

### CHAPTER THREE

## SOME CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT DESIGNING AN ORTHODIDACTIC LESSON

In the previous chapter, some constituents of some disharmonious teaching situations are disclosed. To eliminate this disharmony, an orthodidactician must focus on them to establish a harmonious lesson design. Each of the constituents must be discussed in such a way that particularized orthodidactic activities can arise from them.

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

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

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

To better illuminate the similarities and differences between an orthodidactic and an ordinary didactic lesson, what follows refers to the differences and correspondences between subject-didactics and orthodidactics which parallel considering an ordinary and an orthodidactic event, respectively.

## 1. SUBJECT-DIDACTICS AND ORTHODIDACTICS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Should an inadequate learning effect remain despite intensive teaching and learning attempts, this will lead to a child increasingly experiencing his/her situation as one of educative distress. Then, he/she needs professional orthodidactic help. This involves a complete exploration of his/her lifeworld as an experiential world to determine possible reasons for restrained learning.

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

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

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

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

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

From these pronouncements, the formulation of a teaching aim is of decisive significance to the nature of the lesson activity. In fact, it

serves as a norm in terms of which the different possibilities for designing a lesson can be counterbalanced against each other.<sup>8)</sup> This implies that each of the phases of the course/sequence of a lesson is planned in terms of the teaching aim. Stated more specifically, during each phase of the course of a lesson, there will be a shift or change in aim.<sup>9)</sup>

## 2.1 General educative aims

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

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

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

Orthodidactic assistance also can have nothing more in view than a child's becoming adult. Also, its teaching aim has eventual adulthood in view as an overarching quality, but with this difference: its immediate aim is to bring about an adequate learning effect, which assumes the elimination of a child's educative distress and under actualization of his/her psychic life so that, once again, he/she can receive teaching in the usual ways. For this, it is

necessary that its pedagogical aim be nuanced to such a degree that it is directly focused *on what is achievable for a particular child with learning difficulties*. Van Gelder<sup>14)</sup> declares [in Dutch], in this respect: “The general aim of pedagogical action, of its guidance to independence, to self-decision, to life proficiency, to adulthood must, for the deviant child, be viewed in relation to the achievable, by which some aims must be said to be unachievable or not yet achievable”.

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

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

Thus, research has brought to light that, e.g., the experiential world of a child with learning difficulties has an obscured future perspective.<sup>17)</sup> Engelbrecht<sup>18)</sup> finds that the obscured future perspective has an impact on a child’s learning intention; and further, his/her experiential world is characterized by a devaluation in giving and experiencing meaning: “A child who estimates the lifeworld as less valuable, or who considers it as beyond his abilities is also often inclined to experiences himself as insignificant or of less value ... As an existential being, each person strives for self-realization and self-fulfillment which are now thwarted by his learning impotence”.<sup>19)</sup> Thus, this is a clear indication that the essences of adulthood fall beyond the reach of a child with learning problems—or at least for the time being. The deficient understanding of himself and the false notion of his learning potentialities are all manifestations of a deficient self-concept which

deserves the closest attention of an orthodidactician because its neglect can allow any form of orthodidactic help to miscarry.

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

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

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

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

A precondition for eliminating educative distress is the adequate actualization of the essences of educating. Since a child with learning difficulties lacks their adequate actualization, this requires that an orthodidactician, with a structural plan, must purposefully try to actualize the educative structures. Once again, it is emphasized that an orthodidactic situation of providing help is also a pedotherapeutic situation because, on the one hand, it aims at eliminating the educative distress and, on the other hand, because

the identical educative event must occur more explicitly, intensely, and emphatically.

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

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

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

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

These and similar questions can lead an orthodidactician to insights which will contribute to refining and particularizing the



fundamental pedagogical relationships, which then are planned and must be purposefully actualized in the orthodidactic lesson.

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

## 2.2 THE ORTHODIDACTIC TEACHING AIM

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

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

In contrast to an ordinary didactic lesson, the teaching aim of an orthodidactic program is largely determined by the data from the orthodidactic diagnostic. According to Van Niekerk,<sup>22)</sup> such a diagnostic reveals the nature, scope, and underlying reasons for a child’s inadequate learning. And this happens in terms of a

comprehensive image of his/her lifeworld as his/her experiential-, willing-, behaving-world, by which an indication is obtained of his/her attainable level of learning with the help of pedagogical criteria and learning norms derived from the curricula.<sup>23)</sup>

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

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

Secondly, the orthodidactician must also take stock of the specific learning restraints, especially to the extent that they are interpreted in terms of an inadequate actualization of the various modes of learning-in-education.<sup>26)</sup> This not only implies a pedagogical observation of the childlike learning behaviors but also a search for the relations among the inadequately actualized modes of learning, functions and other problems, and the quality of the actualization of the educative and teaching structures which are at the foundation of the inadequate learning.<sup>27)</sup> In other words, it is not sufficient to ascertain that there is a learning restraint and on that basis to plan

a teaching aim. A learning restraint such as, e.g., inadequate attending must continually be brought into relationship with a child's entire personal being situated. For example, to what extent is inadequate attending attributable to educative distress? Or again, in its turn, what visual-motor problems are related to one or another organic disturbance? If there is educative distress, what role do his/her parents or teachers play in it? What is the quality of the fundamental educative relationships, etc.?

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

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

It is known, e.g., that a child with learning difficulties, as one in need, objectifies inadequately.<sup>28)</sup> Inadequate objectifying means an inability to take an objective position because of an inadequate distancing from the self. In other words, a child is not ready to take a perspective with respect to the essentials of a matter (See chapter

---

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

one, 3.1). Instead, he/she maintains a **perspectivistic** position because he/she only judges life from his/her own standpoint.<sup>29)</sup>

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

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

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

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

On close examination, the constituents of a disharmonious teaching situation (as described in chapter two) appear to disintegrate into moments of relevance to a teacher, the contents and the child. Although the latter reasons have been broached in incidental ways, the three moments [teacher, contents, child] must be put under the magnifying glass to determine those factors which must be

considered in designing an orthodidactic lesson. Since the three factors are closely interwoven and interrelated, the lesson structure will serve as the basis for reflection.

### 2.2.1 Orthodidactic reduction of learning material

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

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

---

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

to participate in the didactic event, and his/her behavioral and experiential world.

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

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

For example, when learning material is reduced for a neurologically handicapped child, an orthodidactician must consider that such a child has a vague, diffuse grip on reality and, thus, on the subject matter contents. This is reflected in his/her possessed experience which falls short of the mark in scope and contents.

Hence, the question arises about whether, e.g., a neurologically handicapped child can handle the elemental, as the verbalized essence of the learning material. His/her being-in-the-world-differently always evidences an inadequate penetration to the essentials. And this leaves an orthodidactician with the imperative of a qualified or modified approach to the elemental as such, and which can include, e.g., a stepwise introduction to the elemental.\*

---

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

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

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

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

### 2.2.2 Orthodidactic statement of the [lesson] problem

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

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

In contrast to this, an orthodidactician is involved with a child who, because of an inadequate actualization of his/her psychic life, and his/her educative distress, is painfully aware of the gaps in knowledge with which he/she will soon be confronted once again. His/her labile-pathic lived experiencing can lead him/her to a negative, aggressive, or uneasy stance toward the learning material. The appealing character of the learning material dwindles and, related to this, asking cognitive questions figures inadequately on the landscape of a child with learning difficulties. A labile sensing and attending are closely related and, thus, it is urgently necessary to consider a child's level of readiness for his/her orthodidactic tasks.

---

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



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

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

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

- a) An accurate analysis of the foreknowledge a child must have available to eliminate the gaps in possessed learning. Foreknowledge serves not only as a starting point for the contents to be unlocked (see reference 43), but also as stability for a child. The known offers him/her a foothold, especially in terms of stable emotionality, or rather, this works against a further labilizing during a lesson presentation.
- b) A meaningful lesson problem presumes it is within the potential grasp of a child, i.e., within his/her under actualized psychic life. Therefore, the formulation must consider the inadequately actualized

modes of learning and, even more, it should avoid vagueness, ambiguity or the injudicious use of concepts.

### 2.2.3 Orthodidactic ordering of the learning material

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

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

Den Dulk and Van Goor,<sup>48)</sup> Kalverboer,<sup>49)</sup> Birch,<sup>50)</sup> Redl,<sup>51)</sup> and Dumont,<sup>52)</sup> mention “structuring” as a pedotherapeutic method of treatment. Although, in general, this has a connection with the pedotherapeutic aspect, in the judgment of the author, it also has consequences for an orthodidactic lesson. Structuring means establishing a structured environment with consistent rules of behavior which are planned from one fundamental idea.<sup>53)</sup> Dumont clarifies further [in Dutch]: “The aim and way are discussed with the child and together the way which must be traveled is outlined. Between where a child stands and where he/she must arrive, a staircase is built and he/she is helped step by step to climb it. Where a step is too large, an intermediate step is constructed; each step is evaluated and rewarded because this allays his/her anxiety, the adaptation is improved, and the results increase”.<sup>54)</sup>

From this it is concluded that the structuring method is in agreement with pedagogically accountable pronouncements; it is a summary of what occurs in educating, re-educating, and therapy.<sup>55)</sup> In this connection, Dumont [in Dutch] observes: “.. it is nothing but trust in the growing power of a child, in his possibilities of doing

things for himself, and an acceptance of the factual level on which he stands each moment, but also trust in his progressing further with real help".<sup>56)</sup>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

An orthodidactic lesson form cannot differ essentially from ordinary didactics. Therefore, the same considerations hold for an orthodidactic lesson design. The difference is only in the fact that an orthodidactic lesson design carefully considers the modes of actualizing the psychic life.

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

Although not the only one, the unique nature of the learning material is certainly the most important single factor determining the didactic ground-forms. This also holds for an orthodidactic lesson. To meaningfully place the contents in the landscape of a

child with learning problems, however, an orthodidactician must consider an additional important factor, i.e., the image of a child's actualization of learning. Since all teaching is directed to the actualization of learning, and the orthodidactician is involved with its under actualization, it is almost inevitable that the modes of actualizing learning will play a decisive role in his/her eventual lesson design.

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

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

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

However, the avoidance of ground-forms is not always possible. In practice, this amounts to a choice from all ground-forms being made

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

After careful consideration, conversation, example, and assignment must similarly be subjected to particularization so they can agree with the potentialities and difficulties of a particular child. For example, it is known that a neurologically handicapped child has difficulty handling abstract concepts, that he/she shows a labile sensing and attending, and that he/she has perceptual disturbances. Thus, if the choice should fall on the example, as a ground-form, this means an orthodidactician must assure him/herself of precisely how he/she will present the example to such a child. Thus, he/she must particularize the example such that it will allow for factors such as figure-ground disturbances, dissociations, perseverations, etc.

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

### 2.2.5 Orthodidactic modalities

The question of learning and teaching aids, (ortho)didactic principles and the modes of learning are discussed next. The

purpose is not to give a complete explication of the modality problematic in its entirety, but to present orthodidactically relevant examples.

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

The familiar Kantian pronouncement, i.e., “... understanding needs observing, not to be pure thinking, but to acquire knowledge”,<sup>64)</sup> [in Dutch] undoubtedly holds to a large degree for a child with learning difficulties. If it is kept in mind that he/she shows an under actualized thinking, which implies a deficient schematizing, ordering, making connections, abstracting, etc., the value of observational teaching and learning aids will be realized immediately. Thus, there must be an attempt to allow the learning and teaching aids to at least fulfill the demand of [disclosing] the “absolute essentials”. This means that the learning aid will disclose the basic structure or structures of the learning material and that it will be stripped of all irrelevancies.<sup>65)</sup>

In this respect, it is especially the textbook which does not fulfill all the demands for use in an orthodidactic lesson. It falls short with respect to quantity, letter font, abstract words and illustrations.<sup>66)</sup> The size of the pages and the complex activities depicted in the illustrations contribute to the “attenuated” course of learning in an orthodidactic program.

From this it is concluded that orthodidactic learning and teaching aids must also be designed in terms of the specific potentialities and difficulties of a child with learning problems. Additionally, it must be kept in mind that orthodidactic teaching and learning aids also must be chosen in each of the phases of a lesson, *and in terms of the help they can offer to the actualization of the modes of learning.*<sup>67)</sup> Thus, they cannot be elevated to a method. In this connection, Strauss and Lethinen make the following observation [In English]: “Although it is true that the materials are used extensively, they are but one means of reaching the child and, as such, represent the

externalization of the method. Without knowledge of the method, the materials are merely static devices”.<sup>68)</sup>

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

Regarding *(ortho)didactic principles of actualization*, the question of *tempo variation* must have a high priority in planning an orthodidactic lesson. First it must be acknowledged that the learning tempo of a child with learning problems in general is slow. It is only logical that someone who does not have a firm grip on the learning material, who shows a historicity of failures with the learning material, and who, because of educative distress, cannot actualize his/her learning adequately, will show a slow learning tempo. Therefore, an orthodidactician will anticipate a slow lesson tempo as a general guideline in his/her lesson planning. And this does not mean a uniform lesson tempo must be maintained throughout the course of the lesson, but rather the tempo is varied in accordance with the learning tempo a child displays. Thus, an orthodidactician must closely evaluate and even anticipate the learning tempo throughout the course of the lesson to maintain a harmonious lesson tempo. A too hurried or a too slow lesson tempo can contribute greatly to the failure of an orthodidactician's giving help.

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

Orthodidactic assistance, indeed, is possible in a class context, provided the pupils involved form a homogeneous group with respect to their learning potentialities and learning difficulties, as



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

If the principles of socialization and activity are not discussed in detail, this is not because they are slighted as orthodidactic principles, but because the same considerations which hold for the above, also are applicable to them. Both deserve the same consideration, anticipation, and eventual use for a specific lesson situation. Thus, the principle of socialization can be implemented for the one child with an eye to strengthening his/her grasp of the learning material; for another child, with the aim of carrying on a dialogue by which he/she can reach an adequate self-image or self-concept.

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

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

the case, there could not be a harmonious lesson, and a teacher also would not be able to anticipate modes of learning.

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

But in the second place, an orthodidactician must thoroughly acquaint him/herself with deficiencies, disturbances, restraints, even the preference for or rejection of some modes of learning which a child shows. For example, it is of essential importance to know, in the anticipation of perceiving, that the auditory reception of information can have a more adequate learning effect than a predominantly visual reception.

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

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

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

#### **2.2.6 Orthodidactic lesson sequence/course**

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

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

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

##### **2.2.6.1 Content as aim and content as means**

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

Normally, there is a delicate balance in a lesson between these two clearly distinguishable phases, the balance of which can shift from one to the other because of various factors, and by the skill of a teacher.

Then the question arises if both aims figure in an orthodidactic program of providing help. Does the content ever come forth as an aim itself, or is there only content which is applied as a means? If providing orthodidactic help is pedotherapy, and if pedotherapy primarily involves giving support to a child to re-lived experience [content], as re-defining it,<sup>76)</sup> must an orthodidactic lesson also be involved in redefining the learning content which was already unlocked for a child? Re-lived experiencing, as redefining, implies changing structure, new constructing and building up new relationships, and not so much bringing new content forward. From this reasoning, in some circles, it is contended that the content cannot appear as an aim in an orthodidactic lesson.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In relation to the issue of content as aim and content as means, an orthodidactician must also reflect on the functional possibilities

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

With respect to the teaching function with the aim of linking up with content as means, they distinguish two possibilities, i.e., a micro-attunement and a macro-attunement: “In the case of a micro-attunement, a teacher anticipates the need for help and support by a pupil. In his lesson design, he anticipates that he will move closer to a child to provide greater safety and security. In this case, he is prepared to temporarily take over, in part or entirely, the tasks which confront a child, to stabilize a child’s affective and cognitive lived experiencing, and to guide him as quickly as possible to again proceed to a desirable venturing attitude, and a turning to the new learning contents without help”.<sup>83)</sup>

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

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

- occurs in a strongly individualized connection:
- the content is attenuated and limited to that with which a child has trouble; and
- a child is dealing with pedagogical distress and, thus, shows an under actualization of his/her psychic life.

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

### 3. SYNTHESIS

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

### REFERENCES

1. See: DE CORTE, E. (Ed.): *Beknopte Didaxologie*, p. 68.
2. See: VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaskein*, p. 131.
3. See: VAN DER STOEP, F. and VAN DYK, C. J.: *Inleiding tot die Vakdidaktieke*, p. 34.
4. LANDMAN, W. A.: *Die praktykwording van die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, p. 25.
5. VAN DER STOEP, F. (Ed.): *Die Lesstruktuur*, p. 5. [English translation: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/43> ]
6. VAN DER STOEP, F. and VAN DYK, C. J.: op. cit., p. 35.



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

- leerprobleme*, op. cit., p. 79.
27. See: Ibid, p. 69.
  28. VAN NIEKERK, P. A.: *Die onderwyser en die kind met leerprobleme*, p. 23.
  29. See: VAN NIEKERK, P. A.: Ibid, p. 24.
  30. Ibid, p. 24.
  31. SONNEKUS, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psigopedagogiek: 'n Inleidende oriëntering*, p. 54.
  32. VAN PEURSEN, C. A.: *Fenomenologie en werklikheid*, p. 18.
  33. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Die onderwysdoel*, in: Van der Stoep, F. (Ed.): *Die lesstruktuur*, p. 48. [English translation: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/43> ]
  34. DE CORTE, E. (Ed.): *Beknopte didaxologie*, op. cit., p. 69.
  35. KLAFKI, W.: *Das Paedagogische Problem den elementaren und die Theorie der Kategorialen Bildung*, p. 393.
  36. See the pronouncement by Pestalozzi about the elemental in: Heafford, M.: *Pestalozzi, his thought and its relevance today*, p. 86.
  37. DEN DULK, C. and VAN GOOR, R.: op. cit., p. 37.
  38. See: VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Die onderwysdoel*, op. cit., p. 34.
  39. OOSTHUIZEN W. L.: *Die plek en betekenis van leerstof reduksie in die ontwerp van die Wiskundeles*, p. 33. [English translation of published version of this M. Ed. thesis: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/94> ]
  40. Ibid, p. 33.
  41. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Onderwyser, les en kind*, p.29.
  42. See: Ibid, p. 29.
  43. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Die kindevraag as wordingspsigologiese verskynsel*, in: Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psychologia pedagogica Sursum*, p. 173.
  44. See: OOSTHUIZEN, W. L.: op. cit., p. 34.
  45. See: SONNEKUS, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psigopedagogiek: 'n Inleidende oriëntering*, op. cit., p 22.
  46. ROSS, A. O.: *Psychological aspects of learning disabilities and reading disorders*, p. 42.
  47. OOSTHUIZEN, W. L.: op. cit., p. 33.
  48. DEN DULK, C. and VAN GOOR, R.: op. cit., p. 113.
  49. KALVERBOER, A. F.: *Over de relatie tussen neurologiese dysfuncties en gedrag bij kinderen*, in: De Wit, J. (Ed.): *Psychologen over het kind*, p. 165.

50. BIRCH, H. G.: *The problem of brain damage in children*, in: Birch, H. G. (Ed.): *Brain damage in children*, p. 70.
51. REDL, F.: *When we deal with children*, p. 35.
52. DUMONT, J. J.: op. cit., pp. 52-55.
53. See: KWAKKEL-SCHEFFER, J. J. C.: *Orthopedagogische behandelingsmethoden*, in: Van Berckelaer, I. A. (Ed.): *Verduisterd Perspectief*, pp. 69 et seq.
54. DUMONT, J. J.: op. cit., p. 53.
55. See: Ibid, p. 55.
56. Ibid, p. 55.
57. See: PIAGET, J.: *The psychology of intelligence*. NEL, B. F., SONNEKUS, M. C. H. and GARBERS, J. G.: *Grondslae van die Psigologie*, pp. 249 et seq.
58. STRAUSS, A. A. and LETHINEN, L. E.: *General principles in the education of the brain-injured child*, in: Frierson, E. C. and Barbe, W. B. (Eds.): *Educating children with learning Disabilities: Selected readings*, op. cit., p. 379.
59. HEWETT, F. M.: *Emotionele stoornissen. Behandeling van kinderen met onaangepast gedrag op school*, op. cit.
60. CRUICKSHANK, W. M.: *Buitenbeentjes*, op. cit.
61. STRAUSS, A. A. and LETHINEN, L. E.: op. cit., p. 379.
62. Ibid, p. 132.
63. See: Ibid, p. 379.
64. KANT, I., as cited by Jaspers, K.: *Kant*, p. 44.
65. STRAUSS, A. A. and LETHINEN, L. E.: op. cit., p. 379.
66. See: FRIERSON, E. C.: *Clinical education procedures in the treatment of learning disabilities*, in: Frierson, E. C. and Barbe, W. B. (Eds.): op. cit., p. 480. STRAUSS, A. A. and LETHINEN, L. E.: op. cit., p. 381.
67. See: VAN DYK, C. J.: *Die didaktiese modaliteite*, in: Van der Stoep, F. (Ed.): *Die lesstruktuur*, p. 130. [English translation: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/43> ]
68. STRAUSS, A. A. and LETHINEN, L. E.: op. cit., p. 379.
69. See: VAN DYK, C. J.: op. cit., p. 114.
70. VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaskein*, op. cit., pp. 138 et seq.
71. See: VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Die betekenis van 'n kategoriale struktuur vir die didaktiese pedagogiek*, in: Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psychologia Pedagogica Sursum*, op. cit., pp 203 et seq.
72. See: VAN DER STOEP, F.: *Didaktiese grondvorme*, p. 51. VAN DYK, C. J.: *Didaktiese modaliteite*, in:

- Van der Stoep, F. (Ed.): op. cit., p. 106.
73. See: SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Onderwyser, les en kind*, op. cit., p. 49.
74. VAN DER STOEP, F. and VAN DYK, C. J.: op. cit., p. 177.
75. Ibid, p. 102.
76. PRETORIUS, J. M. W.: *Grondslae van die pedoterapie*, p. 40.  
[English translation:  
<http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/81> ]
77. KRUGER, R. A.: *Die betekenis van die begrippe elementare en fundamentele in die didaktiese teorie en praktyk*, p. 68.  
[English translation of published version of this M. Ed. thesis in the form of a published journal article:  
<http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/84> ]
78. VAN DER STOEP, F. and VAN DYK, C. J.: op. cit., pp. 279 et seq.
79. See: Ibid, p. 287.
80. Ibid, p. 286,
81. Ibid, p. 286.
82. Ibid. p. 290.
83. Ibid. pp. 292-293.
84. Ibid, p. 293.
85. See: ERASMUS, M. M.: *Die posisie van die leerling in die junior primere lessituasie*, p. 238. [English translation of a journal article based on this D. Ed. Dissertation:  
<http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/58> ]