The Question about the Scientific Position of Transformative Pedagogy

Bogomir Novak

The question about the scientific position of transformative pedagogy is an epistemological question. The discussion about whether (transformative) pedagogy is a science or not is a matter for the epistemological criteria of scientificity. The term 'epistemology' originates from the Greek επιστήμη - *episteme*, and λόγος - logos, knowledge. Epistemology is a newer term for the theory of knowledge which was a philosophical discipline concerned with the nature and scope of knowledge. An increasingly intense development of, in particular, social sciences in the 19th century resulted in the need for establishing in fact how scientific they were. Various epistemologists from the 20th century (Bachelard, Kuhn, Popper, Lakatos, Laudan, Feyerabend, Richards) focused on different criteria of scientificity. There are two different meanings of epistemology listed in Wikipedia. The first, i.e. the traditional meaning of epistemology is the theory of knowledge. The second meaning can be found in francophone countries, where a distinction is made between knowledge (in German *das Wissen/wissen,* in French *(le) savoir*) and recognition or acknowledgment (in German *das Erkenntis/ erkennen*, in French *la connaisance/connaître*). On account of the predominance of American culture and the English language, the first meaning (i.e. the theory of knowledge) is also gaining recognition in other cultures and languages. Scientificity thus signifies the cognitive foundations of the development of pedagogy as a science. Epistemology is defined as the science of the science (how do we know what we know).

Miheljak (2003) questions the cognitive foundations of psychology on account of the paradigm shift and, in this paper, questions are similarly posed with regard to pedagogy. Most often the paradigm signifies an activity pattern in a scientific or any other research. The term paradigm comes from the Greek

παράδειγμα, which means a pattern, an example or a sample. It has been widely used since the end of the 19th century. Ferdinand de Sussure used this term in linguistics to refer to a class of elements with similarities. As part of the science about science, the concept of paradigm was systematically introduced by the philosopher Thomas Kuhn, in particular in connection with the development of scientific thought and with gradual (evolutionary) and revolutionary changes. The criteria of scientificity changed simultaneously with the development of science. However, it was not until the 20th century that the need arose to research this development systematically.

Pedagogy is a science about the relationship between upbringing and education. Since various historically changeable interests drive this field, its definition is not unambiguous – the content of both concepts is namely changing in unison with the relationship between meanings, objectives, subject matters and the means of upbringing and education. In socialism, the primary emphasis was on upbringing and, during the transition period, on education. In recent times, similar polemics have been focused on the primacy of teaching or learning. As will be pointed out later, this depends on definitions for the acknowledgment of the primacy of the Cartesian or the holistic paradigms.

Pedagogical reasoning of the primacy of a teacher's relationship to students existed throughout the development of the pedagogical thought: for instance as early as the ancient times within the Socratic dialogue, in the Middle Ages and in the early modern period as part of the reformatory pedagogy and since the 1960s as an alternative to the rigid transmissive school. There are three similar syntagmas as pedagogy of the oppressed, Freie, P., 1970), critical pedagogy with representatives such as Apple, M., (2005) McLaren, P. (2001), Giroux, H. (1997) and transformative pedagogy. Critical pedagogy originates in Habermas's critical social theory and also includes post-structuralism. One of the present-day objectives of critical pedagogy is the transformation of the global society into a just, honest and compassionate economic democratic society where the interests of people must not be asserted at the expense of others (Brookfield, 2002). Hence, there is no support for the development of the transformative school without a suitable social context.

The subject of studies of transformative pedagogy (R. Quantz, P. Senge, 2000; Mezirow, 1990) is the possibility of a transformation of the transmissive school into the transformative school which encourages different forms of transformative learning. Since the late 1960s, transformative pedagogy has been studying and setting objectives for the transformative school. Its aim is to encourage various forms of transformative learning and to address how to make the society of knowledge/learning function, what determines

it, what is the relation between (constant) school reforms and social needs, etc. (Senge, 2000). Clearly this type of learning is meant to be socially interactive, even though it does not change the society.

One of the most comprehensive definitions of transformative learning is the transformation of students into efficient personalities because it empowers them to 1. develop healthy and productive relationships, 2. solve productive relationships by helping develop emotional intelligence, 3. guide themselves and achieve goals, 4. pay attention to good healthy results, 5. maintain wise responsibility. Transformative learning is oriented towards students and the dialogue with them (Senge, 2000). Senge (2000) puts forward a transformative definition of learning as changing oneself and the environment. Only transformative learning is personally significant, therefore students have to know what they are learning for. Teachers, as reflective practitioners, explore the learning and teaching possibilities with a view to discovering new methods and ways in which they would help them students pursue changes on their own. Individual or social transformative learning is a deeply emotional, spiritual, cognitive, discursive but also an inter-subjective process; the quality of our relationships with significant others. The concept of a simultaneous change of an individual and the society seems idealistic, as it is not clear whether the social changes reach to the national level, the global level or stay within narrower communities (families, classes, schools).

Some authors from Slovenia and Croatia, such as Pediček, F., 2002, Bratanić, M., 1990, Brajša, P., Marentič-Požarnik, B., 2008, 2009, Novak, B., 2006, Rutar, D. 2002 have discussed the relationship between the old and the new school paradigms in respect of the transformative pedagogy and school as an alternative to the transmissive school.

Another of its subjects is the study of the transformative school within the political-cultural context and with regard to the significance of the advantages (transformative) learning has over teaching. An explanation is provided regarding the way the paradigm shift encouraged the development of pedagogical and cultural anthropology in the course of the development of science. Both pedagogical and cultural anthropology have originated from the criticism of the existing society, thematized transformative learning and made traditional school more open for new social changes and development-oriented goals.

The holistic transformative paradigm of learning was put forward by transformative pedagogy. It has lead to holistic teaching whereby a teacher is considered an expert and all people as lifelong learners. Learners learn not only from their experience with other people but also from their own experience. In this sense experiential learning is also a kind of transformative learning.

Since transformative pedagogy is merely one version of alternative pedagogy, the question arises, what was it that legitimized the alternative pedagogies that sprang into existence at the turn of the 20th century and from the 1960's onwards? What they have in common is criticism of the traditional school, which they consider transmissive and believe that its transmission of knowledge and educational formulas makes students passive.

There are three basic principles of reform pedagogy:

a) The advantage of development over learning,

b) The advantage of natural upbringing over planned exertion of influence,

c) The advantage of upbringing that comes from inside the child prior to the upbringing and originates in the culture, the social and cultural values (Medveš, 2002).

Reform pedagogy may be oriented towards the classic pedagogical, didactic and programme-related formalism to an overly radical extent. Instead of highlighting the importance of formal acts (syllabi, curricula, textbooks, prescribed methodical procedures), it gives more significance to the personal and professional profiles of a teacher because of individual children – students. Bureaucratization of public schools marginalizes this interpersonal level.

It does matter what kind of interests pedagogical objectives are determined by. The present-day global and national neoliberal strategies are not favourably disposed to the humane development of educational systems of the 21st century. Gregorič (2008: 76) proves that »the degradation of human potentials is restored of the withdrawing of four basic elements from education: politicking, epistemological curiosity, collective activity and immanence of conflict«. If the imposed neoliberal trend of impoverishing the existing cultural and intellectual capital by lowering the standards of knowledge and cognizance as part of the educational processes continues, the »degradation of human potentials will result in diminishing the quality, broad-mindedness, critical state and creativity of cognizance« (Gregorič, 2008: 58). This is a continuation of the Cartesian objectivistic epistemology according to which the only relevant kind of knowledge is knowledge that is in the interest of the market or the state.

Unlike some other progressivistic and pedocentric alternative pedagogy, transformative pedagogy originates from the constructivist epistemology. However, according to the definitions of transformative learning, transformative pedagogy does not advocate a radically individual personal constructivism as part of which students produce all of their knowledge from inside themselves. This leads to epistemic solipsism. Transformative pedagogy originates in the social constructivism that abides by communicative inter-

action (what Habermas calls *communicative action).* This means that an individual does not create knowledge merely from inside himself, he transforms it as part of interpersonal social contacts. A subject-object relationship exists between the teacher and a student and hence the extremities of objectivism and subjectivism – solipsism fails to hold up in pedagogical practice.

The Search for a Compromise between the Transmissive and Transformative Schools

Štefanc (2005) gives a critical analysis on some problematic suppositions of pedagogical constructivism, which has recently been gaining increasing command over both the theoretical sphere of pedagogy as well as the empirical teaching practice. He shows that the interpretation of constructivist principles is by some built upon an ideological split and a value-related polarization of two otherwise inseparable functions of school lessons, such as the transmission of knowledge and the transformation of a subject.

Authors of the international TALIS study (Sardoč et al. 2009: 127) have established that teachers and head teachers in Slovenia are somewhat more inclined towards constructivist principles of teaching than towards a direct transmission of knowledge. A distinction between three concepts of teaching practices has been made on the international level, i.e.: structured teaching practices, student-oriented teaching practices and more demanding teaching activities. In general, it can be said that all teachers participating in the TALIS study feel closest to structured teaching practices in the sense of a traditional frontal approach to teaching. In comparison to other countries, Slovenia records a high index of the so-called student-oriented teaching practices or differentiated and individualized teaching practices, which includes group work, students' cooperation etc., and a markedly low index of the so-called more exacting teaching practices, which include project work, the making of different things, argumentation, etc. Furthermore, as far as being in favour of constructivism is concerned, Slovenia is placed somewhere halfway between Iceland and Italy.

A comparison can be made between the disadvantages of the old paradigm and advantages of the new one and vice-versa. Those who oppose the transformative side to the transmissive one disregard the comprehensiveness of transmission. The question is whether the new transformative school can succeed in maintaining good aspects of the transmissive one. Opposing content-oriented and process-oriented curricula is senseless, as the contents of knowledge cannot be taught in a non-process-oriented way and without any content there are no processes.

Research on interactive communications or the dialogue within educational theory and practice is only possible on the basis of process-oriented

and integrative curricula, various learning and teaching styles, as well as motivations for them. This enables the comprehension of sustainable development. The empirical part of the research project will include interviews with students and teachers, with a view to establishing their 'subjective theories', their different interpretations of creative learning and their attitudes towards it. Both positive and negative factors of creative classroom and school climates will be examined empirically. This comprehensive anthropological theory will attempt to fill the gap in our field.

Table 1: The differences between the transmissive and transformative school models.

Public schools without a special concept	Healthy, eco-schools, schools for sustainable development, etc.
Content-oriented curricula	Process- and integrative-oriented curricula
Rigid organisation of school work	Flexible organisation of school work
Effect-oriented schools as a burden for talented students	Integrative schools fulfilling everyone's educational needs
A closed school climate	An open, creative school climate
Priority of teaching over learning	Priority of learning over teaching
Prevalence of teachers' explanations	Schools of dialogue with interaction communication
Prevalence of content knowledge and learning	Integration of various forms of knowledge and learning
Prevalence of learning subject quantity	Permanent improvement of educational quality
Teacher as a subject expert	Teachers' complex professionalism (Marentič Požarnik)

These mental dichotomizations are in pedagogical practice more intertwined than can be presented in such a table. A dichotomization as a handy outline thus fails to explain developmental alternatives as complementary or excluding. This issue is more complex as it does not only depend on the planned development of the school based on school legislation and its education organization, but also on various perceptive and reflective aspects of school self-evaluation. It does therefore not suffice for the school to only carry out these evaluations; it is also necessary for it to incorporate different aspects of evaluation of results. Without considering these factors, it is impossible to know whether transformative characteristics are complementary with the transmissive ones at the same school or not.

Štefanc (2005) shows teaching to be an inevitable transmission of objective knowledge, whether a teacher wants it or not. Since teachers participating in the international TALIS study are in favour of both sides of the above table, every school is both transmissive and transformative. Knowledge is objective, since it 1. has been gained historically through scientific progress 2. is prescribed by the syllabi. Oral and written exams in primary and secondary schools, the baccalaureate in all types of upper-secondary schools (the so-called gymnasia in Slovenia) and university exams test objective knowledge. In social sciences and humanities in particular, students have the opportunity to express their subjective knowledge as well. If this knowledge has not been presented to them in a didactically suitable way, they are unable to give it constructive meaning. Students remain passive and do not store it in their long-term memory.

From a holistic anthropological perspective, the most transformative of all schools is the school that takes into consideration the man as a being of dialogue on a biopsychosocial and spiritual level of his personality. The need for the school of dialogue (the medieval, Renaissance school, reform pedagogy, transformative, Ignatian, Gestalt pedagogy) has been emphasized ever since Socrates. Of course, not every private school is transformative, in the same way that the public school is no longer merely transmissive.

In reference to pedagogical practice, we talk about the transmissive-transformative school, which means that certain transformative elements are introduced into public schools, for instance a flexible curriculum and timetable, formative assessment, the optional subject 'learning of learning', team teaching, creative lateral and vertical thinking based on the doctrine of De Bono.

The Slovene nine-year primary school strives for good quality of school lessons, cooperative learning and good relationships between students and teachers, who are not merely experts in their field, as well as other elements included in the right column of the aforementioned table. The nine-year primary schools and upper-secondary schools include the optional subject 'learning of learning', which is one of the elements of transformative learning, but they do not introduce all four teaching and learning styles as listed by Marentič Požarnik (2011) or the four pillars of learning according to Delors (1996). The primary school France Prešeren in the Slovene Municipality of Črenšovci for example is transformative in several aspects. It is well known for introducing the formative assessment of students. It is simultaneously confirmed as an eco-school, a healthy school and a school of good quality.

The concept of the primary school Preserje in Radomlje can also be recognised as transformative. It has been in compliance with the Choice Theory

by William Glasser for ten years. It encourages children's inner motivation by giving meaning to their work and by imparting useful knowledge. It fosters good relationships as part of a safe school environment where mistakes are allowed and much can be learnt from them. Relationships among participants in education (especially between teachers and students) are built on the following habits and values: respect, stimulation, encouragement, trust, kindness, tolerance, acceptance, negotiations, listening and support.

Transformative pedagogy is not a theory that could be put into practice in the entire population; it is thus applied in some public schools with a conceptual mission and in all private schools with a conceptual mission. As far as the situation in other EU Member States is concerned, it is similar. Participants in education still prefer to give thought to good and top-quality schools than transformative ones. It is thus likely that a school, which gives some knowledge and prepares students for life is a transformative one, but it is not certain.

From the perspective of the new holistic paradigm, it is in the long run better if upbringing is thematized as a whole and not merely partially technically functional in the view of its short-term effects and efficiency. This broadest panoramic perspective is needed, so an appraisal can be given about the 'rational core' of each of the school models, without each author speaking only in favour of the truth they defend through a confirmation of transmissive or transformative knowledge. The transmission of knowledge is necessary but it is not enough for personal growth and changes of the society.

There are some common characteristics of transmissive and transformative schools. The transformative school is supposed to carry on the good aspects of the »rational core« of transmissive schools and to augment its downsides by means of multi-prospects of new didactic concepts. With regard to students' progress, transformative pedagogy places more emphasis on the teacher's professional competencies.

Schools in Slovenia are for the greater part still part of the transmissive model with characteristics of a system, which include classrooms, lessons and school bells. In such schools, a hierarchy of relationships comes before democracy, indoctrination before the use of methods for the purpose of developing critical thinking and students' pseudo-activities before activities that are actually suitable for them. The transformative school is well known for its flexibility, teachers' team cooperation, encouragement of students' creativity and the desire for improving of the quality of lessons.

Some teachers put into effect principles of the new transformative school model by being oriented towards:

1) The needs of the future (rather than towards past knowledge),
2) Universal values as man's essence,

3) Inner peace as the foundation of a healthy personality,

4) Cooperation and creativity in learning and teaching,

5) Increased emphasis on the significance of personal experience and intuition rather than towards rationality and,

6) Interpersonal relationships as a foundation for the development of one's personality.

An ambivalent attitude to the theoretical and practical aspirations of reform, pedagogy in Slovenia has rather deep theoretical roots, which originate in the opposition of various expert perspectives regarding some key pedagogical issues. At first the attitude was more ideological than professional (Medveš, 1992). This observation can in my opinion still be perceived in every relationship between the established and the alternative schools. It takes more complex-complementary perspectives to exceed narrow polarizations and one-sided absolutizations of one and the other pedagogical orientations. A transformative school is based on a critical, free and transformative pedagogy that emphasizes communicative action and cooperation between teachers and students.

Some pedagogues can understand the characteristics of the transmissive and transformative pedagogies, the sociocentric and pedocentric ones, the visible and invisible ones, the school of knowledge and the education for values. Bernstein (2007), a well-known 20th century pedagogue, has attempting to intervene between the visible and strict pedagogy, and the invisible and soft pedagogy. One of the invisible pedagogies, as classified by Bernstein, is alternative pedagogy, which has been passed over from the proletariat to the middle class. When it comes to the visible pedagogy, the hierarchy between the teacher and the student is clear and unmistakable, whereas in invisible pedagogy the hierarchy is not visible, it is hidden behind the partnership. Bernstein believes they are both a product of the middle social class; they do however fight for the key position within the field of education. Is dialogue between the visible and the invisible pedagogies possible? Visible pedagogy stimulates competitiveness, whereas the invisible one focuses on one's uniqueness and is a good response to the deficiencies of visible pedagogy (Bernstein, 2007).

Our hypothesis is that the transmissive school is better at developing only a few layers of a person as a complete biological, psycho-social, ethical, political, spiritual and aesthetic being in their complex multi-layeredness, while the transformative school is better at developing the balance between all these layers. A transformative school aims to achieve the best possible results of one's learning performance in other ways, for instance through learning methods that are friendly to one's mind, in comparison to the transmissive school which is 'the ideological apparatus of the state' (Althusser's syntagma).

What does the epistemological paradigm shift mean for the relationship between the transmissive and transformative pedagogies?

The former philosophical theory of knowledge was trying to discover what the essence of knowledge was, while modern epistemology is looking for answers to the question about the criteria for identifying the results of natural and social sciences as scientific. In ancient times and the Middle Ages, the criterion of scientificity was learning about essential reasons of things and knowledge was a well-grounded belief. In modern times, the dominant question has become 'in what way can something be done?' To be able to provide an answer to this, philosophers of science have evaluated scientists' contributions in the sense of a calculating, quantifiable, available world according to a uniform Cartesian method of *mathesis universalis*. This world is an increasingly estranged and dehumanized one. Epistemologists are obviously no longer satisfied merely with the diagnoses of the situation in the world following scientific-technical changes; they wish to impose some norms to scientists according to which the results of science (including pedagogy) would take us to a humane world.

The hypothesis is that the transmissive pedagogy corresponds to the epistemology of Cartesian paradigm and the transformative one to the holistic paradigm. Characteristics of the Cartesian paradigm are as follows:

- dualism of body and spirit,
- mathesis universalis,
- the prevalence of analytical methodical thinking,
- linear cause-and-effect perspectives,
- separated closed spaces (schools, hospitals, prisons, factories),
- separated disciplinary scientific knowledge,
- the world as being instrumentalized, measurable, mathematically calculable, quantifiable, functional, experiential from experiments, polluted.

It is characterized by experimentation, an instrumentalized, technical and cunning mind, mathematization or quantification, nivelization, technification and dualism, etc. Specific characteristics of circumstances are better reflected by holistic science. Pedagogical practice is both a discipline and an art. Certain problems are thus better reflected in the holistic paradigm.

Characteristics of the holistic paradigm are as follows:

- the whole is more than the sum of individual parts,
- a unit of body and soul,
- butterfly effects,
- the systemic-contextual perspective rather than the linear model of traditional science,

- applied methods are observation with participation, double herme-
neutics, empathic understanding and dialogue.

Holism is not an ideal scheme, it is however the most strenuous one. By
itself, holism does not find solutions to all issues. It is therefore a good idea
for the traditional and alternative pedagogies to work together in the same
way that traditional and alternative medicines do.

Capra (2005) claims such a systemic way of thinking calls for the per-
ception to be broadened in a number of different ways:

– from individual parts to the whole: living organisms are integrated
wholes that cannot be reduced to smaller parts. Their system characteristics
are characteristics of the whole that none of the individual parts have.

– from an object to relationships: an ecosystem is not merely a col-
lection of species, it is a community. Moreover, both biological and human
communities are characterized by relationship networks. The subject of re-
search within the systemic way of thinking is relationship networks that are
woven into larger networks. In practice, organizations that are organized ac-
cording to this ecological principle differ from other organizations in that
they are based on relationships that favour cooperation and decision-mak-
ing by consensus.

– from objective to contextual knowledge, a shift from the analytical
to the contextual way of thinking. Characteristics of individual parts can
only be understood in the context of the whole. Such a holistic paradigm ex-
cludes objectivity that is independent from an observer.

Kuhn (1998) explains how essential shifts in the progress of science
come about with a relationship between ordinary and revolutionary science.
However, since Kuhn predicted a shift from the ordinary to revolutionary
science, the question arises when pedagogical theory and practice take on
this role.

Science perceives itself as dogmatic and critical (with Popper's falsifi-
cation principle), normal and revolutionary (Kuhn), evolutionary, reduci-
ble and irreducible (problem solving by Laudan), divergent and convergent
(Bourdieu), diagnostic and prognostic. None of the above authors however
were aware that this was a criticism of the entire Enlightenment anthropo-
centric paradigm, which Horkheimer and Adorno (2002) reproached for its
totalitarian tendencies that had been put into effect through Nazi fascism.
Popper's 'social engineering of spirits', which he adopted from the Stalinist
doctrine, does not lead to an open society; it supports the present-day ten-
dency of technological determinism. The 'anything goes' standpoint (Feyer-
abend) supports the view that pedagogical practice is not merely a science,
but also an art. Social sciences are irreducible to science (Giddens), although
attempts to do so still exist. Holistic science is controversial. An opposing

view is that holistic science is 'pseudoscience' because it does not rigorously follow the scientific method.

The problem with the Cartesian paradigm lies in its trying to affirm the classical Enlightenment hypothesis about the quality of being cultured that is a consistent subjection to social norms. Humanity is bound up with the subordination to the principle of the mind, which is in turn bound up with relinquishing the principle of comfort and children's wild freedom. It does not anticipate the importance of a free decision to act responsibly and in additional fails to distance itself from the conformist (irresponsible) posture of an authoritarian personality as a result of anti-permissive classical authoritarian education.

The Cartesian dualism is manifested in all areas of social life, for instance in relation to secularism, closed rooms, etc. As part of the holistic paradigm science is no longer an objective truth and is not a firm part of the real world; it is becoming determined in a subjective way, it participates subjectively, it is insecure and part of mutual connections. It is therefore auto-reflexive and plural and is thereby also becoming multicultural, understanding, dialogic and integrative – it encompasses and takes into account various points of view. Pedagogy is no longer social engineering. It is opening up room for *mathesis specialis,* for the individual, sensitive and vulnerable.

There are several types of alternative pedagogy: reform, critical, transformative, holistic, queer, radical, pedagogy of listening (Reggio Emilia), multicultural pedagogy etc. They are related to therapies and social sciences, but they are not identical with them. What they have in common is self-regulation. In post-modernism, all of these disciplines have become intertwined, they have even overlapped and uninformed individuals thus no longer know which of them they are following or which is relevant at a given time.

In his theory of the three worlds of knowledge – the objective, subjective and interactive knowledge - Popper (1972) pointed to a possible explanation of this phenomenon. Recently, a lot of emphasis has been put on the intersubjective world of interpersonal communication, which is supposed to connect the objective and subjective worlds. Popper's epistemology of falsification remains a firm part of the Cartesian paradigm. According to Popper, transmissive pedagogy is the social engineering of students for social interests. The principle of objectivity expects the observer's characteristics not to become part of the description of his observations. By excluding those process-oriented aspects of perception that are essential, the observer is degraded to a photocopying machine and thus eludes the concept of ethical responsibility.

The transmissive model still corresponds to the dualistic, mechanical man in the sense of an anthropocentric and anthropological scheme and a

labour-centric society, while the transformative model pertains to the whole of the post-employment and post-industrial, auto-reflexive and high-risk society. The school tries to develop education as a whole by means of didactic, technological and organizational innovations, as well as interactive communication, which activates previously only latently existing potentials.

Process-oriented syllabi steer the development of transformative teaching on the level of independent participation of students on different levels of their perception only by means of formal didactic suggestions. The use of metacognitive competences of critical thinking and the combinations of various learning styles to acquire different kinds of knowledge is called for so that students can achieve this goal assisted by their teacher. Interactive centres within the EU are also introducing those process-oriented approaches by means of which the school model/paradigm changes from the transmissive into the transformative one, as is shown in the above table.

A teacher, as a reflective pedagogical practitioner, may include one of the epistemologies in their lessons or by including the ancient times' epistemology actually all three of them, as they wanders around all three worlds. In keeping with the paradigm of the ancient times, they choose reproductive knowledge as a criterion of successful teaching and learning. By choosing the Cartesian paradigm, they experiment and in line with the holistic paradigm they are in charge of project work. They also apply elements of therapeutic approaches, coaching questions and social games, so students can discover and understand deeper layers of themselves and learn through comprehension as part of a dialogue.

It has been debated for several years whether the student is a subject of education who is entitled to their own activity. The opinion remained based on principles and the student's pseudo-activity was ascertained. Formally, the student is a subject but in fact, the teacher's communication with the student is not of the kind that would encourage student's subjective manner of expression, draw on previous knowledge or stimulate multiculturalism. If the teacher does not allow the student to draw on their previous experience, then their own reflexion and self-transformation cannot come about. The discussion about the meaning of transformative school is not over yet.

Constant school-related changes do not necessary lead to a new paradigm. There has been a lot of talk about constant improvements in the quality of education, it does however depend on our perspective whether it will be done. Transformativity is a result of the quality of lessons; it does not depend solely on the number of innovations. New knowledge-testing procedures are being introduced only slowly and the process-oriented curriculum has exhibited some downsides, but the syllabi will nevertheless be cut down even further.

A comparison can be made between the downsides of transmissive school with good forecasts for the transformative one and vice-versa. Positive aspects of the transmissive school have a comparative advantage over the negative sides of the transformative school.

A new paradigmatic epistemological concept is needed for the transformative school, regardless of whether it is private or public. Private schools have specific pedagogical concepts, which have served as a basis for an alternative to the state. In former socialist times and in today's capitalist times, public school is governed by state. In independent Slovenia, the state is trying to support the autonomy of schools by means of legislation.

Conclusion

It has been ascertained that:

- the transformative school is not merely a theoretical phenomenon; if it were, no empirical messages would be conveyed about it;
- the transformative school does not exist in the sense of being a reformative experiment conducted on the entire population of students in Slovenia. If it were introduced by the White Paper, this would signify just another failed school reform.
- several schools that are identified as transformative have been listed in this paper. If the transformative school is shown as the only true alternative, this is an ideology, and we therefore talk about a complementary transmissive-transformative school. The criteria of what a successful school performance is are relative and countries that have, in practice, introduced no transformative concepts thus take top positions in international competitions.

The emancipative, transformative or critical pedagogies are not the only ones to strive for a comprehensive communication complexity; the reform pedagogy (according to Steiner, Montessori), gestalt pedagogy, Ignatian pedagogy, Wambach's convergent pedagogy, etc., also strive for the same thing.

Every education is transmissive in a frontal didactic form and transformative in several other forms. Every school-related change can be interpreted as transmissive or transformative, depending on the point of view of observation. The new *White Paper* (Krek, 2011) does not encourage the development of transformative schools in full. The main problem at present is how to stimulate students to be more motivated and achieve better results.

False perceptions of the principle of transformation as a transaction have been made. As part of a "friendly school" pedagogical practice, the process-oriented curriculum has been carried out as a means of relieving students of the effort required to obtain complex knowledge. This has resulted

in superficial and fragmentary knowledge, which does not remain stored in long-term memory.

Even though school lessons cannot be reduced to learning only, it is nevertheless important for teachers to use it to stimulate students' learning, dialogue, cooperation, resolution of cognitive conflicts and problems. The aforementioned polarization resulted from the simplification of both of them. The concept of transformative pedagogy has been created because of the narrow-minded practice of public schools. On account of alternative pedagogies (including the transformative one), public schools have been partially changed in the sense of their own paths being developed.

It is likely that the new school will in the entirety of its ideas remain merely an alternative school concept for years to come and that its forms will be adopted by the mass public schools only as supplementary ones. Ever since Slovenia gained independence, the school for the masses has through differentiation been losing on its former uniformity and tendency to resist change. The transformative school concept influences a greater variety of didactic concepts applied by the mass school, it cannot however become a pattern for the way the mass school operates.

Discussions about the suitability of transmissive and transformative schools should not be induced by a cultural battle (Germ. *Kulturkampf*) in the Slovenian spirit of Anton Mahnič against everything that is not acceptable within instrumental rationality because it is different; instead they should be induced by a general and special interest for the progress of schools. So far not enough dialogue has been focused on what kind of school suits users' interests and educational needs. It is quite clear that this is not about a global substitution of the transmissive school by the transformative one in the sense of a triumphant revolutionary paradigm, as understood by Kuhn (1998). The whole paradigm must not turn into a new orthodoxy; it is first and foremost a new developmental option.

Not every educational alternative in itself is a polarization of an existing situation and similarly not every negation rejects everything that had existed before, but only what it refers to. What it refers to is the weaknesses that some are attempting to surpass. If a school of good quality is a common slogan for a good teacher in a good school, then it is a matter of agreeing on whether this will be referred to as transmissive or transformative. As a compromise, the transmissive-transformative school has being mentioned in relation to this transition period. The transmissive school is certainly more complex than what it is supposedly like according to some transformative pedagogy theorists, who fail to point out in what ways the transmissive school is good. What is often overlooked is its implicit transformative and personally important learning.

The concepts of transformative learning by Senge and Mezirow do not make it clear in what way this learning is inevitably still reproductive or repetitive. Another commonly overlooked aspect is that the process-oriented curriculum itself, which was supposedly characteristic for the reform of Slovene schools in 1999, fails to bring about better school results. One of the known methods is the 'rational core maintenance' method. This however does not mean that the transformative school does away with the transmissive school as seen by Hegel on a higher level as a part of its new whole.

The pedagogical world is characterized by a fragmentation of discourses, which hinders dialogue. Authors focus on one of the components of transformative schools and the practice follows their example by doing the same. In discussing the importance of dialogue within the family and the school, Juhant (2008) defines one of essential socio-communicative requirements of the way transformative schools operate. There are quite a few transformative public schools in Slovenia; they are usually referred to as healthy, eco and good-quality schools. In a similar way, private schools have likewise been identified according to the components of transformativity of their concepts.

References

Apple, W. M., Kenway, J. and Singh, M. (ed.) (2007). *Globalizing Education: Policies, Pedagogies & Politics*. New York, Peter Lang Publishing.

Bernstein, B. (2007). *Social Class and Pedagogic Practice*. New York, Routledge.

Brookfield, S. (2002). Reassessing subjectivity, criticality, and inclusivity: Marcuse's challenge to adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly, 52* (4), 265-280.

Dewey, J. (1916/1966). *Democracy and Education. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York, A Free Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1997). *Pedagogy and the Politics of Hope: Theory, Culture, and Schooling*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Gregorič, M. (2008). Epistemologija radikalne pedagogike in kulturni kapital za 21. stoletje. *Sodobna pedagogika*, ZDPDS, 59, 1/2008, 58-77.

Horkheimer, M., Adorno, T. W. (2002). *Dialektika razsvetljenstva : filozofski fragmenti*. Ljubljana, Studia humanitatis.

Juhant, J. (2008). Dialog in šola. In: *Šolsko polje*. Year XIX, No. 5/6, 25-37.

Krek, J. (ed.) (2011). *Bela knjiga*. Ljubljana, MŠŠ.

Kroflič, R. (2006). Vzgoja za odgovornost med navajanjem in razvajanjem. *Tretji dan*. Year. XXXV, No. 7/8 (september/oktober), 88-94.

Kroflič, R. (2010). Pluralna šola in iskanje osebnega smisla. *Nova revija*: mesečnik za kulturo. Year, 29, No. 336-338 (apr.-maj-jun. 2010), 260-272.

Kuhn, T. S. (1998). *Struktura znanstvenih revolucij*. Ljubljana, Krtina. .

Kuhn, T. S. (1984). Dodatne misli o paradigmah. In: *Časopis za kritiko znanosti*, 64/65, 53-68.

Kuhn, T. S. (1984). Objektivnost, vrednostna sodba in izbor teorije. In: *Časopis za kritiko znanosti*. 64/65, 3-16.

Kuhn, T. S. (1970a). Reflection on my Critics«. In: Lakatos I. & Musgrave, A. (ed.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge University Press 1999 /1970/; 231-278.

Kuhn, T. S. (1970b). Logic of Discovery or Psychology of Research. In: Lakatos, I. & Musgrave A. (ed.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge University Press 1999 /1970/, 1-23.

Lojk, B. *(*ed.) (2011*). Glasserjeva kakovostna šola na Slovenskem*. Kranj, Inštitut za realitetno terapijo.

Miheljak, V. (2003). *Spoznavni temelji psihologije*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.

Marentič-Požarnik, B. (2008). *Psihologija učenja in pouka*. Ljubljana, 3. izd. Ljubljana: DZS.

Medveš Z. (1992). Aktualnost reformske pedagogike v sodobnih vzgojnih konceptih in njen pomen v razvoju vzgoje in izobraževanja na slovenskem. In: Rajtmajer, D. (ed.). *Vzgojni koncepti in raziskovanje v vzgoji in izobraževanju: zbornik prispevkov z mednarodnega posveta o alternativnih vzgojnih konceptih in znanstvenega simpozija o raziskovalnih dosežkih v vzgoji in izobraževanju*. Pedagoška Fakulteta Maribor, Maribor, 1–14.

(1990). *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood : a guide to transformative and emancipatory learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (2000). *Learning as transformation: critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Novak, B. (2006). *Moč družbe in transformacija šole. (The power of society and transformative school*). Ljubljana, Educational research institute.

Popper, K. (1970). Normal Science and its Dangers. In: Lakatos, I. & Musgrave, A. (ed.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge University Press 1999 /1970/, 51-58.

Popper, K. R. (1972). *Objective knowledge: An Evolutionary Report*. Oxford, Univesity Press.

Rutar, D. (2002). *Učitelj kot intelektualec*. Radovljica, Didakta.

Sardoč, M. et al. (2009). *Mednarodna raziskava poučevanja in učenja. TALIS. Nacionalno poročilo*. Ljubljana, Pedagoški inštitut.

Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practise of The Learning Organization*. DoubleDay.

Senge, P. et al. (2000). *Schools That Learn*. London, Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Štefanc, D. (2005). Pouk, učenje in aktivnost učencev : razgradnja pedagoških fantazem = Students' education, learning and activity : breaking down pedagogic myths. *Sodobna pedagogika*. Year. 56, No. 1, 34-57.

Quantz, R. A. & O'Connor, T. (1991). Critical Pedagogy, Cultural Politics, and Professional Education. *Paper presented at the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture*

Annual Meeting, Washington, D. C., April 9.

Sources

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holism (14. 1. 2012)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Epistemology (22. 10. 2011)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_pedagogy (12. 2. 2012).

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transformative_learning (20. 12. 2009).

Štefanc, D. Temeljni didaktični koncepti. Pouk. Spletne strani: https://docs.google.com/ viewer?a=v&q=cache:qVMZ19OUzPAJ:www.pedagogika-andragogika.com/files// PPT%2520II%2520kolokvij%2520D idaktika%2520I%2520(prvi%2520letnik).ppt+štefanc +tem (10. 2. 2012)

Zmuda, A., Kuklis, R., Kline, E. (2003). Transforming schools: creating a culture of continuous improvement. Alexandria, In: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development : ASCD. http://www.loc.gov/ catdir/toc/ecip0412/ 2003028148.html (28. 12. 2009).

Ključne besede: metodologija, pedagogi, pozitivizem, priročnik, raziskovanje

Bogomir Novak

Some epistemological problems of transformative pedagogics

The aim of this paper is to answer the question about the scientific position of transformative pedagogy and school. The aim is also to look into how the dimensions of transformative pedagogy can be judged according to the new epistemological criteria in comparison with the transmissive school. Transformative pedagogy is an alternative type of reform pedagogy and part of the new holistic paradigm. The differences between transmissive and transformative schools are presented in a special table.

The existent Cartesian Newtonian anthropocentric Enlightenment paradigm conceptually no longer suffices for the solution of complex world issues. Scientific progress has resulted in the change of epistemological criteria for what is considered scientific. In this paper, the characteristics of post-anthropocentric pedagogy and epistemology are explained. Modern pedagogy is characterized by understanding, dialogue, multiculturalism, students' individuality and their orientation towards learning vis-à-vis the previous school of knowledge transmission, rational argumentation and the priority of teaching. This paper points out which epistemological issues arise from the confrontation of the Cartesian and the new post-anthropocentric holistic paradigms as frames for two different pedagogies.

Key words: learning, constructivism, transformative school, epistemology, paradigm

Bogomir Novak

Nekateri epistemološki problemi transformacijske pedagogike

Cilja tega prispevka sta odgovoriti na vprašanje o znanstveni poziciji transformacijske pedagogike in šole ter oceniti, kako lahko presojamo razsežnosti transformacijske pedagogike po novih epistemoloških kriterijih v primerjavi s transmisijsko šolo. Transformacijska pedagogika je ena izmed alternativnih reformnih pedagogik in je del nove holistične paradigme. Razlike med transmisijsko in transformasko šolo pokaže posebna preglednica.

Dosedanja kartezijansko newtonovska antropocentrično razsvetljenska paradigma konceptualno ne ustreza več za reševanje kompleksnih problemov sveta. Z razvojem znanosti so se spremenjali tudi epistemološki kriteriji njene znanstvenosti. V članku razložimo značilnosti postantropo-

centrične pedagogike in epistemologije. V novejši pedagogiki so pomembne lastnosti razumevanje, dialog, multikulturnost, individualnost učenca in njegova usmerjenost k učenju vis-à-vis prejšnji šoli prenosa znanja, racionalnih argumentacij in primarnosti poučevanja. V članku pokažemo, kateri epistemološki problemi nastajajo pri soočanju transmisijske in transformacijske pedagogike.

Ključne besede: učenje, konstruktivizem, transformativna šola, epistemologija, paradigma.

Joanna Michalak

Inclusive school Leadership in challenging urban communities: comparative study

The aim of the paper is to explore what is perceived to be successful school leadership in the challenging urban communities in Poland and England. This paper reports on outcomes from two case studies. These studies were conducted in two groups of schools in challenging urban communities in Lodz, Poland and in the Yewlands area of Sheffield, England. This paper builds upon outcomes so far from a three-year joint project (2008 - 2011) and firstly presents some differences of context and approach towards school leadership in the Polish and English studies. However, significant similarities in terms of pedagogy and leadership between the two contexts constitute what can be characterised as inclusive school leadership in three main areas: teacher leadership, building "social capital" and in the adoption of subversive approaches.

Key words: leadership, disadvantaged areas, education, case studies, comparative research, Poland, England

Joanna Michalak

Vključujoče šolsko vodstvo v težavnih urbanih skupnostih: primerjalna študija

Namen prispevka je raziskati, kaj je dojeto kot uspešno šolsko vodstvo v zahtevnih urbanih skupnostih na Poljskem in v Angliji. Članek poroča o rezultatih dveh študij primerov. Ti študiji sta bili izvedeni v dveh skupinah šol v zahtevnih urbanih skupnostih v Lodzu na Poljskem in na področju Yewlands v Sheffieldu v Angliji. Članek temelji na dosedanjih rezultatih triletnega skupnega projekta (2008 - 2011) in prvič predstavlja nekatere razlike v okviru in pristopu k vodenju šol v poljskih in angleških študijah. Vendar pa velike podobnosti z vidika pedagogike in vodenja šol med dvema okoljema pomenijo to, kar lahko označimo kot vključujoče vodstvo šole na treh glav-