

CHAPTER IV

THE DISHARMONIOUS DYNAMIC OF TEACHING AS ACCOMPANIER TO LEARNING PROBLEMS: AN EVALUATION OF THE LESSON PRACTICE

1. INTRODUCTORY ORIENTATION

1.1 Intervening with a child with “learning problems”

Viewed historically, it was the conspicuously physically handicapped child who first came forth as claimant to one or another form of special, or extraordinary intervention and care,⁽¹⁾ and then a diversity of schools, and institutions were established in Europe, and later in South Africa, to provide for the needs of these children. First, in the 1930's in South Africa, a beginning was made with the establishment of special schools, also for mentally deficient children, while only in 1948 was similar provision made for children with behavioral deviancies.⁽²⁾ Learning problems in otherwise “normal” *children* began to come under the spotlight at the end of the 19th century and, at first, from a neurological-physiological perspective (Orton). From the beginning, there was a strong emphasis on *reading problems*, a reflection of the importance of the act of reading for the successful participation in the contemporary industrialized, technological society. The field of work opportunity for the poor or nonreader lessens, i.e., as unskilled jobs decreased, and the skilled jobs required a continually increasing level of skillfulness in reading and writing.⁽³⁾ Thus, today the following is truer than ever: “One who cannot read is a fool!”⁽⁴⁾

The contemporary dimensions of the problem, both in scope and seriousness, are partly reflected in the continually increasing volume of material that deal with it. How difficult an overview of literature on the topic has now become is seen in the fact that, in the five years from 1955 to 1960 alone, more than 550 studies in this connection appeared. Just in the U.S.A., in 1964 there were more than 177 professional and official instances which dealt with the development of programs for reading help.⁽⁵⁾ Thus, it is

inevitable that any attempt at a historically comprehensive evaluation of the approaches to the problem can, in no sense, make the claim of completeness.

In contrast to the state of the human sciences earlier in the 20th century, and especially during the early 1920's, when the scientific-theoretical discussion on the Continent was practiced in seriousness and, thus, a regulative influence was allowed to take hold, today the human sciences are all the more characterized by unplanned progress in a pragmatically determined way, while discussions about the terrain, methods, and, aims of a subject are often judged to be fruitless, and idle speculation, or mere philosophizing.⁽⁶⁾ A superficial overview of the contemporary literature on the question of learning problems, as this is raised by physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists, educational psychologists, special education teachers and, last but not least, educationists, allows the almost chaotic consequences of this *scientifically unaccountable*, as well as irresponsible attitude, to appear. In the absence of scientific-theoretical (especially methodological and anthropological) criteria for evaluating the extensive literature, and diverse approaches, and “solutions” to learning problems, it is inevitable that, in addition to a dogmatic bias,⁽⁷⁾ an index of usefulness of the theoretical pronouncements can be the only yardstick for this, whereby one falls into a naïve pragmatism. In most cases, this approach is also paired with a thoughtless, sometimes unconscious, and uncritical use of (natural) scientific methods, models, concepts, and terminologies in which a view of being human inevitably figures implicitly; this anthropological conception, via contrivances, and remedial techniques in practice, has its consequences in the lives of children-in-distress, and forces into the foreground the necessity for a continual reflective accounting.

1.2 The development of the phenomenological-pedagogical approach in South Africa

In 1962, an M.Ed. thesis by S. J. L. Gouws⁽⁸⁾ appeared under the guidance of B. F. Nel (Faculty of Education, University of Pretoria) with the title “The anthropological-pedagogical background of orthodidactics”, which is part of a comprehensive research project carried out by the Child Guidance Institute at this university. Gouws⁽⁹⁾

emphasizes that stagnation in the learning process is the result of a complexity of somatic, psychic, spiritual, and pedagogical-didactic moments, which must be viewed as hindrances in a child's accountable becoming adult, which can only be eliminated by means of accountable pedotherapy, in relation to didactic therapy. Via a thorough and accountable anthropological-pedagogical grounding of the orthodidactic, Gouws makes an important contribution to the elaboration of the school of pedagogical thinking which had arisen in Pretoria on the model of the Utrecht pedagogical school of thought. With this view of learning problems, as with the European exponents of this anthropological-pedagogical stream of thought, the emphasis falls on the affective and conative life, in addition to cognitive functions, and the pedagogical situatedness of a child with learning difficulties is continually put under the spotlight. However, when Gouws⁽¹⁰⁾ proceeds to a phenomenological thinking through an analysis of the teaching situation, and an anthropological interpretation of the learning process of a child with learning difficulties, the functional relationship between learning and teaching problems, as matters of a disharmony in the lesson structure, is not disclosed.

The value of his pioneering work in viewing the learning problematic from an anthropological-pedagogical perspective, particularly is the grounding as preliminary work for the further elaboration of an accountable orthopedagogic, i.e., orthodidactic theory and practice, and, thus, his research had not yet arrived at the lesson situation as an actual place of appearance of learning and teaching problems, and also a necessary situation for anticipating and providing help with respect to these problems. Accordingly, in the earlier literature, the emphasis also is more on pedagogical diagnostics, than on providing practical orthodidactic help, a deficiency which could only be eliminated by a reinterpretation of the lesson structure in terms of the didactic tasks which are brought about by the different, inadequate, or disharmonious actualization of learning by these children. Guidelines for the possible handling of this task are also pointed out in the more recent publications of this university.

“Introduction to orthopedagogics”, by Stander and Sonnekus⁽¹¹⁾ appeared in 1967, in which Sonnekus takes a position against the contemporary approach of “diagnostics-remedial teaching”, and

establishes guidelines for viewing the phenomenon of reading derailment from a phenomenological-pedagogical perspective, as reading derailment on-the-way-to adulthood.⁽¹²⁾ The problematic of a child's reading difficulty is viewed essentially as a complex language problematic, which includes a genuine pedagogical element. In 1971, "The child with learning difficulties", by Sonnekus⁽¹³⁾ (editor) and five co-authors appeared. It is an exposition of the practice of orthopedagogic diagnostics and providing help, based on a theoretical grounding of orthopedagogics as a scientific area of pedagogics, and of the task, terrain, and place of orthodidactics within pedagogics. The orthodidactic diagnostic, and providing help are primarily viewed as pedagogical activities.⁽¹⁴⁾ An accountable view of a child's learning is sketched as the learning world of a child, after which a child with learning difficulties is considered in his/her lifeworld. The learning child is approached from his/her lifeworld, with the aim of penetrating to the essence of the experiential world of a child with learning difficulties and, particularly, there is an enquiry about "the state of this child's inseparable pathic and gnostic experiential worlds, and of his giving and lived experiencing meaning."⁽¹⁵⁾ In a more recent publication by Sonnekus⁽¹⁶⁾, "The teacher, the lesson, and the child", in which the foundation is laid for viewing the functional relationship between the course of teaching and of learning in a lesson situation, in terms of the lesson contents, by which the guidelines are also indicated for viewing the relationship between teaching and learning problems, as manifested in lesson problems, viewed as a matter of disharmony in the lesson practice, and where a subject didactic perspective is also relevant. With this [work], a conspicuous void is filled by viewing the question of learning problems from a classroom situation and, thereby, for the first time, placing this problematic within the illuminative field of didactic theory.

It is envisaged that the starting point given here is for the particularization of microstructures (Van der Stoep)⁽¹⁷⁾ with the aim of providing practical help to children with learning and teaching problems, since orthodidactic assistance is only possible by means of a (particularized) re-planning of the course of learning, and teaching in terms of (subject) contents. In other words, with the solution to the problem by which the psychopedagogic, the didactic

pedagogic and the subject didactic are integrated into a dialectic-hermeneutic coherence, the way is indicated by which pedagogical theory can be realized in accountable ways in the practice of providing (orthopedagogic and orthodidactic) help. In this way, the key is also given to filling the obvious deficiency in the research at this university regarding the practical aspects of giving help to children with learning problems. This improved line of research is anticipated with pleasure. In this context, Van der Stoep⁽¹⁸⁾ says directly: “The time has long passed since a general explanation is interpretable as a matter of particularizing.”

In response to this appeal, in 1980, “The disharmonious teaching situation: Guidelines for orthodidactic practice”, by A. S. du Toit appeared,⁽¹⁹⁾ in which a new perspective is taken on the concept “learning difficulties”. It is stated that learning problems are still too often described in terms of defective modalities of learning, such as perceptual-motor, or auditory-verbal losses, or in terms of difficulties in educating. As an inadequate learner, a child is at the focal point of interest and, although there often is indirect reference to pedagogical-didactic factors, learning difficulties are not integrated with disturbed lesson structure essences: “It is the child who *has* learning difficulties, and it is not brought into consideration that his learning difficulties are the *result* of a disharmonious teaching event.”⁽²⁰⁾ A disharmonious lesson situation is then described as “... disturbed connections among the essences of educating, teaching, learning, and contents, which result in the disturbed appearance of the essences of the lesson structure”.⁽²¹⁾ Thus, a much more comprehensive connotation is given to the concept learning difficulties, i.e., by considering them against the background of a disharmonious lesson situation. However, each disharmonious lesson situation cannot be typified as a situation of learning difficulty. There are only genuine learning difficulties when the inadequate effects of learning accumulate, and there is a history of learning failures. When there are learning difficulties only in this sense, both a child and teacher experience the disharmonious teaching situation as bleak, meaningless, and threatening, and, perhaps, professional help is the only way to clear the situation up.⁽²²⁾

The aim of the following explication, where there is a closer examination of the possible contribution of teaching in the origin of learning problems, is hopefully to contribute to the prevention of restraining personal unfolding by means of impeding learning as a consequence of inadequate teaching in a school's lesson situation. More particularly, such a microstructural evaluation of the way in which the disturbed harmony among the essences of educating, teaching, learning, and contents can appear by means of disturbed lesson structure essences, might serve to caution a teacher and help prevent the constituents of disharmonious teaching, i.e., disharmonious pedagogical relationships, affective distress, experience of being different, inadequate realization of a child's cognitive potentialities, deficient learning results, and mistakenly anticipated didactic lesson designs.⁽²³⁾

2. THE POSSIBILITY OF INADEQUATE ACCOMPANIMENT IN A LESSON SITUATION AS THE BEGINNING OF LEARNING PROBLEMS

2.1 Accompanying to self-actualizing in a lesson situation

The problematic considered here is one of the most fundamental questions with respect to the totality of an educative event, and is characterized by Strasser,⁽²⁴⁾ following Theodore Litt, as the polar tension which is even at the foundation of the most harmonious, and least troubled course of educating, i.e., between the two poles "Wachsenslassen" [letting go] and "Führen" [guiding].

Accompanying implies that he/she who is guided can move under his/her own power at his/her disposal, and it is assumed that he/she who gives guidance has an aim in view, and knows the way to it. However, both aim and way are not given as concrete reality in a situation but are only present as realizable possibilities.

However, the ideal is always that between the two poles, between self-actualizing, and accompanying, a harmonious balance must be established.

The outcomes, or results of educating and teaching cannot be guaranteed, or directly measured, but are only observable in the harmony of the intervention in a child's subjectivity, by which the accompaniment experienced by an individual personal being of a

child is continually interpreted, and transformed in unique ways, via his/her lived experiencing it. Between child and world, there is a relation by which, happily, not everything penetrates a child; the world does not act on a blank slate, but the meanings which come to the fore in this relationship are also co-determined because a child him/herself actively goes out to the world, steps out of him/herself, and because of his/her wanting to be someone him/herself, he/she explores and experiences. A child's spontaneity, his/her freedom, his/her possibilities of giving and lived experiencing meaning, thus, continually codefine his/her participation in a lesson event.

The human way of being is characterized by the freedom to actualize present potentialities.⁽²⁵⁾ Thus, neither teaching – learning nor accompaniment - self-actualization have a direct cause-effect relationship with each other. Teaching effects are only realized through a learning child's unique experiences of the act of teaching, and his/her interpretation, or lived experiences of it have a unique effect on him/her, as a becoming person, by which, in its turn, behaviors are brought about which are not a direct effect of any given act of teaching, or instructing from the past.⁽²⁶⁾ This unpredictability, also regarding the difficult to predict eventual effect of intervening with a child in terms of “success” or “failure”, is partly responsible for the tendency to cling to known, and “proven” ways, the unwillingness to think systematically, and to set up scientific research into phenomena related to educating. The important point brought forth by research such as that of Jackson and Lahaderne (1976)⁽²⁷⁾ is that the same lesson situation can be an entirely different experience for each child in the class, and it is especially a child, who already has a learning handicap, who is exposed to a less favorable experience of the teaching event.

2.2 The responsibility to be self-critical and accountable in teaching

Langeveldt⁽²⁸⁾ indicates that, for all educating, fundamental self-knowledge, naturally, is the first obligation of an educator, both with respect to pedagogical and didactic problems which a child might face: “ ... in all difficulties with a child and learning material, there is a reference to oneself [in alle moeilijkheden met kind en leerstof ligt een verwijzing naar onzzelf]”. With respect to learning

and behavioral difficulties, Vadder⁽²⁹⁾ states that closer investigation usually brings to light the fact that the “fault” for the failure does not lie with the child, a fact of which each educator and teacher is not always sufficiently convinced. Nel,⁽³⁰⁾ in an earlier study of failing (examinations), points to the incontestable fact of inadequate teaching, weak methods, and weak learning ability, in practice. With respect to the learning deficiencies of a child, a teacher must first ask him/herself to what extent he/she has filled his/her obligation to a child, and if he/she has not possibly contributed to his/her failure to learn because of inadequate accompaniment, help, and support. Finally, as initiator of the educative teaching situation in a classroom, a teacher carries the responsibility for its design, beginning, course, and results. This also means that he/she must be able to learn from his/her mistakes to enrich him/herself and his/her calling.⁽³¹⁾

This is not only a moral question, but also a purely technical matter which cannot be separated from his/her total pedagogical responsibility. This self-study by a teacher must be organized theoretically to be able to *give* a responsible *account of* his/her intervention with a child, but also for establishing guidelines for an improved future lesson practice, to which he/she is compelled by pedagogical, as well as scientific knowledge. A dynamic function, such as teaching, can never come to rest without the danger of stagnation; continual revision of methods, and aims are especially necessitated because of the deep-reaching, and often painful societal revolution which nowadays is evident in all areas of the lifeworld, a revision which, indeed, must be reflected in teacher preparation.⁽³²⁾

“Why in the world would only a teacher not be responsible for what he has offered? [Waarom zou een leraar alleen op de wereld niet verantwoordelijk zijn voor datgene waarvoor hij zich aanbiedt?]”⁽³³⁾ (Perquin). Researchers⁽³⁴⁾ have shown, however, that only a very small percentage of teachers are prepared to give an account of their own possible role in learning problems, and usually attribute poor achievement to factors such as low ability, laziness, and problematic family background, while they are much more inclined to attribute successful learning to their good methods of teaching. “Without the orientation to consider the immediate learning environment and themselves as possible causes or contributors to

the difficulties of children in school, there seem (sic) little likelihood of teachers seeing themselves as the major agents of change within the classroom when faced with a far from ideal pupil.”⁽³⁵⁾ It is also instructive that a study by Brophy and Good (1970)⁽³⁶⁾ dealing with the differential quality and sympathy of the teacher’s accompaniment of children who are good or satisfactory achievers, and those who do not meet expectations, have brought to light that the teachers themselves are mostly unaware of their unfair actions.

2.3 “Teaching problems” and “learning problems”

2.3.1 The possibility of “teaching problems” in a lesson situation

Van der Stoep⁽³⁷⁾ indicates that a teacher’s preparation (re content and the didactic) is of fundamental significance for the degree of success which any pupil might achieve in a teaching situation since he/she is the accompanier, initiator, and designer of everything which occurs in a classroom: “If he is negligent, or careless with respect to any of the ... facets of his task, it can be expected that he will make a very important contribution to the origin of learning problems”. In another publication, Sonnekus⁽³⁸⁾ calls attention to the possibility of teaching problems (with an eye to further research), and emphasizes that “the entire spectrum of the teacher’s lesson planning, preparation and design fall within these teaching problems. Thus, teaching problems arise because of disharmony in the lesson aim (reducing the learning material, stating and formulating the problem and ordering the learning material), and in the learning aim (teaching effect, learning effect, and the didactic modalities)”. In 1945, Nel⁽³⁹⁾ related the quality of teaching, poor methods, and poor learning abilities to failing school examinations: “Although a person cannot be certified by means of numbers—perhaps, with the exception of examination results of teachers—that a poor quality of teaching can work to promote failure remains incontestably true and, indeed, it can be and, in many respects, it is the case. We know that it is often a teacher’s fault that a child has no love for school, that he/she neglects his homework, that he is not interested enough in certain subjects, etc.”

A superficial overview of the literature dealing with “learning problems” surprisingly shows that the teaching aspect of the problematic receives little attention, and is mentioned only in passing, and in general, if at all. From systematic research to date, there is similarly little mention of the teaching aspect. In addition, the logical obviousness of the need for such reflection, and research forces into the foreground of everyday experience the fact of complaints against teachers, and objections against some teaching methods which can only be ignored, to a child’s detriment. However, here it is emphasized that there is a search for rather than a definitive answer given in this regard. Because of the complexity, and wide scope of teaching activities, it is not possible to strive for completeness, and only a few aspects of the problematic of teaching are covered.

2.3.2 “Learning problems”

a) Current approaches to learning problems

The question of learning problems is as old as teaching itself, but in the contemporary success and achievement oriented social order, it is at the concerned focal point of a variety of scientifically accountable perspective, such as medicine, neurology, physiology, psychology, psychoanalysis, psychiatry, educational psychology, etc. State authorities also devote increasing attention by departments of education establishing school clinics, help classes for children with specific deficiencies, etc., for the remediation of learning problems, while a preventative attitude is also manifested in the establishment of departmental nursery schools, as well as school readiness programs for school beginners. The South African Association for Learning and Education Difficulties (SAVLO) is an additional manifestation of the omnipresent awareness of the scope and seriousness of the problem and represents an attempt to coordinate the part disciplines which are concerned with the problem.⁽⁴⁰⁾

Nevertheless, here it is noted that the current approach to the question of “learning problems” everywhere in this country still bears the stamp of “remedial teaching”, an approach which is analogous to the medical model, in that it is focused especially on the diagnosis and treatment of symptoms, mostly by means of some

unconnected techniques, as devices which might provide results in practice, but which must be questioned as a whole because of an inadequate anthropological (view of being human), theoretical (pedagogical), and methodological grounding. Such an approach results in a long drawn out list of causes, symptoms, and programs of treatment with respect to learning problems in subjects such as English, mathematics, or arithmetic, or even sub-parts of subjects such as reading, spelling, writing, grammar, etc. where there is strong support given, based on the test results, psychological error-analyses, diagnostic, and scholastic tests, which are summarized in graphs and tables.⁽⁴¹⁾ Especially in the impressive body of the Anglo-American literature on this theme, there are also lots of empirical research results available where the attention is generally focused on very specific subdivisions of learning problems without arriving at a meaningful integration of insights within a comprehensive, and founded theoretical framework. One example of this kind of research is Bruecker's⁽⁴²⁾ error-analysis, based on applying his/her "Diagnostic Test in Decimals" to 500 pupils, by which he isolated and identified 114 different types of errors.

b) Learning problems related to child personal unfolding

A school, as a place where a child is confronted with the formal systems of the adult lifeworld, also implies a dwelling place, and compulsory path to cultural adulthood. As initiative of relationships, as person-in-communication, it is expected of him/her that he/she continually, in self-actualizing ways, gives form to his/her potentialities of becoming adult, and of learning. He/she does this by a continual self-transcending elevation in the level of meaning he/she attributes to the learning material to progressively constitute his/her own world in accordance with the idea of adulthood. This world constituting is his/her personal response to the appeal directed to him/her by his/her educators from their shared situatedness with respect to what is pedagogically proper.

Since, however, both an educator's appeal, or the way of his/her addressing, and a child's response bear the stamp of openness, as freedom, the finiteness, the metaphysical vulnerability, thus, the fallibility of the human way of being, also announces the ever

present possibility of disharmony: of inadequate participation, faulty [lesson] design, under actualizing of potentialities, of alienating, with which, in a learning child-being-on-the-way-to-adulthood, a variety of possible problem situations of a changing nature, intensity, duration, and permanence might arise. Gouws⁽⁴³⁾ states that the possibility continually exists that a learning child can become child-with-learning-difficulties, by which a child-world relationship becomes child-with-learning-difficulties-world-relationship, as a relationship which is inadequate. This implies that his/her dialogue with his/her experiential world becomes attenuated, and his/her world loses its wealth of meaning, its inviting, and attractive character, his/her learning intention becomes impoverished, his/her readiness to venture weakens, the learning situation, and contents become meaningless, and the imperative which speaks from the teaching situation is avoided by fleeing. He/she experiences him/herself as “different”, and inadequate. Resulting feelings of desperation, and being threatened lead to a future perspective, and intentionality which are obscured. Consequently, learning problems must be viewed as a matter of existential distress, and since a learning child who does not proceed properly to acquire the contents of a school’s learning contents in accordance with his/her potentialities is undeniably handicapped in his/her being-on-the-way-to-adulthood. This also constitutes a *pedagogical* situation of distress as an appeal for special help, and support. When the lifeworld is a world torn apart, this always implies culpability, distress, and suffering, but as a normative world, it also continually includes life obligations, and task fulfillment as matters of necessarily changing meaning, and constituting differently the potentialities which are inadequately, or disharmoniously actualized.

Hence, what is emphasized here is that no child who inadequately answers the appeal to learn in school can be qualified as an optimally unfolding person on his/her way to cultural adulthood. Considering the unavoidable appearance of a school, with its character of imperativeness on a child’s horizon, the logical conclusion seems to be that the inadequate realization of the learning effect perhaps can be a school’s greatest and most direct contribution to a child’s inadequate personal unfolding. The justification for this statement is in the mere presence of a school, as

a *compulsory path* to a social form of adulthood which, for a child, is not reachable by alternative means. Through its legal institutionalized nature, and essence, a school proclaims itself to not only be the best but, practically, also the **exclusive place**, and means where a child's learning initiative can be guided by teaching, with the aim of optimally becoming adult. The implication of this is that a school takes upon itself the relentless responsibility for accountably realizing the task demanded of it. For a child who, because of inadequate teaching, shows a restraint, or stagnation in learning, *the only way* to fulfilling his/her existence within a socio-economic context becomes blocked by this. Consequently, that this child becomes alienated in almost concrete ways from the totality of his/her existential potentialities, certainly will be difficult to deny.

c) The occurrence, nature, and intensity of learning problems

In the first place, learning problems will show a different relief with each unique child, and Van Niekerk⁽⁴⁴⁾ emphasizes the necessity of having a good understanding of *who* the child is as such, *how* he/she learns—more particularly, learns *inadequately*— to ascertain the essences of his/her learning problems.

However, more generally, from Perinin,⁽⁴⁵⁾ the following distinctions are made: Haphazardly appearing fluctuations in learning can be evoked by strong emotions, or crises of a fleeting nature, often by incidents which might seem insignificant to a teacher. A teacher who uses punitive measures in such a case will not succeed in repairing the disturbed contact but will only exacerbate the problem. A primary school child who is not able to fully pay attention in a classroom because of his/her parents' disharmonious marriage, sickness, or financial problems at home, unpopularity in his/her peer group, or a falling out with a best friend, and the pathetic turmoil related to these negative meanings, can be berated in front of the rest of the class for his/her "daydreaming". A teacher who sarcastically asks daily "what is it that Sally again finds so interesting outside of the window" can, in this way, unknowingly contribute to a child's essential unhappiness, and inability to attend.

More serious are periodic fluctuations in learning which are closely connected with, e.g., a child's psychosomatic attunement, which also often appears during puberty. Here, a teacher's task is to avoid contributing to more enduring, and serious problems by creating opportunities, exercising patience, and urging a child on, to be able to surmount temporary relapses. Threats and predictions regarding a child's inevitable future, as a manual laborer, or an indigent, e.g., can only serve to add insecurity, or even anxiety to a somewhat less gifted adolescent's current, and future self-image, by which his/her belief in his/her own potentialities and, with this, his/her will to exert him/herself can become further alienated from him/her.

Learning disturbances of a neurotic nature, which are characterized by a disturbed self-confidence from a breach of contact with others, by which he/she is thrown back onto him/herself. An experience of inadequacy leads to avoiding learning despondency, which obscures his/her emotional life, and feelings of insecurity, and anxiety. Later compulsive behaviors can appear, such as the systematic, compulsive repetition of errors, and eventually a kind of stupor follows, a catalepsy, which makes a child completely impotent. This is especially the danger of an authoritarian style of teaching, where a teacher appears forceful, unrestrained, and unsympathetic.

In summary, with any child who has learning problems, of whatever intensity, there is always a gap between the level of becoming adult and of learning achieved and the level which is achievable. Thus, there is an identifiable difference between what a child, as a person, really is, feels, knows, and understands, and what he/she ought to have been, felt, known, and understood in accordance with his/her given potentialities (Van Niekerk).⁽⁴⁶⁾ "The *nature* of the learning problem is, then, knowable in terms of a gap between the child's *attained level of learning* and his *attainable learning* in the context of his current level to which he has become."⁽⁴⁷⁾ Consequently, according to Van der Stoep, learning problems are also "... interpreted as a matter of under achievement".⁽⁴⁸⁾

2.4 A teacher as a person in a lesson situation

Smit and Killian⁽⁴⁹⁾ indicate that the personal quality of a teacher can limit the nature and quality of a child's exploration of the task

of learning in school. Very⁽⁵⁰⁾ says that it is through his/her being a person that a teacher realizes his/her task as an educator. Langeveld⁽⁵¹⁾ explains the vocational psychological factors, as well as the study and employment circumstances which can have a favorable or unfavorable effect on the primary personal characteristics of a teacher. The responsibility and obligation for continual self-criticism, and regeneration are doubly true for teacher preparation, where optimum possibility converges with maximum risk. There is the danger that a young teacher's becoming a mature adult can stagnate where he/she finds him/herself in the sphere of a child (largely isolated from a broader social context), and he/she easily becomes pedantic, and opinionated. He/she is "officious" in a sphere where he/she is always right, in charge, and presides. Routine, thus, is also one of the greatest dangers in the teaching profession; unjustifiable self-confidence through the repetition of the known, by which a teacher becomes dull for the child, tired of his/her vocation, loses his/her ability for self-criticism, and, in general, stagnates spiritually, and intellectually, which result in didactic superficiality, and a loss of meaning of the lesson contents. In the teaching profession, a faulty independence, a lack of being socially venturesome, and life anxiety can lead to grumpiness, a lack of a broader perspective, naïve, and authoritarian actions, as well as feelings of being misunderstood.

The undeniable fact is, however, that amidst all the reform plans for teaching, and an appeal to the personal quality of a teacher, the corpus of teachers, aside from the small group of exceptionally gifted and mature persons, also must have its share of inadequately developed personalities, with the majority still falling within the range of the mean.⁽⁵²⁾ Indeed, this does not imply that the "mean" must be elevated to the norm, or that the "average" teacher is hereby relieved of his/her responsibility to optimally realize those powers and potentialities which he/she does possess. Each must, within his/her own limits, still make the most of the means at his/her disposal. Stellwag⁽⁵³⁾ says the educator must accept his/her specific form of being human, which is partly given as fixed, but he/she must learn to be acquainted with him/herself and the reactions he/she, as a person, elicits from a child—thus, he/she must strive for self-knowledge, and self-understanding. Here, with Langeveldt⁽⁵⁴⁾ it must also be asked if even this limited ideal is in

any sense realizable in the light of contemporary teacher preparation, the positivist subject training, the way in which a young teacher is left to his/her own fate, the lack of real accountable pedagogical, or didactic before- and after-school places for giving concise help and counseling to practicing teachers, and the worthiness of points of view taken on handling pedagogical, and didactic problems in connection with learning material, the school task, textbooks, ordering problems, etc. in the available literature.

Besides the completely, or partially pathological personality who, after years, still feeds the nightmares of children, Langeveld refers to "*types*" of teachers who, in practice, often create problems, among which is the "excessive questioner", who mostly is also a weak teacher who vigorously supports drill, as well as strict testing, the "qualitative excessive questioner" and the "excessive questioner who is estranged from reality", often the frustrated academic, who overestimates him/herself as an intellectual, and is guilty of undervaluing the child, and from whom an almost totally distorted affective appeal goes out which arouses in a pupil unproductive results, such as impotence, insecurity, resistance, hate, rage, etc., by which a child's effective learning is restrained. A child can, because of repeatedly experiencing, e.g., mathematics problems as "too difficult for me", or because of a low score on each essay, irrespective of how hard he/she tries, gradually concludes that he/she "cannot", a notion which very easily can proceed to "I won't try anymore". In such a case, a child's potentialities have nothing to do with progress in the subject of concern, and obviously alienates him/her from the subject because the didactic principle of sympathy is weakened.

The important fact, as Stellwag⁽⁵⁵⁾ states it, is that the personality of a teacher evokes reactions from the class, certain problems, and conflicts arise which are systematically explainable only by his/her own personal psychology. Perquin⁽⁵⁶⁾ also says that a teacher is obligated to give an account of the significance which he/she has for the teaching event.

The possibility that a child who experiences more or less serious learning problems, in the normal course of teaching, can be helped to overcome them, and make up lost ground, is closely related to a

teacher's ability and preparedness to communicate with him/her, as a person, to his/her effectiveness, as a teacher, to which are related his/her own personal pressures, weariness, vocational interests, love for children, relationships with colleagues, and authorities, personal relationships⁽⁵⁷⁾, etc. For example, a teacher who already feels insecure about his/her own teaching skills and presumes that this insecurity is shared by his/her colleagues, and headmaster, can interpret a child's poor achievement in the subject he/she offers as a "red flag". Because of his/her own insecurity, it is doubtful if he/she will be able to intervene orthodidactically in a firm and sympathetic way, with a possibly affectively flooded and anxious child, such that he/she is affectively stabilized, so that there is a real affective unlocking of reality, instead of the child becoming even more alienated from the slice of reality presented as content.

In a previous chapter, there is a more complete consideration of the various aspects of a teacher's actualization of his/her psychic life, and here it suffices to state that a teacher, as a person in a lesson situation can be a defining factor with respect to the origin and handling of learning problems. However, it is precisely in his/her confrontation with a child with learning difficulties in a lesson situation where the highest demands are placed on a teacher as a person. For example, this child is often experienced as a personal threat, he/she undermines a teacher's self-confidence, he/she casts doubt on a teacher's effectiveness, and weakens his/her vocational satisfaction. It is relatively easy and satisfying to give instruction to the "ideal" child, but Leach and Raybould⁽⁵⁸⁾ ask the following question, which each teacher must answer: "But what about children who don't respond to what a teacher usually does, and who persist in getting teachers upset, worried, irritated, anxious or angry? Do they not challenge the best of intentions?"

2.4.1 The connection between the status and the experienced status (self-image) of a teacher with learning problems

According to Langeveld,⁽⁵⁹⁾ two aspects of this problem must be distinguished, i.e., a teacher's self-view, and his/her status in the eyes of society, including parents and children, which can vary from placing him/her on a pedestal of omniscience to someone from a

lower class, on the level of a well-paid house servant. Obviously, this can give rise to arrogance or bitterness, and injustice and, as with his/her self-image, this can vary from a frustrated academician rotting in the morass of teaching, to an intellectual in a non-intellectual milieu, to a reformer, or chosen one—each of which obviously will have far-reaching consequences for the way he/she relates him/herself in a lesson situation to the child, as a person, and presents him/herself as a teacher. A teacher whose vocational satisfaction is undermined by frustrated academic or other (perhaps professional) vocational ideals might view a child's inability to understand his/her explanations as an additional frustration, rather than a possible indication of the quality of his/her didactic designs. If he/she sees him/herself as socially wronged, his/her relationships with children he/she sees as more privileged become so confused that there can be little pedagogical love.

According to Very,⁽⁶⁰⁾ a teacher's self-image lies close to the core of his/her person, and is related to the experience of the meaningfulness of his/her task, as well as the significance and quality of his/her affective encounter with a child. This implies that a teacher must also be someone him/herself. A teacher who has problems with self-acceptance, self-worth, and self-respect will be restrained in communicating, and encountering a child, and will be characterized as forced, and unnatural, which will undermine his/her relationship of authority, as well as his/her conveying knowledge. A teacher who does not experience his/her daily acts of giving lessons as meaningful pedagogical activities and, therefore, as existentially fulfilling, will, in numerous, subtle ways, perhaps only through his/her bodily attitude, and quality of voice, when standing in front of the class, and his/her unmistakable relief when the bell rings, communicate this "meaninglessness" to the children. Related to this is the "*model*" of teaching which he/she follows (often unconsciously), and which obviously will have far-reaching implications for the nature, and quality of his/her teaching activities. Thelen⁽⁶¹⁾ presents a seven-fold model containing: "Socratic discussion"; "The town meeting"; "Apprenticeship"; "Boss—employee, or army model"; "The business deal"; "The good old team"; "The guided tour".

Linking up with this, Wiechers⁽⁶²⁾ points to the effect of *the* child's view of the status of the teacher, as determined by his/her parents, and the community, by which his/her participation in the lesson event, especially via the possibility of identification, can be greatly influenced, and by which a barrier to effective teaching can arise in advance. If a high school boy's father perhaps is a successful businessman with minimal formal training, and is proud of it, and seldom lets an opportunity pass to indicate that each activity and statement of a teacher "typically" is of "a big fish in a little pond", or a similar widely known comment, it ought not surprise him/her when his son chooses to leave school before finishing his school career and goes to work. All that has happened here is that the boy really had no choice, and because of his identification with his father, and the values that he unconsciously had presented and exemplified. This father then had brought about an effective alienation between his child and the educator, but also an alienation from the values represented by the teacher, and the school. Obviously, this factor will also be a determinant of the degree of success with which teachers and parents communicate with each other—a necessary precondition for the optimal progress of a child in school, but also with respect to the timely interception and handling of problems which might arise.

In a society where abundance, being carefree, materialism, and power have largely taken the place of culture, it is obvious that educating is not taken "seriously", which implies that the position of a teacher, in general, will not be improved only by salary increases. This "educatio despecta"⁽⁶³⁾ will not be eliminated without a fundamental reevaluation of human potentialities, and dignity by society, as well as a continual level elevating interpretation, and actualization by a teacher him/herself of his/her situation, and the possibilities which this implies: Societal regard is closely related to the tangibly achieved reality of the worthy discharge of one's duties.

"In our opinion, a teacher is the biggest problem in a didactic situation", says Perquin,⁽⁶⁴⁾ and he adds that this problematic is related to the "circulus vitiosus" which arises because of the deficient respect for teaching by pupils and parents, whereby there are feelings of inferiority, instead of professional pride, and a teacher falls into depression, and routine, which lead a gifted child

to be averse to the calling, etc. However, the way in which a teacher, as a person, gives form to his/her calling will be co-defining for the status with which he/she is invested. In contrast to this, the reality is that the situation of the occupation, and role of teaching is almost impossible, and inhuman demands are placed on him/her, balanced between the world of a child and adult, neither completely as a male, nor as a female, he/she must live between the genders,⁽⁶⁵⁾ amidst responding to an absurd *deluge of demands*, based on inadequate preparation.

Finally, it is illuminating that researchers find that one of the most important factors determining a teacher's effective handling, and interception of learning problems in a lesson situation is his/her view of his/her teaching role, status, image, and purposefulness, as a teacher.⁽⁶⁶⁾ Naturally, the obverse is equally true, as mentioned by Voyat⁽⁶⁷⁾: the success with which a teacher, based on his/her professional preparation, can ensure effective learning, but also can intercept, and handle learning problems, will be influenced by the sense and value of the profession, in his/her own view, as well as that of the community.

2.4.2 The possibility of a teacher him/herself having “learning problems”

The first question to be asked is about the *level and quality* of a teacher's own mastery of his/her subject, as co-defined by the teaching which he/she had received in school, and in his/her later preparation. The question is whether his/her own subject knowledge gives evidence of being well-thought-out, experience-relevant, ordered knowledge of essential facts, and a mastery of the methods of his/her subject. A teacher's relationship to culture, history, and community, because of his/her positivistic academic training, might have a cursory, superficial nature, which makes him/her a “possessor of knowledge” instead of being inwardly formed. “To be a fully successful, and even excellent teacher, one must be a culturally interested person, and be a connoisseur of the mother science of his subject matter” [Zelfs moet men om als leraar ten volle te slagen, behalve een uitstekend leer-aar; en kultureel geïnteresseerd mens, benewens een kenner van de moederwetenschap zijner leervakken zijn].⁽⁶⁸⁾ “Teaching problems”

on the level of teacher preparation can lead to “learning problems” which are often a teacher’s “learning problems”, which, again, result in problematic teaching and learning in a lesson situation. For example, here one can refer to a standard nine (eleventh grade) history lesson on the unification of Prussia, during which a student teacher continually refers to the “Zollverein”. To understand this little piece of European history, the function of tariffs is an elemental of the greatest importance. Even so, he/she might dodge a pupil’s question about the precise meaning of this concept by promising to provide the answer on the following day.

Also, Perquin⁽⁶⁹⁾ mentions, in this context, the lack of cultural background, and narrow-mindedness of a teacher who lives in the little world of his/her own subject area, outside of which nothing exists for him/her, and clearly manifests in his/her person the insularity of his/her narrow-mindedness, e.g., as a salaried person, as a representative of a small town ideal of certainty, and self-complacency, which can invoke in the pupils an aversion for both his/her person, and the subject. Even in the higher school grades, there are few children who can really separate the person of a teacher from the subject. The modern teacher, moreover, is involved in the obligations of both his/her didactic insights, and his/her subject knowledge, always keeping up with continual changes, and renovation, if his/her teaching is to remain meaningful for the contemporary child, a task which can be very difficult to meet if he/she must also contend with an excess of extra-mural activities (Vrey).⁽⁷⁰⁾ A teacher who is exclusively interested in his/her own subject becomes boring to a child. The older, and the more gifted a child, the more differentiated is his/her need for expert help, but a teacher can never give up the conviction that he/she who offers this help, *in his/her total* appearing, because of his/her partnership in the total culture, and because of his/her humanity, must be confidence and appreciation stimulating, a conviction which continually becomes more shared. Not all teachers are suited for the teaching profession.⁽⁷¹⁾

To be a teacher implies that there is much about teaching which must be learned, practiced, ordered, and thought through. A teacher’s didactic skills must be acquired through learning, a task which, considering the continually advancing thought and research

in the areas of pedagogics and didactics, poses increasingly higher demands,⁽⁷²⁾ and the question arises whether a teacher who, after several “criticism lessons”, during his/her preparation, is left to his/her own devices, and falls back on narrow, and stereotypic methods, based on what he/she remembers from his/her own school days, or the board of more experienced colleagues, is not him/herself going to have a defect from pedagogical and/or didactic learning problems, which can predispose a child to learning problems. Linking up with the extremely negative comments of student teachers regarding the practical benefit and applicability of their theoretical preparation, the question arises about possible solutions to this extremely knotty problem. The extent to which teachers do not teach daily at all in terms of recognized didactic principles appears to be a necessary task of research for the immediate future. The fact is, an accounting is continually demanded of a child, his/her participation in a lesson event, is subjected to continuous evaluation and, thus, the question must be asked about accounting for the quality, and level of entry of the other participants in a lesson situation. A child very quickly becomes aware of the uncertainty, unpreparedness, and awkwardness of a teacher, which can seriously damage both the relationships of trust and authority. To be able to be a teacher, in the end, he/she also must allow *a child to learn to know*, and understand, and the question arises whether he/she has at his/her disposal the needed psychopedagogical knowledge to be able to really understand how a child, on his/her level of becoming, can and ought to learn.

The relevance of a perspective on “teaching problems” as a possible “learning problem” of the teacher, obviously has far-reaching implications for teacher preparation. In this context, one thinks of the possibilities of closed-circuit television, one-way mirrors for observation, more effective micro-teaching, etc. for teacher preparation to a genuine teacher-ship.⁽⁷³⁾ Also, Van Gelder⁽⁷⁴⁾ advocates these methods of training for promoting a degree of integration between theory and practice. The effective teacher must also *have learned how to evaluate his/her own teaching*, and the belief held here is that it is still a large gap in contemporary practice, where the central position of the artistic and intuitive

aspects of didactic activity are largely considered to be unaccountable, unscientific, and haphazard teaching.

2.5 The quality of actualizing the essences of the lesson structure in connection with learning problems

2.5.1 The teaching aim

a) Inadequately reducing the contents

Oosthuizen⁽⁷⁵⁾ indicates that the quantity of contents, and the scope of cultural goods which must be acquired by a child are continually expanding and increasing in complexity, and the ready memorization of an encyclopedic quantity of contents is no longer possible, or desirable. However, according to Grayling,⁽⁷⁶⁾ the opposite of the accumulation of learning material is not merely decreasing it, but to reduce the contents to the most important and absolute essentials, as the standpoints which must carry a pupil's insight. This basic fact must be formulated by a teacher in such a way that it is understandable, and meaningful for a pupil; if not, there can be no mention of unlocking reality. If these "anchor points" are not accessible for a child, relationships will not be observable, and a child must learn "off the top of his head", and this will result in unstable meanings as possessed experience, which also will quickly fade away.⁽⁷⁷⁾ The result of striving for encyclopedic knowledge is often that the "more" learned, the "less" acquired, that more is learned by heart than intrinsically, which leads to a barbaric and intellectual disintegration, rather than to the formedness of a child.⁽⁷⁸⁾ The thought-out, and experience-relevant determination of the relationships between grounding experiencing and reduced lived experiencing, on the one hand, and superficial, mechanical learning, on the other hand, are equally fundamental with respect to reflecting, from the perspective of becoming adult (see previous chapter), and from the perspective of didactics and learning.

For example, it is obviously inevitable and necessary that, in the subject of history, a quantity of data, places, and names of persons are memorized, although it remains an open question the extent to which the also obviously inevitable data from bygone battles and peace treaties can make a contribution to the level and quality of

the image of adulthood which a child will eventually realize. However, one also asks oneself, out of necessity, what the quality and level of the standard seven (ninth grade) child's learning activity as such, can be if a teacher's total pedagogic-didactic "repertoire" is that, daily he/she writes on the board the summary of a few pages from the textbook, and at the end of such a lesson assumes that functionalizing the contents have occurred, if he/she has asked several questions which have direct significance for the facts offered.

Smit⁽⁷⁹⁾, following Landman, points to the *suppression of both pedagogical and lesson structure essences by general talk* (idle talk). A torrent of words cannot lead to a genuine understanding and allows the essences to disappear under this deluge of words and, with this, the total course of the lesson will miscarry. If the point at issue is not concentrated on, and clearly, and economically formulated, superficiality is promoted, and the appeal to learn and think genuinely is smothered under a spin of words. Here, e.g., the author remembers observing a specific history lesson given to standard nine (eleventh grade) pupils by a student teacher as a critical lesson. At the end of the lesson, the board was completely covered with chalk. In his argument, the master teacher, mostly in what is characterized as a monotonously droning voice, said that no single fact, name, or date was left out. What the essence of the lesson was, however, can only be determined by consulting the headings of his neatly written out lesson scheme, a privilege which, unfortunately, is not shared with the pupils.

b) Inadequately stating the problem

According to Van der Stoep,⁽⁸⁰⁾ today it is generally accepted that "the phenomenon of learning has its beginning in a meaningful problem", and Landman⁽⁸¹⁾ indicates that this is grounded in the existentielle of being human, as-a-questioning being, and of being human, as a being in-search-of-meaning. This matter is returned to later in the discussion of the course of a lesson in connection with the course of learning and, thus, here it is sufficient to state that a child's lived experiencing of the lesson problem occurs on pathic-affective, and gnostic-cognitive, as well as normative-meaning-giving levels. Thus, the question arises about ways of initiating the

gnostic-cognitive modes of learning, as possibility for solving the (lesson) problem; these gnostic-cognitive modes [ideally] are continually accompanied by a *stable sensing*, as pathic-affective lived experiencing of wonder, resistance, and I can. This stable sensing is a precondition for wanting to remain *attentively concerned* with the (lesson) content as a gnostically-cognitively experienced “what”.

A teacher in a lesson situation who is confronted with the task of also accompanying a child with learning problems to experience the lesson problem as meaningful, must ask about this child’s (under) actualization of his/her willing, his/her ways of experiencing, and lived experiencing, and the nature of his/her possessed experience in relation to his/her modes of learning, as inferred from his/her behaving. For example, for a primary school child who does not have at his/her disposal a basic understanding of number relationships, it would be very inappropriate to simply confront him/her with more decimal computations. If the mastery of basic insights is lacking, with each new problem, the child will progressively be confronted with his/her own inability, since experience has already “taught” him/her that these problems are beyond his/her ability. Encouragement by a teacher that a child must only try harder will have a very minimal benefit, if he/she has not first accurately determined where the child’s real problem lies, i.e., possibly in an unsolved or partially unsolved problem from a previous school semester, or year. (In section 2.5.3c, the question of the phase of stating the problem during a lesson is considered in greater detail).

c) Inadequately ordering contents

To guarantee an orderly progression during the presentation of a lesson, a teacher him/herself must arrange, order, and schematize the learning contents for a lesson, and occasion beforehand. This ordering is a precondition for a child’s intellectual grasp of things as an ordered way of experiencing them. The first question to be asked is about the way a teacher views him/herself in accordance with the teaching which he/she has accepted in his/her own subject, and which can be characterized either as “positivistic quantity” or “meaningful unity and coherence”.⁽⁸²⁾ According to Bassoon,⁽⁸³⁾ a

teacher must plan his/her teaching such that his/her representation of reality shows a correspondence with the orderliness with which reality, as a categorical structure, manifests itself to human beings. Swart⁽⁸⁴⁾ emphasizes that this ordering is not possible unless a teacher also finds a link with a child's levels of readiness and thinking, in his/her choice of principles of ordering. This structuring is of great importance for the success of a lesson, and helps a pupil entertain the correct anticipations. On the contrary, unexpected deviations, and breaches in the anticipated scheme will make a child feel confused and uncertain, after which he/she will focus his/her attention on things other than the lesson contents.⁽⁸⁵⁾ To this, it is added that the problem of ordering, with respect to the way a child experiences the learning material, also is closely related to the outward problem of order, or classroom discipline. There can be little genuinely ordered experience of the lesson contents if the course of the lesson is disturbed, or interrupted because a teacher continually calls pupils to order. Ordering the contents, and the corresponding orientation of a child always occur in terms of certain essences which function as fixed points which must be emphasized as such, so they can serve as anchor points, or "beacons" for a child's experiencing. During a lesson which is characterized by problems of order, it can be that the most prominent "content" to which a child's experiencing is paired, is a teacher's regular outbursts, which very quickly can be elicited by the children for their own entertainment. In our country, this problem has not yet actually become so urgent, but it is an unsettling reality which has already led to the disintegration of the total teaching event in the classroom, or even an entire school in England, Europe, and the U.S.A. In this connection, Perquin⁽⁸⁶⁾ notes that disorderly behavior in a lesson situation is usually a symptom of inadequate teaching: "Then there is no natural, and matter-of-fact object available by which order can arise [Er is dan geen natuurlijk en zakelijk object voorhanden, waardoor orde kan ontstaan]."

A child anticipates that totally different contents will be introduced to him/her at defined times of the day; often a topic cannot be handled in a "period," and must be taken up again on another day, and there is a simultaneous deficiency in the coherence between pieces of learning material within a subject, and between subjects

and, hence, the teaching becomes fragmented, and discontinuous. Unfortunately, in practice, it still happens all too often that it is considered sufficient merely to begin each lesson with the announcement of a theme, without attempting to call up and use a child's foreknowledge so that the new contents can be meaningfully integrated with it. It is doubtful if a child, even on the senior secondary level, can succeed independently in meaningfully integrating the massive number of facts which are contained in a series of lessons, e.g., about the unification of Germany, with a total overview of the history of Europe of the previous century, and its contemporary significance. Still more: if not made explicit to a child through accompanying him/her, it can hardly be expected that he/she can succeed in even discovering the connections between what he/she must learn in Religious Instruction and Physical Education; Economics and History; Art and Chemistry; Biology and Music, to mention only a few possibilities. An ordered, regular course to a child's intellectual becoming, thus, becomes impeded,⁽⁸⁷⁾ a state of affairs which becomes exacerbated by the discontinuities from one year to another, and between teachers' different approaches and methods. Even among good pupils, this unevenness results in their uncertainty, deficient trust in the foundation, and usefulness of their own knowledge, and their superficial adaptation to the demands laid down. According to personal conversations with inspectors from school psychological services, and a variety of other factors, which cannot be elaborated on here, this state of pseudo-formedness apparently often arises with Black pupils who naturally bring about a serious restraint in the continued academic progress of these students on the tertiary level. A merely superficial observation of the quality of teaching and learning which occurs in some schools calls for a serious, radical, and thorough investigation of and reflection on the problem. Above all, one sometimes leaves such a non-White school with the impression that there is a tragic squandering of well-intentioned energy, and time. Little proper continuity in ordering occurs in schools where teachers are often interchanging, or where parents move a great deal because of work circumstances. The guarantee of the continuity of the experience of the different lesson situations is especially of great importance for the less gifted child to guarantee orderliness, and security in the experience of teaching.⁽⁸⁸⁾ Illuminating, in this context, is the view of Leach and Resbould⁽⁸⁹⁾ that children of all ages with learning as

well as behavioral problems share in common the fact that they have a continual need for more ordered teaching, and learning, including factors such as structuring, and ordering contents, decisiveness, clarity, continuity in the planning, course, and ending of the lesson event to ensure that their experienced position is ordered with reference to a teacher, and the learning material. Also, Du Toit⁽⁹⁰⁾ emphasizes the overarching significance of the principle of structuring, with respect to a child with learning difficulties for whom there is, as a rule, an unordered lifestyle. The implication of this is that such a child, especially at first, should not be confronted with “open”, or unstructured questions, and choices in a didactic situation. A delimited assignment with a definite answer, or answers would be more appropriate than a learning aim which includes an exercise in subjective evaluation by a child. Also, a child’s behavior must be subjected to sympathetic, but firm and consistent supervision. Sufficient, and clear examples of what is expected, as well as continual repetition will contribute to making the situation “safe” for a child in a structured and ordered way.

2.5.2 Principles of actualization

a) Inadequately actualizing the principle of activity

Piaget⁽⁹¹⁾ has emphasized that a child’s cognitive growth is not a passive reflection of stimuli from the outside which influence him/her, but only occurs through his/her own activity, through his/her structuring, and restructuring. Knowledge can only be acquired through activity, either self-activity or guided self-activity.

A teacher must accompany (guide) a child to actively turn to the lesson contents and, if he/she (the teacher) is the only one who is truly actively involved in the lesson situation, he/she deprives the child of his/her freedom to become someone him/herself.⁽⁹²⁾ The active involvement of each pupil is the precondition for the contents presented in the lesson situation to become constitutive, lifeworld expansive, and emancipative for each of them. Unfortunately, one of the disadvantages of classroom teaching is that the active participation of a child is often aborted so that his/her mastery of the adult world remains minimized. Often, a lesson event is more characterized as a monologue, than a dialogue when a teacher

speaks more “to” the class than “with” the child. Here, e.g., one thinks of a teacher who must present a subject for which he/she has not had adequate training, or a teacher who, because of his/her inadequate lesson preparation, must direct his/her focus more to the textbook than to the children’s faces from which the quality of their being-there can be “read”. Thus, it is in just such cases that a teacher cannot be aware of the real effects of his/her own behaviors on a lesson event, and he/she is incapable of evaluating the quality of a child’s participation.

A teacher can possibly assume that, by asking questions, he/she activates the pupils to self-activity without being aware that a simple question only makes an appeal to memory, in contrast to a complex question, which appeals to the activity of thinking and, thus, minimizing instead of maximizing self-activity (Bergeijk).⁽⁹³⁾ The author has seen classroom groups which have evidently been drilled to eagerly raise their hands vying to ask a question during the last five minutes of the lesson period. However, a careful listener quickly discovers that the questions merely change the sentences on the board or in the textbook into question form and testify to a passive attunement rather than genuine activities of thinking. Accompaniment which is directed to passivity rather than active participation cannot have a lasting effect, and such learning achievements can be compared with those of circus animals.⁽⁹⁴⁾ Thus, a teaching conversation must always be a reflection of a genuinely encountering dialogue and, as a pedagogical conversation, this always implies that it is an existential attribution of meaning as an elevation in meaning in both the addresser and the listener.⁽⁹⁵⁾

b) Inadequately actualizing the principle of individualization

Langeveld⁽⁹⁶⁾ refers to the faceless anonymity into which a child can sink in a large classroom group, within which sufficient personal attention is simply not possible. The other side of the problem is stated by Vedder,⁽⁹⁷⁾ when he indicates that it is impossible in a classroom of forty or even more children to deal with a child ‘individually’, irrespective of how gladly a teacher would want to do so. Consequently, a school cannot be a therapeutic institute, and a

certain degree of compulsion, and coaching is simply unavoidable. However, an acceptable compromise is possible and, in many cases, a teacher, merely by a change in attitude and behavior, by encouragement instead of criticism, can re-accompany a child from discouragement to newly found effort. However, there is a degree of unanimity among all who reflect on the school situation: in a classroom of, say, forty-five pupils, a child, as an individual, is simply lost.

In his research on the phenomenon of failing school pupils, Nel⁽⁹⁸⁾ finds that inadequate individualization, and classroom groups which are too large are fundamental factors: “Everything is done in the classroom as though all of the children have been cut from the same pattern, ...” and this especially has an adverse effect on the less intellectually gifted child in the primary classrooms. Even in the most homogeneous class there will be a broad spectrum of individual differences. The point of departure for classroom teaching is often (inevitably) the ‘average’, but such a child is a fiction, and a teacher who, thus, attunes him/herself runs the danger that he/she no longer addresses anyone. Viewed historically, there are numerous attempts applied to resist this problem, among which is the Mannheim System in Germany, the St. Louis Plan, the Gary Plan, and the Dalton Plan in America, the Kees Boeke School, and the Montessori School in the Netherlands, etc.⁽⁹⁹⁾, and several others, up to and including the more contemporary Differentiated Teaching in the comprehensive school system of the R.S.A. However, the actuality remains that there must be a compromise found between the individuality of the pupils, and the objective demands which the learning materials make on him/her in fundamental ways. If, e.g., a child, because of lesser intelligence, is in danger of failing mathematics in grade eight, it might perhaps be to his/hher advantage if a teacher decides to concentrate on strengthening his/her understanding of those parts of the curriculum which are within his/her reach, than unnecessarily being confused by problems which are clearly beyond comprehension. The other extreme can be illustrated by a gifted standard seven (ninth grade) pupil who is so interested in the applications of a sub-part of a subject, e.g., space-travel, which he is in danger of badly neglecting the rest of the prescribed curriculum. In both cases, the task of a teacher should be to accompany each of

these children, considering their limitations, and rights as individuals, so that a child does not become alienated from his/her own potentialities, love for the subject, or from a teacher as a person.

Various authors⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ indicate that all children do not learn in the same way, and that a linking up with a child's individual way, and style of learning must be found. A preponderantly non-analytic cognitive style, or a vaguely diffuse way of learning as such, naturally constitutes a pedagogical-didactic task of guiding a child, via analysis-synthesis, to a clear, stable, unambiguous formation of concepts. For example, in the case of a senior primary pupil who experiences learning problems because of this (style), while he/she is reading, a teacher should let him/her correct his/her own errors by first sounding out each word letter by letter, and after that, blending (synthesizing) the letters into the whole word. However, he/she might also find it necessary to exercise this basic function (of analyzing - synthesizing) (Dumont) in another way, e.g., by pattern completion, by selecting incomplete drawings, by arranging pictures, and similar exercises. Even so, the fact is that a teacher must be aware of this style and cannot teach with success if he/she presumes that all children in the class participate in the lesson event in the same way, and on the same cognitive level. Dunn and Dunn⁽¹⁰¹⁾ state that even the prospect that a pupil's right to teaching which complements his/her unique learning, and achievement potentialities will be legally enforceable in the U.S.A.: "... eventually, the courts will rule that ... if a student does not learn the way we teach him/her, we must teach him/her the way he/she learns ...". Interesting factors correlated with individual learning styles are mentioned, such as temperature preference, time of day, lighting, diet, movement, quietness or noise during learning, presence of friends, and adults, auditory, visual, or kinesthetic preference, etc. Research has brought to light that learning styles show differences across all ages, genders, and also are related to a child's self-image.⁽¹⁰²⁾

Smit and Kilian⁽¹⁰³⁾ also point to the danger that the application of the principle of individualization can mainly consider (measured) intellectual differences instead of qualitative differences. That is, in practice, it occurs that pupils are mainly grouped by either an IQ

score, if available, or an achievement test score. To distinguish among children in his/her class, a teacher, only too often, also resorts to these scores which are available and meaningful (so he/she presumes) to everyone. To reduce a child's openness to his/her intellectual potentialities, an accusation of which many parents also are guilty, amounts to overlooking and, therefore, alienating other potentialities for personal unfolding, which are at a child's disposal. Here, one thinks of an attunement to, and caring for fellow humans, a verbal talent, or a practical skillfulness, a social-critical insight, and so many other uncultivated talents, which sometimes carry a person to unexpected heights later in life. Many highly creative and successful persons, especially in the world of business, and the creative and performing arts, have left behind a relatively unsuccessful school career. Anything other than individualizing based on intellectual differences, however, in practice, is hard to implement because of difficulties, e.g., of a financial-economic and organizational nature, as well as problems of time. However, here it must suffice to declare that, based on the fundamental pedagogical-anthropological axiom that a human being is a unique individual, a teacher's activities must continually be carried by an accountable equilibrium between socializing and individualizing intentions: "If the individual pupil has fruitfully participated in the teaching, he is, to a large degree, if not exclusively, dependent on the elbow-room of a social nature offered him in the classroom to escape from the influence of his difficulty and develop [Of de individuele leerling met vrucht aan het onderwijs deelneemt, is alhoewel niet uitsluitend dan toch in belangrijke mate afhankelijk van de speelruimte die het sociale kader van de schoolklas hem biedt, van de mogelijkheid zich te doen gelden en zich te ontplooiën]." (Bergeijk).⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ Some children spend almost their entire school education without ever being viewed as an individual, since they never make themselves conspicuous. To melt away into the anonymity of the group can, in due course, become a life strategy which then results in neither the world being fully disclosed, nor the person becoming fully unfolded. Here one thinks of a child who is apparently invisible, possesses "average" intellectual potentialities, and is not a sports champion, and is, thereby, doomed to exist in the gray area of the statistical average, where he/she seldom is directly addressed by a teacher, seldom looked in the eye, seldom touched, and, in fact, is alienated

from experiencing, and unfolding him/herself as a unique individual.

c) Inadequately actualizing the principle of socialization

The didactic activity which appears in a classroom as “giving a lesson” acquires, from modern didactical thinking, increasing attention of its structural aspects, i.e., the ways in which the mutual didactic interactions between child and teacher, and among children, take their course. The pedagogical-didactic climate in a school class is closely dependent on the structure of these interactions which, at the same time, are co-determinants for the attunement with which a child does his/her work, and the success of his/her learning activities. Bergeijk⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ emphasizes, e.g., that giving and following teaching does not only involve a rational-technical, but also especially a social-emotional matter which influences the efforts of both a teacher and a child. Teacher preparation does not sufficiently consider handling a school class as a social entity, in the sense of an optimal climate by emphasizing a striving for learning results, demanding more from a teacher in terms of the mastery of learning material, and the possession of didactic knowledge and skills. It often arises in classroom teaching, and in a large class, where the children who sit on the periphery of a class, thus, out of a teacher’s direct field of vision, receive too little attention, and interest, their attending wanes, and they begin to become involved in other things. It also sometimes happens that a teacher, in emotional ways, either positive or negative, becomes exclusively involved with a few or even one pupil so that the class fades away for him/her. Also, Nel⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ comments that the internal classroom organization can have a detrimental effect on the progress of a class as a whole, or on the shy and less gifted. It is known that unfriendliness, bashfulness, loneliness, isolation, impoliteness, and poor interpersonal contact are often present in a child with learning problems.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ A study by Garner and Bing⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ indicates that as many as a third of a class is excluded from daily interactions between a teacher and children because of their inconspicuousness, in a positive or negative sense. Didactic expertise exists, in large part, by the grace of a teachers sensitivity to the social dynamic of

the class group,⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ a matter which, in practice, is largely left to chance.

Within the social field of tension in a school class, a teacher, by virtue of age, experience, formal authority, subject qualifications, and mastery of learning materials, can take a unique position and, from this position, he/she can fill a complexity of roles.⁽¹¹⁰⁾ Van Dyk⁽¹¹¹⁾ mentions that some teachers, however, in general separate themselves from the group. Such a teacher stands in front of the class as an actor, as it were. At first the pupils might be captivated by his/her gestures, and stories which, however, can decrease in time, and then they will quit listening to him/her since they cannot be actively involved in the lesson event.⁽¹¹²⁾ Another way in which a teacher can lose contact with the group is by a naïve entry into their little jokes, and silliness, by which he/she loses his/her grip on the class while, in fact, he/she is their plaything, which is something that can easily occur with a shy, insecure, immature, or backward person. Bergeijk⁽¹¹³⁾ mentions the need for research in connection with the effect of different forms and styles of leadership in a didactic-pedagogical situation on group atmosphere, and achievement, which must not leave out of consideration any reflection on the adequate realization of the learning task. With this, an extremely complicated problematic is raised which cannot be approached without considering the gender, and especially the level of becoming of the pupils. A “motherly” style of leadership might have the best results with a small group of school beginners, but perhaps will not have the desired effect with boys in the “gang stage”.⁽¹¹⁴⁾

In contrast with the modern (white) family, which mostly is limited to two parents, and one, two or at most three children, the family from a former generation consisted in a life community of children, adults, and the elderly which, out of necessity, were dependent on each other for their mutual survival, care and well-being. From a very early age, children were separately, and together responsible for specific tasks, and for each other. However, the modern family structure offers a child few opportunities to learn to work together, something which is continued in a school. Various authors point to the pedagogical, social, and didactic significance which this can have when children help each other with projects and problems in a

lesson situation, something which seldom or ever occurs in a contemporary institution. The possibility of not only directly, but also indirectly influencing the individual pupil can be enriched by a classroom teacher with forms of interaction—i.e., by making use of the dynamic potential of a school class as a group, unhappily an observation which has little significance for practice. Often, there is reference to dramatically improved learning achievements of pupils when group work is implemented and, thus, the children also can learn from each other.⁽¹¹⁵⁾ However, this is a method which has found little entry into the act of schooling because of factors such as problems of organization, and the individualistic attunement of a teacher.

d) Inadequately actualizing the principle of tempo differentiation

Langeveldt⁽¹¹⁶⁾ states that, literally, everything in school expresses itself in time, as a course which has its beginning in a preschool, and for which a child must have an almost limitless amount of plasticity at his/her disposal in order not to fall back on inadequate methods of learning, lag behind, or even remain stuck in a grade, by which he/she becomes wrenched away for his/her age group, which is an extremely fundamental life community for him/her. Genuine learning requires a deepening, reflecting, “sinking in” to appropriate it as a possession which has been acquired by humanity through centuries of tedious work. To bring about, and maintain a genuine intention to learn, which means that a child accepts the contents as an open task, and implies acquiring insight, and knowledge, searching for solutions, and practicing skills, etc., requires more time than exercising mere “performance tasks”.⁽¹¹⁷⁾ A child must be given time to pause, he/she must be able to ascertain how a mistake has occurred, why a matter is just the way it is and not different, etc. When there is a jumping from one task to another, there is no authentically intentional learning.

A teacher must be thoroughly aware that one child needs more time than another for mastering a task, since each child learns with his/her own tempo. For one child a lesson drags on; for another it passes quickly. For a gifted child, a tempo which is too slow can lead to boredom, daydreaming and, thus, weaken his/her learning

intention. Hastiness can lead to confusion and anxiety in a child and does not promote learning. Time is needed, especially for insightful learning, and an impatient teacher cannot contribute to it. ⁽¹¹⁸⁾ A too severe limitation in time with work requiring insight and creativity is also, according to Stellwag, ⁽¹¹⁹⁾ extremely detrimental. In the context of the tempo of learning and teaching, Gruber ⁽¹²⁰⁾ notes: "... one should remember that over-expectancy can be a form of oppression". Some researchers believe that any child can master any learning task, provided the appropriate teaching methods are used, and provided sufficient time is given.¹²¹⁾ The implication is that, for each child, provision must be made for him to learn at his/her own tempo, which obviously is an almost impossible task in the framework of contemporary schooling. That is, it is very difficult, during a lesson period of 35 to 45 minutes, to make provision for a child who is slow to understand, as well as for a child who is already a step ahead of a teacher. In addition, there simply are a certain number of prescribed contents which must be covered within a quarter-, half-year, or year. A good teacher's approach is, as much as possible, to always work within this framework. Thus, in mathematics, or algebra, the approach will rather be to build up additional, more challenging problems for what are first dealt with in a class exercise, or test, rather than each child striving to complete several preestablished problems.

2.5.3 Disharmonious dynamic in terms of the course of the lesson and of learning

a) Disharmony in the accompanying modes of learning (i.e., sensing and attending) during a lesson

(i) Inadequately accompanying to a stable sensing during a lesson

As the name indicates, the accompanying modes of learning arise in all learning, and the quality of their self-actualization [by a child] under the guidance/accompaniment of an adult, is of the greatest importance during the entire learning, and the lesson. Langeveld has referred to the significance of "association" in a pedagogical relationship, and the concept also deserves attention from a didactic perspective, especially regarding how it is related to the

accompanying modes of learning: “Concomitant or collateral learnings are significantly affected by the social climate in a classroom” and, according to Blair, Jones, and Simpson⁽¹²²⁾, represent the largest part of the hidden agenda or curriculum in a lesson situation. Here, one thinks of a teacher who aims to teach literature and science but who, because of his/her style of teaching and leadership, is involved in awaking in a child a lifelong dislike of the subject area of concern. The accompanying modes of learning, in connection with the quality of the teaching/didactic-pedagogical association, thus, also are germane to the origin of positive or negative attitudes towards the learning material, the development, or dampening of interests, and the unfolding of the life of values of the reality presented. Sonnekus⁽¹²³⁾ postulates experiencing as the original way of being-in-the-world, which lays the foundation for a child’s attentive-being-in-the-world, as a primordially given possibility for learning and knowing. Hence, a child experiences the contents as well as a teacher’s unlocking, on the level of sensing, and the way in which the (adult’s) accompaniment (of a child) to self-actualizing is realized, determines the possibility of an elevation in level from an a-conceptual to a more cognitive level of a child’s experiencing-as-learning, a task which will contribute equally to the harmony between teaching and learning during each of the phases of the lesson, which are discussed below.

This general statement is particularized by Bergeijk⁽¹²⁴⁾, e.g., when he points to the necessity that a teacher must find connections with a child’s emotional ways of learning, which must be able to be identified, and respected. This means that recognition must be given to positive as well as negative lived experiences, the latter seldom occur in our culture, and are overlooked especially by a teacher who has a one-sided affinity for the learning material. It is of greatest importance that a teacher helps a child clarify his/her emotional lived experiences regarding the learning material, homework, his/her own “can, cannot, supposedly cannot”, participation in discussions, in group work, etc. This accepting and clarifying linking up with a child’s emotions is also important for a child’s lived experiencing which, as possessed experience, is derived from earlier lesson situations, but also refer to anticipated future lesson situations that can give rise to a confused and labilized lived

experiencing of the present situation. Negative experience, as well as anticipated future ones can fill a child with worry and anxiety. A few examples: a standard one student (third grader), who perhaps is punished at home with a spanking for failing a test. A teacher who is not aware of this can create a crisis by continually exhorting the children with the threat of “remaining stuck in the primary school”, since such a possibility really occurring is terrifying to this child. Think also in this connection of warning a child who must already repeat a year that he/she “must pull his/her socks up, or else he/she will remain stuck again”, by which his/her current optimal actualization of learning will come to naught beforehand, by the simultaneous calling up of extremely negative experience, and a terrifying and threatening future. With this, a child’s self-actualization of willing is influenced, which, in its turn, qualifies the direction, purposefulness, and decisiveness of his/her experienced sensing of the lesson contents, and there is rather mention of a not wanting to learn, and an inability to want to learn on a pathic-affective level.

Without a doubt, this constitutes one of the most difficult tasks of accompaniment for a teacher in his/her association with a child in a lesson situation, one which especially requires his/her personal input, and asks for pedagogical dedication grounded in interpersonal contact, which cannot be replaced by instrumental devices. This also requires that he/she have knowledge of the diverse defense “mechanisms” which can be manifested within the framework of a school classroom event, as well as an inculcated practical awareness of their possible ways of manifestation, which will influence the quality of his/her didactic-pedagogical intervention. Also related to this is the way in which praise and encouragement are handled, the class atmosphere, the acceptance of the pupils’ ideas, even when irrelevant, or erroneous—a difficult task if it appears that a child takes a defensive attitude—the way in which questions are asked and answers are accepted, the degree of nuance, preciseness, and clarity of the presentation, the occurrence, and nature of critical, and authoritative actions, the way in which pupil initiative is responded to, and the quality of calmness ,or silence in a class, which can have both a positive and/or negative difference, etc. As far as the latter is concerned, for example, one thinks of the literally “dead” silence which sometimes prevails in a

“harsh” teacher’s classroom, where a continual rustling of shuffling feet is the only sound, which indicates that at least the pupils are physically alive, and present, but perhaps mentally are wandering on far away paths. The other extreme is a class where there is not a moment of silence or calm, where everyone is always busy leaving the room, sharpening pencils, opening, and closing a bookcase, blowing noses, accusing a classmate, with the consequence that there is no genuine attending, even by those who, indeed, are directed to learning.

These are all factors which can give rise to a labilized sensing, as an inadequate pathic-affective, gnostic-cognitive, and normative (meaning giving) accompaniment of a child’s experienced modes of sensing in a lesson situation, which will hinder their congealing in his/her experienced sensing, as a mode of learning, by which the entire self-actualization of his/her learning and, thus, the learning effect, is not able to be [fully] realized, according to Sonnekus.⁽¹²⁵⁾ The eventual consequence is that, in his/her behaving, a child presents him/herself in a lesson situation, as a child with learning problems. When this happens, a teacher who “specializes” in sarcastic wisecracks, at the expense of pupils who do not meet his/her demands, and to the great pleasure of the rest of the group, should not be surprised. This also holds for a teacher who, in degrading and untactful ways, rejects an answer coming from a child who is caught up in the peer group, identity problematic of early adolescence. A few remarks made in this way can cause incalculable damage in the case of a sensitive child who perhaps will lived experience little else during this class period for the rest of the year, than his/her own humiliation and powerless animosity. Thus, the question during each phase of the lesson, separately, and during the entire lesson continually is how the nature or structure of a child’s sensing appears there, as also determined by his/her unique personal situation, his/her potentialities, the state of his/her interpersonal relationships at home and in school, etc. For example, think of a child whose parents continually argue, a child who is without friends, and feels lonely, and like an outcast, or a child who sees him/herself as “dumb”. It also occurs, not infrequently, that for some reason, a child falls in a teacher’s disfavor, and gets the idea that the teacher “picks on him/her”, or even completely ignores him/her on purpose. It must always be remembered that a

child continually gives sense and meaning to all facets of his/her existence and, to the extent that these meanings are favorable or unfavorable, they can stabilize or labilize his/her sensing.⁽¹²⁶⁾ Even when such labilizing is attributable to factors over which a teacher has no direct control, nonetheless, he/she should not feel exempt from the responsibility of at least knowing about such circumstances in a child's situation since, in his/her ignorance, by a lack of understanding, or being unsympathetic, he/she almost necessarily can contribute to a child's problems. However, when a child's learning is blocked because of a conflict, disharmony, or alienation in his/her relationship with a teacher, such a teacher is undoubtedly guilty of the serious accusation of pedagogical-didactic neglect.

(ii) **Inadequate accompaniment to directed attending during a lesson**

The world attracts and entices a child to participate, but of even greater pedagogical importance is voluntary, selective attending, meaning that a child turns him/herself to a world which he/she chooses. A child must choose this directedness, and maintain it because they are preconditions for learning to know the world as it is, in systematic and ordered ways (Langeveld).⁽¹²⁷⁾ Sonnekus⁽¹²⁸⁾ indicates that *the realization of attending, as an accompanying mode of learning, is decisive in each lesson situation* because, without it, no teaching effect which results in a learning effect is possible. However, a child will not remain attentively concerned with the learning content, if he/she is not accompanied to a stable, and ordered experientially meaningful sensing, in his/her first concern with it (also see previous section). From many possible examples, one can mention a lesson which begins with a teacher returning test results, something which occurs often in practice. With respect to a child who has much poorer achievement as an expectation, or who even has failed an examination, it is doubtful that a teacher can expect the child to be motivated to attend if he/she does not provide the necessary pedagogical and didactic intervention, and support by, e.g., encouraging him/her, and clarifying problems for him/her, and deliberately proceeds with the presentation of a lesson. To attend, a child must cognitively-experientially unlock him/herself to the contents as his/her learning

response to an adult's unlocking reality for him/her. Inadequate attending is closely related to a defective learning intention and must also be characterized by a fluctuation in attending, as a way of under actualizing intentionality. In such a case, at most, there is an irrelevant learning intention, and incidental learning.⁽¹²⁹⁾

Inadequate attending in a lesson situation not only proclaims a child as stuck in a didactic-pedagogical situation, but must also always be seen as an attenuated realization of him/herself as Dasein, in the sense that he/she answers inadequately to his/her call to being, as a human being.⁽¹³⁰⁾ In summary, this means that a child him/herself inadequately realizes his/her psychic life as a totality-in-function under the accompaniment of a teacher in a lesson situation.

However, the question must be asked about the adequacy of the accompaniment of a child's self-actualization of his/her wanting to attend by means of the affective, cognitive, and normative accompaniment of a teacher in each phase of a lesson. When a teacher's accompaniment, explicitly or implicitly appears distorted with respect to the exemplification of attending, as a demand of propriety, perhaps because of her own nonchalant appearance, her eyes, which continually wander to the window, or a preoccupation with her necklace, a button on her dress or a wooden ruler, it can hardly be expected that she will pay attention, especially in the case of a primary school pupil. There are also several ways in which gnostic-cognitive accompaniment can lie shipwrecked. Think of a teacher who, because of inadequate lesson preparation, must continually interrupt his/her pronouncements to refer to the textbook; a history of art lesson which ends without a few prints, or slides of the discussed works of art; a series of lessons on the Napoleonic wars for children who cannot at all imagine a three-mast ship, or a European snowy landscape; or the arithmetic lesson during which a teacher continually turns his/her back to the class to make computations on the board, while the children silently joke around with each other; etc. A child can also feel affectively insecure in a lesson situation because of a loss of confidence, e.g., in the case of a teacher who, perhaps because he/she has little confidence in him/herself, continually ignores unsatisfactory achievement, or behavior, or reports it to a child's parents; a teacher who has "pets"; a teacher who eagerly expels children from class as punishment; the teacher who responds to "dumb" questions

with sarcasm, to only mention a few possibilities. If these ways of accompaniment appear as inadequate, and the pedagogical relationship with a teacher is experienced as labile, the leap to becoming independent cannot occur, and a child will stagnate with an excessively attentive disposition. Such a child will show a deficiency in his/her self-becoming, and cannot take a leap to distanced, gnostic-cognitive tasks, and remains caught in naïve-pathic-affective experience, by which he/she cannot acquire an adequate grasp of the formal systems of an adult lifeworld.⁽¹³¹⁾ A labile sensing during any of the lesson phases always holds the possibility of establishing a dialogue with other (irrelevant) landscapes than the lesson contents, whereby the known symptom of the fluctuating attending of a child with learning difficulties becomes explicable.

To accompany a child to a “can-and-will-learn” via a stabile attending, a teacher must continually be aware that the first precondition for this is the creation of a safe learning space, as an authentic pedagogical situation. However, this will be in vain if he/she is also not able to unlock reality in such a way that his/her subject didactic activity [subject matter teaching], as cognitive accompaniment, doesn’t invite or even compel a child to him/herself-want-to-attend. Thus, if during each phase of the lesson, a teacher does not consider a child’s ways of attending, he/she carries on a monologue, and looks in the wrong place for the reason for a child’s “deafness in listening”. An observed actual history lesson for standard seven (ninth grade) children, under the heading “The conflict over land in the Caledon Valley between the Voortrekkers and the Basutos” can provide a few examples. The teacher introduced this lesson by simply announcing the theme. Thus, there was no actualization of foreknowledge, or statement of the problem, except for a couple of ineffective questions in the manner of: “Remember what we had talked about last week?” The map of Caledon Valley was drawn on the board with great difficulty, and the waste of much time and was small and the cities and rivers were drawn with faint black lines, and were difficult to see by those in the back half of the class. There were no other audiovisual aids except for a knitting needle, which was only vaguely used as a place indicator on the map, and for the rest of the lesson period was used to continually tap her teeth. With this, perhaps enough has been

said to make it understandable when Van Niekerk⁽¹³²⁾ states as fact that “a number of teachers almost completely ignore attending, as the genuine act of expanding the lifeworld, and one can only call into question the good faith of such teachers with respect to their intervening with a child with the aim of helping him/her acquire a firmer grasp of reality.”

Finally, with respect to children with learning problems, the important question should be asked about the nature and quality of his/her experiencing of the hierarchy of congealed possessed experience of the learning contents during each phase of the lesson, separately as well as during the entire course of the lesson, when a teachers’ accompaniment must be qualified as inadequate with respect to the child’s willful attending in the lesson situation. It can be stated that this child, because of inadequately experiencing meaning (inadequate attending means inadequately experiencing meaning), carried by labile affective and unordered cognitive experiences (attending is a precondition for ordering), each following lesson phase and each subsequent future lesson situation will be entered with an inadequate, disharmonious hierarchy of possessed experiences and learning. With this it is obvious that the effective realization of the cognitive modes of learning (perceiving, imagining, fantasizing, thinking, and remembering) correspondingly will be restrained.

b) Inadequate accompaniment to actualizing learning during actualizing foreknowledge

The aim of this phase of the lesson is to bring forth foreknowledge as meaningful points of contact and basic insights relevant to the new contents. Thus, the success of a lesson hangs in the balance on this phase. This task is especially important with respect to children who experience problems since, as a rule, a child with learning difficulties already has an established image of learning failures, and disturbed emotional-contact relationships.⁽¹³³⁾ The previous and current negatively experienced accompaniment by a teacher, from the beginning, has labilizing effects on sensing and attending by which a child does not feel ready to self-actualize the cognitive modes of learning, which will form the basis of this lesson phase.

Physically and psychically, children in a class differ from each other and, more so, in their giving sense and meaning, as a foundation for each one's world relationship, as a historically diverse being, a factor which makes it extremely difficult for a teacher to find a point of contact with each child's experiential world and, even more so, when there is an impoverished or heterogeneous cultural background. For example, here one thinks of schools in fast - developing industrial and port areas in the RSA, where a large percent of the population often are immigrant families whose children might wrestle with language and communication deficiencies, as well as with a deficiency in foreknowledge background. and experiences. Also, the plight of Black schools deserves closer study where there is the possibility that, in the same classroom children might be found at the extremes of urban sophistication, and a rural-traditional experiential background, along with all the degrees of differences between. The danger is that these children, who find themselves as "visitors" in a lesson situation, because of a lack in real points of contact are continually estranged further from the reality offered, and from their own potentialities. A child presents him/herself in a lesson situation with his/her unique historicity of learning successes and failures, by which the *totality* of his/her hierarchy of quantitative and qualitative possessed experience of his/her previous learning and lifeworld situations will influence the quality and level of his/her entry [into a lesson situation]. "The child's performance level will depend on the levels of all the resources on which he/she can draw" (Leach and Raybould).⁽¹³⁴⁾ The possible deficiencies, as well as strengths in a child's possessed experience of past lived experiences must first be carefully gauged and supplemented. Especially with respect to a less gifted child, it is extremely important that the new content must clearly and explicitly be linked up with previous experiences.⁽¹³⁵⁾ For example, it would be of little benefit if a teacher appeals to the children's memory with a few questions about contents previously dealt with, if he/she does not also explicitly clarify what the connection is between these [possessed] contents and the new learning material. Indeed, it also is important that a teacher not evoke irrelevant or unrelated foreknowledge because this can quickly lead to confusion. Linking up with the everyday lifeworld of a child continues to be necessary.⁽¹³⁶⁾ Finally, actualizing foreknowledge implies not only intellectual knowledge,

but all the positive and negative lived experiences which have been paired with a previous learning situation, and by which a child's ways of sensing during the present situation will be co-influenced. For example, a girl in standard one (third grade) who on the previous day wet her pants because of waiting too long to go to the lavatory, out of fear of an easily irritated teacher, and the "accident" in the classroom, on the following day again brings with her into the classroom an intense lived experience of distress and embarrassment, even though her pants might remain dry. The same holds for a standard six (eighth grade) boy who, during the previous lesson, was the target of a flare up, a thrashing, or even just a reprimand. A child who lived experienced yesterday's trigonometry problem as "hopelessly too difficult for me", today will hardly have the courage to handle the new problem as a challenging "problem-for-me". Thus, if beforehand, a teacher does not purposefully intervene, or support a child in those cases where a past disturbance can lead to an accumulation of negative experiences relived in the present lesson situation by making sure that he/she accompanies a child to a redefining then, during this lesson phase, learning restraining meanings will be actualized rather than fruitful foreknowledge.

c) Inadequate accompaniment to actualizing learning during stating the problem

Linking up with a child's sensing experiences, which simultaneously are a seeking of sense on a pathic level, by stating the lesson problem, a teacher must accompany a child to a lived experiencing of wonder, as a precognitive attunement, which is a precondition for wanting-to-know. However, Langeveld⁽¹³⁷⁾ refers to the possibility of "teaching problems" on the level of inadequate teacher preparation which results in a teacher him/herself not lived experiencing the problematic of the content affectively, as well as cognitively which, because of the deluge of learning material, he/she has not had an opportunity to have really acquired an attunement which the learning material contains, and digest its unique spirit. Insightful learning means "Fragenlehren" [learning to question].⁽¹³⁸⁾ The important thing is that a teacher's question must give rise to questions in a child him/herself, and the precondition is that the questions must link up with a child's lifeworld, level of becoming,

and readiness to learn, by which the success or failure of previous lessons with respect to stating and solving the problem will be co-determinative of the ways in which each new lesson problem will be experienced and lived experienced. However, a child must lived experience the problem as a *meaningful problem-for-me*: “If a pupil is not directly aware of the problem, and is not personally involved in it, then it is not a problem for him. It simply remains a teacher’s ... problem, and leaves the child *stone cold*” (Vrey).⁽¹³⁹⁾ The success (or not) of the insight-promoting learning in previous lesson situations will also determine how new problems are engaged, but also the factual knowledge which he/she already possesses will be important here. If the learning contents already have a negative valence for a child,⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ it is not likely that he/she will encounter the resistance which he/she initially experienced in his/her sensing, as a resistance-for-me to take on.

This lesson phase often requires a great deal of time, and places the highest demands on a teacher, as an accompanier and, more so when he/she must contend with large groups of children, and the deluge of learning material.⁽¹⁴¹⁾ A teacher can then take his/her refuge in “the panic-question”, which gives rise to *pseudo-questions* from a child. Without a genuine questioning attitude, a child does not learn insightfully. Anyone who has critically observed a lesson knows how readily the children can be persuaded by a student teacher to give a salvo of pseudo-questions at the snap of his/her fingers since they eagerly want to meet an adult’s expectations. Smit and Kilian⁽¹⁴²⁾ state that questions without purpose are a waste of time as well as harmful. That is, such purposeless questions can lead to recalling irrelevant foreknowledge by which the possibility of ordering the contents around the insight-carrying essences is going to be lost. A questioning attitude will not appear if a teacher is unable to accompany a child to a relaxed thinking. Inner unrest, tension, and nervousness because of a tense, inconsistent, unsympathetic, or hurried actions of a teacher will not contribute to this relaxed thinking, and because of the resulting insecurity, a stable, pathic-affective lived experience of “I-can-know”, will not occur.

Stander⁽¹⁴³⁾ indicates that, with respect to his/her cognitive functioning, *a child with learning problems* will more quickly lived

experience a problem situation as one of *tension*, which then quickly leads to a loss of confidence. For such a child, an unsolved problem is not an invitation-to-solve, but rather a confrontation with his/her own lived experienced inabilities, with all its long- and short-term anxiety provoking implications (disapproval, impatience, and even rejection by the teachers and parents, punishment, failing, etc.). The demands placed on a child in school can readily lead to tenseness, which can result in maneuvers of escape, rigidity, and even to a paralysis of learning.⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ With a good lesson beginning, a teacher's task is to build a child's confidence from the calm which he/she projects.

There must be vigilance against the statement of the problem too directly confronting a child with his/her deficiencies in learning and knowledge. An emotionally anticipated "unable-to-solve" because of a lived experiencing of "too-difficult-for-me" leads to a child closing him/herself to the contents as a learning landscape, and will not linger by it. Distancing to a gnostic-cognitive level of learning correspondingly is blocked. Also, during the lesson there will be little evidence of a "fruitful moment".⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ However, it is similarly harmful if a teacher continually solves the problem for a child because, in doing so, he/she deprives him/her of an opportunity to arrive at a solution him/herself. Since, during this phase of the lesson, an appeal especially is made to a child's creative, and original independent potentialities of thinking, here he/she must be given the necessary time. In practice, it too often happens that a teacher too easily assumes that only one or a few children in his/her class can be actively involved during this phase of the lesson. The other children know this all too well, and instead, there arises in them lived experiences of waiting, passivity, or noninvolvement. Then, the problem becomes known as a "problem-for-others", instead of a "problem-for-me", by which a child sits in the classroom as estranged, as an "absent presence".

A child with learning problems already carries the burden of disturbances in his/her emotional/volitional sphere regarding inner directedness, and exploration. Failure-anxiety, feelings of insecurity, dismay, avoidance, and even mistrust frequently arise.⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ Perquin⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ indicates that a child's *anxiety leads to the problems becoming distorted*, and propel him/her to "fixate as

quickly and completely as possible on each method, so that anxiety lessens, and all is no longer completely meaningless [een zo snel en volledig mogelijk fixeren van elke handelswijze, die de angst vermindert, ook al is zij volkomen zinloos]”, by which meaningful learning is impeded. A child must be supported in such a way that he/she is able to distance him/herself from the problem, view it from all angles, and separate him/herself from the familiar schemes of thinking. This task, e.g., can only be accomplished haphazardly by a teacher who moves up and down between the rows of seats, with the aim of letting the other children tremble in fear when he/she quickly turns and, out of the blue, points with his/her ruler to the first child at hand to answer the question. Even worse, most children have experienced teachers who amuse themselves with similar “games”, possibly under the impression that, in this way, they can capture the attention of the pupils. Rather, this task requires openness for and receptiveness of the problematic situation, an inner freedom and calm which are missing when anxiety has become the motive for learning. Without adequate stabilizing, and ordering accompaniment, self-discovery, as a systematic, and orderly turning to, is not possible, and failure can confuse and disillusion a child. A child with learning difficulties is then progressively characterized by task shyness, indifference to learning, and he/she shows a blunted attunement to learning, or even an aversion to it,⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ which is indicative of the way in which his/her negative lived experiences of learning already have impaired the quality of his/her *willingness-to-solve-problems*. A teacher who berates a truly learning handicapped child for his/her “laziness” and lack of interest and urges him/her to “pull his/her socks up before it is too late”, etc. perhaps will do nothing more than contribute to his/her future learning problems by treating them with even greater reserve or aversion. Generally, such a child lived experiences *him/herself* as a *problem for the teacher*, and as a visitor, and as a permanent alien in a landscape amidst others for whom the problems lie on a familiar terrain. Finally, genuine, intentional learning, especially insightful learning, can be damaged by too much pressure to achieve, which can be related to extrinsic motivation, such as rewards and punishments, and by sporadic motivation. A child will then also miss the calm and distance needed to take up the problematic data.⁽¹⁴⁹⁾

d) Inadequate accompaniment to actualizing learning during exposing the new content

This phase of the lesson primarily involves an unlocking of the new content. The meaningfulness of this lesson phase is dependent on the adequacy of the phase of stating the problem, as just discussed. Indeed, a child can be compelled to listen to an explanation, but its insightful appropriation is only possible if the need for interpretation is awakened, and a child *feels ready to open him/herself cognitively, and proceed to self-actualize the distanced, cognitive modes of learning*. The implication of this is that a teacher who boasts that he/she has never experienced a problem of order in his/her class also possibly has never succeeded in accompanying the pupils to a genuine, ordered lived experience of a problem. In Black schools visited by the author, it seems that there is an excess of formal discipline (necessitated by the number of pupils), which (sometimes) is paired with a defect in the children actively turning to [the content], and really being open to it. These pupils will put up with the most monotonous discussions of the most irrelevant compilation of facts without the least outward behavior indicating the quality of their participation in the event.

It is extremely important to keep in mind that according to Stander⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ *the child with learning problems* shows visual and auditory distractibility and an obvious inability to effectively order and avoid incoming stimuli. This points to a susceptibility for interference that gives rise to a fluctuation in attending which disturbs the continuity in learning and undermines the possibility of a harmonious dynamic during this phase of the lesson. With this another danger is underlined, i.e., a class atmosphere that is too loose or unordered where continual movement and restlessness can be the source for a fluctuation in attending. Some examples have been mentioned of how the teacher can continually draw a child's attention to irrelevant "contents" by his appearance, behaviors and mannerisms.

The exposition of new content is often characterized by a communicative way of presentation and can be impeded by factors such as weak articulation, absence of lively gestures and facial expressions, deficient intonations, boring, uninteresting input, along

with inadequate linguistic proficiency and word usage, insufficient clarity, succinctness and delimitation, etc. all factors which can inhibit a child's adequate entry into the slice of reality presented as content.⁽¹⁵¹⁾

With respect to the teaching of Blacks in South Africa [circa 1982] the inadequate mastery of language by the teaching corps is a serious problem that calls for the most urgent reflection on and research of the entire system of mother tongue and second language instruction.

A special danger during this lesson phase is that the teacher, e.g., by exhaustively writing or drawing on the board, *or by reading excessively from a textbook breaks contact with the child and thus with their joint directedness to the learning material.*⁽¹⁵²⁾ Another danger is that a teacher, even if he/she is able to reduce the learning contents to their essentials, cannot succeed in allowing these essences to appear for a child as cardinal points in his/her experience of them. Obviously, this will be impossible if he/she does not use language and concepts which a child understands. Often, in practice, a lesson is merely the continuation of the exposition of what was not completed in a previous lesson. He/she takes wrong paths which have nothing to do with the essences and confuses and bewilders a child, by which *the content becomes obscured and muddled rather than unlocked.* The result of this is that a cognitively ordered lived experience of meaning and insight will be lacking, by which the harmony in the lesson learning will become negated.

If a child does not understand something, he/she gives "the meaning of meaninglessness" to it. Then, all meaning which the "something" has for him/her is foreign and threatening,⁽¹⁵³⁾ and he/she will lived experience the state of his/her willing, and knowing as affectively labile via the distorted and also labilized accompanying modes of learning (i.e., sensing and attending). *Deficient encountering*, as the foundation for communicating and understanding, will doom the lesson to failure since the teacher will then not be able to *evaluate and check* the harmony (i.e., disharmony) between the teaching and the learning. Then he/she will have difficulty justifying his/her accompaniment of a child to

full-fledged readiness because of the lived experience of affective stability, to arrive at a conceptual level of learning via intensified attending and lived experiencing cognitive order.

e) Inadequate accompaniment to actualizing learning during actualizing the new content

This lesson phase is focused on the control of insight, reviewing, summarizing, surveying, schematizing, and *practicing to insight*. During this lesson phase a child must *have an opportunity to become calm and relaxed*. If he/she feels hurried, he/she becomes restless and this sometimes makes his/her resistance more tangible. Perquin⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ indicates that there are some teachers who are insensitive to this, or even believe that the resistance must be broken. A teacher who explains more than a child can assimilate disturbs this necessary calm, and delivers a severe blow to his/her readiness to learn. The *stabilizing importance of adequate exemplifying* by a teacher, as supporting a child to a *self-can-do and self-ought to do*, cannot be over-emphasized, especially where a child comes to school with a handicap because of the unsuccessful or even absent exemplifying activities in a modern family where both parents work.⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ Vrey⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ mentions the deluge of learning material as a factor which allows this extremely important lesson phase of establishing, or consolidating insights to miscarry in practice. The result of an overambitious curriculum might be that the time is missing for sufficiently practicing to insight under the accompaniment of a teacher so that the refuge necessary becomes an overburdening of a child with homework, which is really an “overflow” from class work. Then the task of accompaniment often falls on the parents, usually the mother, who, although willing, is seldom equipped or prepared for this. It also often happens that what the parents still remember about content and method from their own school or university days is so obsolete that it only gives rise to further uncertainty, and even confusion in a child, not to mention the affective alienation between parent and child which often arises in such joint homework sessions. In the latter case, there also is an alienation from insight rather than a consolidation of it.

Stander⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ indicates that *a child with learning problems* develops a coping strategy for fleeing from, or being superficially involved with the problem in his/her attempt to be finished with it, and get out of the tense situation—at the expense of the quality of the solution. This attunement, with its roots in a [child’s] emotional ground, often develops into inflexible, autonomous involvements with the learning material, and an inclination to impulsive, concrete, infantile solutions—the quality of a child’s potentiality can be an indication to a teacher of deficient control (mastery) of a child’s involvement with the content. Van Parreren⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ points out that even the best insights are overlooked if provision is not made for this control (mastery). With respect to a child with learning difficulties, a teacher is faced with the difficult, *intensified task to control* the child’s experiencing, as a movement toward and to the learning content, as well as assessing the actualization of his/her willing, knowing, but particularly, his/her lived experiencing of his/her willed experiencing. Particularly, a teacher who wants to ensure that he/she does not contribute to learning problems by inadequate accompaniment must see to it that a child’s stable affective lived experiences are paired with cognitively ordered lived experiences, as an adequate way of constituting the lived experience of meaning [i.e., the normative].

The question must also be asked if a misconception of a learning child, which leads back to applied psychological theories of learning, such as the psychology of memory, conditioning, drill work, or trial-and-error, Gestalt psychology, the psychology of thought⁽¹⁵⁹⁾, etc., can be the basis for adequately accompanying a child to an active attitude on a conceptual level during this phase of the lesson, which so *often degenerates into drill work, and endless repetition*. Think only of the chorus of little voices repeating the multiplication tables over and over, while the teacher “directs” them. Then, for a child, the emphasis can fall so much on the pathically lived experienced rhythm of “singing together” that he/she cannot provide the answer to a simple problem of multiplication, since it only exists reflexively in the context of the “little song”, and there really is no understanding of number or multiplication, as an arithmetic operation. It can also happen that when a teacher does not succeed in unlocking the *value* of automatic mastery in a meaningful way for a child, drill work,

because of boredom, frustration, or rebelliousness, resistance by a child, and rejection of the contents are elicited rather than an invitation to appropriate them as valuable possessions.

f) Inadequate accompaniment to actualizing learning during functionalizing the content

This phase of the lesson is concentrated on exercising, with the aim of transferring in new situations, i.e., applying and integrating the new contents with already existing knowledge. Functionalizing will only succeed to the extent that teaching has led to the self-actualization of a child's learning potentialities, which result in meaningful possessed experience. The integration of the newly learned contents with the existing possessed knowledge is necessary, but something which doesn't occur with some children⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ and, thus, hinders this knowledge from becoming their genuinely personal possession. This integration can be especially impeded where genuine interest is lacking, e.g., when a child learns out of fear of disapproval from an adult, or fear of failing. The importance of this lesson phase is that *a child is given an opportunity to show that he/she will, can, and ought to be someone him/herself* and, to this end, a teacher must take the greatest care by, e.g., seeing that the assignments, or exercises are not beyond a child's abilities, by which he/she then can lived experience feelings of impotence, being inferior, and threatened, which will force the learning to a standstill. On the other hand, one must also be on guard against meaningless, and mechanistic drill work, as exercising/practicing, by which the learning aim can go awry. Van Parreren⁽¹⁶¹⁾ mentions the danger of too much exercise in one and the same stereotypic form of task, by which the original insight can again be lost. Also, a teacher must be able to distinguish between ready [available] and functional knowledge (Kohnstamm).⁽¹⁶²⁾ Availability is not yet a guarantee of functionality.

Also during this lesson phase, the *contact* between teacher and child become broken, to the detriment of a child's learning, e.g., when a teacher allows a child to read or interpret, and sit and stare at his/her own book, instead of letting him/her lived experience that he/she is with him/her, that his/her attention is directed to him/her.⁽¹⁶³⁾ Equally unfavorable is that sort of accompaniment

which, in this lesson phase, is *conspicuously disturbing*. Now, a child must be able to see and experience that what he/she has learned is applicable, and the teacher must be able to identify, and correct the origins of errors in thinking underlying incorrect methods. The same error made by many pupils is an indication of the quality of his/her accompaniment during the previous phases of the lesson. For example, here one can refer to a geography lesson for standard six (fourth grade) pupils where, during this phase of the lesson, to her consternation, the teacher realizes that after all of her explanations and repetitions, almost no child in the class had an idea of the difference between “cyclonal” and “anti-cyclonal”, leftward and rightward, or clockwise and counterclockwise. However, a video recording of the lesson clearly played out its origin: During her explanation, she continually requested that the pupils imagine themselves to be watches, and then, swung her arms in the right direction *for her*, but without being aware that, in facing the class, right and left for her are opposite what they are for the pupils, a great didactic blunder had begun which resulted in nothing more than to create total confusion in the children.

The traditional oral practice is not only time consuming, but it can also create a waiting attitude in a child who sits and waits, instead of him/herself actively doing something. Especially the style of involvement with the learning material by a child with learning problems points to a disturbed contact, which leads to being a passive spectator rather than a healthy explorer with the learning task. They are often the so-called “broad categorizers”, with an inclination to quick, impulsive, and especially uncritical generalizing, after a superficial involvement with the facets of the learning content. A teacher is confronted with the task of also accompanying this child to an adequately willed moving-to. and ordered, insightful, thoughtful reaching the learning content, which he/she then must be able to experience as a source of nutrition for a more adequate possessed experience in future lesson situations. For example, a teacher might perhaps be under the mistaken impression that she discharged her task well, since each child in her class faithfully completed their homework, and no problems were experienced. However, it is a disturbing general practice among children to quickly copy work from each other before school on the bus, or in the cloakroom. Unhappily, it is precisely those who

already experience problems who seek aid from their friends. That this is a problem difficult to control is illustrated by a personal communication from a Kwa-Zulu inspector from the school psychology service, who recently had discovered two brothers in standard seven (grade five) who could not read. They were both older than sixteen-years, and by their own account, and for their advancement, blindly copied homework and tests from their fellow pupils—a skill that they clearly had developed to a high degree.

g) Inadequate accompaniment to actualizing learning during evaluating

Hannah⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ states that evaluation, as an integral part of each lesson design, involves an investigation, and promotion of the teaching and learning effects. This involves evaluating the degree of meaningful, self-actualized lived experiencing of the learning content. Evaluating a child's work with an eye to his/her progress, and promoting meaning, implies that *both teacher and child are called to be accountable for the quality of their normative participation in a lesson event*. The meaning of didactic evaluation cannot be sought outside the pedagogical, and this implies that, for a child, light can be thrown on problems which he/she might experience in his/her being-on-the-way to adulthood, while a teacher is given an opportunity to examine the didactic-pedagogic accountability, and purposefulness of his/her intervention with a child. However, to penalize a child for mistakes, as often occurs, can lead to the penalized behavior becoming fixated, and the mistake is repeated compulsively, or the child can have a dislike for the work, a dislike for the teacher, or promotes a loss in self-confidence, and even a feeling of anxiety.⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ Punishment can take many forms in a teaching situation, among which is awarding points by an injudicious teacher.

It is especially this lesson phase which brings about a fruitful moment for *intercepting learning problems* of a child, provided the teacher knows how to make use of it. He/she must be thoroughly aware that evaluating the learning effect implicitly means *evaluating the quality of his/her teaching*, and be prepared to identify and correct any teaching problems which this might bring to light. Effective learning and effective teaching are always directly related

to each other (Hannah).⁽¹⁶⁷⁾ Lived experiencing success is coupled with experiencing progress. If a child does not lived experience, and experience that he/she progresses in the direction of an aim, his/her initiative to exert additional effort is nullified. If his/her progression is not evaluated regularly, a child cannot have an understanding of his/her own status, and then he/she can stagnate in his/her learning.⁽¹⁶⁸⁾ Vrey⁽¹⁶⁹⁾ stresses the importance of the *lived experience of success* by a child, which will influence his/her self-confidence, and motivation with which future situations will be entered, and he refers to various empirical investigations which support this—however, the precondition is that this success is attainable only through effort, if it is to have any motivational value. Obviously, this is a matter which must be handled with the greatest didactic-pedagogical tact, and especially with a child who is already insecure because of problems. The planning of evaluating with a focus on a child lived experiencing successful effort with learning problems, is one of the most important means available to a teacher for also accompanying these children to learn meaningfully, and adequately. This task is impossible to realize if a teacher is not always focused on *continually evaluating* both the lesson and learning during each of the lesson phases. Such uninterrupted evaluating is the only guarantee for intercepting potentially disharmonious moments before serious teaching and learning problems arise.

It is also of great importance to keep in mind *test achievements as such, still do not provide an adequate image* of the acquisitions, or problems of a child. Only within a trusting relationship with a teacher will a child be ready to ask questions regarding his/her difficulties and errors. Destructive criticism, admonitions, and spankings for poor achievements, errors, etc. can only result in restraining a child's efforts in future learning situations by creating a sphere of discouragement. The question must also be asked if a child with learning handicaps always, amidst making achievements on examinations absolute, making comparisons, etc., as boundary situated, as a child in existential distress, and if he/she, as a misconceived laggard, continually becomes more estranged, and even proceeds to establish an experiential world-in-opposition-to the school world.⁽¹⁷⁰⁾

Leach and Raybould⁽¹⁷¹⁾ indicate that the teacher or the school where the standard is too high by too strict evaluating, creates learning problems in the children who cannot fulfill them, and where “failures” are ascribed to the inadequateness, or malfunctioning of a child, a child with “learning problems” constitutes an unavoidable percentage of the class- and school-population. Subjective, and biased evaluation of a child’s achievement, and his/her person by a teacher is a danger which is always present here. Finally, it remains a truth that evaluating, or testing, merely with a view of diagnosing, or categorizing is a meaningless dead-end street, if it is not planned so that it guides a child to further insight. *The aim of evaluating must continually be help in learning, as an accompaniment to self-actualizing,*⁽¹⁷²⁾ and, indeed, to determine the quality of accompaniment to self-actualizing the psychic life of a child-in-education, as a total event of learning and becoming. With this a teacher is also confronted with a meaning-altering task to support a child who learns, and becomes inadequately, as an attenuated way of becoming (being) adult, to an adequate elevation in level in his/her entire psychic live on his/her way to the aim of educating (adulthood).

3. SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSION

In the past, a teacher seldom viewed a child with learning problems as part of his/her responsibility, or task, and the orthodidactic aspect of teaching each of the school subjects was sorely neglected in teacher education. Today, there is increasing awareness that there must be urgent reflection on the *orthodidactic-orthopedagogic facets of the everyday field of work of the professional educator, with which a large percentage of the problems arise* in children, or can be nipped in the bud, while in this way a contribution should be made to both the self-image, and the status of a teacher. It is increasingly felt that a teacher now must quickly refer each “problem child” to a “specialist” and that he/she at least must be prepared and trained to identify, and deal with problems (including learning problems) on a “first-aid” basis. For the prevention, and correction of problems, each teacher must also be a pedagogue-didactician with orthopedagogic-orthodidactic training.

A teacher's accompaniment of a child with learning problems in a lesson situation, thus, must always occur in terms of a qualitative understanding of each child's unique differentness, as an inadequate, or disharmonious way of self-actualizing his/her modes of learning, via actualizing his/her psychic life as a totality-in-function. The modes of learning for each child with learning problems will show a distinctive disharmonious course because of a child's unique hierarchy of possessed experience resulting from his/her labile pathic- and disordered cognitive-lived experiencing, as less meaningful. This is always a matter of individual, subjective giving and receiving meaning, and a child with learning problems should never be viewed as a member of a homogeneous group. Especially with these children, Sonnekus'⁽¹⁷³⁾ warning must be kept in mind that "in anticipating the modes of learning, one must be extremely careful not to try to force a child into a rigid 'learning pattern'". Especially because of the negativity, resistance, and lability which already exists in these children, at all costs, they must be re-accompanied in tactful and flexible ways to greater stability, as a precondition for the harmonious realization of a teaching effect, which eventually must culminate in an adequate learning effect, the result and crowning of the adequate accompaniment to the self-actualization of the psychic life of a child-in-education, by means of teaching in a lesson situation. The help given to a child with learning problems, as a child in educational distress, always involves a totality-activity which must be focused on *reestablishing harmony in a child's total pedagogical and didactic-pedagogical situatedness*, which is only possible if based on a qualitative fathoming of each child's total lifeworld relationships, as learning relationships, and this is not realizable as a symptom-diagnosis, and treatment of problems with regard to contents, or subject areas. That today, this task can no longer be viewed as being outside the normal field of work of a teacher, has been convincingly indicated by Van Niekerk⁽¹⁷⁴⁾ in a recent publication, since there are several ways and means at a teacher's disposal to make realizable a thorough exploration of a child's personal-actualization-in-education. With respect to a child where there is a gap between his/her achieved learning and becoming adult, and his/her pedagogically achievable level, a teacher is strongly addressed to fulfill his/her task of *continually exploring, and evaluating each pupil*.⁽¹⁷⁵⁾

For a teacher as an accompanier in a lesson situation, the following pronouncement by Liebenberg⁽¹⁷⁶⁾ holds true as a guideline, and as a task: "... in the event of a learning-disturbance, the child must be accompanied to have a conscious, intentional stake in learning. This then ought to result in his lived experience of success, of self-realization, so that he can arrive at a synthesizing, and explicating of reality, while his future expectations, in the light of his potentialities, will emerge in a new form, and his tension will proceed to effort."

If a teacher, within his/her normal course of everyday activities of giving a lesson, does not succeed either in realizing this task or, *at least*, identify such a child in a timely way, and (until such time as he/she can be helped by a trained orthopedagogue-orthodidactician) by approaching him/her with a greater degree of sympathetic understanding, he/she undoubtedly is guilty of contributing to his/her existential and pedagogical alienation. The result of this must be the glossing over, instead of the thriving, of a child's potentialities, by which his/her being-at-home in the world, into which he/she was thrown, becomes threatened, his/her dialogue with reality, and his/her educators, is obscured, and he/she loses his/her way to reaching his/her destination (adulthood).

4. REFERENCES

1. GOUWS, S. J. L.: *Die antropologiese agtergrond van ortodidaktiek*, p. 8.
2. Ibid.
3. DEN DULK, C. and VAN GOOR, R.: *Inleiding in de orthodidaktiek en in de remedial teaching van het dyslectische kind*, p. 98.
4. Ibid. p. 107.
5. Ibid, p. 98.
6. MEYER, A. N. T. and NEL, B. F.: *Die wetenskap as ontwerp*, p. 7.
7. STANDER, G.: *Gangbare benaderingswyses by die ondersoek en behandeling van kinders met leesprobleme*, p. 72.
8. GOUWS, S. J. L.: *Die antropologiese agtergrond vn ortodidaktiek*.
9. Ibid. p. 6.
10. GOUWS, S. J. L.: op. cit., p. 17.

11. STANDER, G. and SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Inleiding tot die ortopedagogiek*.
12. Ibid, 9, 17.
13. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Die leermoeilike kind*. **English translation:** georgeyonge.net/node/80
14. Ibid, p. 37.
15. Ibid, p. 60.
16. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Onderwyser, les en kind*.
17. VAN DER STOEP, F.: In: *Hulpverlening aan kinders met leerprobleme*, p. 89.
18. Ibid.
19. DU TOIT, A. S.: *Die disharmoniese onderwyssituasie: riglyne vir die ortodidaktiese praktyk*. **English translation:** georgeyonge.net/node/102
20. Ibid. p. 22.
21. Ibid, p. 23.
22. Ibid, p. 24.
23. Ibid, pp. 114-129.
24. STRASSER, S.: *Opvoedingswetenskap en opvoedingswijsheid*, pp. 13-21.
25. LANGEVELD, M. J.: *Ontwikkelingspsychologie*, pp. 37-45.
26. LANGEVELD, M. J.: *Verkenning en verdieping*, pp. 302-303.
27. LEACH, D. J. and RAYBOULD, E. C.: *Learning and behavioural difficulties in school*, p. 21.
28. LANGEVELD, M. J.: op. cit., p. 112.
29. VEDDER, R.: *Kinderen met leer- en gedragsmoeilikheden*, p. 11.
30. NEL, B. F.: *Druiping by skoolleerlinge*, pp. 137-139.
31. SMIT, R. J. and KILIAN, C. J. G.: *Onderwysende opvoeding*, p. 61.
English translation: georgeyonge.net/node/44
32. LANGEVELD, M. J.: op. cit., p. 112.
33. PERQUIN, N.: *Algemene didactiek*, p. 162.
34. See: LEACH, D. J. and RAYBOULD, E. C.: op. cit., pp. 27-28.
35. Ibid, p. 28.
36. Ibid, p. 32.
37. VAN DER STOEP, F. and LOUW, W. J.: *Inleiding tot die didaktiese pedagogiek*, p. 357. **English translation:**
georgeyonge.net/node/4
38. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Onderwyser, les en kind*, p. 76.
39. NEL, B. F.: *Druiping by skoolleerlinge*, p. 137.
40. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: op, cit., p. 74.

41. See: BARNARD, J. S.: *Remedierende onderwys in die praktyk*.
42. Cited in BLAIR, G. M.: *Diagnostic and remedial teaching*, p. 34.
43. GOUWS, S. J. L.: *Pedagogiese diagnostisering van kinders met leermoeilikhede*, p. 1.
44. VAN NIEKERK, P. A. (Ed.): *Hulpverlening aan kinders met leerprobleme*, p. 59. **English translation:**
georgeyonge.net/node/80
45. PERQUIN, N.: *Pedagogiese psychologie*, pp. 150-154.
46. VAN NIEKERK, P. A.: *Die onderwyser en die kind met probleme*, p. 29.
47. VAN NIEKERK, P. A. (Ed.): *Hulpverlening aan kinders met leerprobleme*, p. 68.
48. VAN DER STOEP, F. and LOUW, W. J.: op. cit., p. 357.
49. SMIT, R. J. and KILIAN, C. J. G.: op. cit., p. 42.
50. VREY, J. D.: *Die opvoeding in sy selfaktualisering*, p. 202.
51. LANGEVELD, M. J.: op. cit., pp. 117-131.
52. Ibid, pp. 181-184.
53. STELLWAG, H. W. F.: *Viaticum didacticum*, p. 4.
54. LANGEVELD, M. J.: op. cit., p. 184.
55. STELLWAG, H. W. F.: op. cit., p. 45.
56. PERQUIN, N.: *Algemene didactiek*, p. 164.
57. LEACH, D. J. and RAYBOULD, E. C.: op. cit., p. 6.
58. Ibid, p. 14.
59. LANGEVELD, M. J.: op. cit., pp. 112-131.
60. VREY, J. D.: op. cit., p. 217.
61. Cited by: BERGEIJK, J.: *Didactisch handelen*, p. 49.
62. WIECHERS, E.: *Die moontlikheid van effektiewe leer deur die hoerskoolkind in die lessituasie: 'n psigopedagogiese perspektief*, pp. 106-108.
63. LANGEVELD, M. J.: op. cit., pp. 303-313.
64. PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., pp. 168-169.
65. LANGEVELD, M. J.: op. cit., p. 206.
66. LEACH D. J. and RAYBOULD, E. C.: op. cit., p. 33.
67. VOYAT, G.: In SCHWEBEL, M. and RAPH, J.: *Piaget in the classroom*, p. 171.
68. LANGEVELD, M. J.: op. cit., p. 221.
69. PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., p. 71.
70. VREY, J. D.: op. cit., p. 204.
71. PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., p. 158.
72. LANGEVELD, M. J.: op. cit., pp. 186-187.

73. See: SPARGO, P. E.: *Closed circuit television in teacher training*, pp. 158-170.
74. See: BERGEIJK, J.: op. cit., p. 7.
75. OOSTHUIZEN, W. L.: *Leerstofreduksie in die wiskundeles*, p. 31.
English translation: georgeyonge.net/node/94
76. GREYLING, P. J.: *Eksemplariese onderrig*, p. 125.
77. VREY, J. D.: op. cit., p. 210.
78. LANGEVELD, M. J.: op. cit., pp. 197-198.
79. SMIT, A. J.: *Die opvoeder in sy spreke tot die kind*, pp. 131-133.
80. VAN DER STOEP, F. *Didaktiese grondvorme*, p. 41.
81. LANDMAN, W. A., ROOS, S. G. and LIEBENBERG, C. R.:
Opvoedkunde en opvoedingsleer vir beginners, p. 150.
English translation: georgeyonge.net/node/119
82. LANGEVELD, M. J.: op. cit., p. 186.
83. BASSON, N. J. S.: *Leerstofordening in die lessituasie*, p. 1.
English translation: georgeyonge.net/node/95
84. See: VAN DER STOEP, F. (Ed.): *Die lesstruktuur*, p. 91.
English translation: georgeyonge.net/node/43
85. PERQUIN, N.: *Algemene didactiek*, p. 127.
86. Ibid.
87. LANGEVELD, M. J.: op. cit., pp. 201-202.
88. FEATHERSTONE, W. B.: *Teaching the slow learner*, p. 68.
89. LEACH, D. J. and RAYBOULD, E. C.: op. cit., p. 9.
90. DU TOIT, A. S.: op. cit., p. 153.
91. See: SCHWEBEL, M. and RAPH, J.: *Piaget in the classroom*, p. 75.
92. PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., p. 128.
93. BERGEIJK, J.: op. cit., p. 139.
94. KEYTER, J. DE W.: *Opvoeding en onderwys*, p. 232.
95. See: SMIT, A. J.: op. cit., pp. 110-135.
96. LANGEVELD, M. J.: op. cit., p. 210.
97. VEDDER, R.: op. cit., p. 12.
98. NEL, B. F.: op. cit., pp. 131-132.
99. PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., pp. 128-129.
100. See: VREY, J. D.: op. cit., p. 211.
101. DUNN, R. and DUNN, K.: *Teaching students through their individual learning styles: a practical approach*, p. 387.
102. Ibid. p. 390.
103. SMIT, R. J. and KILIAN, C. J. G.: op. cit., pp. 101-102.
104. BERGEIJK, J.: op. cit., p. 54.
105. Ibid. p. 4.

106. NEL, B. F.: op. cit., p. 132.
107. VAN DER STOEP, F.: In: *Hulpverlening aan kinders met leerprobleme*, p. 47.
108. See: LEACH, D. J. and RAYBOULD, E. C.: op. cit., p. 20.
109. BERGEIJK, J.: op. cit., p. 4.
110. Ibid, p. 48.
111. VAN DER STOEP, F. (Ed.): *Die lesstruktuur*, p. 115.
112. PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., p. 128.
113. BERGEIJK, J.: op. cit., p. 5.
114. PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., p. 154.
115. SMIT, R. J. and KILIAN, C. J. G.: op. cit., pp. 103-104.
116. LANGEVELD, M. J.: op. cit., p. 196.
117. VAN PARREREN, C. F.: *Leren op school*, pp. 52-54.
118. VREY, J. D.: op. cit., p. 214.
119. STELLWAG, H. W. F.: p. 83.
120. GRUBER, H. E.: In: SCHWEBEL, M. and RAPH, J.: op. cit., p. 103.
121. VREY, J. D.: op. cit., p. 262.
122. See: BERGEIJK, J.: op. cit., p. 61.
123. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Onderwyser, les en kind*, p. 42.
124. BERGEIJK, J.: op. cit., pp. 136-141.
125. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: op. cit., p. 43.
126. SONNEKUS, M. C. H, and FERREIRA, G. V.: *Die psigiese lewe van die kind-in-opvoeding*, p. 110.
127. LANGEVELD, M. J.: *Ontwikkelingspsychologie*, pp. 76-77.
128. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Onderwyser, les en kind*, p. 43.
129. BOTHA, T. R.: *Die dualiteit in die leerverhoudinge van die potensiele skoolverlater*, p. 41.
130. MEYER, S. M.: *Die onderaktualisering van leer deur die potensiele skoolverlater in die lessituasie: 'n psigo-ortopedagogiese perspektief*, p. 137.
131. VAN NIEKERK, P. A.: *Aandagfluktuasies as verskynsel by onderaktualisering van intensionaliteit met spesiale verwysing na die agterlike kind*, p. 65.
132. Ibid, p. 191.
133. STANDER, G.: In: *Die brug tussen opvoedkunde teorie en navorsing in die opvoedings- en onderwyspraktyk*, p. 176.
134. LEACH, D. J. and RAYBOULD, E. C.: op. cit., p. 6.
135. FEATHERSTONE, W. B.: op. cit., p. 65.
136. VAN PARREREN, C. F.: op. cit., pp. 42-43.
137. LANGEVELD, M. J.: *Verkenning en verdieping*, pp. 122-123.

138. PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., p. 145.
139. VREY, J. D.: op. cit., p. 256.
140. VAN PARREREN, C. F.: op. cit., pp. 10-12.
141. PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., p. 148.
142. SMIT, R. J. and KILIAN, C. J. G.: op. cit., p. 107.
143. STANDER, G.: op. cit., p. 177.
144. PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., p. 72.
145. SONNEKUS, M. C. H. and FERREIRA, G. V.: op. cit., p. 300.
146. STANDER, G.: op. cit., p. 176.
147. PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., p. 72.
148. STANDER, G.: op. cit., p. 177.
149. VAN PARREREN, C. F.: op. cit., p. 49.
150. STANDER, G.: op. cit., p. 178.
151. SMIT, A. J.: op. cit., p. 119.
152. PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., p. 126.
153. SMIT, R. J. and KILIAN, C. J. G.: op. cit., p. 70.
154. PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., p. 151.
155. SMIT, R. J. and KILIAN, C. J. G.: op. cit., p. 113.
156. VREY, J. D.: op. cit., p. 215.
157. STANDER, G.: op. cit., p. 177.
158. VAN PARREREN, C. F.: op. cit., p. 29.
159. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: *Onderwyser, les en kind*, pp. 62-63.
160. VAN PARREREN, C. F.: op. cit., pp. 44-45.
161. Ibid, p. 28.
162. Ibid, p. 31.
163. PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., p. 126.
164. STANDER, G.: op. cit., pp. 177-178.
165. HANNAH, C.: *Die probleem van evaluering in die onderwys*, p. 14.
166. VAN PARREREN, C. F.: op. cit., p. 58.
167. HANNAH, C.: op. cit., p. 17.
168. See: PERQUIN, N.: op. cit., p. 152.
169. VREY, J. D.: op. cit., p. 233.
170. BOTHA, T. R.: op. cit., p. 145.
171. LEACH, D. J. and RAYBOULD, E. C.: op. cit., p. 4.
172. VREY, J. D.: op. cit., p. 215.
173. SONNEKUS, M. C. H.: op. cit., p. 51.
174. VAN NIEKERK, P. A.: *Die onderwyser en die kind met probleme*, pp. 72 et seq.
175. Ibid, p. 55.

176. LIEBENBERG, C. R.: *Die didaktiese situasie as pedagogiese situasie*, p. 93.