*, and that this involves more than just knowing the learning contents.

As noted earlier, life contents are not *ipso facto* available for a child. They only become accessible to him by means of elementals and because finding and unlocking the elementals assume adult intervention, this once again underlines the ontic fact that a child cannot [properly] become and learn without the help and support of an adult. The harmony between the elementals and the form of teaching will only emerge when there is also harmony between the form of learning and the elementals. In other words, only when the elementals become fundamentals can there be a harmonious lesson event. In the language of Klafki, such a situation can be described as categorical forming as a consequence of the double unlocking of reality.

2.4.1.2 Learning aim and teaching aim

As in the case of the original experience [home], in a second-order established [school] situation, there is *purposive* teaching. That is, an adult has a consciously planned teaching aim that he wants to realize in a lesson situation. The form of a lesson, its contents and the didactic modalities are, thus, also directed to a teaching aim with its constitutive components of a learning- and a teaching-aim.

The lesson aim has to do with the role of the teacher regarding the presentation of teaching contents while the learning aim emphasizes the role of a child with the aim of him learning effectively.

The learning contents connect the lesson- and learning-aim. A teacher designs a lesson with the aim of meaningfully unlocking the teaching contents in order to make a meaningful self-unlocking possible. If this occurs, it necessarily means that there is harmony between the lesson- and learning-aim. Without a balance among these components, a harmony between form and content is not possible.

A harmonious lesson implicitly implies a careful design of a lesson- and learning-aim so that guided actualization and self- actualization will be harmonized.

2.4.2 Synthesis

The previous discussion reveals that a harmonious lesson situation is unique and complex in its original activity structure. The two essential activities, teaching and learning, with the contents as a connecting factor, can only lead to childlike emancipation if the balance between the course of teaching and the course learning is maintained throughout the lesson. It also seems that it is the task of the adult to represent the unlocking of reality in such a way that the lesson and learning aims are linked harmoniously. The didactic modalities, as initiators of movement, play a predominant and decisive role in this. Therefore, the principles of actualization, the teaching and learning aids, as well as the actualization of the child's modes of learning require a correct design that must be functionalized according to the [lesson] planning.

Supported by the primordial fact of being that a child is someone who will learn, the actualization of which occurs in terms of modes of learning, the didactician-teacher can anticipate with a reasonable degree of certainty the actualization of the modes of learning by a child. Would this have not been possible, it would be difficult to think about a lesson structure and consequently an accountable lesson plan; actually the lesson structure represents a convergence of teaching design with insight into the modes of learning on the basis of which the teaching is guaranteed, as far as this is humanly possible.⁶¹⁾

2.4.3 The disharmonious lesson situation

The previous discussion of a harmonious lesson situation provides evidence that the current idea of "learning difficulties" signifies a narrow concept not only in its name but also in its contents. Actually, this concept reflects very precisely the current approach where a child, as an inadequate learner, is at the center of interest. Hence, learning problems still too often are described as defective modalities of learning such as perceptual-motor or auditory-verbal problems⁶²⁾ or in terms of educative difficulties.⁶³⁾ Although there are often indirect references to pedagogic-didactic factors, learning problems are not brought into an integrated relationship with distorted lesson structure essences. In other words, it is the child who *has* learning difficulties and it is not considered that his

learning difficulties are [or could be] the *result* of a disharmonious teaching event.

In accordance with the description of a harmonious lesson situation, a disharmonious one should then be described as one with *disturbed relationships among the essences of educating, teaching, learning and the contents that result in the disturbed appearance of the essences of the lesson structure.*

If the idea of learning difficulties is played out against the background of a disharmonious lesson situation then it is obvious that it has a much broader connotation, especially in so far as it is now basically viewed as leading back to a disharmony in the event of double unlocking.

Even so, learning problems cannot be entirely equated with a disharmonious teaching situation simply because all such situations do not necessarily result in learning difficulties. Normally, adequate learning effects still emerge and indeed by means of (a) re-designed lesson(s) that, on the one hand, implies that a teacher, after gauging the effect of his teaching, teaches with greater insight, proficiency and purposefulness. On the other hand, this also implies that he is able to anticipate other modes of learning and that a learning child can link up with the unlocked contents. Thus, every disharmonious situation cannot be typified as a situation of learning difficulties. Consequently, the concept “learning difficulties” requires a further particularization in the disharmonious teaching situation.

In section 2.4.1.1 it was mentioned that an adequate learning effect presumes a change in the elemental [contents]. Kruger⁶⁴⁾ elaborates further on this when he says, “Future involvement with reality rests on the meaning of the contents that speak as an ‘extension of the elemental’. A child’s participation in future situations thus implies enlisting the contents already at his disposal”. From the perspective of experiencing, Ferreira⁶⁵⁾ agrees with this when he says, “The insights a child acquires in the act of learning, on the basis of previous experiences, are always qualified and changed in order to continually anticipate new reality. Experiencing, then, continually is turned back on itself in the act of learning in order to judge the possibilities of new experiencing”. Thus, from different

perspectives, both authors mention the importance of adequate possessed experiences drawn from previous lesson situations with the aim of understanding future teaching situations. The implicit meaning that the above discussion holds for particularizing learning difficulties is clear: Disharmonious teaching situations normally are a matter of learning difficulties when inadequate learning effects accumulate with additional inadequate learning effects, thus when there is a *history of failures* present.

Following Ter Horst⁶⁶⁾ it is explained that there are only learning difficulties if both teacher and child experience the disharmonious teaching situation as being without perspective, meaningless and menacing, and where professional help appears to be necessary to clear up the situation. In this sense, a disharmonious teaching situation is an area for orthodidactics.

The author does not advocate a new approach to learning difficulties as much as a new, expanded meaning for the concept “learning problems”.

Next a few methodological problems will be attended to.

3. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Introduction

Previously mention was made of the interpretation and explanation of the essences of the part-perspective for orthodidactics. This raises many questions:

Why is orthodidactics dependent on particularizing and interpreting the essence of other part-perspectives? Who must do this particularizing: the other part-perspectives or orthodidactics? If it is orthodidactics, what is its scientific status? Why doesn't it have its “own” categorical structure?

These questions are closely related to the incidental remarks (in 2.4) that a disharmonious teaching situation is not a primordial phenomenon. An answer to these questions is only possible after a

closer localization of the concepts perspective, part-perspective and collective perspective.

3.2 Perspective

The idea of perspective is particularly closely related to primordial human relatedness to being as well as to the problem of objectivity.

Van Peursen⁶⁷⁾ asserts that objectivity (equated by many authors with truth) is not thinkable without human being and reality. Objectivity can be described as a disinterested, unbiased, meaning-giving directedness to reality, as reaching reality itself by a subject (Landman). Ricoeur⁶⁸⁾ agrees with this in saying, “Objectivity is the indivisible unity of an appearance and an articulation; the thing shows itself and can be articulated. To articulate the thing, is to determine its appearance; to appear is to be capable of being articulated” [In English]. If it is the case that objectivity assumes that there is a synthesis between meaning and appearance,⁶⁹⁾ this once again stresses that a person always stands in the midst of objectivity, i.e., objectivity is only possible in relation to subjectivity.

But this raises a new problem, namely, to what extent objectivity really is possible. Someone such as Van der Stoep⁷⁰⁾ asserts that something such as a complete objectivity does not exist within the power of human cognition because human knowledge is always *personal* knowledge. In the same way Van Peursen⁷¹⁾ remarks that in each individual and momentary perception there is something that is open to correction but because reality is always seen by a human being from continuously changing perspectives, and moreover, is replenished by inter-subjective dialogue, a human being becomes aware of reality as such. Thus, objectivity is attainable because a person’s relational connectedness with reality prevents him from being caught in a few perspectives. This insures a look at reality from a perspective by which truth becomes possible through a “continuous struggle”⁷²⁾. Ter Horst⁷³⁾ [in Dutch] describes truth “as the cognitive ferreting out of indisputability”.

The posited possibility of truth has particular relevance also and especially for scientific practice. Objectivity as a scientific ideal⁷⁴⁾ necessarily implies a view of reality from a perspective that, on the

one hand, emphasizes the unbreakable connection of subject and object; on the other hand, this fact emphasizes that a whole view of the entire lifeworld is not humanly possible.⁷⁵⁾

A particular slice [of reality] is taken according to that aspect of reality about which the scientist is intensely amazed (Plato), and most admires (Marcel). By questioning what is amazing or admired they are verbalized and the scientist then attentively surrenders himself to what reality has to say about itself (Marcel), but continually against universal reality as a background.⁷⁶⁾ This is a scientific perspective.

To become qualified as a scientific perspective, it must fulfill several requirements. According to Landman,⁷⁷⁾ a scientific perspective is a thinking and illuminating penetration into a facet of the life world examined in order to disclose and know its possible real essences. The disclosing of essences as an answer to a scientific question is only possible by means of the phenomenological method. The disclosure of essences means an ontological understanding of the generally valid contents, their meaning and relationships by which it is implied that ontology and phenomenology are reciprocally related.

A perspectivistic view, as a deposit of absolutized meanings in the phenomenon to be penetrated, is largely averted because the disclosed essences are necessarily verbalized and thus made communicable. Through inter-subjective communication it is assured that knowledge is not limited to a relativism but flourishes to its real relations, thus to true, universally valid knowledge.⁷⁸⁾

By “necessarily verbalized” is meant that essences cannot be until the act of verbalizing is completed. Although a number of phenomenologists, among others Van Peursen, Merleau-Ponty and Van der Stoep, have expressed themselves on this matter, the following remark by Landman is sufficient:⁷⁹⁾ “No being *is* when the verbalization of it is missing because the available word confers being to a being”.

On the basis of this particular connectedness between word and essence, it is understandable that there are particular demands

placed on the naming: Because it must disclose, describe and interpret the essential-meaningful, such names (categories) must be extracted from the phenomenon itself, thus be found phenomenologically. Hence, in order to claim categorical status, the naming must allow the essential to come to light, make it present as it really is.⁸⁰⁾ Consequently, phenomenological thinking is always categorical thinking (Landman).

For evaluating the disclosed essences, the scientist must also have a criterial structure at his disposal because this also lies on his way to evaluating the quality of realizing and implementing the categorical being-structures made present.⁸¹⁾

Thus it seems that an approach that is founded on a [particular] perspective can make the claim of having the character of an autonomous science because, from its particular question(s), a slice can be taken from life reality with the aim of disclosing its essentials, meanings and relationships.

If pedagogics can balance [the ledger of] the above norm structure, it appears that it will have fulfilled the requirements of that structure and, thus, that it can be qualified as an autonomous scientific perspective on life reality.

3.3 Part-perspective

When life reality, and thus also the educative reality, is so complex that different questions can arise about it, this means that only particular essences of the reality of educating can be disclosed from or through a particular question. In order to be able to see other essences, this would mean that there must be a change in place or standpoint⁸²⁾ so that answers can be found to another pedagogic question in terms of other illuminative means of thinking [categories]. These various places or standpoints are nothing more than individual pedagogic perspectives on the reality of educating.

However, it should be emphasized that the accent never falls on the multiplicity of part-perspectives but always on their unity because they are bound to each other on the basis of their common point of departure. Van Zyl⁸³⁾ remarks directly that the pedagogical in each

part-perspective remains the central theme and that there is no clear dividing line between them. Moreover, one continually points to the other. Each only shows a perspective on the fundamental theme and thus one illuminates the other. Pedagogic part-structures are also bound to each other by a common scientific aim, namely, to bring pedagogical essences to light by means of a particular essence-awareness.⁸⁴⁾ The implicit idea implied by this is that, on the one hand, each part-perspective must design its own categorical structure and, on the other hand, the necessary connections among the essences, as disclosed by the different part-perspectives, must be shown.

In light of this cursory explanation it seems that a pedagogic part-perspective can claim to be autonomous, provided it fulfills all of the requirements for being an autonomous pedagogic perspective.

3.4 Collective perspective

The educative event, as the common point of departure for the autonomous part-perspectives, attests to the fact that there are numerous phenomena that are interrogated via different pedagogical questions in order to be interpreted and understood. Often a particular phenomenon forms a “convergence” of one or more part-perspectives—meaning that the same phenomenon has particular relevance for more than one part-perspective—in which case a collective perspective seems to be necessary and logical in order to amplify on its pedagogic significance.

In no way does a “collective perspective” mean a mutual attack on the autonomous character of the involved part-perspectives: Rather, this has to do with an enlarged perspective because in terms of more illuminative means of thinking [categories], essences can be disclosed that in its absence can “fall between” the [separate] perspectives.

With the above discussions as background, the problem of the scientific status of orthopedagogics (respectively orthodidactics) as an autonomous part-perspective of pedagogics is considered.

3.5 Orthopedagogics (respectively orthodidactics) as an

independent part-perspective of pedagogics

3.5.1 Orthopedagogics

Original [primary] experience unquestionably shows that the pedagogic manifests itself as varying from an adequately to an inadequately actualized practice. Pedagogic activities can be qualified as inadequate when the actualization of its essences appear as attenuated, distorted or contradictory⁸⁵⁾ by means of misdeeds, mistakes and incorrectly anticipated activities.

Fundamental pedagogics, didactic pedagogics and psychopedagogics bring pedagogical essences to light because of their particular awareness of them (Landman), and [each] casts [its own] perspective on the reality of educating where the pedagogical essences are adequately realized. Seeing pedagogical essences always presumes that they are adequately actualized because what does not exist simply cannot be seen. Viewed in this light, a harmonious educative event is more “original” [primary] than a disharmonious one.

When orthopedagogics takes responsibility for [dealing with] an inadequate educative event, it follows logically that the scientific aim of disclosing essences is not possible because attenuated-appearing essences cannot be disclosed in their essential-ness. However, the impression that there is no realization of essences in a disharmonious educative situation is not true. But when such essences do appear in adequately actualized form, it is meaningless to verbalize such essences once again from an orthopedagogic perspective because they have already been verbalized as real essences in their essential-ness by other perspectives [e.g., a fundamental pedagogical perspective]. If it were possible to re-name an already named essence from another perspective in its real essential-ness, this would imply either that the essence was not originally named in its real essential-ness, or that the essence has changed its universal, formal structure in a disharmonious situation—both possibilities imply a *contradictio in terminis*.

The same reasoning holds true for attenuated-appearing essences. No attenuated-appearing essence can make a claim to categorical status because from an orthopedagogic perspective, it is named

differently. The adequately actualized essence is always “more original” [i.e., more primary] in the sense that it is seen “earlier”; it must have been seen first in its adequately actualized form before it could be typified as attenuated, distorted or contradictory.

The dilemma of orthopedagogics, then, is that a disharmonious situation really implies a “degenerate” harmonious one,* that, consequently, it cannot be qualified as essence seeking and that the design of its own categorical and criterial structures are not possible. Thus, in accordance with the norms for an autonomously functioning part perspective, orthopedagogics fails methodologically.

The above arguments carry the same weight when the orthopedagogic situation (in which reflections on a disharmonious educative situation have to result in corrective activities) is in focus.

To avoid the risk of any entanglement in particular theories** and methods, the orthopedagogic situation, as it takes place in the original experience of it, is put under the magnifying glass by the orthopedagogue. From this it is very clear that the orthopedagogic event is and can be nothing more than educating. After all, what other supporting and helping intervention that can be provided to a child by an adult ultimately is not typified as educating? In its essential structure, the orthopedagogic event is nothing more than educating and where educating is already described and interpreted in its essential structure, it is meaningless for orthopedagogics to also be a seeker of essences.

Although the orthopedagogic event often is still described as “re-educating”,⁸⁶⁾ rather than viewing this as an orthopedagogical “category”, it has to be seen as an orthopedagogic *notion* that, in distinction from the normal course of educating, emphasizes particular qualitative accentuations and refinements.

In spite of the argument so far, in no way is it said that orthopedagogics has no right to exist. Indeed, orthopedagogics has

* See Van Niekerk, P. A. : Die problematiese opvoedingsgebeure, p. 60.

** See, e.g., a psychoanalytically grounded child therapy and the non-directive methods of Rogers.

a clearly delimited terrain of study. In addition, it is indisputable that the orthopedagogue is called to a unique profession and practice.⁸⁷⁾ In striking ways, Ter Horst⁸⁸⁾ indicates that orthopedagogics is a practical inquiry directed at taking action and that its task is not to practice science for the sake of truth.

The disclosure of the structural, as ontologically given, thus is beyond the scope of orthopedagogics and its focus is on the way the pedagogic constituents are mobilized in an orthopedagogic situation. Thus, it is justifiable to conclude that orthopedagogics cannot be practiced without the categorical pedagogical structure. In this light, Van der Stoep's postulate acquires increased relevance when he states that the task of orthopedagogics is two-fold, namely, to interpret generally valid findings [i.e., pedagogical categories] for an orthopedagogic situation, and to research the applicability of these findings in an orthopedagogical framework, which is a matter of particularizing them.⁸⁹⁾

What Van der Stoep advocates is precisely what happens in a primary [home] educative situation. In discovering a disharmonious event, the parents interpret it in light of an adequate educative event; intuitively they make the necessary adjustments and accentuations for their particular situation—and in most cases this is effective. The distinction that Du Mont⁹⁰⁾ [In Dutch] draws between educating and (pedo-) therapy reflects to a large extent what orthopedagogics is involved with. “In the therapeutic event there is nothing to be found that is not analogous to educating The difference is that in a situation called therapy, educating occurs in the same or another manner, more explicitly, more intensely, more emphatically, or with less emphasis, in greater detail or more briefly, more verbally or more concretely Thus, it is concentrated educating, or stated differently, educating is itself therapeutic”.

With this, orthopedagogics is immediately elevated to a full-fledged, equivalent perspective because, *as a perspective aware of the essences disclosed by the other part-perspectives, it accurately focuses on them with the aim of adapting and refining them, as necessary, for its own specialized practice.* Its ontological dependence at least assigns it an inferior status in the range of pedagogic part-perspectives, while its mandated task insures that it

at least can claim to have organizational independence. Its mandated task implies an ultimate convergence of particularized and subtly nuanced pedagogical essences and relationships with the aim of eliminating the disharmonious educative situation. And again, this insures the identity of orthopedagogics and prevents a possible dividing up of its terrain.

For evident reasons, there is an inclination and danger that the orthopedagogic can be reduced to the other part-perspectives of pedagogics in so far as their various categorical structures will be interpreted and clarified for orthopedagogics by the autonomous part-perspectives themselves. In such cases there is mention of psycho-orthopedagogics, fundamental-orthopedagogics, didactic-orthopedagogics, etc.

This inclination is strongly opposed. First, in such cases, the autonomous part-perspectives act *ultra vires* [beyond their power]. Using his specialized knowledge of a disharmonious educative situation, only an orthopedagogue can make pronouncements regarding his terrain, and merely applying findings from other part-perspectives would imply that orthopedagogics, as such, does not have a right to exist.

Second, this would mean that a “pure” orthopedagogics cannot exist because it can only be practiced by using the categorical structure of the pedagogical; that is, it has to link up with one or another autonomous part-perspective of pedagogics.

However, there is no objection to using notions such as fundamental-orthopedagogic moments, psycho-orthopedagogic moments or didactic-orthopedagogic moments, provided it is understood that this amounts to an orthopedagogic interpreting and nuancing of the various categorical structures with the aim of harmonizing such essences in an orthopedagogic event. The idea of a collective perspective and inquiry has to be seen in this context because only an orthopedagogician can make orthopedagogical claims through research and a specialized command of his terrain. At most there can be a collective perspective if the findings obtained via it are orthopedagogically valid, i.e., if such findings remain under the jurisdiction of orthopedagogics.

3.5.2 Orthodidactics

The orthodidactic, as an inseparable facet of orthopedagogics, also has the role of interpreting generally valid pedagogical findings with the aim of establishing a very definite practice. Briefly formulated, the task of orthodidactics is to search for ways that will allow children who have become blocked in a formal school situation to enter into a presented piece of reality so that their learning of it will be adequate.

Because a child with learning problems is involved with his entire being in a distressful situation,⁹¹⁾ this implies that, *ipso facto*, the orthodidactic task is one that has to be carried out within the overarching orthopedagogical. For those who disclaim categorical statements, their burden is to show that (re-) educating and (re-) teaching are separate entities. By implication, this also means that they have to show that learning difficulties are partial defects,⁹²⁾ which, as exclusively cognitive problems, can be brought into line with the help of remedial teaching techniques that in many respects rest on psychological theories of learning.

Hence, to practice orthodidactics also implies an interpretation of pedagogical findings with the aim of engaging in a harmonious practice in a particular orthodidactic situation. Because such findings are not merely applicable to an orthodidactic situation, the analysis of a disharmonious situation is of great importance. This includes a comprehensive diagnostics as well as the [orthopedagogic/orthodidactic] interpretation of findings from the various auxiliary sciences (e.g., medicine, psychology) that can be of value for its specialized practice.

In addition to a grounded knowledge of the categorical pedagogical structure and findings of related sciences, the orthodidactician has to thoroughly acquaint himself with subject didactic findings. Where it is the task of subject didactical theory to particularize the lesson, as a practical convergence of the various pedagogic perspectives for a specific teaching practice, it is obvious that orthodidactics relies heavily on subject didactical theory. Orthodidactic designs have to be finely nuanced, particularized

lessons and, therefore, subject didactic designs are of great value to it.

4. SUMMARY

In the present chapter an attempt is made to justify the meaning of the following scientific reflections:

First it is shown that the idea of learning difficulties has a narrow meaning, especially to the extent that it is not brought into relationship with a child's formal teaching situations. Reasons for this, on the one hand, are the one-sided psychological-pedagogical interpretation of learning problems and, on the other hand, the lack of a categorical pedagogical structure that only appeared recently.

With the help of the categorical pedagogical structure, an attempt followed to give an accountable description of learning difficulties by interpreting them against the background of a disharmonious teaching situation.

The above reflections allowed some methodological problems to come to light, the most important of which is the question of whether orthopedagogics (respectively orthodidactics) loses its autonomous status if, because as a particularizing science, it is dependent on the interpretation of pedagogical essences disclosed by the other part-perspectives. This required that there also be a reflection on the concepts perspective, part-perspective and collective perspective.

5. THE AIM OF THE INVESTIGATION

The aim of the present study is to penetrate the problem of learning difficulties against the background of and in connection with a disharmonious teaching situation in order to particularize guidelines for orthodidactic practice to eliminate or overcome the disharmony. The orthodidactic question of how must I deal further with this child entrusted to me (Van Gelder), that until now has shown a haphazard character, in this way will be placed on a grounded foundation.

6. PROGRESSIVE VIEW OF THE PROBLEM

In chapter two constituents of a disharmonious teaching situation are particularized. A few children with learning difficulties who, in their actualization of learning, underlying causes and learning results, might show a divergent and even conflicting image in a disharmonious teaching situation are placed under a magnifying glass. From this, common factors are disclosed and provisionally put forward as constituents of a disharmonious teaching situation.

Chapter three is devoted to an exhaustive discussion of orthodidactic considerations for designing lessons for a child with learning problems. The lesson form, contents and modality questions, together with aspects of the course or sequence of a lesson are considered with the aim of explicating the orthodidactic task of particularizing and nuancing [structure of] such a lesson.

In chapter four the question of the inadequate act of learning is discussed indirectly by coupling it with the problem of diagnostics. Pedagogical diagnostics (and therefore orthodidactic diagnostics) has no inherent aim in itself. Its aim is always found in providing corrective help. Therefore, by asking about the relevance of those data made available to the practice of orthodidactic help by particular orthodidactic media, not only is insight acquired about the inadequate actualization of learning by a child with a learning difficulty, but also there is a reevaluation of the existing practice of diagnostics.

In chapter five an orthodidactic lesson model is designed in which the data from the images of actualizing learning and the learning effects, as well as the results of the orthodidactic considerations of didactic questions, are arranged harmoniously. After that an example of a disharmonious situation-analysis is presented, and issuing from this, an example of an orthodidactic program for providing help is given that is rounded out with an orthodidactic lesson design.

In chapter six, a general synthesis, conclusions and recommendations are presented.

REFERENCES

1. LUIJPEN, W.: *Existensiele Fenomenologie*, p. 126.
2. HEIDEGGER, M.: *Einführung in die Metaphysik*, p. 11.
3. MERLEAU-PONTY, M.: as cited by Bakker, R.: *De Geschiedenis van het Fenomenologisch denken*, p. 408.
4. LANDMAN, W. A.: 'n *Fenomenologiese werkwyse*, in: *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek, Volume 6, No. 2*, p. 49.
5. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *D. Ed. Colloquium*, September 1974.
6. VAN ROOYEN, R. P.: 'n *Ontologies-antropologiese interpretasie van die sin van opvoeder wees*, p. 52.
7. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Taalanalise en Taalevaluering as pedagogies-didaktiese diagnostiseringsmetode*, p. 2.
8. NOHL, H.: as cited by Klafki, W.: *Das Paedagogische Problem des Elementaren und die Theorie der Kategorialen Bildung*, p. 294.
9. VAN DYK, C. J.: *Analise en Klassifikasie in die Vakdidaktiek*, p. 4.
10. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaskein*, p.11.
11. *Ibid*, p. 134.
12. *Ibid*, p. 137.
13. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Die Leerwereld van die kind as beleweniswereld*, p. 4.
14. LANGEVELD, M. J.: *Die Schule als weg des Kindes*, p. 17.
15. BOTHA, T. R.: *Die Sosiale lewe van die kind-in-opvoeding*, p. 1.
16. See: PEARSON, L. B.: *Reconsidering the place of educational of media*, in: *Prospects, Volume 11, No. 1*, p. 28.
17. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaskein*, p. 18.
18. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaktiese kriteria en leereffek*, in: *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek, Volume 6, No. 2*, p. 58.
19. See: GOUWS, S. J. L.: *Pedagogiese diagnostisering van kinders met leermoeilikhede*, p. 1.
20. LANDMAN, W. A.: *Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente in die Voorvolwassenheidsbeleving*, p. 10.
21. SONNEKUS, M.C.H.: *Die vraagstuk van Remedierende Onderwys as pedagogiese aangeleentheid*, in: *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek, July 1969*, p. 30.
22. GOUWS, S. J. L.: 'n *Besinning oor die ondersoek van kinders met leermoeilikhede*, pp. 4-14.
23. STANDER, G.: in: Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C, H.: *Inleiding tot die Ortopedagogiek*, pp. 26-51.
24. VAN GELDER, L.: *Een orientatie in de Orthopedagogiek*, p. 10.
25. GOUWS, S. J. L.: *Pedagogiese diagnostisering van kinders met leermoeilikhede*, p. 10.
26. GOUWS, S. J. L.: 'n *Besinning oor die ondersoek van kinders met leermoeilikhede*, p. 11.
27. See: LANDMAN, W. A. and GOUS, S. J.: *Inleiding tot die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, chapter 2.

- LUIJPEN, W.: *Existensiele Fenomenologie*, pp. 101-116.
28. NEL, B. F.: *Die problematiek van pedagogiese diagnostisering*, in: *Jubelium-lesings, 1937-1962*, pp. 96-97.
29. SCHONELL, F. J.: *Backwardness in the basic subjects*, p. 494.
30. OBERHOLZER, C. K.: *Prolegomena van 'n Prinsipiele Pedagogiek*, p. 13.
31. See: GOUWS, S. J. L.: *Pedagogiese diagnostisering van kinders met leermoeilikhede*.
NEL, B. F. and SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Psigiese beeld van kinders met leermoeilikhede*.
ENGELBRECHT, C. S.: *Die samehang tussen liggaamsbeleving en leerprobleme by die kind: 'n Ortopedagogiese studie*.
32. SONNEKUS, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psigopedagogiek: 'n Inleidende oriëntering*, p. 9.
33. NEL, B. F.: in: Nel, B. F. and Sonnekus, M. C. H.: *Psigiese beelde van kinders met leermoeilikhede*, p. 8.
34. Ibid, p. 8.
35. VAN DER STOEP, F.: in: Van der Stoep, F. and Van der Stoep, O. A.: *Didaktiese Oriëntasie*, pp. 41-42.
36. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Onderwyser, Les en Kind*, p. 75.
37. LANDMAN, W. A.: *Denkwyses in die Opvoedkunde*, p. 98.
38. Ibid, p. 48.
39. LANDMAN, W. A., ROOS, S. G. and VAN ROOYEN, R. P.: *Die Praktykwording van die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, p. 182.
40. LANDMAN, W. A.: *Denkwyses in Opvoedkunde*, p. 48.
41. LANDMAN, W. A., ROOS, S. G. and VAN ROOYEN, R. P.: *Die Praktykwording van die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, p. 161.
42. See: VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaktiek Grondvorme*.
VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaskein*.
VAN DER STOEP, F., VAN DYK, C. J., LOUW, W. J. and SWART, A.: *Die Lesstruktuur*.
43. See: VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaskein*, p. 69.
44. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Die herkoms van die lesstruktuur* in: Van der Stoep, F. (ed.): *Die Lesstruktuur*, p. 6. **{English translation: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/43> }**]
45. SONNEKUS, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psigopedagogiek: 'n Inleidende Oriëntering*, p. 11.
46. LANDMAN, W. A., ROOS, S. G. and VAN ROOYEN, R. P.: *Die Praktykwording van die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, pp. 165 and 185.
47. VAN DER STOEP, F. and VAN DYK, C. J.: *Inleiding tot die Vakdidaktiek*, p. 17.
48. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaskein*, p. 131.
49. LANDMAN, W. A., ROOS, S. G. and VAN ROOYEN, R. P.: *Die Praktykwording van die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, p. 161.
50. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Die betekenis van 'n kategoriale struktuur vir die Didaktiese Pedagogiek*, in: *Psychologia Pedagogies Sursum*, p. 204. **[English translation: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/46>]**
51. KLAFKI, W. as cited by Kruger, R. A.: *Die betekenis van die begrippe Elementare en Fundamentele in die Didaktiese teorie en praktyk*, p. 72. **English translation: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/139>]**

52. KRUGER, R. A.: Ibid, p. 72.
53. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaktiese Grondvorme*, p. 7.
54. LANDMAN, W. A. et al.: *Die Praktykwording van die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, p. 182.
55. See: VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaskein*, p. 137.
56. Ibid.
57. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Die leerwereld van die kind as beleweniswereld*, p. 4.
58. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaktiese Grondvorme*, p. 47.
59. Ibid, p. 59.
60. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Onderwyser, Les en Kind*, p. 51.
61. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaktiese criteria en leereffek* in: *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek, Volume 6, No. 2*, p. 62.
62. See: JOHNSON, D. J. and MYKLEBUST, H. R.: *Learning disabilities*.
KEPHART, N. C.: *The slow learner in the classroom*.
63. See: NEL, B. F.: in: Nel, B. F. and Sonnekus, M. C. H.: *Psigiese beelde van kinders met leermoeilikhede*,
VAN GELDER, L.: *Ontsporing en Correctie*.
64. KRUGER, R. A.: op. cit., p. 75.
65. FERREIRA, G. V.: *Ervaar as Psigopedagogiese kategorie*, p. 69.
66. TER HORST, W.: *Een orthopedagogisch gezichtpunt*, in: *Verduisterd Perspectief*, p. 5.
67. VAN PEURSEN, C. A.: *Fenomenologie en Werklikheid*, p. 16.
68. RICOEUR, P.: *The antinomy of human reality and the problem of philosophical anthropology*, in: *Readings in existential phenomenology*, p. 394.
69. See: Ibid, p. 394.
70. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Taalanalise en taalevaluering as pedagogies-didaktiese diagnostiseeringsmetode*, p. 2.
71. VAN PEURSEN, C. A.: op. cit., p. 17.
72. Ibid, p. 18.
73. TER HORST, W.: *Proeve van een orthopedagogisch theorie-concept*, p. 9.
74. VAN PEURSEN, C. A.: op. cit., p. 28.
75. LANDMAN, W. A.: *Pedagogiese wetengebiede: Hulle fundering en onderlinge verband*, in: *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek, Volume 2, No. 1*, p. 67. [**English translation:** <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/36>]
76. VILJOEN, T. A. and PIENAAR, J. J.: *Fundamental Pedagogics*, p. 19.
77. LANDMAN, W. A. et al.: *Opvoedkunde en opvoedingsleer vir beginners*, p. 27.
78. VAN PEURSEN, C. A.: op. cit., p. 18.
79. LANDMAN, W. A.: *Aanwending van die pedagogiese kategoriee in die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, p. 33.
80. LANDMAN, W. A.: *Enkele aksiologies-ontologiese momente in die voorvolwassenheidsbeleving*, p. 17.
81. LANDMAN, W. A.: *Aanwending van die pedagogiese kategoriee in die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, p. 42.
82. VILJOEN, T. A.: *Die kernrelasie gesien in pedagogiese perspektief*, p. 16.

83. VAN ZYL, P.: *Die striktuur van die Pedagogiek en sy deeldisiplines*, p. 10.
84. LANDMAN, W. A. et al.: *Die praktykwording van die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, p. 183.
85. LANDMAN, W. A.: *Ongepubliseerde aantekening oor die Pedagogiek en sy deeldisiplines*.
86. See: LOTZE, J. M. A.: *Die Ortodidaktiek: Taak, terrain en plek binne die pedagogiese*, in: Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Die Leermoeilke kind*, p. 43.
87. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *D.Ed. colloquium, 9 September 1975*.
See: STANDER, G. and SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Inleiding tot Die ortopedagogiek*, pp. 17-25.
88. TER HORST, W.: *Proeve van een orthopedagogisch theorie-concept*, p. 12.
89. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *D. Ed. Colloquium, 9 September 1975*.
90. DUMONT, J. J.: *Orthopedagogiek, Pedotherapie en Opvoeding*, in: *Íuid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek, Volume 3, No. 2*, p. 54.
91. See: Vliegenthart, W. E.: *Op gespanne voet*, pp. 146-147.
GOUWS, S. J. L.: *Pedagogiese diagnostisering van kinders met Leermoeilikhede*, p. 2.
DEN DULK, C. and VAN GOOR, R.: *Inleiding in de Orthodidactiek en in de Remedial teaching van het Dyslectische kind*, pp. 27-30.
VAN NIEKERK, P. A.: *Die problematiese opvoedingsgebeure*, p. 58. [**English translation:**
<http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/89>]
92. See: VEDDER, R.: *Kinderen met leer- en gedragmoeilikheden*.
SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Die problematiek van lees- en Spelontsporinge by die skoolgaande kind*.