**Master's Thesis of Arts**

# A Non-technical Dimension of the Pedagogical Role of Teachers: Based on Max van Manen's Phenomenological Pedagogy

**February 2021**

**Foundations of Education Major**

**Graduate School**

**Seoul National University**

**Stella Nikiko ROOSTANTO**

# A Non-technical Dimension of the Pedagogical Role of Teachers: Based on Max van Manen's Phenomenological Pedagogy

**Thesis Adviser Duck-Joo, KWAK**

**Submitting a Master's Thesis of Arts**

**February 2021**

**Foundations of Education Major**
**Graduate School**
**Seoul National University**

**Stella Nikiko ROOSTANTO**

**Confirming the Master's thesis written by**
**Stella Nikiko ROOSTANTO**

**February 2021**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Chair | Kyung-Hee SO | (seal) |
| Vice Chair | Sung-Sang YOO | (seal) |
| Examiner | Duck-Joo KWAK | (seal) |

[3] Those who are wise will shine like the brightness of the heavens, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars for ever and ever.

Daniel 12:3 (NIV)

[3] Children are a heritage from the Lord, offspring a reward from him. [4] Like arrows in the hands of a warrior are children born in one's youth. [5] Blessed is the man whose quiver is full of them. They will not be put to shame when they contend with their opponents in court.

Psalm 127:3-5 (NIV)

[10] Sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; poor, yet making many rich; having nothing, and yet possessing everything.

2 Corinthians 6:10 (NIV)

I pray that through this thesis many will be reminded that children—all children—are a blessing from God. I will continue to pray ceaselessly that we may not lose hope and continue to fight for our children. May God grant and sustain the honor and joy of bringing up the children God has placed in our lives.

## ABSTRACT

# A Non-technical Dimension of the Pedagogical Role of Teachers: Based on Max van Manen's Phenomenological Pedagogy

**Stella Nikiko Roostanto**

Major Advisor: Duck-Joo KWAK, Ph.D

Department of Education

The Graduate School

Seoul National University

Compared to their previous generations, children and young people today live in a severely fractured world full of changes, conflicts, plurality, contradictions of values, beliefs, and living conditions that make their living experiences contingent. In this study, an attempt was made to understand and explore the role of adults in a child's growth and personhood formation at present. Since the reality of these changes have also caused the erosion of parental involvement in a child's life, this study sought to identify the roles of teachers as pedagogical adults acting in *in loco parentis* to encounter and fulfill the needs of the younger generation in their

complex lived present. This study examined the works of Max van Manen, a Dutch-born Canadian scholar who specializes in phenomenological research methods and pedagogy.

The aims of this thesis are three-fold. The first aim is to examine the characterization of the phenomenological pedagogy to which Max van Manen subscribes. Works about phenomenological pedagogy were studied because it is critical to our understanding of Max van Manen's ideas. Next, the second aim of this thesis is to examine the common role with respect to children shared by teachers and parents as adults, according to Max van Manen. Third, this study aims to investigate the characteristics of 'pedagogical' teachers.

The conclusion of this study found that possessing pedagogical hope, pedagogical tact, and pedagogical thoughtfulness is essential to the forming of a pedagogical teacher. Moreover, this study also found that the concept of Max van Manen's pedagogical relationship can uniquely contribute to the creation of an interactive and responsive pedagogy of field-based teacher education that is based on thoughtfulness and tact as the conceptual frameworks.

**Keyword:** Max van Manen, Pedagogical Relationship, Phenomenological Pedagogy, Pedagogical Tact, Pedagogical Thoughtfulness, Pedagogical Adult, Teacher Education

**Student Number:** 2017-23964

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# I. Introduction

## 1. Background & Literature Review

Intergenerational relations have always been the focus of education, while the bringing up of young people has always been a matter of philosophical debate. Regardless of whether education is viewed as being essentially adult-centered or child-centered, the formation of the new generations has always been at the core of educational philosophy from the classical era, the Enlightenment to modern times. For Plato, who regarded the topic of education in *The Republic* as an integral and vital part of the wider subject of the well-being of human society, the goal was to align educational formation with the demands of his ideal adult society, the Republic. For Kant, the cosmopolitanized human creation was the goal of education. while for Dewey, education served the aim of a democratic society. For Rousseau, the formation of educated adults who freely recognize their common interests and, based on that recognition, voluntarily comply with the general will of the community and take part in a common body politic in the future (Cohen, 2010) is the goal of education. For Arendt, education was a positive endeavor, the aim of which is to introduce the old world to the new generation. All of these ideas are different, yet they all agree that education concerns the transition from childhood to adulthood and from ignorance to ethical and moral maturity in one way or the other. The history of educational ideas demonstrates that the

educational formation of young people assisted by adults is closely related with the formation of an ideal society and thus with political thought.

**New Progressivism in Education and the Commodification of Education**

However, we are now living in an exceedingly post-modern culture and individualist world where adults' role in a child's growth and personhood formation is considered to be less significant than the protection of the individual child's own interests. We reside in a culture where an adult is advised to not attempt to influence or educate the child but rather to respect the rights of the child, tolerate the child's feelings, and to willingly and actively learn from the child's behavior. This shift is also reflected within the changed role of teachers, in which currently teachers are considered to be merely facilitators for their students' learning rather than being the students' leaders and role models. All of this shift towards a child-centered culture is due to the development of two radically different ideological currents that have heavily influenced educational policy and practice since the mid-1900s.

On the one hand, there is the perspective of new progressivism, which is what Darling and Nordenbo (2003) calls "'progressivism in a trivial sense." In this sense, progressivism does not describe a coherent school of thought that is derived from (or loyal to) any particular progressivist thinker that has proven very crucial in modern education policy and practice. But rather, progressivism in this sense

indicates a group of commonly accepted educational procedurals and tenets, including the ambition "to consider the child's nature, to care for learner-centeredness, to adapt the lessons to the child's "natural" motivation, to promote children's personal growth and creativity, demands that belong today to the standard equipment of modern teacher's vocabulary and practice" (p. 305). Within this turn towards child-centered education and parenting, the adult (teacher and parent) authority itself also becomes closely questioned. William H. Kitchen argues in his book *Authority and the Teacher* about contemporary progressive education that "there is no place for any form of authority and no belief in what authority represents" (2014, p. 42). The destabilization of adult figures' natural authority means that the older generation is no longer held liable for introducing the world to the new generation. Rather, children are to discover the world themselves.

At the same time, since the 1960s, educational discourse has been influenced by economic concepts and ideals. In this regard, education is mostly considered as a method for accomplishing economic values like measurability, effectiveness, competition, maximization of human capital, and accountability. Though these two dominant trends have very different ideological foundations — progressivism promotes a common understanding of education and human well-being, while economic logic presumes a more individualistic understanding of the same— unexpectedly, there are some ways in which they converge. As an example,

despite the clear tension between progressive ideals and the economization of education, the progressive ideal of student-centeredness seems suited to the economic idea of the student as a consumer. Indeed, these two very different yet connected currents within the contemporary world have called adult authority into question and caused the shift toward the child-centered culture we have now. We have seen previously that education is unavoidably bound up with the formation and upbringing through intergenerational relation. Now I would like to explore how this notion of education as formation is related to the influential modern understanding of education as primarily geared toward 'supporting or facilitating learning' (Biesta, 2005, p.55).

Gert Biesta (2005) in his work *Against Learning: Reclaiming a Language for Education in an Age of Learning,* argues that the growing support for the notion of teacher as facilitator signifies the erosion of adult authority in education that occurs and aligns with the overall commodification of education that is resulted from the erosion of the traditional welfare state. He argues that "the relationship between governments and citizens has in many cases changed into a relationship between the state as provider of public services and taxpayers as consumers of these services…as a result, parents and students are also maneuvered into an economic relationship—one in which they are the consumers of the provision called 'education' (p. 58). Biesta's discussion of the 'learnification[1]' of education

[1]Learnification of education refers to "the tendency to replace a language of education with a

also shows how education has shifted its focus from being an intergenerational exchange aimed at the formation of those to be educated, to an economic exchange. The focus of education as an economic change is placed on the providers and consumers of educational services rather than on the transformational potential of the educational experience itself (p.58).

However, the problem with the tendency to describe education in terms of an economic transaction is that it presupposes a relationship in which the "consumer/student is assumed to already know what their needs are and that they know what they want" (Biesta, 2005, p.58). Yet this is a problem because this assumption contradicts the point that "a major reason for engaging in education is precisely to find out what it is that one actually needs—a process in which educational professionals plays a crucial role because a major part of their expertise lies precisely there" (Biesta, 2005, p. 70). As a consequence, by depriving the teacher of her or his professionalism, this supplier-consumer model also fundamentally weakens the authority of the teacher. Yet professionalism, in this regard, builds upon a base of public on which teachers are entrusted to make use of their judgment to depict different authoritative ideas about human flourishing. As John White, in his essay entitled "*Education, the Market, and the nature of Personal Being* (2002)*,"* argues that, "the individual on his or her own

language that only talks about education in terms of meaning…the transformation of an educational vocabulary into a language of learning" which has dominated educational circles for the past two decades (Biesta, 2005, p. 14)

is not the final authority on what counts as his or her flourishing." He continues to say that "there is a centuries-long continuous tradition of thought about this topic to guide us" (p. 452). Hence, though at a glance the supplier-consumer model seems to empower students by basing education on the student-consumer's individual desires and choices, these choices are limited because they are kept within the bounds of the natural limitation of the student's personal experience. Accordingly, in order to empower students and expand their perspectives about the world, we need to go back to the notion of education as formation where the teachers are demanded to be responsible for introducing the student to the world about which they do not know much.

Moreover, there is another problem with the description of education in terms of economic transaction where educators are to facilitate and fulfill the wants of the student-consumer. The suggestion for teachers to facilitate instead of directing education relies on the assumption that since the students are autonomous beings who are already able to make choices independently from adult authority, teachers are to treat their students as their equals. However, although I believe that even if someday our children and young people (who are living in a society that is currently undergoing radical changes) are to be given the chance to make their own autonomous life choices, the provision of a conservative environment

consisting of "security, stability, direction, support[2]" where a child can grow before they go out to the world needs to come first in priority.

**The Significance of a Secure and Protected Environment to a Child's Growth**

Philosopher Hannah Arendt also spoke about the significance of a secure and protected environment to a child's growth. While talking about the concept of natality in her work, *The Human Condition* (2013), Arendt argues that the birth of every individual is a promise of a new beginning. Her idea about children is that they are new beings and strangers in the world that are born with the capability to grow into people of action and speech (HK, 182). Yet, she also emphasizes that in order for children to be revolutionary and creative and for them to change and renew the *public realm* or the world, they have to first receive protection and guidance from the adults in the *private realms*. Hannah Arendt argues in *The Crisis in Education* that "having claim on the public world, that is, a right to see and be seen in it, to speak and be heard," (184) is the highest form of liberation that a person can have. Yet, this kind of liberation is not available to children, who are not yet full-grown adults, because they are still at a phase of life where their life preservation and growth come first. Hannah Arendt holds that whenever human life is consistently exposed to the world without the protection of privacy and security "its vital quality is destroyed" (HC, 184).

[2] (Van Manen, 2016, 54)

When a child is first born, the child is born with a liveness that needs to be protected so that the world will not overrun or destroy its newness. Because the child must be secured against the world, the child's traditional place is in the family, "whose adult members daily return back from the outside world and withdraw into the security of private life within four walls. These four walls, within which people's private family life is lived, constitute a shield against the public aspect of the world. They enclose a secure place, without which no living thing can thrive." (HC, 183). Arendt furthers argues that there are problems arising from the idea of the autonomous child and the immature separation of the world of childhood from the world of adulthood. As a result of this, without the guidance of adults, children are not only left to the tyranny of their own group, they are also not sheltered from popular opinion. Eventually, Arendt claims that seeing children as already political beings who are naturally equipped for the public world of politics robs them of their chances of actually forming their own political future[3].

[3] d'Entreves, M, P. (2019) points out that "political being according to Hannah Arendt means people with freedom and plurality, which are two central features of action. Freedom to Arendt means the capacity to begin, to start something new, to do the unexpected, with which all human beings are endowed by virtue of being born. Action as the realization of freedom is therefore rooted in *natality*, in the fact that each birth represents a new beginning and the introduction of novelty in the world. And by the virtue of plurality, each of us is capable of acting and relating to others in ways that are unique and distinctive, and in so doing of contributing to a network of actions and relationships that is infinitely complex and unpredictable."

Thus, to sum up Arendt's argument, the purpose of education should be to provide a safe and private realm (with caring and responsible adults in it) in which children can undergo the preparation and formation for the public world.

A Dutch-born Canadian scholar, Max van Manen, also holds in his work *the Tact of Teaching* that "this inward-directed emotional climate of intimacy sponsors outgoing interests, curiosity, risk and independence in the child". He continues to mention that "especially because when the children experience the benefits of intimacy and caring, they can seek and assert their own growing identity" (199b1, p. 34). The discussion on the necessity of a secure and protected environment filled with intimacy and caring that will benefits a child's growth brings us back to the notion of education as formation. Education in this sense requires adults to be present and available to guide the child. Education in this sense holds responsible the teacher/adult as a representative of the world with the authority to impart knowledge so that the new generation can come to know the world into which they have been born in order to renew it. Thus, education as formation calls for a teacher who is competent and willing to assume responsibility for the educational transition from childhood to adulthood. This means the adult needs to be equipped to meet this call. Consequently, this notion of education as formation through intergenerational relations makes one wonder about a twofold question about the contemporary situation: are children receiving the care from the older generation that they need to grow? And is the older generation equipped enough

with whatever they need to encounter and fulfill the needs of the young generation in their complex lived present?

Every child deserves and needs to have adults who can carry the primary responsibility for the child's wellbeing and the child's development. And the task of caring for children used to belong to the parents, as a young child usually stands in a very close relation to one or both parents. Nonetheless, families have changed over the past years, and due to these changes in our world, modern families find it increasingly difficult to meet the demands of intimacy and moral responsibility that they owe to their children. Consequently, in times of eroding parental and family influence, this task to care for children has been entrusted (if not shifted) into the hands of professional educators and schools.

**The Conventional Direction of Teacher Education Focused on the Technical Realm**

Van Manen holds that "the modern society requires that professional educators develop a caring school environment…" and that the "institution of the school needs to orient itself to the norms of parenting that parents themselves seem to have forgotten as it were" (van Manen, 1991b, p. 6). However, currently the purpose of schooling has been increasingly defined in terms of the technical aspect. For example, in the last few decades schooling's purpose has been that of the "effective production of a predetermined output that is often measured in terms of

exam scores" (Biesta, 2002, p. 174) and current approaches to teaching and schooling tend to be based on models[4] and agendas that do not necessarily reflect the experiential priorities of classroom life. Consequently, just like parents, it seems that the school has not been able to fulfill the role to care for children in a way that may contribute to their (the children's) formation too. Therefore it seems like the answer to the first part of the twofold question of whether children are receiving the care they need to grow from the older generation is a no. Moving on to the next part of the question, is the older generation equipped enough with what they need to encounter and fulfill the needs of the young generation in their complex lived present?

For adults working in the education field, the question regarding "am-I-equipped enough?" may be interpreted as a question of whether one is equipped enough to be a real teacher, to be a good teacher. Though there are not exact answers to the question of how one can become a real teacher, schools throughout the world nevertheless have been trying to improve the quality of their teachers. Yet, due to the contemporary policy perspectives and discourses of education that emphasize

[4] As Van Manen writes in his 2002 work, the teaching and schooling approach of our age "are described in terms of business, leadership, industrial, market, technology, and political models that have corporatist, managerialist, productionist, consumerist, technocratic, and political agendas, the key items of these agendas are indicated with buzz-words such as 'cost effectiveness', 'performance evaluation', 'achievement level' ' instructional productivity', and 'user satisfaction'. The point is that these orientations, discourses, and perspectives do not adequately reflect the ways that teachers and students experience the pedagogical cares and daily tasks of teaching" (p. 135).

measurable (quantifiable) outcomes and accountability, the direction of teacher development is mainly aimed to increase the educator's professional knowing and understanding about the subject matter they are teaching and to increase their teaching practice quality. A term called PCK or pedagogical content knowledge that gained momentum in U. S. literature since 1986 is one example.

However, although knowledge about subject matter and general teaching practices are definitely skills and knowledge that modern teachers need to have, we have to remind ourselves that many children whom teachers meet at school no longer come from a normal and protected environment. Political migration, economic centralization, increasing unemployment, highly competitive and ever-changing organizational changes in society and work affect families, kindergarten, educational institutions like schools and universities, social welfare programs, and cultures. All of these diverse backgrounds and widely varying experiences are contexts for the lives of many children modern teachers are encountering here presently. All of these changes in human and cultural life also means it is harder to find caring and sheltered pedagogical spaces where children can find supportive and protective areas in which to live, play, explore, learn and develop. Yet, when children are lacking something fundamental which nobody is providing them, how can they fruitfully accomplish academic goals that are demanded of them? How can they fully benefit from a teacher who possesses excellent mastery of subject

matter at school when they feel unloved, uncertain, doubtful, tense and isolated all the time?

Tone Saevi (2017) states that "the structural changes of human and cultural life in the world contest the common meaning of humanity and democracy and revive critical questions of how to possibly judge and incite alternative thinking and acting in the present situation in education. Yet, at present:

> The "sole focus on knowledge and (lifelong) learning is making education the strategic rotation of society with issues of humanity in the purpose and aims of education coming under severe pressure. This critical situation calls for a radical rethinking of educational means and aims, and actualizes a renewed interest in how to encounter the young generation in the complexity in their lived present, rather in their potential to increase the outcomes of education (p. 1790).

All of this means that more knowledge no longer represents the primary answer to our educational problem. Moreover, this also means that the aims and goals of teacher training—the mastery of subject master knowledge and the improvement of teaching skills—should no longer remain the way they are. If training teachers to be competent in these technical areas is one of the primary goals that most schools are aiming as part of their teacher training, then it seems like the answer to the next part of the twofold question that was mentioned in the previous part of this paper—the question of whether the older generation (which includes teachers) is equipped enough with whatever they need to encounter and fulfill the needs of the young generation in their complex lived present? —is probably a no. Then

what should be the kind of task teachers in their everyday preoccupations need to pay attention to, in order to become the good teachers that their students need?

I think providing safety and security for the developing children (which can help children extend themselves within their educational environment) should be the priority of education. Hence, since a caring relationship with adults (which is part of a non-technical aspect of education) is what give children the "surety, certainty, courage" to experiment with the world (van Manen, 1991b, p. 57), I would like to argue that a teacher's sole focus cannot just remain that of building knowledge and lifelong learning, but rather the pedagogical relationship with the student. In the introduction to the journal *Teaching and Teacher Education 18 (2002),* van Manen writes that the focus of teachers tends to be the pedagogical, which is "*the complexity of relational, personal, moral, emotional, aspects of teachers everyday acting with children or young people they teach*" (p. 135). He also argues that although new teachers are usually prepared to enter classrooms with countless learning and student management strategies, not to mention preservice and continual in-service practice in diverse new technical skills that educational research has shown to be effective, what the research does not make visible, but teacher experience soon acknowledges, is that, "teaching is much more than the dutiful execution of technical acts" (van Manen, 1984, p. 157). Many people who are involved in education would agree that good teaching is more than technical skill and performance, and van Manen builds upon this notion by arguing for the

importance of the nontechnical aspects of teaching. By the nontechnical he means "those aspects of teaching where the issue is not skill-based strategies but the necessity for pedagogic tactfulness or the sensitivity or sensitiveness to a situation that enables me to do pedagogically the right thing for a child" (1984, p. 158).

This can be seen through the way teachers teach their classes; while they do incorporate and teach the compulsory curriculum required by the school, behind classroom doors "they *interpret* and *modify* the curriculum in a manner that reflects the personality, the philosophy, and the style of teacher as well as the character, the voices, the needs, the activities, and the influences of the students (individually and as a class)." In other words, Max van Manen is trying to make the point that apart from making comprehensive preparations to master psychological theories of child development, curriculum methods, and techniques of instructions, there is a whole new nontechnical aspect of pedagogy, in which pedagogical relation is included, that teachers cannot ignore. This pedagogical relation is difficult to master because this "pedagogical relations tend to be driven by intuitive, emotive, immediate, informal, local, personal, or unsystematic forms of knowledge," which are all aspects of education that cannot be described in technical terms. Additionally, van Manen argues that a pedagogically sensitive language that "recognizes the improvisational, normative, embodied and pedagogical essence of good teaching" is worth recovering or inventing" (van Manen, 1991a, p. 194). Over the years there has been an increased interest in

relational pedagogy. Mary Poplin (1993) holds that there is a growing need for theory of pedagogical relation in this era where the number one issue in the classroom is that of relationships. "Participants feel the crisis inside schools is directly linked to human relationships." She continues to say that this theme was prominently stated by participants and so deeply connected to all other themes in the data that is believed; this may be one of the most central issues in solving the crisis inside schools."[5] Agreeing with these views, I want to argue that we urgently need today teachers who focus on the non-technical aspect of education and their pedagogical relationship with their students.

[5] Poplin, M. S., & Weeres, J. (1993). *Voices from the inside: A report on schooling from inside the classroom, part one, naming the problem*. Institute for Education in Transformation at the Claremont Graduate School.

## 2. Research Gap and Purpose of Study

It seems that all of these scholars' works are attempts to answer the urgent need for relational educational theory as we are living in the age where educational reforms are centered mainly on accountability and academic achievement. "The concepts of relations, if properly developed, can serve as a more useful educational tool than those that have been developed around the vast array of human particularities," said Sidorkin (2004, p.1). Although I cannot yet present a complete theory of educational relations, through this study I would like to map out important potential conversations about the nature of pedagogical relations, while inviting others to participate. As we have seen above, even if scholars in North America have made various attempts to contribute to establishing the concept of relational pedagogy, there have not been many scholars who fully explored the significance of the pedagogical relation for the practice of teaching and learning. Not many have investigated what it means to be a 'pedagogical' adult or teacher too. For example, Martin Buber mainly focuses on the establishment of the relation itself, and the same applies to Nel Noddings' works on caring relation. That is why I want to focus on Max van Manen's work since he has mainly focused on the concept of relational pedagogy. Having received the influence from Noh, Max van Manen, a Dutch-Canadian philosopher, first established the term pedagogical relation in English approximately 25 years ago.

Hence this paper will mainly work to clarify van Manen's concept of pedagogical relation, since he is the one who was very much interested in teachers' role as adults who can compensate for the lack of parental care for contemporary school children.

## 3. Research Question

In order to contribute to triggering philosophical discussion on relational pedagogy, this paper aims to reconstruct van Manen's concept of pedagogical teacher as what is urgently needed for today's schooling. This reconstruction will lead us into the nature and characteristics of 'pedagogical' teacher, while giving us some insights and implication for the direction of teacher education in the future. To accomplish this goal, there are two research questions to be examined as follows:

First, what is the common role for children shared by teachers and parents *as* adults, according to Max van Manen?

Second, what are the main characteristics of pedagogical teachers according to Max van Manen?

The answers to these two questions will help clarifying the main characteristics of pedagogical teachers for Max van Manen.

# II. Theoretical Framework

## 1. Teacher-student Relation as Viewed by Nel Noddings and other scholars

In order to understand what it means to be 'pedagogical' teacher according to Max van Manen, we may need to first examine the concept of *pedagogical relation.* The pedagogical relation refers to a special relation between child and teacher, which has long been a central topic of the Continental pedagogy tradition. The term was first established in Europe by the German philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey and was explicit described and defined by German Educationist Herman Nohl for the first time. Although the European term "pedagogical relation" is a foreign concept in the English world, in the introduction to their edited collection, *No Education without Relation,* Alexander M. Sidorkin points out that "there is a long philosophical tradition of emphasizing (educational) relations' in philosophy that goes back to as far as Plato or Aristotle. Additionally, modern day scholars like Nel Noddings, Martin Buber, and Paulo Freire also talk about relational pedagogy in their educational and philosophical works. To start, we will take a look at Nel Noddings' Martin Buber's and Paulo Freire's work on caring relation and see how van Manen's differs from their concepts of pedagogical relation.

According to Noddings a caring encounter is one that consists of a party that acts as a carer towards the other who is called the cared-for. Noddings argues that in

equal relations (for example, adult caring relations), the parties regularly exchange positions (Noddings, 2012, p. 772) Then, are all caring relations equal? Noddings answers negatively to this question. She argues that there are many important yet unequal relations where full mutuality cannot be expected. For example, the parent-child relation is not one of equality. The parent can and must do things for the child that the child cannot possibly do for the parent. Yet, she further argues, "although the potentially caring relations are not equal, both parties contribute to the establishment and maintenance of caring." (2012, p. 773) What roles does the cared-for play in maintaining the caring relation then? Noddings argues that the cared-for simply has to show somehow that the caring has been received (2012, p. 772). Bollnow and Nohl, who worked on pedagogical relation, also made a similar stance regarding the crucial role of the student. They said that only when the intentions of the educator to give direction are met by a responsiveness on the part of the student that a pedagogical relation can come into existence. This means that, according to the concept of pedagogical relation, something is expected of the child as well; "dedication, openness, and trust toward the teacher or educator" (van Manen, 1984, p. 144). The Austrian philosopher, Martin Buber, who is best known for his philosophy of dialogue however, makes a slightly different argument about the equality of the relation. In his work he talks about the possibility of one-sided nature to exist in a relation between adult and child. Buber describes his conception of the pedagogical I-Thou relationship (in which the I is

the teacher and thou is the child) as a special one because for him, experience of envelopment is a one-sided one, "*He (the educator)* experiences the child's growing up, but it (the infant) cannot experience the education by the educator. The adult stands at both ends of the shared situation, the child at only one (Buber, 1964, p. 36).

What about Paulo Freire's stance regarding the mutuality or equality of teacher-student relationship? In his critical pedagogy, Freire argues that teachers and educators should reject a 'banking' model of education, in which the teacher owns and knowledge and deposit it in students. Instead he promoted a "problem-posing' method in which teachers and students learn together, through dialogue. Problem-posing education depends on a transformed and respectful relationship between teacher and student. According to Freire, "through dialogue, the teacher-of-the-students and the students-of- the-teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher-student with student-teachers…The teacher is no longer merely the one who teaches, but one who is . . . taught in dialogue with the students, who in their turn while being taught also teach." (1996, p. 53) In other words, it seems that mutual participation is expected from both the teacher and the student in order for problem-posing education to happen. Freire's words, which seemed to equate teachers and students, generated some debate over the role of the teacher. However, in a dialogue with Sergio Guimaraes and Moacir Gadotti, Freire sought

to clarify his view of the teacher as "directive and authoritative, but not authoritarian":

> I have never said that the educator is the same as the pupil. . . . The educator is different from the pupil. But this difference, from the point of view of the revolution, must not be antagonistic. The difference becomes antagonistic when the authority of the educator, different from the freedom of the pupil, is transformed into authoritarianism. . . . For me, it is absolutely contradictory when the educator, in the name of the revolution, takes power over the method and orders the pupil, in an authoritarian way, using this difference that exists. This is my position, and therefore it makes me surprised when it is said that I defend a nondirective position. (Barlett, 2005, p. 348)

According to the quote above, Freire advocated a directive role for teachers that nonetheless respect student autonomy and built upon student knowledge.

Let us try to compare Freire's stance on authority in teacher-student relationship with Max van Manen (2016a). Van Manen also advocates from a different direction the place of authority in teacher-student relationship. He argues that "the pedagogy of teaching must take place within a relation of symmetry of respect between young and old and an asymmetry of the relational responsibility that the teacher carries for the students" (2016a, p. 121). Van Manen has come to advocate for the relation of symmetry in pedagogical relationship between teacher and student because he recognizes that the exploitation, abuse, and neglect of children have continued to happen throughout history. He mentions that "parents and other caretakers of children too easily assume that they have license to enforce tough discipline over children, to exert their will over children's desires, to inflict pain and mental anguish and to control children by fear and punishment," (van Manen,

1991b, p. 69) It is due to these horrible examples of abuse that child advocates have called for children and young people to be emancipated from all forms of parental and educational influence. Several advocates [6] even assert that all pedagogical influence is really a disguised form of adult domination and control. Indeed, it is for this reason that he recognized that adults and children are equals and that laws and educational practices for children should be those that are governed by the same laws, principles, and behaviors that govern the life of adults.

However, van Manen also argues for the asymmetry in the pedagogical relation between teacher and student. According to van Manen, parents or teachers and children are not equal. Children are dependent on pedagogical authority, thus, in a sense, children call[7] upon adults to serve them. Quoting van Manen (1991b), "pedagogical authority is really a designation of moral service" (p. 69). Van Manen argues that the notion of authority in itself is not a negative idea (oftentimes, the negative connotation we have regarding authority is because

[6] Throughout the history of modern education, there have been three independent but related movements – deschooling, children's rights, and antieducation – that share a profound moral indignation at the way modern society treats children. They see children as victims: of sexual abuse at one extreme, but at the other of the soft paternalism operated in all kinds of contexts of care, even by well-meaning teachers. (Darling and Nordenbo, 2003)

[7] "In situations where we feel "called" by the child's vulnerability, or by the child's need for our self-forgetful attentiveness, the adult relation is more accurately described as a non-relational relation. The philosopher Emmanuel has pointed out that? when the "other" makes a claim on us, then we temporarily transcend our self-centered way of being in the world. I am just there for the child and thus the polarity and two-sidedness of the relation is suspended" (van Manen, 2016a, p. 121).

authority is easily confused with its abuse—authoritarianism). Authority essentially refers to a certain "asymmetry, difference, unevenness, inequality, dissimilarity in the relation between two or more persons. To be in authority is to be in a position of influence," (p. 70). This is exactly the relation between a parent of teacher and a child or youth. But van Manen also emphasizes that the pedagogical influence over children or young people can only be exerted when the authority is based on love, affection, and internalized permission on the part of the child, and not on power:

> Pedagogical authority is the responsibility that the child grants to the adult, both in an ontological sense (from the viewpoint of the pedagogue) and in a personal sense (from the side of the child). The child, in a manner of speaking, authorizes the adult directly and indirectly to be morally responsive to the values that ensure the child's well-being and growth toward mature self-responsibility. These formulations are not merely theoretical; they are practical insofar as the pedagogue and the child are influenced and guided by the experiential manifestations of pedagogical authority. For example, an adult who sees a child in need, who observes a situation of child abuse, or who responds to a child's interests and questions may actually feel motivated to do some- thing, to help or assist the child. In this sense we may say that the adult is prompted to act on the sense of responsibility that comes with the experience of authority. And now something interesting happens: The adult who is oriented to the child's vulnerability or need may experience a strange sensation—the true authority in this encounter rests in the child and not in the adult. (van Manen, 1991b, p. 70)

On the text above, we can see that only when a child opens up and let him or herself be known by the adult that the adult responds to that invitation and feels prompted to react to the child's call for response and help.

Additionally, when it comes to the goal and priority of a teacher, the four scholars mentioned above all have slightly different views. Nel Noddings argues that a caring teacher should aim to establish and maintain the caring relation through caring for the being of the learner. By listening, and being attentive and reflective,

teachers will be able to make thoughtful connections and develop critical thinking in their students and give their students moral education. On the other hand, Paulo Freiro argues that the goal of the teacher is mainly to cultivate and encourage critical consciousness towards oppressive situations. He believes this is the only way students can recover freedom and establish justice. Yet, there is one point that distinguish a Freirean teacher from van Manen's pedagogical teacher. Van Manen holds that a pedagogical teacher's relationship with the student is a personal one, yet Freire argues that teachers, although they must love their students and their jobs, must also maintain a certain distance with their students. A teacher's love for the students should be "armed love" which "not only cares for the students but also protects their (the teachers') own rights, making sure that these are not infringed upon through their arbitrary treatment as teachers" (Freire, 2005, p. 74). In other words, Freire regards teaching as a profession and teachers as professionals, different from parents or ministers who serve and sacrifice for others without expecting any rewards.

Now that we have examined the different ways four scholars viewed teacher-student relation, now it is time to investigate the idea of phenomenological pedagogy. Max van Manen's notion of pedagogy comes from the Continental tradition of phenomenological pedagogy so understanding this concept is critical to our understanding of Max van Manen.

# 2. The Historical Tradition of a New Pedagogy: Phenomenological Pedagogy

## The Cultural History of Anglo-American Education and Continental Pedagogical Traditions

In the introduction part of this thesis I have mentioned the critical situation where the new progressivism and commodification of education has cause education to increasingly become a means for political and economic interests. This critical situation calls us to rethink radically about the educational means and aims and to actualize a new a renewed interest in how to encounter the young generation in the complexity of their lived present, instead of in their potential to extend the outcomes of education. But first, it is important to understand the word education. The circumstances have triggered major contrasting educational views that the Western traditions of education represented. The cultural history of education we are talking here are Anglo-American (North America or the English-speaking world and Continental traditions (Europe and Scandinavia) (Biesta, 2011).

Although the present problem is not based on neither of the two systems, the notion that the main answer to educational problems and prospects is more knowledge is originated in the Anglo-American ideal of "capitalism, competition, and the belief in an always more profitable future" (Saevi, 2017, p. 1790). While

in North American (eg. The US, Australia, the UK, Canada, and New Zealand) education is an object of study that is dependent upon interdisciplinary views that originate from 'real disciplines' such as philosophy, history, psychology, economy, and sociology in the historical European or Continental educational discourse, education has always been understood as "pädagogik" which indicates an independent discipline "in its own right with its own conceptions, characteristics, and historical justification" (Saevi, 2017, p. 1790). In other words, education being an interdisciplinary objective study—the object knowledge study—and education as pädagogik—— a discipline of its own oriented toward the moral relation between the new and the older generation—positions distinctive differences in how educationalists understand their connection to education and the way education relates to other disciplines like philosophy and phenomenology (Saevi, 2017, p. 1790).

The relation of phenomenology to other disciplines is affected depending on whether one consider phenomenology to be a philosophy or a methodology. Phenomenology as a philosophy in its own rights has its own definitions, conceptions and "disciplinary regulations that encounters the sphere of other disciplines based on philosophy's own language and meanings" (Saevi, 2017, p. 1791). Philosophy of education is said to be an example of philosophy as a discipline:

> Philosophy of education might be an example of how philosophy as a discipline lends its bearing to the object of education by subjugating education to philosophy in a hegemonic relationship. An encounter between phenomenology as a philosophy and education in this context would mean that education accepts the philosophical (phenomenological) characteristics to take control over educational intentions, purposes, and vocabulary. Education would become "phenomenologicalized" and lose its own disciplinary qualities. While phenomenology as a philosophy claims its own independence from other disciplines, phenomenology as a methodology lets itself be applied to other disciplines, allowing the disciplines to be in their own right and asking their own professional questions. (Saevi, 2017 p. 1791)

On the other hand, phenomenology as a methodology does not merely signifies a method to be applied, but rather a "way of seeing and living life," or as Klaus Mollenhauer, a German pedagogical theorist, terms it, "a way of life." Phenomenology as a methodology, according to Saevi (2017), "positions itself according to the disciplinary character of the other discipline. Phenomenology as a methodology is a kind of human science theory that explores the discipline and questions its foundations, not in order to subjugate it, but in order to sustain its legitimation. Hence, phenomenology as a methodology supports the discipline's own questions and intentions without taking over its vocabulary and disciplinary characteristics. (p. 1791)

It is said that phenomenology as a methodological approach (or a way of seeing and living life as Mollenhauer terms it) and education as "pädagogik" have existed side-by-side for over years as a method of "existential inquire into professional practices of children and young peoples' life-worlds" (Saevi, 2017, p. 1791). Phenomenology as a methodological approach started off in the early 1950s in

Dutch universities where academics there, inspired by the works of phenomenological philosophers like Edmund Husserl, Martin Heiddegger, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, started to advance toward their own expertise fields in a phenomenological manner. The scholars [8] that integrated phenomenological themes into their professional disciplines' languages and structures are reported to "largely shied away from discussing theoretical, methodological, and technical philosophical issues… as they were primarily interested in phenomenology as an applied and reflective enterprise, not in phenomenology as theoretical philosophy" (van Manen, 2016a, p. 194).

**Phenomenology as Methodology or Human Science Theory**

In North America, a few decades later, the phenomenological sociologist Alfred Schutz-inspired social science streams such as ethnomethodology, ethnography, interpretive sociology brought phenomenology as methodology into the professional fields. Van Manen (2016b) reported in that point, some scholars including the psychologists Amadeo Giorgi and Adrian van Kaam had developed contact with Dutch advocates at the University of Utrecht[9]. The notion of *human science phenomenology* or *human science theory* since then was used in North

[8] These scholars were, as Max van Manen (2014) in his *Phenomenology of Practice* book mentioned, "pedagogue Martin Langeveld (1983), the medical doctor Frederik Buytendijk (1970a, 1970b), the psychiatrist Jan Hen- drik van den Berg (1966, 1972), the pediatrician Nicolas Beets (1952/75), and the psychologists Hans Linschoten (1987) and Henricus Rümke" (p. 194).

[9] The Utrecht School has been the very school that has served the basis of Max van Manen's work in pedagogy.

America to differentiate “the professional interest in phenomenology from the purely philosophical interest”. The so “called human science phenomenology combines phenomenological methods with more empirically based methods imported from the social sciences,” (van Manen, 2016b). Phenomenology as methodology (or human science theory) is not solely a method to be applied, but as Mollenhauer (2013) implied, it is a “way of life”, a way of seeing and living life.

As mentioned before, the professional practice of research demonstrates that phenomenology is seen from “the perspective of the actually professional practice rather than from the perspective of philosophy” (Saevi, 2017, p. 1791). This means that when it comes to phenomenology in education, phenomenology is seen not as a philosophy of education but as a way to do educational (pedagogical) research and practice. In other words, Phenomenology is a way of thinking about educational questions within the context of theory and practice of education. Max van Manen in his most recent work, *Phenomenology of Practice (Developing Qualitative Inquiry)* calls this “practice” a *phenomenological of practice*. He adopted this phrase to describe “the development and articulation of meaning giving methods of phenomenology on the basis of the practical examples” (2016b, p. 212). He also asserts that phenomenology of practice “not only wants to be sensitive to the concerns of professional practices in professional fields, but also to the personal and social practices of everyday living.” (van Manen, 2016b, p.

213) For this reason, he also believes that phenomenology of practice is a methodological approach relevant to any professional practice.

**Phenomenological Pedagogy**

Moreover, the specific phrase used to describe phenomenology in education is "phenomenological pedagogy (pedagogic)." But what does this phrase really mean? We may be able to find the answer by investigating the importance of two parts that comprise the whole: phenomenology and pedagogy. Since we have delved into the meaning of phenomenology in education above (in which phenomenology in education is the phenomenology as methodology), we now need to understand the nature of the term pedagogic as sometimes terms that seem familiar may be adapted and adjusted to suit a range of contexts and situations, causing the meaning to become less purposeful, less definitive and more easily misunderstood. The term pedagogic' was first mentioned and used in *Phenomenology & Practice 2/2014* as a "common basic anglicized term" to point us to the fact that there is no word for the practice of pedagogy derived from this tradition since this pedagogical tradition does not exist in the Anglo-American educational world. Therefore, it may not be easy for the English reader to understand what the Continental pedagogue mean by pedagogic.

> The European notion of pedagogy includes both education and child rearing (van Manen, 1979, p. 49). In this view, pedagogy encompasses the entire realm of lifeworld issues that are encountered in teacher/student/adult/child relationships. The concerns of these relationships can range from questions of curriculum and learning methodology to what it

> means to be a parent with a pedagogical responsibility to a child. A term given to anthropological and ontological significance, it reflects the view that pedagogy is not just an activity carried out in schools. Pedagogy is a particular normative stance one takes in the world toward children.(Brown, 1991, p. 17)

Looking at the excerpt above, Van Manen mentions that one main difference the terms 'education' and 'pedagogy' is that 'education' denotes to activities happening in school and educational institutions, while 'pedagogy' (pedagogic[10]) refers to everything that happens to children from their early childhood to adulthood, that it is about the broader upbringing and educating the young generation (Saevi, 2017, p. 1792). Moreover, although the word pedagogy does exist in the educational literature of the English-speaking world, the word is oftentimes used as a synonym of teaching. In this sense, the word pedagogy is perceived as "a catch-all term for such things as teaching procedures, teaching practice, curriculum, instruction, and so on" (van Manen, 2002, p. 137). Yet, drawing on this European tradition, pedagogy is not merely the action of teaching.

[10] Tone Saevi (2017) writes in her work Phenomenology in Education that there was a special issue of P&P that was a tribute to the translation into English of Klaus Mollenhauer's classic book Vergessene Zusammenhänge. Über Kultur und Erziehung (*Forgotten Connection: On Culture and Upbringing*) (Mollenhauer 1983), 30 years after its publication. It is a virtually giving or giving back "the phenomenon of pedagogic itself […] without recourse to pat definitions and easy theoretical conceptualizations" (Levering and Saevi 2014, pp. 5–6), as the word "pedagogic" is the anglicized form of the German term "pädagogik," the adults' formal, nonformal, and informal being and acting in relation to the younger generation. The term "pedagogic" indicates a differentiation to the English term "pedagogy" that according to Wivestad ( 2014, p. 7), "lacks the 'ic' and hence the 'techne'; it lacks the signals of an academic discipline. Wivestad ( 2014, p. 8) refers to Hügli ( 1989, p. 4), who claims that pädagogik "is and continues to be… a collective singular [noun] encompassing the whole spectrum of practice and theoretical concerns with upbringing [Erziehung]." Pädagogik as a discipline of its own is here pointed out in English by the term "pedagogic" (p. 1792).

Within the culture of Europe and Scandinavian [11] countries, pedagogic is "understood as the educational practice of helping the young generation to grow up in a culture, as well as the theoretical and conceptual reflective and reflexive responsibility for questioning and reformulating this particular culture's insights and habitations" (Saevi, 2017, p. 1792). Another aspect of the meaning of the term pedagogic is that while we may view education as a preparation process to build the qualifications needed for jobs in society and as the socialization of children to their peers and cultural norms and the society standards, "pedagogic also assume what European scholars call an element of subjectification *of* and *by* the child or young person (as well as of the adult or teacher). Saevi (2017) mentions that "this quality of subjectification, which in German is called "Bildung," indicates a subjective independent counter voice or self-action sometimes from the utterly other; a resistance to the actual, which according to this tradition is the crucial identifier of pedagogic." (p. 1792) In other words, what differentiates pedagogy (and pedagogical theorizing and practice) from other social disciplines and

[11] There is a range of European countries that share the German educational tradition and thus the term "pädagogik" in singular, indicating the unity and autonomy of the discipline (e.g., Norway – pedagogikk, Sweden – pädagogik, Denmark – pedagogik, The Netherlands – pedagogiek, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Poland – pedagogia, Latvia- pedagoģija, Lituania – pedagogika, Estonia – pedagoogika, France –pédagogie).

practices is its orientation the children and young people's lifeworld and growing up toward maturity.

Now that we have defined both parts of the term 'phenomenological pedagogic', it is time to investigate the question that it asks. Phenomenological pedagogy asks, "How are we to act and live with children, helping them create their human capabilities while realizing that we are apt to do harm?" (van Manen, 2014, p. 606). It reflects *phenomenologically* on the meaning of pedagogy and, through situation analysis, tries to understand the child's world as it is lived and experienced by the child. Phenomenological pedagogy claims that one must begin from the phenomenon of pedagogy—which is rooted in the ethical sphere of the adult-child relation and the cultural contexts that shape the pedagogical relation (van Manen, 2016a, p. 21)—itself, as it is experienced, instead of from certain theoretical or philosophical concepts or preconceived educational ideas and ideals that might incline one to perceive the challenge of bringing up and educating children and young people in foreclosed ways. This does not mean that we can liberate ourselves from our cultural and historical context, but it does mean that we can orient to the way in which the pedagogical context is experienced in the here and now.

# 3. Max van Manen's Perspectives on Teacher-Student Relation

### Who is and Why the Works of Max van Manen?

Before we examine Max van Manen perspectives on Teacher-student relation, we need to know the who Max van Manen is. Max van Manen is a Dutch-born Canadian scholar who specializes in phenomenological research methods and pedagogy. He was born and raised in Hilversun (1942), the Netherlands, where he completed the State Pedagogical Academy with teaching qualifications for all levels (K-12) and a major in teaching English as a Second Language. After immigrating to Canada in 1967, he taught for several years with Edmonton Public Schools, and went on to complete an MEd (1971) and a PhD (1973) in the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta. He became a Canadian citizen in 1973.

Van Manen was aware that the European approaches to education is different with the North America's, thus he has translated classic phenomenological pedagogical texts from German and Dutch into English in order to make the European approaches more accessible to Canadian graduate students and educators**.** He has also been actively involved in the organizing of several international human science (phenomenology) research and pedagogy conferences in various countries including Canada, the Netherlands, Italy, Australia, and China. He has presented numerous keynotes, public lectures, and

workshops at universities and in countries all over the world and he has supervised dozens of Canadian and international doctoral students from various Faculties and universities.

Van Manen's works serve as a strong phenomenological stance acquired initially from his early college studies at the Utrecht school in his native Holland (Brown, 1991, p. 5). After migrating to Canada in 1967 where he completed his graduate work, van Manen was dismayed by the deep intellectual chasm that existed between the pedagogical approaches to education in the Netherlands and the strong positivistic empiricism that guided the North American education[12]. He then cultivated a desire to develop an alternative research methodology and pedagogical rationale that incorporates an articulate phenomenological orientation to research and theorizing in curriculum, with particular emphasis given to the dynamics involved in student/teacher relationships. In the midst of his study van Manen realized the inadequacies and "injustice" that existed in a General Systems approach to the "lived reality" of instruction (van Manen, 1983, p. 20).

From that point on in his dissertation and in his later research, van Manen shifted the emphasis of his study to a research of curriculum that maintained a strong phenomenological orientation. In the end, although Max van Manen does not classify his works as solely phenomenological, nor does he consider himself to be

[12] Contrary to the emphasis upon teacher performance and observable outcomes of the latter, the pedagogical approaches addressed the personal, relational, motivational, emotional and values-based preconditions of good teaching.

phenomenologist in the strict sense, but he does admit that phenomenology offers significant influence to his examinations of pedagogy, especially to his examinations of curriculum and instruction (van Manen, 1982, 1990). It is said that van Manen's strong phenomenological orientation was deeply influenced by the tradition of pedagogy from the Dilthey-Nohl School.

**The Dilthey-Nohl School and Pedagogy**

The human science tradition (or phenomenology as methodology) was first advocated by European scholars such as Wilhelm Dilthey, Herman Nohl, Wilhem Flitner, Josef Derbolav, and Theodor Ballauf. The theoretical works collection of this group later became known as the Dilthey-Nohl school and was essentially oriented to explain the meaning of pedagogy in human life. The desire to be liberated from the normative restrictions brought by old pedagogies sparked the desire in this human science pedagogy[13]. It is also around this time that the term "pedagogical relation was claimed by these European scholars. This tradition of emphasizing educational relation in education was started by scholar Wilhelm Dilthey in 1888, as he argued that the explication of the pedagogical relation

[13] "In the 18th and 19th centuries, the education and upbringing of children were strongly influenced by the norms and values of the church (Catholicism and Protestantism), denominational belief systems, and class-driven ideas. With the emergence of the human sciences (Geisteswissenschaften), the taken-for-granted beliefs and practices of historical pedagogies were increasingly questioned and philosophically interrogated. In this critical context, phenomenology and hermeneutics became strong philosophical platforms for attempts to develop new approaches to pedagogy emancipated from the normativities and habituated presumptions and prejudices of the social and ideological milieus in which they operated." (van Manen, 2014, p. 607)

between child and adult must be made the start of the study of pedagogy. It turns out that Dilthey's works deeply influenced three famous scholars—Martin Buber, Hans-Georg Gadamer, and Martin Heidegger—to contribute to this tradition. Martin Buber encountered the ideas of Dilthey while he was studying in Vienna. Dielthey was the supervisor of Martin Heiddegger teacher, Edmund Husserl, and in turn Gadamer had Heiddegger as his supervisor. It is in this context that during the 1930s in Germany, Dilthey's student, Nohl, elaborated and worked out a pedagogical philosophy on the basis of Diltheyan starting points and formulations.

Like many of scholars of his age, Nohl taught a range subjects consisting of philosophy, pedagogy, and ethics. Nohl started his early phenomenological research on pedagogy centering the phenomenon of educating and bringing up children directly in the lifeworld of everyday thinking and acting. But this was not an easy work since it means he had to resist the common pedagogical research's trend to derive insights about pedagogy from theory. Drawing up Dilthey's distinction between understanding and explaining in the human sciences, Nohl resisted to use objective and natural scientific ways to pedagogical questions. Norm Friesen in his work *The Pedagogical Relation Past and Present: Experience, Subjectivity and Failure* (2017) points out that Nohl "saw himself as consolidating a 'movement' in which pedagogy is investigated in terms of the relation between educator and educand" (p. 744). When the pedagogical relation was established in English-language discourse, Max van Manen cites the influence of Nohl that

describes the pedagogical relation between pedagogue (a mature person) and child (a developing person) as an "intensely experienced relation" characterized by three characteristics: "The personal, 'intensely experienced quality of the pedagogical relation, its intentional focus on both the present and future of the educand, and what van Manen calls its 'oriented quality:' its orientation to the pedagogical significance of the child's present situation" (2015, p. 119). Here below is a citation of van Manen's detailed interpretation of Nohl's work done in 1982.

> First, the pedagogical relation is a very personal relation animated by a special quality that spontaneously emerges between adult and child and that can be neither managed nor trained, nor reduced to any other human interaction. Second the pedagogical relation is an intentional relation wherein the intent of the teacher is always determined in a double direction: by caring for a child as he or she is, and by caring for a child for what he or she *may become.* Third, the educator must constantly be able to interpret and understand the present situation and experiences of the child and anticipate the moments when the child in fuller self-responsibility can increasingly participate in the culture." (van Manen, 1994, p. 143)

Looking at the above text, we can summarize the characteristics of pedagogical relation to be first, an intimate relation that happens between an adult that is irreducible to other human interactions. Secondly, in this relation, the teacher's intent is directed in double direction as not only the teacher care for the children as who they are, but the teacher also care for who the children may become. And lastly, the third characteristics is that the teacher, while caring and interacting with the children, continuously react, understand and make interpretations of the

child's present situations and experiences. Furthermore, notion of pedagogical relation between child and adult has since then become a main theme in the further development of the field of phenomenological pedagogy.

**The Influence of Langeveld**

However, it was not until Martinus Jan Langeveld, a Dutch educationist, began his work that the proper phenomenological pedagogy truly began [14]. In Langeveld's widely read book Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek (Concise Theoretical Pedagogy), he demonstrated the need to grasp the meaning of the child's lifeworld, not only from a hermeneutic ontological perspective but also from the point of view of the child. Langeveld suggested that, "the center of pedagogical interest must reside in a sensitive grasp of meaning as lived and experienced by the child… to come to an understanding of what is good for the child, what is educationally desirable, we must first be able to listen to the child

[14] Martinus Jan Langeveld (1905–1989) was one of the most prominent educational theorists in the Netherlands in the second half of the twentieth century. He was one of the originators of the Dutch tradition of "pedagogiek" (pedagogy) and was the founder of the study of "pedagogiek" at the university in the Netherlands after WWII. During his own years of study he was mentored by the Dutch philosopher and educational theorist Philipp Kohstamm and the Dutch philosopher Hendrik Pos and was taught by such prominent philosophers and scholars as (among others) Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, Wilhelm Stern, Karl Jaspers, Herman Nohl, and Ernst Cassirer. (Springer Encyclopedia of educational Philosophy and Theory)

in a manner that respects the child's subjectivity—the way the child experiences and perceives things" (van Manen, 2014, p. 608).

Max van Manen, the scholar whose works are the base of this thesis, was deeply influenced by this Dutch educationist. When it comes to Langeveld,[15] van Manen agrees on the scholar's insight that "the pedagogical (relation) in everyday life is from the very beginning ethical" (2014, p. 608). Nohl, van Manen, and Langeveld also agree on a further point that is about the preconditions for understanding the pedagogical relation. It is "the primacy or 'primordiality' of consciousness and lived experience' over theory and rationality" (Friesen, 2017 p. 749).

We will take a look at few examples of how Langeveld has arrived to some of his pedagogical works' arguments by reflecting on his personal lived experience with children. Langeveld's pedagogical principle is the existence of 'relation of influence' that flows from the adult to the child in the pedagogical relation. Langeveld's work that reflected on this relation of influence suggested in the following passage:

> As we all know, nothing is so silent as that which is self-evident. Thus it becomes our task to render audible, readable, articulate, that which is silent. As we all know too, humans are not simply born; they do not just grow up into mature adults. For what we call a child is a being that calls to be educated. (1983, p.5)

Here Langeveld reflects on two aspects of phenomenological approach taken to

[15] Max van Manen translated and published selected pedagogical writings by Langeveld (and also works of other scholars) in his work *Phenomenology and Pedagogy*.

pedagogy. The first being the vital importance of the phenomenologically oriented individual to make “audible, readable, and articulate the realm of the silent “self-evident” (Langeveld, 1983, p. 5). This demands a continual process of the interpretation of the everyday world around us. It has been the project of the Utrecht School, the school which Langeveld belonged to, to develop this activity of pedagogical interpretation into a “science” of the self-evident, a lifeworld science” (Brown, 1991, 20). This lifeworld science, as a consequence brought us that:

> Elucidation of those elements of our existence with which we are in contact most, our everyday lived world, those of which are the most illiterate. Having practical ways of investigating our lifeworld would put us subjectively in touch with the knowledge of what it is to be-in-the-world instead of separating and alienating us from it by objectification. Objectification is the act of making the world fit into distinct dichotomous realms of subjects and objects. This dualism stresses the independent existence of things in the world and obscures the interactive, holistic existence of reality by phenomenology. The latter is what Merlau-Ponty (1983) refers to as the “embodied” nature of existence.” (Brown, 1991, p. 20)

Secondly, due to the fact that children are born without knowing what it is to be human and because they did not ask to be born, it is required of us adults to assume a pedagogical role with children that assumes a determination “to bring into being for the sake of this child and with the help of this child, all that is essential to its being human,” (Langeveld, 1983, p. 5). Van Manen observes the importance of Langeveld’s view of human nature as he writes the paragraph below:

> Humanness is not something with which a child is born but rather something to which a child is born, he [Langeveld] says. The human child is born to the promise of educational potential; it is this "potential of educability" that distinguishes a young homo sapien from the newly-born among the rest of the animal species. A human child is not just someone who can be educated,

> says Langeveld, it must be educated, by virtue of its need for extended care, security, and the need for growth opportunities to become an autonomous human being. Every child wants to become someone, him or herself: a person—that is, someone with personality, (van Manen, 1979, p. 50)

According to the statements above, children are born into the world by the willful acts of (adult) others and bring with them an intrinsic need to become who they can be. As the volitional beings who have made possible their existence adults are to assume "the pedagogical purpose of assisting children through the self-formative process of possible ways of being-in- the-world."

Moreover, Langeveld's second pedagogical principle is the view that "the possibilities of being are structured by the child's experience and therefore lie within the child's world, not the adults' world" (Brown, 1991, p. 21). Subsequently, in the pedagogical activity, the child assumes a primary, not secondary place. Thus, instead of being merely the recipient of instruction, the child also serves as its source. Phenomenological pedagogical investigation is therefore both for children, and also by children. Adults provide the occasion for the lifeworld of the child and the potentiality that lies therein to appear. Yet, although the process where the children also participate in the pedagogical investigation, Langeveld also argues the foremost "intent of pedagogical influence is charged with a certain responsibility," that is, "teachers are there to primarily serve the child as it will take time for the child to gradually grow into responsibility" (van Manen, 1996, p. 6). He also furthers holds that "one of the

decisive signs of increased adult maturity is that one can assume responsibility for children." Yet, this notion that a mature adult can and is willing to assume responsibility for children is the notion that present-day scholars criticize, as due to the influence of the new progressivism and commercialization of education, it is unlikely that adults in our present age experience their relation to their children as filled with responsibilities.

Additionally, as someone who has had clinical works with children[16], Langeveld continues to propose that even though children are living in a changing world, there are certain pedagogical values that the children will always need: security, reliability, and continuity. To quote Lavengeveld's claim, "children need to experience the world as secure, they need to be able to depend on certain adults as being reliable, and they need to experience a sense of continuity in their relations with those who care for them…children who lack security, who cannot depend on at least one person in their life, who are not permitted to establish long-term relationships with an adult, will become a pedagogical concern" (van Manen, 1996, p. 6).

All in all, from the works of Langeveld, we can see that how Langeveld locates the normative in the phenomenological account of children. He argues that "it is inevitable to see how the normative is intimately linked to our understanding of

[16] As part of his academic work, Langeveld founded the *Institute for Clinical Pedagogy,* where he practiced clinila pedagogy, helping children with learning and psychological problems, as well as their parents (van Manen, 2016a, p. 198).

children's experiences, since we are always confronted with real life situations wherein we must act: we must always do what is appropriate with our interactions with children" (van Manen, 2016b, p. 200). In the end, many may feel uncomfortable with the way in which phenomenologists like Langeveld seem to reach deeply into the stylistic realms of the humanities. Van Manen made a comment of how oftentimes "the texts by proponents of the Utrecht School are not only insightful but also evocative. The texts not only analyze and probe the lived experience, they "speak" to us and they may stir our pedagogical, psychological, or professional sensibilities" (van Manen, 2016a, p. 200). Max van Manen further holds that most people that criticized Lavengeveld (and his articulation of the pedagogical relation and values) are probably those who "want to base educational research theorizing on more rationalistic foundations", or those who "want to make the field of pedagogy and educational policy making more scientific and subject to management control" (van Manen, 2016a, p.7).

**Max van Manen's Conception of Pedagogy**

In conclusion, having receiving huge influences from diverse European authors such as Martin Langeveld, Otto Boll-now, Wilhem Dihley, Nohl that see pedagogy as being rooted in the normative-ethical sphere of the adult-child relation and the contexts of culture that shape the pedagogical relation, it is expected to see the how van Manen defines pedagogy. In *Pedagogical Tact:*

*Knowing What to Do When You Don't Know What to Do,* he refers to pedagogy as "this primordial adult-child relation that is biological and cultural, ancient and present, mundane and mysterious, sensuous and sensitive to the ethical demand as it is experienced in pedagogical relations, situations, and actions. As well, the relational affect for the child or young person is constitutive of the relational ethics between the adults who are caring for the child. This relational ethic intends fidelity, love, trust, mutual dependency, and the acceptance of caring responsibility of the adults for their child and for each other" (van Manen, 2016a, p.20). Along with that, he also asserts that pedagogy "involves us in distinguishing actively and/ or reflectively what is good or right and what is life enhancing, just, and supportive from what is not good, wrong, unjust, or damaging in the ways we act, live, and deal with children" (2016a, p. 19).

# III. Common Role for Children Shared by Teachers and Parents as Adults according to Max van

## Recovering Our Forgotten Pedagogical Responsibility Towards Children

In the past, life seemed to be less uncertain. After all, the past was the ages where people knew, by being in a particular society, what they were expected to become, whom they could count on, and what could they do. Yet, it is not the case with our present-day children and young people. A lot of them gradually think that the world we live in is one that is bound to destroy itself, after all, our modern world are defined by unstoppable events and phenomena such as climate change, pollution, dying oceans and melting artic ice, to realities like brutal terrorism, greedy capitalism, extreme inequalities of wealth, religious wars, and global poverty. But not only that, living in this uncertain world, present-day children and young people, in van Manen's phrase, "they must make active choices in their lives for fear of not becoming anything or anyone," and the reason for this is because our present-day children are literally a contingent generation:

> The modern child must actively realize that he or she, is born into a condition of possibilities. He or she is this body of possibilities. To become a person, to grow up and to become educated, is to transform one's contingency into, commitment, responsibility- one must choose a life…to be a contingent person can be seen both negatively and positively. Negatively it means that many present-day children are growing up in an uncertain world, a world with too many conflicting views, values and aims; this predicament can mean that children drift into (self-)destructive lifestyles.

> Positively it means that each young person must make choices and commitments, in life, that they all must come to terms with their possibilities. The child is in a real sense the agent of his or her own destiny - at both the individual and the social level. (van Manen, 1991b, p. 3)

In other words, children living in this present day, cannot be certain of the world they are living in as it is full of infinite possibilities. For those who have high expectations are apt to changes and adventures, this is good news as they can now freely make a life of their own. Unfortunately, the rest of children in the modern world may not have the same tendency, most of them would prefer stability and certainty. This makes the modern world a bad news for them if they are not equipped to make the right choices.

Since adults are volitional beings who have made possible their existence, we must assume the vocation of pedagogy of assisting these children and young people through their self-formative process of possible ways of being-in- the-world. Yet if the above statements are true, if our children no longer live in an stable and certain world, then we need to find ways of being educationally involved with children in a way that can empower them to actively shape their life's contingencies. Max van Manen (1991b) calls this new way of being educationally involved with children, the phenomenological "new pedagogy of theory of practice of living with children" that knows "how to stand in a relationship of thoughtfulness and openness to children and young people rather

than being governed by traditional beliefs, discarded values, old rules and fixed impositions" (van Manen, 1991b, p. 3). In other words, he is inviting us adults to learn a new way of relating and belonging to our children so that these children can receive the proper care that will enable them to grow and survive in this world. I believe, this new pedagogy that Max van Manen proposed will help equip the older generation with whatever they need to encounter and fulfill the needs of the young generation in their complex lived present.

## 1. Understanding *In Loco Parentis* in its Relation to Pedagogy

But before we go on to the elaboration of this new pedagogy, we should investigate the common role for children that teachers and parents share. Van Manen proposes that this new pedagogy is based on the notion of *in loco parentis*. But what is this *in loco parentis?* In Latin, *in loco parentis* means in the place of a parent. It is a legal doctrine describing a relationship similar that of a parent to a child. It refers to the legal responsibility an individual or organization take on some of the parents' functions and responsibilities. Originally derived from English common law, *in loco parentis* is applied in two separate areas of the law[17], but by war, the most common usage of in *in loco parentis* relates to teachers and

[17] First, it allows institutions such as colleges and schools to act in the best interests of the students as they see fit, although not allowing what would be considered violations of the students' civil liberties. Second, this doctrine can provide a non-biological parent to be given the legal rights and responsibilities of a biological parent if they have held themselves out as the parent.

students. Many years ago there were many resistance in the US against this doctrine as traditionally *in loco parentis* focused on dormitory visitations, regulating curfews, and campus dress code—but as *in loco parentis* gradually change into a new form:

> *In loco parentis* has morphed into set of policies governing interventions in students' lives and mainly at keep[ing] students out of actionable situations (Weigel), shielding institutions from lawsuits, where specifically this new *in loco parentis* focuses on curtailing problems such as binge drinking and illegal substance use, intervening in cases of students with mental problems, and enforcing rules against proscribed language or hate speech. (Podis & Podis, 2007, p. 122).

there were resurgences of this doctrine, especially since the students' parents involvement in pushing the schools to take parental roles "reassert the school's traditional right to act *in loco parentis.*

However, the kind of *in loco parentis* I want to discuss in this section is not the actual *in loco parentis* in the area of residential life. I would like to discuss *in loco parentis*-type of power dynamics in educational settings. Yet, it is not the social power-dynamic based *in loco parentis* that I seek to investigate, but the other model of *in loco parentis.*

> Research into the history of *in loco parentis* reveal that its "roots (…) lie deeper than the American educational system" and can be traced to the Oxford and Cambridge models (Sweeton and Davis). According to one source, the term first appears in connection with American education in 1765, and the concept was first applied to U.S. higher education in 1866 (Weigel). In the 1960s, it gained widespread recognitions as students sought to contests its legitimacy. Regardless of the period, what appears common

> to many versions of *in loco parentis* as a student affairs doctrine is that it has been construed as a means whereby by the institution exercises a *stern* or *disciplinary* form of parental control. George Lakoff in *Moral Politics*…has called this approach the "Strict Father" model, according to which the parent "teaches children right from wrong by setting strict rules for their behavior and enforcing them through punishments"(Podis & Podis, 2007, p. 123).

According to the statement above, the operative principle of the *in loco parentis* above is power in the Foucauldian sense. From this perspective, *in loco parentis* pedagogy that positions students in an inferior posture is to be expected as institutions naturally function to maintain their power and guard their self-interest. Yet we know that this authoritarian approach is no longer productive in helping us relate to our younger generation. This is why I would like to bring up a more benign *in loco parentis* pedagogy that still instill conceptions of social power dynamics, but in a more subtle way than the previous controlling model. In the previous paragraph I mentioned George Lakoff and his discussion about "the Strict Father". According to his theory, aside from the Strict Father, there need to be another role called the Nurturant Parent: "The primal experience behind [this] model is one being cared and cared about," (Lakoff, 2010, p. 134). While the previous model of *in loco parentis* leads us to insights coming from the Foucauldian perspective, the nurturing variation of this pedagogical parentis aligns with Emmanuel Levinas' and Jean-Francois Lyotard.[18]

[18] Levinas' philosophy stresses the need to take responsibility for the other, and Lyotard's

Max van Manen's work in pedagogy is the example of a nurturing model of *in loco parentis*. In his book *The Tact of Teaching,* van Manen urges parents and teachers to consider "*the in loco parentis* relation as a source for exploring pedagogical understanding and insights that maintain a holistic focus on the lived world of professional educators and children," (van Manen, 1991b, p.4). He mentions that though we should recognize the fact that the notion of parenting and education is now conceived as a "a living process of personal engagement between an adult teacher or parent and a young child or student" that may well disappear in an increasingly managerial, corporate, and technicized environment," (van Manen, 1991b, p. 4) no one can have the right to decrease the rights and abilities of parents to carry their primary responsibility to make sure their children are well and grow. Yet indeed, due to many factors, including the influence of new progressivism and commercialization of education, we can no longer assume that in contemporary society the everyday relations between adults and children are still normally governed by pedagogical qualities. Many parents feel they are incapable or not wanting to get involved in parenting. A lot of teachers are often just there to "teach" what they are told to teach and nothing more. Many of them even spend their teaching days with "what's the use?" question that is less a question than a sigh, a shrugging off of any suggestions that there might be any hope. In various spheres of not only North American society but also in Asian

advocates generous listening to the other.

society, including South Korean society, the common assumptions as to how we should and should not deal with children and young people are lost.

Yet, we may not take it as a given that we have completely forgotten that a great responsibility for our children are bestowed on us. Max van Manen (1991b) mentions that when we forsake our "pedagogical responsibility as parents and/or professional educators" in our daily lives, "we leave our children in the lurch, and rob ourselves of the occasion to act and reflect on the pedagogical impulse that gives meaning to the lives of our children as well as to our own lives" (p. 216). He further argues that though many adults seem to find it easier to fatalistically, to despair, to sigh that the worst is yet to come, those of us who live with children cannot afford to be so nihilistic. To surrender to a nihilistic theorizing and ways of viewing the world that is also lacking in moral intuition, is, in van Manen's own words, "anti-pedagogical." In other words, we cannot abandon the pedagogical place we occupy in the lives of our children.

## 2. Common Roles of Parents and Teachers as Adults for Children

Before we examine the common role of parents and teachers for children, I would like to explain why I use the term adult (specifically pedagogical adult) to describe the common role of parents and teachers. The reason why I choose the

word adult is because in phenomenological pedagogy, the role of teachers and parents in a child's life are not clearly differentiated and separated. While we are used with the separation of education and child-rearing, which means that we also separate the interactions between teacher-students that happen in school and educational institution and the interactions between parents-children at home, that is not how it is in Europe where the nature of teaching and parenting are considered to be deeply connected. The term pedagogy (pedagogic) in phenomenological pedagogy refers to everything that happens to children from their early childhood to adulthood, or in other words, pedagogy is about the broader upbringing and educating the young generation. In the tradition of pedagogy, the education of children is an integral part of the whole process of growing up. Thus, because the process of bringing up and helping children grow up consists of the "entire moral, intellectual, physical and spiritual" aspects, European scholars argues that all adults, including teachers and parents are responsible for the this upbringing process (van Manen, 1991a, p, 6).

But was there not a reasonable reason for the separation of education and child-rearing? Was it not because parents are the ones considered to be legal primary care-givers for their children? Indeed, van Manen does argue that parents are the still the primary care-givers that are responsible for the child's well-being and development. Nevertheless, considering the various societal influences that have caused the erosion of actual parental involvement, he believes that the teacher's

charge, now more than ever is to act *in loco parentis,* using a more nurturing connotation of parenting. In this scheme, it is the duty of teachers to provide "a protective sphere" within which children can develop a self-responsible maturity (van Manen, 1991a, p.6). Traditionally the school's boundaries were commonly regarded as a transitional space between the secure family and the life in the public that is open and full of risks. However, in modern society we can no longer presume that children have this secure family. And even if it exists, we can no longer assume that the "intimacy" in the family grows out the right kind of love for the children. And so, to quote van Manen (1991b) the *in loco parentis* responsibility of the school and teachers do not only "consist in preparing the child for the larger world, it also consists in protecting the child from the possible risks of abuse and shortcomings in the intimate sphere of the family" (p. 6).

Also, as someone whose works were deeply influenced by the Continental tradition of pedagogy (which encompasses the entire real of lifeworld issues of educating and bringing up children), Max van Manen believes that "professional educators, if possible, must try to assist parents in fulfilling their primary pedagogical responsibility" (1991b, p. 4) In other words, since there is a deep connections between the nature of teaching and parenting, since "what is relevant for the relation between parents and children may be informative for the pedagogical relation between teachers and students," he is making the argument that the teacher's charge as a responsibility *in loco parentis* flows out of the

parents primary responsibility towards the children (van Manen, 1991b, p. 4) This idea may be foreign to educationalists from North America (or even South Korea) as the parent is largely absent from the educational literature. In van Manen's words "it is as if in the mind of education theorist the education of children is not an integral part of the whole process of growing up," (1991b, p. 6). Indeed, as we have discussed earlier in the phenomenological pedagogy section, not only that the English language separates education (schooling, learning and teaching) from child-rearing (the parenting process at home), there is "no single word in English that describes the entire moral, intellectual, physical, and spiritual complex of bringing up children," (van Manen, 1991b, p.6).

All in all, since according to the European pedagogical tradition parenting and teaching derive from the same essential experience of pedagogy, the common role for children shared by teachers and parents as adults according to Max van Manen(1991b) is "protecting and teaching the young to live in this world and take responsibility for themselves, for others, and for the continuance and welfare of the world," (p.7) In one word, this common role for children shared by teachers and parents as adults is the new pedagogy that—conditioned by care, love, and worries for the child (p.65), as well as hope and responsibility for the child (p. 67)—will help equip the older generation with whatever they need to encounter and fulfill the needs of the young generation in their complex lived present. Indeed

these noble goals of are well worth the consideration of any parents and any teachers of any level.

# IV. Characteristics of Pedagogical Teachers

## 1. Differences between Pedagogical Teachers and Non-pedagogical adults

As we have elaborated the common role of teachers and parents for children above, it is now the time to investigate Max van Manen's description of pedagogical teachers and non-pedagogical adults. It was mentioned in the previous section of the paper that nowadays it is unsurprising to look around us and find that people increasingly think the world we live in is one that is bound to destroy itself. Consequently, it seems easier to join the bandwagon and surrender to the theorizing and ways of viewing the world that are nihilistic and that lack moral intuition and stop. However, this tendency is exactly what van Manen called, "non-pedagogical."

> Those who are inhabited by hope are "true" fathers, "true" mothers, and "true" teachers to children.. the experience of hope distinguishes a pedagogic life from a non-pedagogic one," argued Max van Manen (1983, p.3).

According to van Manen, "those who live with children cannot afford to be so nihilistic without forfeiting the pedagogic place they occupy in the lives of their children" (van Manen, 1983). Children are brought into this world by willful adults. However, children cannot live without hope in this world. Thus we have the responsibility to demonstrate an active pedagogical hope for our children. Max

van Manen argues that "pedagogical hope animates the way a parent or teacher lives with a child: it gives meaning to the way an adult stands in the world, represents the world to the child, takes responsibility for the world, and embodies or stylizes the forms of knowledge through which the world is known, shown, and explained to children" (van Manen, 2016a, p. 191). In other words, the experience and inhibition of hope are what distinguish a pedagogic life from a non-pedagogic one. Hope is what makes us "true parents and teachers", it is what turns a non-pedagogical adult into a pedagogical adults. But do we really know what pedagogical hope is? Do we understand its nature? How have we demonstrated and experienced this active pedagogical hope? What are the damages that may happen if non-pedagogical adult do not demonstrate this pedagogical hope? In this section of the paper, I will be focusing on exploring the experience of pedagogical hope from teachers/educators' point of view.

As I was reading from various sources about how educators experience this pedagogical hope, I came across a work by scholar from Spain Raquel Ayala Carabajo (2011) titled *Pedagogical hope: A fresh and deep glance to educational experience from van Manen's approach*. She used a phenomenological-hermeneutic approach[19] to attempt to analyze what she (and also van Manen and

[19] The basic descriptive (or empirical) methods that the author applied to her work were *live experience descriptions* (LEDs) and *conversational interviews*. The descriptions that are the basis for her research were taken from "written texts of a group of educators (mainly teachers) as they reflected from written texts upon the real experience of having personally lived hope" (Ayala, 2011, p. 138).

other phenomenological pedagogues) believes to be the substratum from which the lived meaning of pedagogical hope emerges: the simple transient everyday moments of interchange between teachers and students in the classroom context or beyond it. Attempting to contribute to the phenomenology of practice, Ayala Carabajo did her research using descriptive methods to record and reflect on experiences of ordinary educators that have been described as "hopeful educators[20]" by their colleagues, parents, and authorities. Among her work, there is one transcript of an interview in which a second grader teacher described his experience while teaching a student called Richard.

> Richard has numerous learning and behavior difficulties. He does not follow a fixed schedule at home; most days he comes to school tired, late or unkempt. During class he is easily distracted. He often instigates conflicts with his classmates, especially during recess. Many days he arrives at school without having finished his homework, or he forgets his homework at home. He frequently misses class without a valid reason. It is hard for him to be accepted by his peers; and the like.... I believe he is a child with great opportunities to succeed in life, and I remind this to him [sic] all the time. He is smart, he has imagination, and he is creative and street-wise. He has great potential, but needs help to develop it. (Ayala, 2011, p. 136)

Here in this interview the teacher described Richard as a kid with various difficulties, as well vast potential. But if I were in the teacher's shoes, I probably would have asked the same question some of us who do not have enough experience in teaching and interacting with students has always asked, "how is it possible to discern the potential in a student with such poor performance in school? How and from where did that teacher get that certainty that the student will have

[20] These educators, according to Ayala (2011), are ordinary in their educational duties, but extraordinary in the ways the live them because their lives are filled with hope (p. 137)

a future?" However, the answer to these questions is a phenomenon that has deeply fascinated me: hope. Pedagogical hope is the "driving force that motivates teachers to talk the way Richard's teacher does, that explains the kind of thoughts and feelings that grow and emerge, that lies within certain attitudes and behaviors towards students, school, and teaching, that is the "motive" of certain accomplishments and achievements" (Ayala Carabajo, 2011, p. 137). It is "one of the qualities that most sustains teachers in their work" (Nieto, 2003, p. 83). But why is the educational responsibility of many teachers and educators deeply filled with (pedagogic) hope? What is the nature of this hope?

Before we investigate the nature of pedagogic hope it is important to first understand the current educational context that modern teachers have. Though van Manen has encouraged teachers to aim for pedagogical hope as it is the driving force that motivates and keeps teachers going, in reality, the present work of teachers[21] at all educational levels is continuously driven towards despair. Bullough (2011) describes the condition of teachers' reality in the paragraph below:

> Across much of the industrial world teachers are under attack as incompetent, selfish, and self-serving. Aggressive reform—not renewal—efforts are underway based on a set of generally false assumptions about teacher motivation (increased competition promises higher levels of teacher and school performance), intentions (teachers are selfish and self-serving), the nature and difficulty of the work of teaching (aims can be prescribed in advance and almost anyone can teach), evidence of performance (test scores are meaningful representations of the essential school aims), the power of schooling (that setting standards

[21]At least teachers in developed countries such as the US, the UK, and South Korea.

> and tinkering with curricula can resolve persistent social problems), and responsibility (teachers are wholly responsible for student learning)…Hope weakens and teachers are left increasingly anxious, fraught with self-doubt, and lacking control over their work-lives. (Bullough, 2011, p.16)

Moreover, there are also several other reasons for stress that arise in the school context: online and in-person bullying and harassment, immigration and multicultural families, rapid growth of the knowledge and information available on the internet, diet problems, educational reforms on a national level, and so on. Furthermore within each classroom, within that pedagogical space, also emerge ongoing discouraging reasons: the growing gap between digital native students with teachers, the presence of technological devices (like phones) that distract the students' attention from learning and studying, and the lack of or even complete absence of parental support and affection. Yet even in the midst of this educational context, there are ordinary educators who not only remain in the educational field, but also continue to live their lives and fulfill the educational duties extraordinarily because they are filled with hope.

**The Nature of Pedagogical Hope**

Hope is rooted pedagogical relationship, it is only pedagogical when it is grounded in this relationship. Van Manen cited Nohl to define pedagogical relationship as an intense personal relationship between a pedagogue and a child that is characterized mainly by three characteristics, first, by the fact that it can be "neither managed nor trained, nor reduced to any other human interaction",

second, by its intentional focus on both the present and future of the child, and third, by its 'oriented quality,' which is an orientation to the pedagogical significance of the child's present situation; the teacher "must constantly be able to interpret and understand the present situation and experiences of the child and anticipate the moments when the child in fuller self-responsibility can increasingly participate in the culture" (van Manen, 2016a, p. 119). Hope is rooted in pedagogical relationship because it is in this intentional relationship that teachers take interest in the growing maturity and learning progress of the child entrusted to them. This intentional relationship is why teachers dedicate themselves to their students (van Manen, 1991a) and it is why teachers pin their hope in them, upon them, and for them. Moreover, the other reason why hope is only pedagogical when it is grounded in this relationship is because when teachers hold their intentional focus on both the present and future of the child, their hope is rooted in reality. Having hope does not mean that a teacher pretend to be blind as not to see reality in all of its rawness. Having hope is not equal to denying existing facts, or interpreting reality naively. A teacher can only have hope in the future of the child when he or she sees everything that is present in the reality as it is. Ayala Carabajo describes the significance of a realistic pedagogical gaze below:

> If hope is rooted in reality, it sees not only the dark side, but also the bright side: everything positive, potential, good, and favorable that these situations, people and resources. Limitations appear easier to overcome; learning difficulties, for instance, can be evaluated, detected, and diagnosed to a certain point. But what detains a child or youth's maximum learning capacity? Paradoxically, the bright side of reality (contrary to common belief) is broader than the dark side: where do we draw the educability limits of each child or youth?

> How can we foresee the real learning potential of a certain educational experience? Who would dare to determine the amount of influence that we as educators have on our pupils? Moreover, possibility belongs, essentially, to children and youth. A pedagogical gaze is hopeful when it is realistic. A child who is seen with this gaze is very lucky! (Ayala, 2011, p. 140).

Though the reality of students that are often filled with no answers, no changes nor solutions with may make teachers frustrated, discouraged, and even desperate, it is exactly this being hopeful, this believing that something good which "does not presently apply to one's own life or the lives of others, could still materialize" (Halpin, 2001, p. 395) that give teachers a solid, unwavering handhold.

So to be a parent or a teacher is to have pedagogical hope that is rooted in reality, not the blind, cliché, nor superficial kind of hope. But what does it mean to have, or in van Manen's words, to experience this pedagogical hope? According to van Manen, we must examine "how living with children is experienced as hope, how what we do we do is hope," as "the most important aspect of our living hope is a way of being with children. It is not what we say and do, first of all, but a way of being present to the child" (2016a, p. 191). We may say things like "I hope that they learn to read…" "I hope we can finish this lesson by this time today…" "I hope they pass the exam." But these hopes that are associated with reference to particular expectations and desires are hopes that come and go as the time pass by. Pedagogic hope, on the other hand, is one that implies commitment and work in our living and doing with children. It is hope that make it possible for adults to "transcends themselves and say, "I hope," "I live with hope," "I live life in such a

way that I experience children as hope!" (van Manen, 2016a, p. 191) It is this experience of hope that enables us to refuse to give up on our lives nor our children's lives no matter how absurd and painful our life circumstances are. But we can only do this when we truly love our children (not in a romantic sense), but rather in a pedagogic sense. In van Manen's own words:

> Hope refers to that which gives us patience, tolerance, that which gives us belief in the possibilities of our children and in the world which sustains them. Hope is our experience of the child's possibilities. It is our experience of confidence that a child will show us how a life is to be lived, no matter what the odds, no matter how many disappointments we may have felt. (van Manen, 1983, p. 3)

When we truly love our children, we will possess this pedagogic hope that will enable us to continuously vouch for our children by saying, "I will not give up on you. I know you can find your way in this world. I know you can make a life for yourself.! I place my hope in you. I won't lose my hope in you!"

Throughout the years, as the "industrial model, computer technology, information processing, and marketplace thinking has deeply invaded our schooling," (van Manen, 2016a, p. 191), we continuously hear educationalist theorist and administrators use terms such as "knowledge production," "program delivery," "outcomes-based instruction," or "management by objectives" (Biesta, 2011, p. 176) to define educational practice. On the one hand, we know that these terms are used to encourage teachers to make a difference in their educational lives. But these terms are not really a terms imbued with hope because they only focus on the future, not on, in van Manen's words, "our being with children now"

which is basically “being present with hope” (2016a, p. 192). In other words, having hope” does not equal to “having measurables objectives”. Of course, teachers need to have expectations, set objectives and targets, assess and evaluate growth, progress and development. However, they should likewise have a more profound trust and bigger view of the power of teaching and the marvel of learning and growing up. Anticipations and expectations easily decline into wants, needs, convictions, predictions. In this way teachers may shut themselves from possibilities that lie outside the direct or indirect vision of those expectations. He warns us of the problem of replacing pedagogical hope with “measurables objectives” :

> The point is not that the curricular language of program delivery, management objectives, or learning outcomes is wrong. Seen in proper perspective, this language is probably a useful administrative convenience. Teachers have always planned what should take place in a particular course, class, program, or lesson. The problem is that the “administrative” and “technocratic” values and practices have so penetrated the very lifeblood of our existence that parents and teachers are in danger of forgetting a certain other type of understanding: what it means to hope for and bear children and then to take care of and hope for them. Recalling what thus seems to be forgotten belongs to being a parent or a teacher (Saevi, 2015). Not to do so has dire consequences. (van Manen, 2016a, p. 192-193)

Indeed, while other adults can made goals, objectives and systems with the goal to fix the present situation, bearing and having children, and then caring and having hope for them are something that only parents and teachers can do. Parents are the only adults who keep trying to have children despite multiple miscarriages. And teachers are the only adults who keep on trying to educate generations by

generations despite countless failures along the process. In the end, to hope, in van Manen's words, is "to believe in possibilities." Hope strengthens and builds. And parents and teachers need to recall life of hope.

After all of the discussions about the significance of adults taking the responsibility to demonstrate the active pedagogical hope, we may now ask the question of what may happen to our children and young people when we forsake our responsibility by failing or refusing to show how a life of hope is to be lived? Van Manen states that our responsibility may turn "entire generations of young people into cynic, adults without hope, grown-ups who have no sense of commitment, who refuse to model how life is to be lived" (2016a, p. 191). Why? Because while young children may not be able to perform superhuman achievement, through play they experience the world with a sense of possibility and openness. When one is young, everything is possible! This is hope, and this is what parents and teachers are rewarded with when they are with the child. Yet, children cannot continue to see the world in that sense of openness when the adults around them are not able to experience openness themselves. Quoting van Manen:

> The child needs that openness to make something of him or herself. As parents and teachers, we need that openness to be what we are and to examine what we have made of ourselves. We must openly examine ourselves in front of children, for we must model asking ourselves how life is to be lived so that children, used to the question, will freely ask it of themselves. To live responsibly as an adult is to always remain open to the question of how life is to be lived.

> "Am I living my best life?" Thus, my living becomes a constant example for the child. Whether I like it or not, my life will be saying, "This is the way one may live." My responsibility toward a child constantly confronts me with the need to act, constantly makes me express and conduct myself in such a manner that the child is asked to recognize in me and through me an image of mature adulthood. That is the way we must learn from our children. We must be even better learners than they are, because they in turn must learn from us. (van Manen, 2016a, p. 193)

## 2. Characteristics of Pedagogical Teachers: Pedagogical Tact and Thoughtfulness

We have investigated in the previous section, the necessity of pedagogical hope to pedagogical teachers. Now I want to discuss the two key concepts that can account for van Manen's idea of pedagogical teachers; pedagogical thoughtfulness and pedagogical tact. It is necessary, however, to remind ourselves of van Manen's pedagogy, which is the root of pedagogical thoughtfulness and tact. It may be worth recalling that etymologically, word "pedagogy" consists of two parts; *paides,* meaning child or young person, and *agogy,* meaning to give guidance, to accompany, to help, or to lead. Hence, the origin of the term "pedagogy" denotes the supporting of young people. This term has appeared in various disciplines[22] such as social and cultural pedagogy, school pedagogy,

[22] Van Manen (2016a) explained how the term has been used in various disciplines: "Social and cultural pedagogy (inspecting and discussing how we see and treat children in various societal and cultural contexts), school pedagogy (pointing on the pedagogical relations between educators like teachers, administrators and students), historical pedagogy (examining how we have seen,

historical pedagogy, political pedagogy, pedagogy as agogical science, ortho-pedagogy, pedagogy of technology, and andragogy. However, when it comes to the topic of pedagogical thoughtfulness and tact, the term pedagogy that Van Manen concentrates on is pedagogy that "focuses primarily on that sphere and relational reality where adults play a role in the education and bringing up of children and young people. To act pedagogically always means to support and to strengthen the (young) person, never to break down or diminish the person for whom we carry pedagogical responsibility " (van Manen, 2016a, p. 203). This pedagogy "involves us in distinguishing actively and/or reflectively what is good or right and what is life enhancing, just, and supportive from what is not good, wrong, unjust, or damaging in the ways we act, live, and deal with children" (van Manen, 2016a, p. 20).

If the above statements are true, then pedagogical teachers are those who are able to distinguish what is pedagogically good or bad for their students. But in order to

understood, and treated childhood and children throughout ages), political In the wider literature the term pedagogy may appear in such disciplinary phrases as social and cultural pedagogy (examining and discussing how children are seen and to be treated in various societal and cultural contexts), school pedagogy (focusing on the pedagogical relations between educators such as teachers or administrators and their students), historical pedagogy (considering how childhood and children have been seen, understood, and treated through the ages), political pedagogy (primarily preoccupied with government and institutional policies affecting young people, such as in citizenship education, and young-offenders legislation), pedagogy as an agogical science (studying childcare practices in various professions such as child psychology, counseling, social work, and health care), ortho-pedagogy (which deals with special education of handicapped children), pedagogy of technology (that examines how technology affects the way children grow up and are affected by new media and technologies), and andragogy (the ethical practices of dealing with adults and with adult education concerns)" (p. 203).

do this pedagogy, van Manen argues, one must know "how to act tactfully in pedagogic situations on the basis of a carefully edified thoughtfulness" (van Manen, 1984, p. 36). This brought us to the question of what pedagogical tact means. Pedagogical tact itself means "sensitivity or sensitiveness to a situation that enables me to do pedagogically the right thing for a child" (van Manen, 1984, p. 37). For van Manen, such tactfulness is not so much "a body of knowledge" one possesses, but rather "a knowing body", "a way of being with students that recognizes the pedagogical actions that are appropriate in a given moment with a particular child." In other words, it is a peculiar quality that has as much to do with what we are as with what we do. It is an improvisational thoughtfulness that involves "the total corporeal being of the person; an active sensitivity toward the subjectivity of the other, for what is unique and special about the other person" (van Manen, 1988, p. 5).

A teacher who knows how to exercise tact is one who recognizes the subjective nature of learning, and is responsive and attentive to the uniqueness of the student and of every situation. A tactful teacher knows when to exert influence, and when to withhold it. A tactful teacher is able to retain a continuing sense of pedagogic confidence and capability despite in spite of the various unpredictable learning and teaching situations they encounter. A tactful teacher knows how to implement tact in speech, as well as in silence. Van Manen further describes the compositions of tact into four abilities:

> First, a tactful educator has the sensitive ability to interpret inner thoughts, understanding, feelings, and desires from indirect clues such as gestures, demeanor, expression, and body language. Tact involves the ability to see through motives or cause or effect relations. Such a teacher is able as it were to read the inner life of the young person.
>
> Second, tact consists in the ability to interpret the pedagogical significance of the features of this inner life. This means knowing how to interpret, for example, the significance of sadness, shyness, frustration, interest, difficulty, tenderness, humor, discipline, embarrassment in concrete situations with particular children or students.
>
> Third, an educator with tact appears to have a fine sense of standards, limits, and balance that makes it possible to know almost automatically how far to enter into a situation and what distance to keep in individual circumstances.
>
> Fourth, a tactful teacher seems to have the ability of instantly sensing what is the right or good thing to do on the basis of perceptive pedagogical understanding of children's nature and circumstances. This moral intuition is predicated on the practical requirement of the means and ends of education that the teacher must constantly be able to distinguish between what is appropriate and what is not appropriate for a student or a group of children. (van Manen, 1991a, p. 197)

In other words, van Manen's Tact is comprised of first, the ability to read non-verbal communication gestures in order to get insights about the inner life of their students, second, the ability to interpret what the features of the students' inner life mean to the students' specific everyday situations, third, the sense to know when to keep a distance or when to approach the student, and fourth, the ability to spontaneously know and make the right and good decision for the students.

Let me give you an example of this fourfold complex and insightful sensitivity of tact in teaching offered by van Manen in the *Tone of Teaching* (2016c). In a section called "Pedagogical Dimension of Teaching", van Manen describes a story of how an English teacher interacts with a confrontational student. The student whose name was Daniel was dressed in provocative street-style attire and his head

was shaved, making him stood out in the small junior highs school where the teacher belonged.

> *It is the first day of class and I explain my Reading Room program. Daniel wanders into class, positions himself directly in front of me and proclaims, "I don't do reading."*
>
> *"Really?" I reply, "Reading Room should be an unusual experience for you then." As the students begin to read, the class quiets down. Silence replaces the chatter and scuffling of the grade nine class.*
>
> *I notice that Daniel doesn't have a book. He sits sagging in his chair, drumming his index finger on his desk. I peruse the bookcase and select a few novels. I am not expecting miracles. Quietly, I approach his desk, bend down, and tentatively whisper, "Uh, Daniel, why don't you choose the least offensive book…see if, uh, you can read a few pages before the class if over."*
>
> *He raises his haughty eyes and with a throw of the head dismisses me benignly, sighing: "I'll see."*
>
> *But I leave the carefully picked titles on his desk. Daniel is still hanging back in his seat. He casually spins the books around with his hand, seemingly indifferent. I turn away.*
>
> *A few minutes later, out of the corner of my eyes, I see that Daniel has picked up Carol Matas' novel* The Freak.
>
> *"Yes, I hooked him!" Now the book has to reel him in. I am hopeful: Daniel may turn into a reader yet.*

What was happening there? To a pair of untrained eyes, Daniel only seemed like a trouble-maker that can be found in any school around the globe. Yet this teacher saw him as a student who intentionally acted out to be recognized as different. She addressed the student in a light and humorous but also respectful. She respected the image the student was created; she understood Daniel's desire to be recognized. Now, of course, some of you may feel that the teacher did wrong, that she should have nailed the student who after all had been trying to provoke the teacher's authority. But in this exact understanding lies this teacher's application of tact.

The teacher seems to know just how near to approach the student and how to keep a proper distance. And rather than criticizing, defeating, or preaching, she respected and enhanced the student's possibility to start dig in into the world of reading that the teacher was about to introduced. As van Manen says as a comment to this pedagogical scene, "but how does this teacher know what to say? How does she know what distance to keep? No theoretical knowledge, no specific techniques or general rules of how to act tactfully can be found, and yet in the active understanding of what is at stake in this concrete classroom situation, it is possible for the teacher to practice and cultivate thoughtfulness and tact" (van Manen, 2016c, p. 42-43). Moreover, the example above where also shows us the necessity of tact. For van Manen, tact is pedagogically necessary because "it maintains the child's preeminence in the learning environment; it strengthens what is good and enhances what is unique in the child…it is important because with it, teachers are suspicious of that which could hurt the student, and yet tact also heals (makes whole) what is broken" (van Manen, 1998, p. 6).

Additionally pedagogical tact does what it does because it is based on pedagogical thoughtfulness, which is multifaceted and complex mindfulness oriented toward the child that is characterized by a self-awareness of the impact one has on the child" (van Manen, 1991b, p. 8). Before a pedagogical teacher is able to exercise a particular perceptive sensitivity as well as practicing an active, expressive, and caring concern for the student that is needed at that time, the

teacher has to first learn to be thoughtful. Van Manen argues that pedagogical thoughtfulness and tact are closely related concepts. Someone who is normally thoughtful is more likely to demonstrate tact in particular circumstances than a person who is quite thoughtless. Pedagogical thoughtfulness, according to van Manen, is a "reflective capacity that is formed by careful reflection on past experiences" (van Manen, 2016c, p. 43). However it differs from the reflective wisdom (phronesis) because the constantly changing and lively classroom life of teachers requires the teachers to immediately act in the moment. In other words, there is an emphasis on "sensing what is happening in the moment and what is significant in the concrete situation" (2016c, p. 43). For this reason, van Manen encourages us to understand tact, not as "a process of making instant "decision" and practical "judgments" (phronesis), but he suggests that we may reconceive pedagogical tact as "a mindfully mode of being that permits us to act in the instant of the moment contingently and yet thoughtfully in our living with children and young people" (van Manen, 2016a, p. 213). Lastly, we may have well heard about the concept of caring that Nel Noddings developed. How is pedagogical tact related to Noddings' caring ethic? The answer lies in the order of the happening of these two relations. Caring is an attitude that needs to happen prior to pedagogical tact. For without beginning with a caring attitude, pedagogical teachers can never become truly responsive to their children using their pedagogical thoughtfulness and tact. In one of his work, Max van Manen discusses

what would be required of an adult to be able to practice the rational-ethical sensitivity of pedagogy.

> First, the adult needs to have a reflective sense of what it means to be a humane human in this complex world and how each person is on the way to become a uniquely human person.
>
> Second, the adult needs to be oriented to the question of what is in the child's (best) interest.
>
> Third, the adult needs to understand his or her responsibilities in helping the child become independent.
>
> Fourth, the adult needs to have an active understanding of the pedagogically ethical perspectives that come into play in distinguishing good from less desirable ways of interacting with and educating children.
>
> Fifth, the adult must deeply care for the children in his or her care. This care-as-worry is an affect that cannot be forced or coerced onto parents or teachers, but without this caring concern pedagogy is impossible. (van Manen, 2016a, p. 179)

Here we can see that while it is necessary to have all four qualities—first, a reflective sense about being human means, second, an mind that is always oriented to the child's best interest, third, a responsibility to help children grow into independent adults, fourth, an active understanding to help discern what is best for the child in the concrete situations—that are needed to practice pedagogy, in the end, care for children is the most important component that is needed to start as well as to maintain the continuity of pedagogy.

## 3. Implications of Max van Manen's View on Pedagogical Relation to Teacher Education and Educational Research

This far I have discussed various aspects of Max van Manen's view on pedagogy and pedagogical relation. However, before proceeding to the conclusion of this thesis, I want to quickly explore the implication of van Manen's pedagogy to two aspects, the collaboration between parents and teacher as well as the teacher Education. In chapter 3 of this paper, I examined the common role with respect to children shared by teachers and parents as adults. I pointed out that that the common role that both teachers and adult should have, according to van Manen, is to protect, teach, and equip the young to live in their complex world and to be responsible for themselves, others and the world. I am well aware that this notion of parents and teacher having to work togethe to bring up and educate the young generation may not be common in the context of North America. Even the English language reflects this separation between child rearing (usually considered the process of parenting in home) and education (usually considered the process of teaching and learning in schools or educational institutions). But after studying van Manen's works and the European pedagogical tradition that he belongs to, I came to realize that just because there is no single word in English that "describes the entire moral, intellectual, physical, and spiritual complex of bringing up children" (van Manen, 1991a, p.6), that does not mean the deep connections

between the nature of teaching and parenting does not exist. In fact, there are European words that describe the total and complex process of bringing up children. For example, in van Manen's native Dutch language, the term *opvoeding* is said to be a general concept that equally describes the efforts of teaching (education, including schooling) and parenting (family child rearing). *Erziehung*, the German word for education that Klaus Mollenhauer the German pedagogical theorist used in his work, is also a term that covers both schooling and the process of bringing up children. Therefore, the connections between the nature of teaching and parenting are there, yet they are just rarely explored and thus, these connections remain fairly unknown to English-speaking educational scholars.

After learning these connections, I have come to think that it is time for teachers and parents to take a renewed interest in their common role in the children's lives. While I believe that there are parents and teachers who have close relationships with each other, parent-teacher conflict has been a more prevalent phenomenon in the world we are living right now. But it is now time to for teachers and parents to realize that they are not enemies, but they are rather natural allies in educating and supporting the development of children. Parents and teachers, I believe, must choose collaboration and partnership as the direction of their relationship. How can they do this? Well, first, I think parents and teachers must acknowledge that what is relevant for the relation between parents and children may be informative for the pedagogical relation between teachers and students and vice versa. When

both parents and teachers recognize this fact, I believe it will be easier for teachers to welcome parents' perspectives, to take the role of parents and put themselves in the parent's shoes, and also for parents to actively seek the teachers to share concerns about their children and listen carefully to the teachers' perspective about what happens in their children's classroom.

Secondly, and most importantly, I think both parents and teachers must learn to restore the place of child in their pedagogy. They must, I believe, regain a true pedagogic orientation to children. We are all aware that raising children is hard, parenting is emotionally and intellectually draining, and it often requires sacrifice and financial hardships. The task of teaching and educating the child is also challenging and hard, as teachers are expected to interact with the children while at the same time delivering and making sure the children learn the school materials. So although I have argued throughout this paper that caring relationship with adults is necessary to children as it is what gives the children the "surety, certainty, courage" to experiment with the world (van Manen, 1991b, p. 57), I also understand why parents and teachers seem to be more willing to sacrifice the relational and emotional realms in their parenting or educating and instead focus more on tasks like providing financial supports or delivering the subject matter content in education. However, although it may require more efforts and sacrifice, in order to truly see our children grow and flourish, I believe it is crucial that

parents and teachers learn to understand the child's world as it is lived and experienced by the child. Although I do not doubt that parents and teachers mean well when they try to emphasize their values and goals to the children, I would argue that it is important for adults to allow the children to dwell in their proper place, that adults should reorient their observation to view the "meaningful" experience of their children.

One of the ways parents and teachers can do this, I believe is to adapt to the act of asking phenomenological pedagogical questions in their day-to-day interaction with children. Questions such as, "How are we to act and live with children in a way that will help them foster their potentials and human capabilities while also realizing that we are prone to do them harm?" Or pedagogical hope-imbued questions such as, "are we living our lives in a way that is full of hope? Is our living with children right now experienced as hope to our children? Are we experiencing children as hope?" The other way to do this, I believe, is to learn to put into practice the concepts of pedagogical tact and thoughtfulness. They can do this by learning to first cultivate a self-awareness of the impact they have on the child, and second, by learning to interpret their children and students' inner thoughts, feelings, and desires from indirect nonverbal clues like gestures, expression and body language, as well learning to interpret those inner life's features' pedagogical significance. Tact, after all, as van Manen phrases it,

"involves the ability to see through motives or cause or effect relations." (van Manen, 1991a, p. 197)

On the other hand, in recent years, various authors have devoted time and effort to reflect and construct theories of teaching and learning which objective is to create improved teaching competence in the classroom that will make learning more efficient and systematic. Annually, new teachers and student teachers are ushered into classrooms with various learning and student strategies. They have been given the chance to participate in pre-service practice as well as continuing in-service training in a different new technical skills that research has proven to be effective. What the research does not show, but the new teacher experience soon acknowledges, is that teaching is "much more than the dutiful execution of technical acts" (Brown, 1991, p. 33). The novice teachers may have thought that as long as they are very well-prepared, they can just walk in and teach the materials, that as long as they knew it all, expressed it all, and interacted with and involved the students, the task would be done. But experienced teachers know that real teaching is not just a technique. This has brought us to the topic of Teacher education.

Let us consider the term teacher education. In most contexts, the use of this term is synonymous with pre-service teacher preparation. It is said that students of teaching seek to develop "skills and knowledge of teaching and to learn how to

competently apply these in practice" in the pre-service teacher preparation program (Bullough and Gitlin, 2001). So naturally, in teacher education, students of teaching enter their program with an innate interest to learn about teaching while their teacher-educators undoubtedly have a major responsibility for, and hopefully, an interest in teaching about teaching to their student-teachers. Thus, there are two priorities of teacher education: learning about teaching (content to be taught) and, teaching about teaching (learning to be experienced). Both of them, we can say doubtlessly, involves complex skills, abilities, competences, and knowledge. However, these priorities are made even more complex by the existence of "the competing agenda (learning about the particular content that is being taught and learning about teaching." (Loughran, 2006, p. 4).

It is difficult for a student of teaching to consistently pay attention, let alone responding to both of these competing agenda. In fact, it could be well argued that it is "clearly much easier for a learner to pay attention (or not) only to the content that is being taught" (Loughran, 2006, p. 4). After all, that is what 12 years of formal schooling and traditional university teaching have encouraged and reinforced. Therefore, it requires energy for students of teaching to get out of their well-established comfort zone of (passive) learning and begin to "question the taken for granted in their learning about teaching at both levels" (Loughran, 2006, p. 4). Most importantly, I believe, it would require an expectation, or belief, that there is real value and purpose for doing so. This is then where Max van Manen's

argument that teaching is so embodied and so tied into the phenomenology of one's world begins to play an important role. He argues that if it teaching has something to do with not only what we do, but also what we are, then the experience of practice teaching or internship is extremely important for the pedagogical preparation of teachers. Yet, as I have elaborated above, what we need more than ever is not a content-learning-orientated pedagogical preparations of teachers. Rather, what we need is a learning-about-teaching-oriented pedagogical preparations of teachers. Quoting van Manen, "the student teacher must somehow acquire this knowledge in an imitative and personal relation to the master teacher. By observing and imitating how the teacher animates the students, walks around the room, uses the board, and so forth, the student teacher learns with his or her body, as it were, how to feel confident in this room, with these students. This "confidence" is not some kind of affective quality that makes teaching easier; rather, this confidence is the active knowledge itself, the tact of knowing what to do or not to do, what to say or not to say" (van Manen, 2016a, p. 183).

Lastly, some may ask the question of what teacher education has to do with van Manen's *in loco parentis* pedagogy which is focused on the relationship between adults and children and young people. However, van Manen argues that while the term refers to "what parents, teachers, and other adults do when interacting with children or young people, the term may also be appropriate in relational activities

between adults who have become students again, such as in advanced levels of education, apprenticeship, mentorship, or university studies" (van Manen, 2016a, p. 203). Hence, I would like to suggest that Max van Manen's pedagogy is relevant to this teacher education field and so there is a real need in the future to develop an interactive and responsive pedagogy (based on thoughtfulness and tact as the conceptual frameworks) of field-base teacher education. I believe that when this kind of teacher-education pedagogy is developed, we will be able to create a climate where the actions of the future teachers (that will be involved pedagogically with our children) can be made more thoughtful and tactful. And I also believe that only after we learn to be more thoughtful and tactful, we will accomplish the goal of the new pedagogy that van Manen has tried to articulated as follows: to support and to strengthen and to never to break down or diminish the children and young person for whom we carry pedagogical responsibility.

# V. Summary and Conclusion

I have started this paper with the goal to reconstruct van Manen's concept of pedagogical teacher because I believe this concept is urgently needed for today's schooling and bringing up children. To accomplish this goal of reconstructing the characteristics of pedagogical teachers, I needed to examine some important concepts. First, I needed to investigate into the person of van Manen and the tradition of new pedagogy that he introduced in his works. Coming from Continental traditions, the term pedagogy in this sentence, as I have elaborated, does not have the same meaning as the word education in North America or the English-speaking world. For instance, one main difference between the terms 'education' and 'pedagogy' is that while 'education' denotes to activities happening in school and educational institutions, 'pedagogy' (pedagogic) refers to everything that happens to children from their early childhood to adulthood, that it is about the broader upbringing and educating the young generation (Saevi, 2017, p. 1792). It is also said that phenomenology as a methodological approach (or a way of seeing and living life as Mollenhauer terms it) and education as "pädagogik" have existed side-by-side for over years as a method of "existential inquire into professional practices of children and young peoples' life-worlds" (Saevi, 2017, p. 1791). Max van Manen has used this phenomenology as a methodological approach for his pedagogy-related works too. Later he called the

practice of the development and articulation of meaning giving methods of phenomenology on the basis of the practical examples, a *phenomenological of practice.*

After examining the characteristics of the phenomenological pedagogy Max van Manen subscribe to, I set on to look van Manen's pedagogy, as well as the common role for children shared by teachers and parents as adults according to Max van Manen in order to find the answer to what will help equip the older generation with whatever they need to encounter and fulfill the needs of the young generation in their complex lived present. In this section I elaborated about state of the world that our children and us are living and how this uncertain world requires parents and teachers (but especially teachers) to focus on a pedagogy that is based *in loco parentis* in order to provide children with "a protective sphere" that will help them grow and survive in this world. According to the European pedagogical tradition parenting and teaching derive from the same essential experience of pedagogy. Thus, following this tradition, teachers and parents shared a common role as adults which, according to Max van Manen(1991b) is "protecting and teaching the young to live in this world and take responsibility for themselves, for others, and for the continuance and welfare of the world," (p.7) However, though Max van Manen does argue that parents are the still the primary care-givers that are responsible for the child's well-being and development, considering the various societal influences that have caused the erosion of actual

parental involvement, he does argue that the teacher's charge, now more than ever is to act *in loco parentis,* using a more nurturing connotation of parenting.

Next, I investigated the difference between pedagogical teachers and non-pedagogical adults according to van Manen. He argues that "pedagogical hope animates the way a parent or teacher lives with a child: it gives meaning to the way an adult stands in the world, represents the world to the child, takes responsibility for the world, and embodies or stylizes the forms of knowledge through which the world is known, shown, and explained to children" (van Manen, 2016a, p. 191). Thus, the experience and inhibition of hope (hope that is grounded and rooted in pedagogical relationship) are what distinguish a pedagogic life from a non-pedagogic one. Hope is what makes us "true parents and teachers", it is what distinguish a non-pedagogical adult from a pedagogical adult.

Going back to Van Manen's conception of pedagogy, it is a pedagogy that that "focuses primarily on that sphere and relational reality where adults play a role in the education and bringing up of children and young people. To act pedagogically always means to support and to strengthen the (young) person, never to break down or diminish the person for whom we carry pedagogical responsibility " (van Manen, 2016a, p. 203). This pedagogy "involves us in distinguishing actively and/or reflectively what is good or right and what is life enhancing, just, and supportive from what is not good, wrong, unjust, or damaging in the ways we act, live, and deal with children" (p. 20). Due to the nature of this pedagogy,

pedagogical teachers are those who are able to distinguish what is pedagogically good for their students. But in order to do this pedagogy, van Manen argues, one must know "how to act tactfully in pedagogic situations on the basis of a carefully edified thoughtfulness" (van Manen, 1984, p. 36).

Thus, for the next section of this thesis, I examined two important concepts that helped me to reconstruct the characteristics of pedagogical teachers. They are pedagogical tact and thoughtfulness and they are rooted in van Manen's pedagogical relationship. Pedagogical tactfulness refers to "sensitivity or sensitiveness to a situation that enables me to do pedagogically the right thing for a child (1984b, p. 158), while pedagogical thoughtfulness refers to "multifaceted and complex mindfulness oriented toward the child that is characterized by a self-awareness of the impact one has on the child" (1991b, p. 8). For van Manen, tact is pedagogically necessary because "it maintains the child's preeminence in the learning environment; it strengthens what is good and enhances what is unique in the child…it is important because with it, teachers are suspicious of that which could hurt the student, and yet tact also heals (makes whole) what is broken" (1998, p. 6).

Thus in conclusion, by examining these concepts such as phenomenological pedagogy, *in loco parentis,* pedagogic hope, as well as pedagogical tact and thoughtfulness I have been able to clarify and reconstruct the main characteristics

of pedagogical teachers according to Max van Manen. Lastly, I also explored the implication of van Manen's pedagogy to two important aspects of modern education and upbringing, the collaboration and partnership of parents and teachers and teacher education and training. Since there exists a deep, yet rarely explored, connection between the nature of teaching and of parenting, I suggested that it is time for teachers and parents to take a renewed interest in their common role in the children's lives. Parents and teachers, I believe, must choose collaboration and partnership as the direction of their relationship. How can they do this? Secondly, since Max van Manen argued for the necessity of the non-technical dimensions—the phenomenological sensitivity to lives experience (children's realities and lifeworlds)—in guiding the actions of teachers when they are part of the classroom, I believe there is a need to make this practical knowledge about the non-technical dimension of teaching available to future student-teachers. This kind of training that focus on articulating the experiential quality of practical knowledge of teachers and of the lived experiences of the students they teach, argued van Manen, is the task of phenomenological and narrative human science methods. I suggested that there is a real need in the future to develop an interactive and responsive pedagogy (based on thoughtfulness and tact as the conceptual frameworks) of field-based teacher education.

# References


Arendt, H. (2013). *The human condition*. University of Chicago Press.

Arendt, H., & Kohn, J. (2006). *Between past and future*. Penguin.

Ayala Carabajo, R. (2011). Pedagogical hope: A fresh and deep glance to educational experience from van Manen's approach. *REVISTA ESPANOLA DE PEDAGOGIA*, *69*(248), 119-143.

Bartlett, L. (2005). Dialogue, knowledge, and teacher-student relations: Freirean pedagogy in theory and practice. *Comparative Education Review*, *49*(3), 344-364.

Biesta, G. (2005). Against learning. Reclaiming a language for education in an age of learning. *Nordisk Pedagogik*, *25*, 54-70.

Biesta, G. J., & Miedema, S. (2002). Instruction or pedagogy? The need for a transformative conception of education. *Teaching and Teacher education*, *18*(2), 173-181.

Biesta, G. (2011). Disciplines and theory in the academic study of education: A comparative analysis of the Anglo-American and Continental construction of the field. *Pedagogy, culture & society*, *19*(2), 175-192.

Blake, N., Smeyers, P., Smith, R., & Standish, P. (2002). *The Blackwell guide to philosophy of education*. Blackwell Publishing.

Bloom, A., & Rousseau, J. J. (1979). Emile, or on Education. *New York: Basic*.

Brown, R. K. (1991). Toward a Phenomenology of Curriculum: The Work of Max Van Manen and T. Tetsuo Aoki.

Buberr, M. (1964) *Reden über Erziehung* (Heidelberg).

Bullough, R., & Gitlin, A. (2001). Becoming a student of teaching. *New York*: *RoutledgeFalmer*.

Bullough, R. V. (2011). Hope, happiness, teaching, and learning. In *New Understandings of Teacher's Work* (pp. 15-30). Springer, Dordrecht.

Cohen, J. (2010). *Rousseau: A free community of equals*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Darling, J. and Nordenbo, S. E. (2003) Progressivism, in: N. Blake, P. Smeyers, R. Smith and P. Standish (eds) *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Education* (Malden, MA, Blackwell Publishing), pp. 288–308.

d'Entreves, M, P. (2019). Hannah Arendt. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2019/entries/arendt/>

Dilthey, W. (1888). Über die Möglichkeit einer allgemeingültigen pädagogischen Wissenschaft [On the possibility of a universally valid pedagogical science]. *Kleine pädagogische Texte*. Langensalze: Beltz.

Freire, P. (1996). Pedagogy of the oppressed (revised). *New York: Continuum*.

Freire, P. (2005). Teachers as cultural workers. *Colorado: Westview Press*.

Friesen, N. (2017). The pedagogical relation past and present: experience, subjectivity and failure. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *49*(6), 743-756.

Halpin, D. (2001). The nature of hope and its significance for education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *49*(4), 392-410.

Kitchen, W. H. (2014). *Authority and the Teacher*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Lakoff, G. (2010). *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think*. University of Chicago Press.

Langeveld, M. J. (1983). Reflections on phenomenology and pedagogy. *Phenomenology+ Pedagogy*, 5-7.

Loughran, J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. Taylor & Francis.

Mollenhauer, K. (2013). *Forgotten connections: On culture and upbringing*. Routledge.

Nieto, S. (2003). *What keeps teachers going?*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2012). The caring relation in teaching. *Oxford Review of Education*, *38*(6), 771-781.

Podis, J., & Podis, L. (2007). Pedagogical" In Loco Parentis": Reflecting on Power and Parental Authority in the Writing Classroom. *College English*, *70*(2), 121-143.

Poplin, M. S., & Weeres, J. (1993). *Voices from the inside: A report on schooling from inside the classroom, part one, naming the problem*. Institute for Education in Transformation at the Claremont Graduate School.

Saevi, T. (2017). Phenomenology in education. *Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory. Singapore: Springer*, 1790-1795.

Sidorkin, A. M. (Ed.). (2004). *No education without relation*. P. Lang.

Van Manen, M. (1979). The Utrecht School: An experiment in educational theorizing. *Interchange*, *10*(1), 48-66.

Van Manen, M. (1982). Phenomenological pedagogy. *Curriculum inquiry*, *12*(3), 283-299.

Van Manen, M. (1983). On pedagogic hope. *Phenomenology+ Pedagogy*, i-iii.

Van Manen, M. (1984). *Action research as theory of the unique: From pedagogic thoughtfulness to pedagogic tactfulness*. Department of Secondary Education, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta.

Van Manen, M. (1988). The relation between research and pedagogy. *Contemporary curriculum discourses*, 437-452.

Van Manen, M. (1991a). Can Teaching Be Taught? or Are Real Teachers Found or Made?. *Phenomenology+ Pedagogy*, 182-199.

Van Manen, M. (1991b). *The tact of teaching: The meaning of pedagogical thoughtfulness*. Routledge.

Van Manen, M. (1996). Phenomenological pedagogy and the question of meaning. *Phenomenology and educational discourse*, 39-64.

Van Manen, M. (2002). Introduction: The pedagogical task of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18*, 135-138.

Van Manen, M. (2014). Phenomenological Pedagogy: Phenomenology in Philosophical Issues in Educational Research'. <http://www.maxvanmanen.com/files/2014/03/2014-SAGE-Phenomenological-Pedagogy.pdf>

Van Manen, M. (2016a). *Pedagogical tact: Knowing what to do when you don't know what to do* (Vol. 1). London & New York: Routledge.

Van Manen, M. (2016b). *Phenomenology of practice: Meaning-giving methods in phenomenological research and writing*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Van Manen, M. (2016c). *The tone of teaching: The language of pedagogy*. London & New York & Routledge.

White, J. (2002). Education, the Market and the Nature of Personal Well–Being. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *50*(4), 442-456.

## 국문초록

# 교사의 교육적 역할의 비기술적 차원: 막스 반 매넌의 현상학적 교육학을 중심으로

서울대학교
사범대학원 교육학과
교육철학 전공
Stella Nikiko ROOSTANTO

이전 세대에 비해 오늘날 아동 및 청소년은 그들의 삶의 경험을 예측할 수 없게 만드는 변화, 갈등, 다원성/복수성, 가치 및 신념과 삶의 조건의 모순으로 가득 찬 심각하게 분열된 세상에 살고 있다. 본 연구에서는 이러한 세상에 살고 있는 현재 아동의 성장과 인격 형성에서 성인이 해야 할 역할을 이해하고 탐색하는 것을 목적으로 하였다. 변화와 갈등으로 가득한 이러한 현실로 인해 아동의 삶에 대한 부모의 관여가 점점 약화되거나 왜곡되고 있다. 본 연구는 이러한 어려움과 위기 속에서 살아가는 젊은 세대의 요구를 마주하고 충족시키기 위해 '부모를 대신한다(in loco parentis)' 는 교육적 전통 하에서 의무를 부여 받는 '교육하는 성인(pedagogical adult)'으로서 교사의 역할을 새롭게 확인하고자 하였다. 특히 이 연구는 현상학적 방법으로 교육학을 탐구한 네덜란드 태생의 캐나다 학자 막스 반 매넌(Max van Manen)의 교사에 대한 철학적 관점에 기초하여 그것을 검토하고자 하였다.

상술된 연구 목적을 달성하기 위해 본 논문이 검토한 문제는 세 가지다. 첫째, 막스 반 매넌이 옹호하는 현상학적 교육학(phenomenological pedagogy)의 핵심적 특징을 살펴보았다. 이것은 막스 반 매넌의 교육학적 사유를 이해하는 데 중요하기 때문이다. 둘째, 반 매넌이 말하는 교사와 부모가 성인으로서 분담하는 어린이들에 대한 공통적인 교육적 역할을 검토하였다. 이것은 그가 성인에게 부여하는 어린 세대들에 대한 '교육적 역할'에 대한 원칙에 입각한 교육 철학적인 관점을 이해하게 하기 때문이다. 셋째, 본 연구는 반 매넌이 말하는 '교육적' 교사의 구체적 특성을 검토하였다.

이 연구의 결론은 오늘날과 같이 복잡하고 갈등이 많은 사회를 살아갈 젊은 세대의 교육에서 교사에게 필요한 것은 특정 교과 지식에 대한 전문성 뿐만 아니라, 아이들에 대한 '교육적 희망(pedagogical hope)', '교육적 요령(pedagogical tact)', '교육적 사려심(pedagogical thoughtfulness)' 이라는 것이다. 더 나아가 이 연구는 막스 반 매넌의 '교육적 관계 (pedagogical relationship)' 개념이 개념적 틀로서의 사려 깊음(pedagogical thoughtfulness)과 교육적 요령(tact)에 기반한 현장 기반 교사 교육(teacher education)의 상호반응적 교육의 형성에 독창적으로 기여할 수 있음을 보인다.

**주제어:** 막스 반 매넌, 교육적 관계, 현상학적 교육학, 교육적 요령, 교육적 사려심, 교육적 성인, 교사교육

**학번:** 2017-23964