

W. A. LANDMAN AND THE DISCLOSURE OF THE PEDAGOGICAL ACTIVITY AND AIM STRUCTURES*

C. G. de Vries
University of Stellenbosch

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

A few introductory remarks about aspects related to what is mentioned in the title are warranted to put Landman's work in perspective. This is done to avoid, as far as possible, losing sight of the total person, when aspects of his life and work are put into sharp focus. In the Faculties of Education at universities, teacher colleges, and technicons, where more than a passing acquaintance with the study of education occurs, the name of W. A. Landman is not unknown. This familiarity is not only the result of his having brought forth and expanded on a particular approach in the practice of pedagogics as a science but especially because, for almost two decades, he has impressed with the high quality of scientific thinking which has appeared in his writings. His penetrating and direction-giving thought, particularly in fundamental pedagogics, are evident in each scientific contribution which has flowed from his pen.

Landman is not only recognized in South Africa as an authority in fundamental pedagogics, and for the outstanding quality of his pedagogical thinking, but he has also received favorable comments from noted Netherlanders, such as S. Strasser, R. Bakker, W. Luijpen, and J. H. van den Berg. Landman's works are not only read by noted foreign educationists and philosophers, but they even formally prescribe his works for their students (Kilian, 1977: 51). Even M. J. Langeveld, the world-renowned educationist, expresses himself as follows in his response to one of Landman's letters: "It pleases me that the pedagogical continues to develop so elegantly in

* Translation (2012) of C. G. de Vries: W. A. Landman en die openbaring van opvoedende bedrywighede en die opvoedingsdoel. *Pedagogiekjoernaal* (1988), 9(1), 7-22.

your country” (Landman, no date: 25). There is no doubt about the high regard his pedagogical proficiency enjoys.

In connection with a scientist’s recognition for his thought, the immediate question which arises is about the originality of his thinking. Although there are those who are of the opinion that Landman, in his search for the essences of the phenomenon of educating, or in his constituting categories, clearly is influenced by Heidegger (Turkstra, 1981: 107) and, thus, these are not entirely the result of his own original thinking; in this respect, he receives credit for his broad erudition, and for the fact that he is not merely a parrot, but takes his own standpoint convincingly and accountably (Schoeman, 1971: 76). The entire matter is put in perspective by Viljoen and Van Zyl, when they express the issue as follows: “Who, after all, is so gifted that he does not rely on predecessors—especially Heidegger, who has shown a way of thinking?” (1973: 95).

The educationist who wants to remain confident in his/her scientific engagement knows that he/she must continually reflect on the methods he/she uses for his/her research. Also, in this regard, Landman has remained confident in his engagement, and decidedly is seen as someone to whom Van der Walt refers when he writes: “The method as, it is, used by some educational scientists in South Africa differs markedly from the method as it was formulated by Husserl, Heidegger, and Brentano” (1981: 45). His use of the phenomenological method has not remained static, but shows an expanding and deepening, which has even given rise to a broadening of his view of science. His work has a dynamic character because there is a clear progress observable in his dealing with the phenomenological method, as well as in the outcomes or results of his thinking.

Because the way of presenting results is of particular importance in any science, it is necessary to look closely at Landman’s use of language. Indeed, he does not use a simple language to carry and convey his thoughts, and he has made use of constructions and phrases which are strange to the Afrikaans idiom. Put mildly, it is mentioned that pedagogics is not written for the person on the street, and that Landman, as the father of essence-pedagogics, out of necessity used concepts and words which had not existed

previously. Disclosing a new terrain, necessarily brings forth new words and concepts which will not find approval everywhere. The question to which an answer must be found is if his use of language has a clarifying or obscuring influence on bringing the essence of the phenomenon of educating to light. In terms of this criterion, his use of language decidedly has a more clarifying than obscuring influence.

2. THE DISCLOSURE OF PEDAGOGICAL ACTIVITIES

In the study of education, no one has used the phenomenological method as a founding method more effectively than Landman. In the pedagogical activity structures, as well as in the aim structures, he has sought the grounds which make possible the appearance of the structures known as the activities and the aims. The phenomenological method, and, indeed, Landman's use of it, has guaranteed that fundamental pedagogics is and will remain a grounded science.

In a speech Landman delivered on 12 February 1969, in accepting his professorship in the Department of the Philosophy of Education, he made the following fundamental pronouncement: "If the point of departure is the pedagogical reality and phenomenological fathoming follows, it is brought to light that the pedagogical is an exclusively anthropological matter" (Landman, 1969a: 4). However, he warns against approaching being human from a prejudged human image, such as talking of being human "... as a historically determined, drive-propelled, and drive-captivated being", because then it is not only incomplete but incorrect for him/her to even talk of "anthropology". The phenomenologist strives for a radical rescuing from prejudgments as they arise in several anthropological conception, as well as for an ontological-anthropological reflection. An ontological-anthropology means that the human being is considered in his/her existential totality. In an ontological understanding, there is a striving for a description and elucidation of the essentials of being human, or of what being human really essentially is (Landman, 1969a: 4).

For the grounding of his pedagogical activity structures, Landman then looks for ways (activities) of human being-there (Da-sein),

which are founded in a person's being-in-the-world, and which can be understood as [ontic] characteristics of being human. In 1969, he indicates *being-with, temporality, and being-someone* as three examples of ontological criteria, which also can serve as anthropological criteria to see or reflect on and deal with human being in ontological-anthropological ways. That the concept being-with is derived from the work of Heidegger, temporality from that of Oberholzer, and being-someone from that of Langeveld is not relevant; the fact is that, for our purpose, he made wide use of them, which resulted in his pedagogical activity structures. The following pedagogical criteria stem from the mentioned anthropological criteria (later called categories):

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| - Being-with | venture-with-the-other
gratefulness-for-security
responsibility-for-relationships |
| -Temporality | hope-for-the-future
task-of-designing-potentialities
fulfilling-destination (adulthood) |
| -Being-someone | respect-for-own-dignity
task-of-self-understanding
freedom-to-responsibility |

It is interesting to point out that at the end of 1969, Landman used the same anthropological criteria, now called categories, to allow pedagogical categories to stem from them, i.e., to determine what the pedagogical significance is of anthropological categories, such as being-in-a-meaningful-world, being-with, temporality, and being-someone-oneself (Landman, 1969b: 60-68). The anthropological categories and criteria had the same names, but the pedagogical categories and criteria were named differently. Between the naming of categories and criteria, at this stage, there appeared yet another difference for Landman, although it is difficult to reconcile with his standpoint at the end of 1969 when he writes: "... pedagogical criteria are categories with universally valid evaluative content and significance" (Landman, 1969c: 471). In his *Aanwending van die pedagogiese kategoriee in die Fundamentele Pedagogiek [The application of pedagogical categories in fundamental pedagogics]*

(no date), he unambiguously states his standpoint when he writes: “When the same names are kept, the fact that criteria are categories-for-evaluating is emphasized” (Landman, no date: 42). In *Inleiding tot die Fundamentele Pedagogiek [Introduction to fundamental pedagogics]* (Landman & Gous, 1969b), he refers to Oberholzer’s categories of *safe space* and *openness*, with *address-listen to* (as his own addition to pedagogical categories), which stem from the anthropological category of being-in-a-meaningful-world. It seems that, at this stage, Landman is still strongly influenced by Oberholzer, who clearly distinguishes between “reflecting” and “judging”, and indicates that “... in addition to pedagogical categories, pedagogical criteria must also be designed” (Oberholzer, 1968: 325). According to Roos (1980: 113), in 1971, with the appearance of *Denkwyses in die Opvoedkunde [Modes of thinking in education]*, there is a departure from Oberholzer’s standpoint, and criteria are now viewed as categories in the form of questions.

Although, initially, Landman had formulated pedagogical criteria which had stemmed from the anthropological criteria (12 February 1969), only after that was human being-there referred to as founded in his/her being-in-the-world; this does not mean that he only “discovered” the anthropological category of being-in-the world later. From the beginning, he had no doubt that the first category of reality, or the first category of being human is Da-sein (being-there) or being-in-the-world (Landman, 1969c: 465). Later in the same year, he appropriately formulated being-in-a-*meaningful*-world (emphasis C d V), known as one of his four anthropological categories which has being-in-the-world as a fundamental precondition for the further description of categories (Landman, 1969b: 55).

This approach was necessary to arrive at the twelve main categories which Landman used to present his pedagogical activity structures. The words emphasized in the pedagogical criteria stemming from the anthropological criteria (categories) of being-with, temporality, and wanting-to-be-someone-oneself, are the same as what are used in a recent publication in which all structures are indicated with their essences (Landman *et al.*, 1982: 111). The pedagogical categories of giving-meaning-with-increasing-responsibility, gradually-breaking-away-from-lack-of-exertion, and exemplifying-

and-emulating-norms, stemming from the anthropological category of being-in-a-meaningful-world, is taken up in the essence table of Landman's activity structures with the words *meaning*, *exertion*, and *norms*. These pedagogical categories appeared for the first time somewhere between 1969 and 1972, i.e., between the appearance of *Op soek na Pedagogiese Kriteria [In search of Pedagogical criteria]* and *Leesboek vir die Christen-opvoeder [Textbook for the Christian Educator]*. In *Aanwending van die pedagogiese kategoriee in die Fundamentele Pedagogiek* (no date) we find the twelve pedagogical categories stemming from the anthropological categories, and which form the core of Landman's activity structures. In 1972, in his *Leesboek vir die Christen-opvoeder*, Landman presented the preconditions for the course of genuine pedagogical activities, and then showed further how this ought to progress in an educative situation where the educator does his/her educative work from a Christian foundation (Erasmus, 1972: 51). Thus, Landman went further and is not satisfied with universally valid contents and the significance of the categories and essences of the structure of activities, but also made provision to include contents from a Christian foundation [as a philosophy of life matter].

3. THE DISCLOSURE OF THE PEDAGOGICAL AIM STRUCTURES

Education has advanced on a long path from the time that J. F. Herbart (1776-1841) had said that pedagogics borrows its aim from ethics, and its means from psychology (Gunter, 1969: 212). The progress made also is necessarily connected to other aspects of pedagogics, e.g., such as the place of a philosophy of life in the aim of educating, and the question of the scientific justification of such a step. Landman himself was accosted by the complexity of this matter and then, in no small way, provided an entirely original contribution. Although it is not seen as the aim of this paper, the place of a philosophy of life in the aim of educating cannot be completely left out of consideration.

Already in 1969, in one of his most known works, i.e., *Inleiding tot Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, he left no doubt about his view of the aim of educating. Educating does not occur in a person's life for its own sake, but for the sake of what results from it. Fundamental pedagogics, first, learns to know the event known as educating and,

then, Landman continues as follows: “Bringing to light the components and moments, deeper relationships and references of the event, including illuminating its formal aim” (Landman, 1969b: 45). He had turned down [the idea of] an aim which might be formulated from outside because, in his view, this would be unscientific. At this stage, he was also very decisive about what philosophy of life contents could provide the formal aim so that it could become enlivened in the educative situation. For him, this was a post-scientific matter.

In the light of later pronouncements and standpoints by Landman, which had given rise to the question of a “turn” or “change” in his pedagogical thinking, (Van der Walt, 1977: 68), it is interesting to indicate that he continually remained true to what he viewed as the task of pedagogics. He expressed himself as follows about this: “Pedagogics must thus autonomously decide about its own formal aim, as deduced from the thinking-intuiting analysis of the phenomenon of educating which is disclosed or revealed as an educative event” (Landman, 1969b: 46).

From this, no other conclusion can be drawn than that pedagogics, naturally in terms of recognized scientific methods, itself must decide on the specific contents which should be given to its formal aim, as well as on the way in which this should be done within the limits of scientific permissibility.

Turkstra (1981: 112) believes that Landman’s description of the educative aim corresponds, in principle, with “self-responsibility and self-determination” with which M. J. Langeveld so aptly typified the aim of educating, i.e., adulthood. This [adulthood] amounts to a time in a person’s life when “he must accept responsibility for determining himself”. Landman’s description reads as follows: “Educating must lead to the awakening of personal responsibility in [a person’s] relationships with the lifeworld. The aim of educating then is to become an adult person by making personal decisions unconditionally and in awareness of his responsibility for the claims his lifeworld makes of him” (Landman, 1971:32). This amounts to the same idea which Langeveld promotes. He also does not view adulthood as a “complete” or “final” stage, but as an elevation in

dialogue and choice, by implication, the adult becomes increasingly more the adult he/she can and ought to be.

Landman does not obtain the aim of educating from outside the educative situation but, for him, it is nothing more than the actualization of the relationship, sequence, and activity structures with an eye to attaining the educative aim. The pedagogical aim structures to which all acts and activities must be directed to be classified as educating, is essentially the universally valid contents of the form of being human to which the child is on the path. He distinguishes the following as contents of adulthood:

- (i) Meaningful existence
- (ii) Self-judgment and self-understanding
- (iii) Respect for human dignity
- (iv) Morally independent choosing and acting
- (v) Norm identification
- (vi) Philosophy of life (Landman, 1971: 9).

In one of his later publications, the word “responsibility” is not taken up, but he complements it with morally independent choosing and acting, i.e., “... assuming responsibility for one’s own way of living independently.” Thus, by implication, it is taken up.

With respect to designating contents of adulthood, Landman was not the first. Already in 1963, Gunter (1963: 11), calling it the “core” of adulthood, indicates *independence, freedom, responsibility, and self-discipline*. Where Landman does distinguish himself as the first and original thinker, is in denoting the essences of each of the six categories of the pedagogical aim structures. Here he stands out to such an extent and is clearly seen as a pioneer that it can be said that, in the South African phenomenologically oriented pedagogical literature today, no other categories and essences in describing the aim structures figure as much as those of Landman. In presenting the essences, Landman shows his fine sense for the use of the most descriptive word or words to clearly convey an idea. The essences are not only presented with a word but, indeed, with words and concepts which convey a very clear and illuminating message. It is said that Landman allows the pedagogical activity structures too little involvement in the aim structures, i.e., more emphasis should

be placed on indicating the activities which are focused on a particular [essence of the] aim structures. This would result in a more structured table, but this would include the risk that educating is so rigid that it always moves on a fixed course. Landman's designation attests to the unpredictability of activities. A particular activity does not always have a specific aim, although it can have an original directedness to this aim. Also, a specific action can be directed to more than one aim. Despite the tabulation of categories and essences, the openness of acts and activities remains present. With the disclosure of the contents of the activity and aim structures, Landman corroborates that educating takes its course in a way which cannot be described as "cause and effect".

The groundbreaking work which Landman has done in this regard speaks very clearly if it is viewed against the background of a pronouncement by his primary teacher and mentor, C. K. Oberholzer who, in 1968 had asked the question if there is any meaning in an adult intervening with a child and, if there is any meaning in devoting oneself to working on a child's future. He then answers himself as follows: "Each person must answer this question for himself, since their answer will fall completely outside the framework and competence of science" (Oberholzer, 1968: 423). Landman has illuminated the universal sense and meaning of the activity called educating without violating the task and limitations of science.

4. APPLYING THE ESSENCES OF THE ACTIVITY AND AIM STRUCTURES

It is important to indicate that Landman did not bring to light his essences of the activity and aim structures, and the relationship and sequence structures, against the background of science for the sake of science. He saw, as his full-fledged task, the use of already known essences to shed additional light on and acquire knowledge of essences which are hidden in other structures. In one of his works, he states this as follows: "In the pedagogical situation, this involves the realization of the following with an eye to the eventual actualization of the aim structures:

- (i) *Giving-meaning-with-increasing-responsibility* to all the essences and coherencie of:
- a) the pedagogical relationship structures,
 - b) the pedagogical sequence structures” (Landman, 1973: 147).

This gave rise to the fact that, in a review after the appearance of this work, it was written: “In the present publication, once again, it is clear what an eminent methodologist Landman is” (M. O. Oberholzer, 1973: 84).

For Landman, it was necessary not to leave the essences he illuminated in words or concepts, but to descriptively illuminate them and further disclose their coherence. For example, with respect to the activity structures, we find that “giving-meaning-with-increasing-responsibility” must occur because the child “ ... must *exercise* giving meaning, and this occurs if the following ESSENCES OF GIVING MEANING are actualized:

- a) *Attributing-meanings*. Meanings are given to persons, events, etc. (Landman *et al.*, 1978: 72). [only one essence appeared in the article, but the other essences appearing in Landman follow--GDY]
- b) *Testing-meanings*. The child must be helped to test if the meanings he attributes are correct and appropriate.
- c) *Lived experiencing meaning*. The personal meaning (i.e., meaning-for-me) of what is valuable must be accepted and felt.
- d) *Living meanings*. The child must be helped so that what is meaningful (important, valuable) becomes part of his way of life.
- e) *Meaningful acts*. Meanings, the valuable, must be transformed into acts, and in this connection, the child must receive meaningful teaching.
- f) *Meaning elevation*. The teacher helps the child give meaning on yet a higher level. He must give meaning in accordance with his level of becoming.

In broad strokes, Landman’s work is divided into two main streams: the first extends to approximately 1977, within which the main

emphasis falls on constructing pedagogics as an autonomous science, and the following period, within which the main emphasis falls on the serviceability of fundamental pedagogics for the practice of educating and teaching.

5. SUMMARY

In summary, in disclosing the activity and aim structures, with their various essences, Landman has accomplished groundbreaking work, in the sense that he was the first to enter this terrain and, in doing so, to bring to light a corpus of knowledge which is unique and has never existed before. He has done more than just this: he introduced the essences hermeneutically and, thereby, threw additional light on the essences of schooling and giving lessons, which were still hidden. It also is important to point out that South African educationists not only have taken note of Landman's thought, but they have made use of it in their own writings.

As educationist, Landman's aim was to be scientific, but then, only to justify his work scientifically. In this, he has had excellent success; his work must also be understood and evaluated against this background.

REFERENCES

1. ERASMUS, O. C. (1972): Resensies van Leesboek vir die Christen-opvoeder. In: *Suid-afrikaanse Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek*, Vol. 6(1), July.
2. GUNTER, C. F. G. (1963): *Aspecte van die Teoretiese Opvoedkunde*. Stellenbosch, University Publishers and Booksellers.
3. GUNTER, C. F. G. (1969): *Fenomenologie en Fundamentele Opvoedkunde*. Stellenbosch, Univeristy Publishers and Booksellers.
4. KILIAN, C. J. G. (1969): Buitelandse kommentaar oor drie Suid-Afrikaanse Fundamentele Pedagogikers. In: *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek*, Vol. 11(2), September.
5. LANDMAN, W. A. (1969a): *Op soek na Pedagogiese Kriteria*. Pretoria, Van Schaik.
6. LANDMAN, W. A. & GOUS, S. J. (1969b): *Inleiding tot die*

- Fundamentele Pedagogiek*. Johannesburg, Afrikaanse Press.
7. LANDMAN, W. A. (1969c): Pedagogiese Kategoriee: Verantwoording. In: *Pedagogiese Studien*, Desember.
 8. LANDMAN, W. A. (et al.) (1971): *Denwyses in die Opvoedkunde*. Pretoria, NG Kerkboehandel.
 9. LANDMAN, W. A. (1972): *Leesboek vir die Christen-opvoeder*. Pretoria, NG Kerkboehandel.
 10. LANDMAN, W. A. & ROOS, S. G. (1973): *Fundamentele Pedagogiek en die Opvoedingswerklikheid*. Durban, Butterworths.
 11. LANDMAN, W. A. (et al.) (1978): *Opvoedkunde vir Onderwysstudents*. Stellenbosch, University Publishers and Booksellers.
 12. LANDMAN, W. A. (et al.) (1982): *Fundamentele Pedagogiek*. Cape Town, Juta & Kie.
 13. LANDMAN, W. A. & BECKMANN, J. L. (1986): *Fundamentele Pedagogiek, begeleiding en bewaring*. Pretoria, NG Kerkboekhandel Transvaal.
 14. OBERHOLZER, C. K. (1968): *Prolegomena van 'n Prinsipiele Pedagogiek*. Cape Town, HAUM.
 15. OBERHOLZER, M. O. (1973): Resensie van Fundamentele Pedagogiek en die Opvoedingswerklikheid. In: *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek*, Vol. 7(1), July.
 16. ROOS, S. G. (1980): Fundamentele Pedagogiek. In: *Pedagogiekjoernaal* (Feesuitgawe), Vol. 1(2).
 17. SCHOEMAN, S. J. (1971): Resensie van Enkele Aksiologies-ontologiese momente in die voorvolwassenheidsbeleving: 'n Studie in die Wysgerige Anthropologie. In: *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek*. Vol. 5(1), July.
 18. TURKSTRA, J. (1981): Naar een "Fenomenologiese" Pedagogiek in Nederland en Zuid-Afrika. In: *Pedagogiekjoernaal*, Vol. 2(2).
 19. VAN DER WALT, J. L. (1977): *Wetenskapsidee en Opvoedkunde*. Unpublished D.Ed. dissertation. University of Potchefstroom for Christian Higher Education.
 20. VAN DER WALT, J. L. (1981): Professor W. A. Landman: Exponent of the phenomenological method of practicing Educational science. In: Beard and Morrow: *Problems of Pedagogics*. Durban, Butterworths.
 21. VILJOEN, T. A. & VAN ZYL, M. E. J. (1973): Resensie van

Fundamentele Pedagogiek en die Opvoedingswerklikheid.
In: *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek*. Vol. 7(2),
December.

AUTHOR'S ENGLISH SUMMARY

W. A. LANDMAN'S REVEALING OF THE PEDAGOGICAL ACTIVITY AND PEDAGOGICAL AIM STRUCTURES

From the foregoing discussion, it is evident that Landman had made a fundamental and essential study of the phenomenon of education. In revealing the pedagogical activity and pedagogical aim structures, with their essences, he did pioneer work, in the sense that he was the first to enter this field, and to bring about knowledge which is unique. He did more than just revealing the essences, he revealed them in a scientific and hermeneutic manner so that the ensemble of these essences became clear. Essences, which are indispensable for the appearance of the activity and aim structures, cast more light on other structures in the pedagogical situation, as well as on school and didactic structures.

Landman revealed the activity structures from within the following anthropological categories: being-in-a-meaningful-world, co-existence [being-with], temporality, and wanting-to-be-someone-oneself. This is the only way to lay the foundation of the pedagogical activities, as activities performed by a human being in the pedagogical situation.

Landman did not bring the aim of education from outside the pedagogical situation, but, to him, the aim of education is nothing else than the fulfillment of the pedagogical relationship, sequence, and activity structures. The pedagogical aim structures, as the aim on which all the pedagogical activities are focused, is essentially the general contents of adulthood.

Landman proved himself as the most influential educationist in South Africa today. It is an honor to pay tribute to him for the scientific way he served the science of education.

