

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 1946 was similar provision made for children with behavioral deviciencies.⁽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 shrinks, i.e., as the number of unskilled jobs decrease and the skilled jobs require a continually increasing level of skillfulness in reading and writing.⁽³⁾ Thus, today the following is more true 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 deals 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 that dealt with the development of programs for reading help.⁽⁵⁾ Thus, it is inevitable that any attempt at an 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 particular 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 was 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-didactical moments and that it must be viewed as a hindrance in the child's accountable becoming adult that 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 made an important contribution to the elaboration of the school of pedagogical thinking that 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 the 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 the child with learning difficulties, the functional relationship between learning and teaching problems, as matters of a disharmony in the course of the lesson structure, is not disclosed.

The value of his pioneering work in viewing the learning problematic from an anthropological-pedagogical perspective in particular is the grounding as preliminary work for the further elaboration of an accountable orthopedagogical, i.e., orthodidactical theory and practice, and consequently 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 was more on pedagogical diagnostics than on providing practical orthodidactic help, a deficiency that only could be eliminated by a reinterpretation of the lesson structure in light of the didactic tasks that 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 that 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 on the basis of 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 rendering of help are primarily viewed as pedagogical activity.⁽¹⁴⁾ An accountable view of a child's learning is sketched as the learning world of the child, after which the child with learning difficulties is considered in his lifeworld. The learning child is approached from his lifeworld with the aim of penetrating to the essence of the experiential world of the child with learning difficulties and in particular there is an inquiry 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 the 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 the classroom situation and thereby, for the first time, placing this problematic within the illuminative field of didactic theory.

It can be 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 particular (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 coherency, 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 was taken on the concept “learning difficulties”. It was 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 the child is at the focal point of interest and although there often is indirect reference to pedagogical-didactical 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 that 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 it against the background of the disharmonious lesson situation. However, each disharmonious lesson situation cannot be typified as a situation of learning difficulty. There is only mention of genuine learning difficulties when the inadequate effects of learning accumulate and there is a history of learning failures. When there is mention of learning difficulties only in this sense, both the 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 explication to follow, where there is a more particular examination of the possible contribution of teaching in

the origin of learning problems, is hopefully to make a contribution to the prevention of restraining personal unfolding by means of impeding learning as a consequence of inadequate teaching in the school's lesson situation. More particularly such a micro-structural 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 the teacher and help prevent the constituents of disharmonious teaching, i.e.: disharmonious pedagogical relationships; affective distress; experience of being different; inadequate realization of the 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 the educative event and is characterized by Strasser⁽²⁴⁾, following Theodore Litt, as the polar tension that is even at the foundation of the most harmonious and least troubled course of educating, i.e., that between the two poles "Wachsenslassen" and "Führen". Accompanying implies that he who is guided can move under his own power at his disposal and moreover it is assumed that he who gives guidance has an aim in view and also knows the way to it. However, both aim and way are not given as concrete reality in the 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 the child's subjectivity by which the accompaniment experienced by the individual personal being of the child is continually interpreted and transformed in unique ways via his lived experiencing it. Between child and world there is a relation

by which, happily, not everything penetrates into the child; the world does not act on a blank slate, but the meanings that come to the fore in this relationship are also co-determined because the child himself actively goes out to the world, steps out of himself, and because of his wanting to be someone himself, he explores and experiences. The child's spontaneity, his freedom, his possibilities of giving and lived experiencing meaning are thus continually co-definitive of his participation in the lesson event.

The human way of being is characterized by the freedom to actualize present potentialities.⁽²⁵⁾ Consequently, neither teaching – learning nor accompaniment - self-actualization have a direct cause-effect relationship with each other. Teaching effects are only realized through the learning child's unique experiences of the act of teaching, and his interpretation or lived experiences of it have a unique effect on him as a becoming person, by which, in its turn, behaviors are brought about that are not a direct effects 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 the 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 the 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

Langeveld⁽²⁸⁾ indicates that for all educating fundamental self-knowledge naturally is the first obligation of the educator, both with respect to pedagogical and didactical problems that the child might face: “ ... in all difficulties with a child and learning material lies a reference to oneself [in alle moeilijkheden met kind en leerstof ligt een verwijzing naar onzzelf]”. With respect to learning and behavioral difficulties, Vedder⁽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, the teacher must first of all ask himself to what extent he has filled his obligation to the child and if he has not possibly contributed to his failure to learn because of inadequate accompaniment, help and support. Finally, as initiator of the educative teaching situation in the classroom, the teacher carries the responsibility for its design, beginning, course and results. This also means that he must be able to learn from his mistakes in order to enrich himself and his calling.⁽³¹⁾

This is not only a moral question but also a purely technical matter that cannot be separated from his total pedagogical responsibility. This self-study by the teacher must be organized theoretically in order to be able to *give a responsible account of his intervention* with the child but also for establishing guidelines for an improved future lesson practice to which he 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 in light of the deep-reaching and often painful societal revolution that nowadays is evident in all areas of the lifeworld, a revision that 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 were 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 the teacher's preparation (re content and the didactical) is of fundamental significance for the degree of success that any pupil might achieve in the teaching situation since he is the accompanier, initiator and designer of everything that occurs in the 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 particular 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 the teacher's fault that a child has no love for school, that he 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 was 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 particular teaching methods that can only be ignored at the child's detriment. However, here it must be 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 will not be possible to strive for completeness and only a few aspects of the problematic of teaching can be 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 more or less scientifically accountable perspectives such as medicine, neurology, physiology, psychology, psychoanalysis, psychiatry, educational psychology, etc. State authorities also devoted 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 was 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 that concern themselves with the problem.⁽⁴⁰⁾

Nevertheless, here it must be noted briefly that the current approach to the question of "learning problems" everywhere in this country still bears the stamp of "remedial teaching", an approach that is analogous to the medical model in that it is focused especially on the diagnosis and treatment of symptoms, mostly by means of a number of unconnected techniques as devices that might provide particular results in practice but that 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 particular 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, all of 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 "Diagnostic Test in Decimals" to 500 pupils on the basis of which he isolated and identified 114 different types of errors.

b) Learning problems related to childlike personal unfolding

The school, as a place where the 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 that he continually in self-actualizing ways give form to his potentialities of becoming adult and of learning. He does this by a continual self-transcending elevation in the level of meaning he attributes to the learning material in order to progressively constitute his own world in accordance with the idea of adulthood. This world constituting is his personal response to the appeal directed to him by his educators from their shared situatedness with respect to the pedagogically proper.

Since, however, both the educator's appeal, or the way of his addressing, and the 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 the 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 the learning child can become child-with-learning-difficulties by which the child-world relationship becomes child-with-learning-difficulties-world-relationship as a relationship that is inadequate. This implies that his dialogue with his experiential world becomes attenuated and his world loses its wealth of meaning, its inviting and attractive character, his learning intention becomes impoverished, his readiness to venture weakens, the learning situation and contents become meaningless and the imperative that speaks from the teaching situation is avoided by fleeing. He experiences himself as “different” and inadequate. Resulting feelings of desperation and being threatened lead to a future perspective and intentionality that are obscured. Consequently, learning problems must be viewed as a matter of existential distress and since the learning child who does not proceed properly to acquire the contents of the school’s learning contents in accordance with his potentialities is undeniably handicapped in his 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 that are inadequately or disharmoniously actualized.

Hence, what must be 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 way to cultural adulthood. In light of the unavoidable appearance of the school with its character of imperativeness on the child’s horizon, the logical conclusion seems to be that the inadequate realization of the learning effect perhaps can be the school’s greatest and most direct contribution to the child’s inadequate personal unfolding. The justification for this statement is in the mere presence of the school as a *compulsory path* to a particular social form of adulthood that for the child is not reachable by alternative means. Through its legal institutionalized nature and essence, the school proclaims itself

to not only be the best but, practically, also the **exclusive place** and means where the child's learning initiative can be guided by teaching with the aim of optimally becoming adult. The implication of this is that the school takes upon itself the relentless responsibility for accountably realizing the task demanded of it. For the child who, because of inadequate teaching, shows a restraint or stagnation in learning, *the only way* to fulfilling his existence within a particular socio-economic context becomes blocked by this. Consequently, that this child becomes alienated in almost concrete ways from the totality of his 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 learns—more particularly, learns *inadequately*—in order to ascertain the essences of his learning problems.

However, more generally, from Perquin⁽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 that might seem insignificant to the teacher. The teacher who uses punitive measures in such a case will not succeed in repairing the disturbed contact but will only exacerbate the problem. The primary school child who is not able to fully pay attention in the classroom because of his parents' disharmonious marriage, sickness or financial problems at home, unpopularity in his 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 "day-dreaming". The 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 the child's essential unhappiness and inability to attend.

More serious are periodic fluctuations in learning that are closely connected with, e.g., the child's psychosomatic attunement that also

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

Learning disturbances of a neurotic nature that are characterized by a disturbed self-confidence on the basis of a breach of contact with others, by which the child is thrown back onto himself. The experience of inadequacy leads to avoiding learning, despondency that obscures his 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 that makes the child completely impotent. This is especially the danger of an authoritarian style of teaching where the 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 that is achievable. Thus there is an identifiable difference between what the child as a person really is, feels, knows and understands and what he ought to have been, felt, known and understood in accordance with his 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 The teacher as a person in a lesson situation

Smit and Killian⁽⁴⁹⁾ indicate that the personal quality of the teacher can limit the nature and quality of the child's exploration of the task of learning in school. Vrey⁽⁵⁰⁾ says that it is through his being a

person that the teacher realizes his task as an educator. Langeveld⁽⁵¹⁾ gives an explanation of the vocational psychological factors as well as the study and employment circumstances that can have a favorable or unfavorable effect on the primary personal characteristics of the teacher. The responsibility and obligation for continual self-criticism and regeneration is doubly true for teacher preparation where optimum possibility converges with maximum risk. There is the danger that the young teacher's becoming a mature adult can stagnate where he finds himself in the sphere of the child (largely isolated from a broader social context) and he easily becomes pedantic and opinionated. He is "officious" in a sphere where he 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 the teacher becomes dull for the child, tired of his vocation, loses his ability for self-criticism, and in general stagnates spiritually and intellectually that 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 in the midst of all of the reform plans for teaching and an appeal to the personal quality of the 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 responsibility to optimally realize those powers and potentialities that he does possess. Each must, within his own limits, still make the most of the means at his disposal. Stellwag⁽⁵³⁾ says the educator must accept his specific form of being human that is partly given as fixed but he must learn to be acquainted with himself and the reactions he as a person elicits from the child—thus, he must strive for self-knowledge and self-understanding. Here, with Langeveld⁽⁵⁴⁾ it must also be asked if even this limited ideal is in any sense realizable in light of contemporary teacher preparation, the positivist subject training, the way in which the young teacher is left to his own fate, the lack

of real accountable pedagogical or didactical 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 didactical 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 himself as an intellectual and is guilty of undervaluing the child, and from whom an almost totally distorted affective appeal goes out that arouses in the pupil unproductive results such as impotence, insecurity, resistance, hate, rage, etc., by which the child’s effective learning is restrained. The 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 tries, gradually conclude that he “cannot”, a notion that very easily can proceed to “I won’t try anymore”. In such a case the child’s potentialities have nothing to do with progress in the subject of concern, and obviously alienates him from the subject because the didactical principle of sympathy is weakened.

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

The possibility that the 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 the teacher’s ability and preparedness to communicate with him as a person, to his effectiveness as a teacher to which are related his own

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

In a previous chapter there is a more complete consideration of the various aspects of the teacher's actualization of his psychic life, and here it suffices to state that the teacher as a person in the lesson situation can be a defining factor with respect to the origin and handling of learning problems. However, it is precisely in his confrontation with the child with learning difficulties in the lesson situation where the highest demands are placed on the teacher as a person. For example, this child is often experienced as a personal threat, he undermines the teacher's self-confidence, he casts doubt on the teacher's effectiveness and weakens his vocational satisfaction. It is relatively easy and satisfying to give instruction to the "ideal" child, but Leach and Raybould⁽⁵⁸⁾ ask the following question that 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., the teacher's self-view and his status in the eyes of society, including parents and children, that can vary from placing him 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, just as with

his 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 relates himself in the lesson situation to the child as a person and presents himself as a teacher. The teacher whose vocational satisfaction is undermined by frustrated academic or other (perhaps professional) vocational ideals might view the child's inability to understand his explanations as an additional frustration rather than a possible indication of the quality of his didactic designs. If he sees himself as socially wronged, his relationships with children that he sees as more privileged become so confused that there can be little pedagogical love.

According to Vrey⁽⁶⁰⁾ the teacher's self-image lies close to the core of his person and is related to the experience of the meaningfulness of his task as well as the significance and quality of his affective encounter with the child. This implies that the teacher must also be someone himself. The teacher who has problems with self-acceptance, self-worth and self-respect will be restrained in communicating and encountering the child and will be characterized as forced and unnatural which will undermine his relationship of authority as well as his conveying knowledge. The teacher who does not really experience his daily acts of giving lessons as meaningful pedagogical activities and therefore as existentially fulfilling, will in numerous, subtle ways, perhaps only through his bodily attitude and quality of voice when standing in front of the class, and his unmistakable relief when the bell rings, communicate this "meaninglessness" to the children. Related to this is the *"model"* of teaching that he follows (often unconsciously) and that obviously will have far-reaching implications for the nature and quality of his 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 parents and the community by which his 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 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 the child in school, but also with respect to the timely interception and handling of problems that might arise.

In a society where abundance, being carefree, materialism and power have largely taken the place of culture, it is obvious that education is not really taken "seriously", which implies that the position of the 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 the teacher himself of his situation and the possibilities that this implies: Societal regard is closely related to the tangibly achieved reality of the worthy discharge of one's duties.

"In our opinion, the teacher is the biggest problem in the didactic situation", says Perquin⁽⁶⁴⁾ and he adds that this problematic is related to the "circulus vitiosus" that arises because of the deficient respect for teaching by pupils and parents whereby there are feelings of inferiority instead of professional pride and the teacher falls into depression and routine that leads the gifted children to be averse to the calling, etc. However, the way in which the teacher as a person gives form to his calling will be co-defining for the status with which he 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, balanced between the world of the child and adult, neither completely as a male nor as a female he must live between the genders,⁽⁶⁵⁾ in the midst of responding to an absurd *deluge of demands* on the basis of inadequate preparation.

Finally, it is illuminating that researchers find that one of the most important factors determining the teacher's effective handling and interception of learning problems in the lesson situation is his view of his 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 the teacher, on the basis of his 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 own view as well as that of the community.

2.4.2 The possibility of a teacher himself having “learning problems”

The first question to be asked is about the *level and quality* of the teacher's own mastery of his subject, as co-defined by the teaching that he had received in school and in his later preparation. The question is whether his 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 subject. The teacher's relationship to culture, history and community, because of his positivistic academic training, might have a cursory, superficial nature that makes him a “possessor of knowledge” instead of being inwardly formed. “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” that are often the teacher's “learning problems” that again result in problematic teaching and learning in the lesson situation. For example, here one can refer to a standard nine (eleventh grade) history lesson on the unification of Prussia during which the 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 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 the teacher who lives in the little world of his own subject area outside of which nothing exists for him and clearly manifests in his person his insularity of his narrow-mindedness, e.g., as a salaried person, as a representative of a small town ideal of certainty and self-complacency that can invoke in the pupils an aversion for both his person and the subject. Even in the higher school grades there are few children who can really separate the person of the teacher from the subject. The modern teacher is moreover involved in the obligations of both his didactic insights and his subject knowledge, always keeping up with continual changes and renovations if his teaching is to remain meaningful for the contemporary child, a task that can be very difficult to meet if he also has to contend with an excess of extra-mural activities (Vrey).⁽⁷⁰⁾ The teacher who is exclusively interested in his own subject becomes boring to the child. The older and the more gifted the child, the more differentiated is his need for expert help, but the teacher can never give up the conviction that he who offers this help, *in his total* appearing, because of his partnership in the total culture and because of his humanity, must be confidence and appreciation stimulating, a conviction that 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 that must be learned, practiced, ordered and thought through. The teacher's didactic skills must be acquired through learning, a task that, in light of the continually advancing thought and research in the areas of pedagogics and didactics, poses increasingly higher demands,⁽⁷²⁾ and the question arises whether the teacher who, after a number of "criticism lessons" during his preparation, is left to his own devices and falls back on narrow and stereotypic methods based on what he remembers from his own school days, or the board of more experienced colleagues, is not himself going to have a defect from pedagogical and/or didactical learning problems that can

predispose the 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 the child, his participation in the 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 participant in the lesson situation. The child very quickly becomes aware of the uncertainty, unpreparedness and awkwardness of the teacher that can seriously damage both the relationships of trust and authority. In order to be able to be a teacher, in the end he also must allow *the child to learn to know* and understand, and the question arises whether he has at his disposal the needed psychopedagogical knowledge to be able to really understand how the child on his 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 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 that must be acquired by the 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 Greyling⁽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 that must carry the pupil's insight. This basic fact must be formulated by the teacher in such a way that it is understandable and meaningful for the pupil; if not there can be no mention of unlocking reality. If these "anchor points" are not accessible for the child, relationships will not be observable and the child must learn "off the top of his head" and this will result in unstable meanings as experiential residues, 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 the 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 particular 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 that the 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 the teacher's total pedagogic-didactic "repertoire" is that daily he 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

has asked a number of questions that 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 that 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 will be returned to later in the discussion of the course of the lesson in connection with the course of learning, and consequently, here it is sufficient to state that the 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 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”.

The teacher in the lesson situation who is confronted with the task of also accompanying the child with learning problems to experience the lesson problem as meaningful must ask about this child's (under) actualization of his willing, his ways of experiencing and lived experiencing and the nature of his experiential residues in relation to his modes of learning as inferred from his behaving. For example, for a primary school child who does not have at his disposal a basic understanding of number relationships, it would be very inappropriate to simply confront him with more decimal computations. If the mastery of basic insights is lacking, with each new problem the child will progressively be confronted with his own inability since experience has already "taught" him that these problems are beyond his ability. Encouragement by the teacher that the child must only try harder will have a very minimal benefit if he 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 the course of the lesson will be considered in greater detail).

c) Inadequately ordering contents

In order to guarantee an orderly progression during the presentation of a lesson, the teacher himself must arrange, order and schematize the learning contents for a particular lesson and occasion beforehand. This ordering is the precondition for the child's intellectual grasp of things as an ordered way of experiencing them. The first question that must be asked is about the way the teacher views himself in accordance with the teaching that he has accepted in his own subject and that can be characterized either as "positivistic quantity" or "meaningful unity and coherence".⁽⁸²⁾ According to Basson⁽⁸³⁾ the teacher must plan his teaching such that his 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 the teacher also finds a link with the child's levels of readiness and thinking in his choice of principles of ordering. This structuring is of great importance for the success of a lesson and helps the pupil entertain the correct anticipations. On the contrary,

unexpected deviations and breaches in the anticipated scheme will make the child feel confused and uncertain after which he will focus his attention on things other than the lesson contents.⁽⁸⁵⁾ To this it must be added that the problem of ordering with respect to the way the 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 the teacher continually calls particular pupils to order. Ordering the contents and the corresponding orientation of the child always occur in terms of certain essences that function as fixed points that must be emphasized as such so that they can serve as anchor points or “beacons” for the child’s experiencing. During a lesson that is characterized by problems of order it can be that the most prominent “content” to which the child’s experiencing is paired is the teacher’s regular outbursts that very quickly can be elicited by the children for their own entertainment. In our country this particular problem has not yet actually become so urgent but it is an unsettling reality that 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 the lesson situation is usually a symptom of inadequate teaching: “Then there is no natural and matter-of-fact object on hand by which order can arise [Er is dan geen natuurlijk en zakelijk object voorhanden, waardoor orde kan ontstaan].”

The child anticipates that totally different contents will be introduced to him 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, consequently, 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 the 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 amount of facts that 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 the child through accompanying him, it can hardly be expected that he can succeed in even discovering the connections between what he 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 the child's intellectual becoming thus becomes impeded,⁽⁸⁷⁾ a state of affairs that 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 foundations 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 that cannot be elaborated on here, this state of pseudo-formedness apparently often arises with Black pupils that naturally brings 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 that occurs in these 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 interchanged 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 in order to guarantee orderliness and security in the experience of teaching.⁽⁸⁸⁾ Illuminating in this context is the view of Leach and Raybould⁽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 in order to ensure that their experienced position is ordered with reference to the teacher and the learning material. Also, Du Toit⁽⁹⁰⁾ emphasizes the overarching significance of the principle of structuring with respect to the 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 the didactical situation. A delimited assignment with a definite answer or answers would be more appropriate than a learning aim that includes an exercise in subjective evaluation by the child. Also, the 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 the child in a structured and ordered way.

2.5.2 Principles of actualization

a) Inadequately actualizing the principle of activity

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

The teacher must accompany (guide) the child to actively turn to the lesson contents and if he (the teacher) is the only one who is truly actively involved in the lesson situation, he deprives the child of his freedom to become someone himself.⁽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 the child is often aborted so that his mastery of the adult world remains minimized. Often the lesson event is more characterized as a monologue than a dialogue when the 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 has not had adequate training, or the teacher who, because of his inadequate lesson preparation, must direct his 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 the teacher cannot be aware of the real effects of his own behaviors on the lesson event and he is incapable of evaluating the quality of the child’s participation.

The teacher can possibly assume that by asking questions he activates the pupils to self-activity without being aware that the simple question only makes an appeal to memory in contrast to the complex question that appeals to the activity of thinking and thus minimizing instead of maximizing self-activity (Bergeijk).⁽⁹³⁾ The author has seen classroom groups that 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 that 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, the 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 particular child 'individually', irrespective of how gladly the teacher would want to do so. Consequently, the 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 the teacher, merely by a change in attitude and behavior, by encouragement instead of criticism, can re-accompany the child from discouragement to newly-found effort. However, there is a relative degree of unanimity among all who reflect on the school situation: in a classroom of say forty-five pupils, the 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 that 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 the teacher who thus attunes himself runs the danger that in reality he 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 a number of others up to and including the more contemporary Differentiated Teaching in the comprehensive school system of the R.S.A. However, the actuality still remains that there must be a compromise found between the individuality of the pupils and the objective demands that the learning materials make on him in fundamental ways. If, e.g., a particular child, because of lesser intelligence, is in danger of failing mathematics in grade eight, it might perhaps be to his advantage if the teacher decides to concentrate on strengthening his understanding of those parts of the curriculum that are within his reach than unnecessarily being confused by problems that 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 particular sub-part of a subject, e.g., space-travel, that he is in danger of badly neglecting the rest of the prescribed curriculum. In both of these cases, the task of the teacher should be to accompany each of these children, taking into account their limitations and rights as individuals, so that the child does not become alienated from his own potentialities, love for the subject, or from the teacher as a person.

Various authors⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ indicate that all children do not learn in the same way and that a linking up with the 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-didactical task of guiding the 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 as a result of this (style), while he is reading, the teacher should let him correct his own errors by first sounding out each word letter by letter and after that blending (synthesizing) the letters into the whole word. However, he 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 the teacher must be aware of this style and cannot teach with success if he 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 the pupil's right to teaching that complements his 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, we must teach him the way he 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 the child's self-image.⁽¹⁰²⁾

Smit and Kilian⁽¹⁰³⁾ also point to the danger that the application of the principle of individualization can mainly take into account (measured) intellectual differences instead of qualitative differences. That is, in practice it really occurs that pupils are mainly grouped on the basis of either an IQ score, if available, or an achievement test score. To distinguish among children in his class the teacher, only too often, also resorts to these scores that are available and meaningful (so he presumes) to everyone. To reduce a child's openness to his intellectual potentialities, an accusation of which many parents also are guilty, amounts to overlooking and therefore alienating other potentialities for personal unfolding that are definitely at the child's disposal. Here one thinks of a particular attunement to and caring for fellow humans, a particular verbal talent or a practical skillfulness, a social-critical insight, and so

many other uncultivated talents that 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 on the basis of 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 on the basis of the fundamental pedagogical-anthropological axiom that a human being is a unique individual, the 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]." (Bergerijk).⁽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 that then results in neither the world being fully disclosed nor the person becoming fully unfolded. Here one thinks of the 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 seldom is directly addressed by the teacher, seldom looked in the eye, seldom touched, and in truth is alienated from experiencing and unfolding himself as a unique individual.

c) Inadequately actualizing the principle of socialization

The didactic activity that appears in the 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-didactical climate in the school class seems to be closely dependent on the structure of these interactions that at the same time are co-determinants for the attunement with which the child does his work and the success of his 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 that influences the efforts of both the teacher and the child. Teacher preparation does not give sufficient consideration to handling the school class as a social entity in the sense of an optimal climate as a result of emphasizing a striving for learning results, demanding more from the teacher in terms of the mastery of learning material and the possession of didactic knowledge and skills. It often arises in classroom teaching, and also in a large class where the children who sit on the periphery of the class, thus out of the 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 the teacher in emotional ways, either positive or negative, becomes exclusively involved with a few or even one pupil so that the class as a whole fades away for him. Also, Nel⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ comments that the internal classroom organization can have a detrimental effect on the progress of the 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 really excluded from daily interactions between the teacher and children because of their inconspicuousness in a positive or negative sense. Didactic expertise exists in large part by the grace of the teachers sensitivity to the social dynamic of the class group,⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ a matter that in practice is largely left to chance.

Within the social field of tension in the school class the 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 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 gestures and stories that however can decrease in the course

of time and then they will quit really listening to him since they cannot really be actively involved in the lesson event.⁽¹¹²⁾ Another way in which the teacher can loose contact with the group is by a naïve entry into their little jokes and silliness by which he loses his grip on the class while in reality he is their plaything which is something that can easily occur with the 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 the didactical-pedagogical situation on group atmosphere and achievement that must not leave out of consideration any reflection on the adequate realization of the learning task. With this, an extremely complicated problematic is raised that cannot be approached without taking into account the gender and especially the level of becoming of the pupils. The “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 that mostly are 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 that 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 the child few opportunities to learn to work together, something that is continued in the school. Various authors point to the pedagogical, social and didactical significance that this can have when children help each other with projects and problems in the lesson situation, something that seldom or ever occurs in the contemporary institution. The possibility of not only directly but also indirectly influencing the individual pupil can be enriched by the classroom teacher with forms of interaction—that is, by making use of the dynamic potential of the school class as a group, unhappily an observation that 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⁾ This however is a method that has found little entry into the act of schooling because

of factors such as problems of organization and the individualistic attunement of the teacher.

d) Inadequately actualizing the principle of tempo differentiation

Langeveld⁽¹¹⁶⁾ states that literally everything in school expresses itself in time, as a course that has its beginning in the preschool and for which the child must have an almost limitless amount of plasticity at his disposal in order not to fall back on inadequate methods of learning, lag behind, or even remain stuck in a grade by which he becomes wrenched away for his age group, which is an extremely fundamental life community for him. Genuine learning requires a deepening, reflecting, “sinking in” in order to appropriate it as a possession that has been acquired by humanity through centuries of tedious work. To bring about and maintain a genuine intention to learn, which means that the 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⁾ The child must be given time to pause, he must be able to ascertain how a particular 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.

The teacher must be thoroughly aware that one child needs more time than another for mastering a task since each child learns with his own tempo. For one child the lesson crawls along; for another it passes quickly. For a gifted child, a tempo that is too slow can lead to boredom, daydreaming and consequently weaken his learning intention. Hastiness can lead to confusion and anxiety in the child and does not promote learning. Time is needed especially for insightful learning and the 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 overexpectancy 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 own tempo, that 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 the child who is slow to understand as well as for the child who is already a step ahead of the teacher. In addition, there simply are a certain amount of prescribed contents that must be covered within a quarter, half year or year. The good teacher's approach is, as much as possible, always 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 a number of pre-established 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 the course of the lesson**
 - (i) Inadequately accompanying to a stable sensing during the course of the lesson**

As the name indicates, the accompanying (concomitant) modes of learning arise in all learning and the quality of their self-actualization [by the child] under the guidance/accompaniment of the adult is of the greatest importance during the entire course of learning and the lesson. Langeveld has referred to the significance of "association" in the pedagogical relationship, and the concept also deserves attention from a didactical 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 the classroom" and, according to Blair, Jones and Simpson⁽¹²²⁾, represent the largest part of the hidden agenda or curriculum in the lesson situation. Here one thinks of the teacher who intends to teach literature and science but who, because of his style of teaching and leadership, is actually involved in awaking in the child a lifelong dislike of the subject area of concern. The accompanying modes of learning, in connection with the quality of

the teaching/didactical-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 that lays the foundation for the child's attentive-being-in-the-world as a primordially given possibility for learning and knowing. Hence, the child experiences the contents as well as the teacher's unlocking on the level of sensing and the way in which the (adult's) accompaniment (of the child) to self-actualizing is realized determines the possibility of an elevation in level from an a-conceptual to a more cognitive level of the child's experiencing-as-learning, a task that will contribute equally to the harmony between teaching and learning during each of the phases of the lesson that are discussed below.

This general statement is particularized by Bergeijk⁽¹²⁴⁾, e.g., when he points to the necessity that the teacher must find connections with the child's emotional ways of learning, that 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 the teacher help the child clarify his emotional lived experiences regarding the learning material, homework, his own "can, cannot, supposedly cannot", participation in discussions, in group work, etc. This accepting and clarifying linking up with the child's emotions is also important for the child's lived experiencing that, as possessed experiences, are 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 past experiences as well as anticipated future ones can fill the 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. The 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 "must pull his socks up or else he will

remain stuck again”, by which his current optimal actualization of learning will come to naught beforehand by the simultaneous calling up of extremely negative past experiences and a terrifying and threatening future. With this the child’s self-actualization of willing is influenced, which, in its turn, qualifies the direction, purposefulness and decisiveness of his 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 the teacher in his association with the child in the lesson situation, one that especially requires his personal input and asks for pedagogical dedication grounded in interpersonal contact that cannot be replaced by instrumental devices. This also requires that he have knowledge of the diverse defense “mechanisms” that can be manifested within the framework of the school classroom event as well as an inculcated practical awareness of their possible ways of manifestation that will influence the quality of his didactical-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 the 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 the 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 that sometimes prevails in a “harsh” teacher’s classroom where a continual rustling of shuffling feet is the only sound that indicates that at least the pupils are physically alive and present but perhaps mentally are wandering on far away paths. The other extreme is the 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 that can give rise to a labilized sensing as an inadequate pathic-affective, gnostic-cognitive, and normative (meaning giving) accompaniment of the child's experienced modes of sensing in the lesson situation that will hinder their congealing in his experienced sensing, as a mode of learning, by which the entire self-actualization of his learning, and thus the learning effect, is not able to be [fully] realized, according to Sonnekus.⁽¹²⁵⁾ The eventual consequence is that in his behaving the child presents himself in the lesson situation as a child with learning problems. When this happens, the teacher who "specializes" in sarcastic wisecracks at the expense of pupils who do not meet his demands, and to the great pleasure of the rest of the group, should not be surprised. This also holds for the 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 own humiliation and powerless animosity. Thus the question during each phase of the lesson, separately, and during the entire course of the lesson continually is how does the nature or structure of the child's sensing appear there as also determined by his unique personal situation, his potentialities, the state of his 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 himself as "dumb". It also occurs, not infrequently, that for some reason a child falls in the teacher's disfavor and gets the idea that a particular teacher "picks on him" or even completely ignores him on purpose. It must always be remembered that a child continually gives sense and meaning to all facets of his existence and to the extent that these meanings are favorable or unfavorable, they can stabilize or labilize his sensing.⁽¹²⁶⁾ Even when such labilizing is attributable to factors over which the teacher has no direct control, nonetheless, he should not feel exempt from the responsibility of at least knowing about such circumstances in the child's situation since in his ignorance, by a lack of understanding or being unsympathetic he almost necessarily can contribute to the child's problems. However, when a child's learning is blocked because of a conflict, disharmony or alienation in the relationship with the teacher himself, such a

teacher is undoubtedly guilty of the serious accusation of pedagogical-didactical neglect.

(ii) Inadequate accompaniment to directed attending during the course of the lesson

The world attracts and entices the child to participate but of even greater pedagogical importance is voluntary, selective attending, meaning that the child turns himself to a world that he chooses. The 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 that results in a learning effect is possible. However, a child will not remain attentively concerned with the learning content if he is not accompanied to a stable and ordered experientially meaningful sensing in his first concern with it (also see previous section). From many possible examples one can mention a lesson that begins with the teacher returning test results, something that occurs fairly 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 really doubtful that the teacher can expect the child to be motivated to attend if he does not provide the necessary pedagogical and didactical intervention and support by, e.g., encouraging him and clarifying problems for him and deliberately proceeds with the presentation of the lesson. To attend, a child must cognitively-experientially unlock himself to the contents as his learning response to the adult's unlocking reality for him. 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 mention of an irrelevant learning intention and incidental learning.⁽¹²⁹⁾ Inadequate attending in a lesson situation not only proclaims a child as stuck in the didactical-pedagogical situation but must also always be seen as an attenuated realization of himself as Dasein, in the sense that he answers inadequately to his call to being as a human being.⁽¹³⁰⁾ In summary, this means that the child himself inadequately realizes his 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 during each phase of the course of the lesson of the child's self-actualization of his wanting to attend by means of the affective, cognitive and normative accompaniment of the teacher. When the 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 that continually wander to the window, or a pre-occupation with her necklace, a button on her dress or a wooden ruler, it can hardly be expected that he will pay attention, especially in the case of a primary school pupil. There are also a number of ways in which gnostic-cognitive accompaniment can lie shipwrecked. Think of the teacher, who because of inadequate lesson preparation, must continually interrupt his pronouncements in order to refer to the textbook; the history of art lesson that 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 the teacher continually turns his 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 has little confidence in himself, continually ignores unsatisfactory achievement or behavior or reports it to the child's parents; the 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 the teacher is experienced as labile, the leap to becoming independent cannot occur and the child will stagnate with an excessively attentive disposition. Such a child will show a deficiency in his self-becoming and cannot take the leap to distanced, gnostic-cognitive tasks and remains caught in naïve-pathic-affective experiences by which he cannot acquire an adequate grasp of the formal systems of the 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.

In order to accompany a child to a “can-and-will-learn” via a stable attending, the 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 is also not able to unlock reality in such a way that his subject didactic activity [subject matter teaching], as cognitive accompaniment, doesn’t invite or even compel the child to himself-want-to-attend. Thus, if during each phase of the lesson the teacher does not take into account childlike ways of attending, he 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. In reality 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 that 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 the child with the aim of helping him 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 experiencing of the hierarchy of congealed possessed

experiences of the learning contents during each phase of the lesson separately as well as during the entire course of the lesson when the 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 the total course of a lesson hangs in the balance on this phase. This task is especially important with respect to children who already 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 the teacher from the beginning has labilizing effects on sensing and attending on the basis of which the child does not feel ready to self-actualize the cognitive modes of learning that will form the basis of this lesson phase.

Physically and psychically children in a class differ from each other and all the more so in their giving sense and meaning as a foundation for each one's world relationship as a historically diverse being, a factor that makes it extremely difficult for a teacher to find an actual point of contact with each child's experiential world, and even more so when there is mention of an impoverished or heterogeneous cultural background. For example, here one thinks of schools in fastly developing industrial and port areas in 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 of the degrees of differences between. The danger is that these children, who find themselves as “visitors” in the lesson situation, because of a lack in real points of contact are continually estranged further from the reality offered and from their own potentialities. The child presents himself in the lesson situation with his unique historicity of learning successes and failures by which the *totality* of his hierarchy of quantitative and qualitative possessed experiences of his previous learning and lifeworld situations will influence the quality and level of his entry [into the lesson situation]. “The child’s performance level will depend on the levels of all the resources on which he can draw” (Leach and Raybould).⁽¹³⁴⁾ The possible deficiencies as well as strengths in the child’s possessed experiences of past lived experiences must first be carefully gauged and supplemented. Especially with respect to the 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 the teacher appeals to the children’s memory with a few questions about contents previously dealt with if he does not also explicitly clarify what the connection is between these [possessed] contents and the new learning material. Indeed, it also is important that the teacher not evoke irrelevant or unrelated foreknowledge because this can quickly lead to confusion. Linking up with the everyday lifeworld of the child continues to be necessary.⁽¹³⁶⁾ Finally, actualizing foreknowledge implies not only intellectual knowledge but all of the positive and negative lived experiences that have been paired with the previous learning situation and by which the 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 completely 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. The 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 the teacher does not purposefully intervene or support the 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 accompanies the child to a re-defining, 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 the child's sensing experiences that simultaneously are a seeking of sense on a pathic level, by stating the lesson problem, the teacher must accompany the child to a lived experiencing of wonder as a precognitive attunement that is a precondition for wanting-to-know. However, Langeveld⁽¹³⁷⁾ refers to the possibility of "teaching problems" on the level of inadequate teacher preparation that result in the teacher himself not lived experiencing the problematic of the content affectively as well as cognitively, that because of the deluge of learning material he has not had the opportunity to have really acquired an attunement that the learning material contains and digest its unique spirit. Insightful learning means "Fragenlehren".⁽¹³⁸⁾ The important thing is that the teacher's question must give rise to questions in the child himself, and the precondition is that the questions must link up with the 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, the child must lived experience the problem as a *meaningful problem-for-me*: "If the 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 the 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 that he already possesses will be important here. If the learning contents already have a negative valence for the child,⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ it is not likely that he will encounter the resistance that he initially experienced in his 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 the teacher as an accompanier, and all the more so when he has to contend with large groups of children and the deluge of learning material.⁽¹⁴¹⁾ The teacher can then take his refuge in “the panic-question” that gives rise to *pseudo-questions* from the child. Without a genuine questioning attitude, the 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 fingers since they eagerly want to meet the 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 the teacher is unable to accompany the child to a relaxed thinking. Inner unrest, tension and nervousness because of the tense, inconsistent, unsympathetic or hurried actions of the 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 cognitive functioning the *child with learning problems* will more quickly lived experience a problem situation as one of *tension* that 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 own lived experienced inabilities with all of 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 the child in school can readily lead to tenseness that can result in maneuvers of escape, rigidity and even to a paralysis of learning.⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ With a good lesson beginning, the teacher’s

task is to build the child's confidence from the calm that he projects.

There must be vigilance against the statement of the problem too directly confronting the child with his deficiencies in learning and knowledge. An emotionally anticipated "unable-to-solve" because of a lived experiencing of "too-difficult-for-me" leads to the child closing himself 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 in the course of the lesson there will be little evidence of a "fruitful moment".⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ However, it is similarly harmful if the teacher continually solves the problem for the child because in doing so he deprives him of the opportunity to arrive at a solution himself. Since during this phase of the lesson an appeal especially is made to the child's creative and original independent potentialities of thinking, here he must be given the necessary time. In practice it too often happens that the teacher too easily assumes that only one or a few children in his 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 without involvement. Then the problems becomes known as a "problem-for-others" instead of a "problem-for-me" by which, in reality, the child sits in the classroom as estranged, as an "absent presence".

The child with learning problems already carries the burden of disturbances in his 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 the child's *anxiety leads to the problems becoming distorted* and propel him 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. The child must be supported in such a way that he is able to distance himself from the problem, view it from all angles and separate himself from the familiar schemes of thinking. This task, e.g., can only be accomplished haphazardly by the teacher who moves up and down between the rows of seats with the aim of

letting the other children tremble in fear when he quickly turns and out of the blue points with his 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 and receptiveness of the problematic situation, an inner freedom and calm that 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 the child. The child with learning difficulties is then progressively characterized by task shyness, indifference to learning and he shows a blunted attunement to learning or even an aversion to it,⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ that is indicative of the way in which his negative lived experiences of learning already have impaired the quality of his *willingness-to-solve-problems*. The teacher who berates a truly learning handicapped child for his “laziness” and lack of interest and urges him to “pull his socks up before it is too late”, etc. perhaps will do nothing more than contribute to his future learning problems by treating them with even greater reserve or aversion. Generally such a child lived experiences *himself as a problem for the teacher* and as a visitor and as a permanent alien in a landscape in the midst of others for whom the problems really lie on a familiar terrain. Finally, genuine, intentional learning, especially insightful learning, can be damaged by too much pressure to achieve that can be related to extrinsic motivations such as rewards and punishments and by sporadic motivation. The 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 the child *feels ready to open himself cognitively and proceed to self-actualize the distanced,*

cognitive modes of learning. The implication of this is that the teacher who boasts that she has never experienced a problem of order in 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), that (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 that disturbs the continuity in the course of 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. A number of 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 that can inhibit the 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 the teacher, even if he is able to reduce the learning contents to their essentials, cannot succeed in allowing these essences to appear for the child as cardinal points in his experience of them. Obviously, this will be impossible if he does not use language and concepts that the child understands. Often, in practice, a lesson is merely the continuation of the exposition of what was not completed in a previous lesson. He takes wrong paths that have nothing to do with the essences and confuses and bewilders the 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 course of lesson learning will become negated.

If a child does not understand something he gives “the meaning of meaninglessness” to it. Then, all meaning that the “something” has for him is foreign and threatening⁽¹⁵³⁾ and he will lived experience the state of his 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 course of the lesson to failure since the teacher will then not be able to *evaluate and check* the harmony (i.e., disharmony) between the course of teaching and the course of learning. Then he will have difficulty justifying his accompaniment of the child to full-fledged readiness, on the basis 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 the child must *have the opportunity to*

become calm and relaxed. If the child feels hurried he becomes restless and this sometimes makes his 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. The teacher who explains more than the child can assimilate disturbs this necessary calm and delivers a severe blow to his readiness to learn. The *stabilizing importance of adequate exemplifying* by the teacher, as supporting the 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 the modern family where both parents work.⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ Vrey⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ mentions the deluge of learning material as a factor that allows this extremely important lesson phase of establishing or consolidating insights to miscarry in practice. The consequence of an overambitious curriculum might be that the time is flatly missing for sufficiently practicing to insight under the accompaniment of the teacher so that the refuge necessary becomes an overburdening of the child with homework that is really an “overflow” from class work. Consequently, 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 the child, not to mention the affective alienation between parent and child that 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 *the child with learning problems* develops a particular coping strategy for fleeing from or being superficially involved with the problem in his 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 the [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 the child’s potentiality can be an indication to the teacher of deficient control (assessment) of the 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 (assessment). With respect to the child with learning difficulties the 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 willing, knowing, but in particular, his lived experiencing of his willed experiencing. In particular, the teacher who wants to insure that he does not contribute to learning problems by inadequate accompaniment must see to it that the child's stable affective lived experiences are paired with cognitive 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 the learning child, that leads back to applied psychological theories of learning such as the psychology of memory, conditioning in the form of drill work or trial-and-error, Gestalt psychology, the psychology of thought⁽¹⁵⁹⁾, etc. can be the basis for adequately accompanying the child to an active attitude on a conceptual level during this phase of the lesson, that 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 the child the emphasis can fall so much on the pathically lived experienced rhythm of "singing together" that he 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 need to mention an understanding of number or multiplication as an arithmetic operation. It can also happen, when the teacher does not succeed in unlocking the *value* of automatic mastery in a meaningful way for the child, that drill work because of boredom, frustration or rebelliousness, resistance by the 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 the child's learning potentialities that result in meaningful possessed experiences. The integration of the newly learned contents with the already existing possessed knowledge is absolutely necessary, but something that 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 the child learns out of fear of disapproval from the adult or fear of failing. The importance of this lesson phase is that *the child is given the opportunity to show that he will, can and ought to be someone himself* and to this end the teacher must take the greatest care by, e.g., seeing that the assignments or exercises are not beyond the child's abilities, by which he then can lived experience feelings of impotence, being inferior and threat that will force the course of 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, the 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 the child's learning, e.g., when the teacher allows a child to read or interpret and sit and stare at his own book instead of letting him lived experience that he is with him, that his attention is directed to him.⁽¹⁶³⁾ Equally unfavorable is that sort of accompaniment that in this lesson phase is *conspicuously disturbing*. Now the child must be able to see and experience that what he has learned is applicable and the teacher must be able to identify and correct the origins of and errors in thinking underlying incorrect methods. The same error made by a large number of pupils is an indication of the quality of the 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 that succeeded in nothing more than to create total confusion in the children,

The traditional oral practice is not only time consuming, it can create a waiting attitude by the child who sits and waits instead of himself actively doing something. Especially the style of involvement with the learning material by the child with learning problems points to a disturbed contact that 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. The 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 that he 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 in reality could not read. They were both already older than sixteen years of age 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, basically involves an investigation and promotion of the teaching and learning effects. Essentially this involves evaluating the degree of meaningful, self-actualized lived experiencing of the learning content. Evaluating the child's work with an eye to his progress and promoting meaning implies that *both teacher and child are called to be accountable for the quality of their normative participation in the lesson event*. The meaning of didactic evaluation cannot be sought outside of the pedagogical and this implies that for the child light can be thrown on problems that he might experience in his being-on-the-way to adulthood, while the teacher is given the opportunity to examine the didactic-pedagogic accountability and purposefulness of his intervention with the child. However, to penalize the 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 the teaching situation, among which also is awarding points by the injudicious teacher.

It is especially this lesson phase that brings about the fruitful moment for *intercepting learning problems* of the child, provided the teacher knows how to make use of it. He must be thoroughly aware that evaluating the learning effect in reality implicitly means *evaluating the quality of his teaching* and also be prepared to identify and correct any teaching problems that 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 progresses in the direction of an aim, his initiative to exert additional effort is nullified. If his progression is not evaluated regularly, the child cannot have an understanding of his own status and correspondingly he can stagnate in his learning.⁽¹⁶⁸⁾ Vrey⁽¹⁶⁹⁾ stresses the importance of the *lived experience of success* by a child that will influence his self-confidence and motivation with which future situations will be entered and he refers to various empirical investigations that 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 that must be handled with the greatest didactical-pedagogical tact, and especially with a child who is already insecure because of problems. The planning of evaluating with a focus on the child lived experiencing successful effort with learning problems is one of the most important means available to the teacher for also accompanying these children to learn meaningfully and adequately. This task is impossible to realize if the teacher is not at all times focused on *continuously evaluating* both the course of the lesson and learning during each of the lesson phases. Such uninterrupted evaluating is the only guarantee for intercepting potentially disharmonious moments before really 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 the teacher will the child be ready to ask questions regarding his difficulties and errors. Destructive criticism, admonitions and spankings for poor achievements, errors, etc. can only result in restraining the child's efforts in future learning situations by creating a sphere of discouragement. The question must also be asked if the child with learning handicaps always in the midst of making achievements on examinations absolute, making comparisons, etc., as boundary situated, as a child in existential distress and if he, 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 in reality 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 the child, the child with "learning problems" constitutes an unavoidable percentage of the class- and school-population. Subjective and biased evaluation of the child's achievement and his person by the teacher is a danger that is always present here. Finally, it still 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 the

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 the child-in-education as a total event of learning and becoming. With this the teacher is also confronted with a meaning-altering task in order to support the child who learns and becomes inadequately as an attenuated way of becoming (being) adult, to an adequate elevation in level in his entire psychic life on his way to the aim of educating (adulthood).

3. SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSION

In the past the teacher seldom viewed the child with learning problems as part of his 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 *orthodidactical-orthopedagogical 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 real contribution should be made to both the self-image and the status of the teacher. It is increasingly felt that a teacher now must quickly refer each “problem child” to a “specialist” and that he 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 orthopedagogical-orthodidactical training.

The teacher’s accompaniment of the 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 modes of learning via actualizing his 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 the child’s unique hierarchy of possessed experiences resulting from his 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 the child into a rigid ‘learning pattern’”. Especially in light of the negativity, resistance and lability that 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 the teaching effect that 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 the 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 that must be focused on *reestablishing harmony in the child’s total pedagogical and didactical-pedagogical situatedness*, that is only possible on the basis of 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 particular contents or subject areas. That today this task can no longer be viewed as being outside of the normal field of work of a teacher has been convincingly indicated by Van Niekerk⁽¹⁷⁴⁾ in a recent publication since there are a number of ways and means at the teacher’s disposal to make realizable a thorough exploration of the child’s personal-actualization-in-education. With respect to a child where there is a gap between his achieved learning and becoming adult and his pedagogically achievable level, the teacher is strongly addressed to fulfill his task of *continuously exploring and evaluating each pupil*.⁽¹⁷⁵⁾

For the teacher as an accompanier in the 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 light of his potentialities, will emerge in a new form and his tension will proceed to effort.”

If the teacher, within the normal course of his 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 can be helped by a trained orthopedagogue-orthodidactician) by approaching him with a greater degree of sympathetic understanding, he undoubtedly is guilty of contributing to his existential and pedagogical alienation. The consequence of this necessarily must be the glossing over, instead of the thriving, of the child's potentialities by which his being-at-home in the world into which he was thrown becomes threatened, his dialogue with reality and his educators is obscured and he loses his way to reaching his 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 orthodidactiek 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:** <http://www.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:** <http://www.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 gedragsmoeilijkheden*, 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: <http://www.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:** <http://www.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:**
<http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/80>
45. PERQUIN, N.: *Pedagogiese psichologie*, 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: <http://www.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: <http://www.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: <http://www.georgeyonge.net/node/95>
84. See: VAN DER STOEP, F. (Ed.): *Die lesstruktuur*, p. 91.
English translation: <http://www.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 onderwyspraktik*, 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.