

Attending the Pathic in the Development of Transactional Curriculum

Blaine E. Hatt (Brandon University)

Presented at:

2nd Annual IERG Conference
Vancouver, BC
14 -17 July 2004

Introduction

Prior to University teaching, I invested thirty years of my adult life in public education; nearly two decades as a classroom teacher of Senior Years English Language Arts, and over a decade as an administrator. One of the primary areas of responsibility that I had as Principal of a grade 7-12 middle/high school was oversight of classroom teaching and learning including teacher effectiveness and student achievement. I had a number of teachers, both novice and experienced, who evidenced major difficulties in establishing a classroom environment that was positive, inviting, and inclusive of risk-taking and that would lead each student toward learning through maximizing imaginative growth and personal fulfillment.

The relationships within their classrooms were strained and there were frequent conflicts between teacher and students and between students and students. In one-on-one interviews with those teachers who were struggling, I determined that it was not a lack of personal motivation, moral intention, or competency in the prescribed curriculum that prevented them from being the kind of teacher that they desired to be. Rather, it was something else.

Teaching is a complex human practice that involves both cognitive and non-cognitive dimensions of learning and knowing. Cognitive insights are in themselves not sufficient to address non-cognitive or pathic meaning in learning, knowing and understanding. The non-cognitive dimensions of teaching all too often inhere in the mystery of teacher effectiveness and continually challenge efforts to adequately describe quality achievement and/or excellence in education. The pathic in teaching is a pedagogical sensitivity to others that recognizes that teachers need to be accommodating of and actively responsive to meeting students' needs with respectful recognition, attentive listening, genuine encouragement, facilitating assistance, and personal availability. Opening an inner capacity that is sensitive, understanding and

responsive to students' difficulties and needs is a challenge for both novice and experienced teachers who have not been schooled in attending the pathic. Teresa, as a beginning teacher, is a case in point.

There was no question that when she had the attention of her students, Teresa could teach and teach very well, but when she was on her own, without anyone supervising her instruction, no technique that she employed would bring her students to the task at-hand sufficiently for the lesson to unfold as planned. The curriculum-as-planned and the lived experiences of each student in her classroom were in the words of Aoki (1993) "at once different in kind and resisting integration" (p. 261). The more she sought to reach her students via the official curriculum of daily and unit plans, the greater became the gulf between them.

The situation worsened and it was an infrequent day that did not end with Theresa in my office, in tears, lamenting the woes of teaching. The more we explored what was occurring in her classroom, the more the polarity of "me – they" was established. I often heard: "they" (meaning the students who are assigned to "me" and to whom "I" am assigned) don't like me; "they" don't like each other; "they" won't listen to my instructions; "they" constantly make comments that disrupt the learning that might take place; "they" don't do homework; "they" don't come to class prepared, even in some cases with a pen and paper. "They" are disinterested, poorly motivated, and "they" are certainly bred from the shallow end of the gene pool.

I was standing in the hallway outside her Biology laboratory listening and watching her prepare her students for a demonstration lesson on dissecting frogs. Her instructions and questions were precise, cold, calculating, like the movement of the scalpel which deftly cut the air between her and her students as she modeled the dissection that was about to take place.

Soon the air was filled with the sights, sounds, and odours of the dissection. "Oohs" and "aahs," and comments ranging from "gross" to "cool" sprang from the lips of students as they pressed in around her with a steady stream of questions: "Doesn't the smell bother you?" "How can you possibly do that?" "Don't you ever get sick?" "What's that called again?" and, "Are we going to do that?" Teresa, intent on her task, answered each question with ease as the demonstration progressed. At the end of the procedure, she looked up, with

surprise, at the throng of students that had encircled her. I had moved to the outer edge of the gathering. She looked out at me, caught my eye, her eyes brightened, and a warm smile spread across her face.

In her presentation Teresa demonstrated a surgeon's skill in dissecting the frog and she demonstrated a confidence of knowing that inhered in her skill, knowledge of content, her competency and understanding of methodology that opened a pedagogical space between her and her students that transcended conceptual, intellectual or gnostic understanding to the felt experiences of learning and knowing. Such learning and knowing is pathic, like "a silent practice" (van Manen, 2002) implicit in the classroom world of relationship that cannot be captured in words but as evidenced in Teresa's case can effectively and expressively be communicated in the bodily language of a warm smile.

Teresa's smile signaled a transformation. For the first time in her teaching career she had fully connected with her students and they with her via the transactional curriculum. Indeed, the curriculum had been wrapped around all of them within the pedagogical relationship of her teaching. It was not a moment that she feared but one that she warmly embraced and one that she repeated and built on as she continued to attend the pathic in her teaching.

Attending the pathic in teaching preconditions embracing imaginative enlightenment in the classroom and persuades teachers who develop transactional curriculum through their relationality with students to agree with Leonard Cohen (1993) in "Anthem:" "You can add up the parts / but you won't have the sum. // Forget your perfect offering / There is, a crack in everything / That's how the light gets in" (p. 373).

Attending the pathic

I use the verb *attend* in its original Old French and Latin transitive form to mean, respectively, "to expect, wait for" and "to stretch one's mind to" (Klein, 1971, p. 59). Hence, attending, which embodies the concept of *tend*: "to move in a certain direction" (p. 752), means to stretch, extend or direct one's mind toward a specific course or direction. Attending, in this context, is similar to the "reaching out" feature of imagination that enables us to extend ourselves beyond that which we have already experienced or mastered. Attending is an active, not a passive verb and in the case of education, it demands an intended, or intentional, pedagogical action on the part of the teacher toward his/her students in the practice of teaching.

Pathic is closely associated with pathos, another word stemming from the same root, and meaning the “quality which arouses pity or sorrow” (p. 540) and like empathy and sympathy, etymologically finds its base in the Greek pathy or pathia meaning affection, passion or feeling for disease and suffering (Klein, p. 540). In the larger context of developing a transactional curriculum in the classroom, pathic refers to the felt emotion, the receptivity of mood, and the shared sensibility of being in the world as ‘One’ and as ‘Other’ that exists between the adult as pedagogue and the child as student.

The pathic is not an event, it is an experience of felt response, an enactive dimension of teaching that cannot be understood through media that are principally designed to transmit cognitive meaning. Pathic teaching (van Manen, 1999) requires a deliberate or intentional felt understanding of ourselves as educators, and of our students as Other(s), in each learning situation. Students cannot make rather than take meaning from their lived experience(s) without themselves attending the pathic. Cognitive insights, no matter how attractive or well presented cannot call forth or elicit pathic experience in the transactional curriculum of the classroom.

Defining transactional curriculum

I do not use the term ‘transactional’ to designate one of the English language arts curricula for senior high school as in the Province of Manitoba (McCrae, 1999, pp.1-16). I do not use transactional to indicate a language that has evolved from the expressive language of being and becoming into a pragmatic language of getting things done; nor, do I use it to denote transactional leadership as a mode of administrative theory. Rather, I use transactional in a context that is adapted from Rosenblatt as a designation for the confluence of all curricula within the classroom.

Rosenblatt (1985) employed the term transactional to distinguish her reader-response theory from others that had arisen during the New Criticism of the 1970s and 1980s and to emphasize the reciprocal importance of both reader and text via “pedagogical implications” (in Karolides, 1999, p. 169). I agree with Rosenblatt’s insistence that ‘transactional’ connotes important pedagogical implications especially as it applies to the realization that meaning in literature does not reside in the text nor in the reader but between the evocation and response during their engagement (Rosenblatt, 1985, p.44), but I de-emphasize her notion of reciprocity in order to emphasize more strongly the oscillations between tension and harmony that exist between and among the various curricula that consolidate in the transactional curriculum.

Specifically, I refer to the ebb and flow, the back and forth, the give and take of all human relationality that takes place within, between, and among those who live and experience the various curricula that exist in any moment in the classroom and that are mediated by the teacher through attending the pathic. The transactional curriculum subsumes all the constituent curricula in the classroom. It subsumes the mandated curriculum-as-planned, the imbedded curricula: the null curriculum and the hidden curriculum, and the lived curricula of individual students and of the teacher.

Imagine a Venn diagram composed of five congruent ellipses. As the curves of each ellipses cross and re-cross they create 25 intersections. By far the largest section is at the epicenter or nexus of the Venn. It is a pentagon bounded on each side by the interior curve of each congruent ellipses. Despite the fact that the epicenter derives its shape and being from the multiple intersections of the five congruent ellipses it is devoid of any internal intersection. Like the eye of the hurricane it is a calm and clear territory. It is a confluent area at the centre of multiple divisions as the ellipses intersect and re-intersect each other. To get to the nexus of the Venn, one must mediate the buffeting of tensions that comprise the conflict zone that surrounds, yet creates, the nexus. Wholeness or completeness is attained in the nexus of the Venn through the interior connection of the five ellipses as they flow into or accommodate one another.

The nexus is the actuated reality of the transactional curriculum or to apply Friere's term (1997) it is the 'gnoseologic' nature of education. Education is said to be gnoseologic when it "engages subjects (educators and learners), mediated by a cognizable object, or the content to be taught by the educator-subject and learned by the learner-subject" (pp.106-107). The characteristics of gnoseologic in education are: natural curiosity and unrest for knowledge, understanding, or meaning; mutual respect, maturity of thought and behaviour between dialoguing subjects; a spirit of adventure or risk-taking; confidence in investigating and questioning; seriousness in providing answers; and, a genuine surrender on the part of educator and learner to the critical quest (p. 99). Within education as a gnoseologic process, the learner is challenged to develop a critical or cognitive stance that is preoccupied with the *raison d'être* of the phenomenon of inquiry. Inquiry facilitates a dialogue of learning and is fundamental for developing epistemological curiosity. However, the gnoseologic process does not refuse consideration of the non-cognitive or pathic, indeed, it requires "respect for the freedom of others" and it requires an ethical perspective conditioned by "humility, coherence and

tolerance” (p. 105). It also requires as actuated reality the accommodation of Other as self made possible through attending the pathic.

The pathic cannot be perceived, nor received, in an educational world in which feeling for an Other or the emotive state of being is absent or marginalized. The gnoseologic process within the transactional curriculum is created by the mediating influence of the teacher attending the pathic. As such, the transactional curriculum is the educational world of the classroom and simultaneously accommodates the differing curricula and facilitates their coalescence. When the gnoseologic of education is fully achieved in the transactional curriculum then teaching and learning is transformative. However, it must be noted that an over-reliance on cognitive learning places careful attending of the pathic in learning in danger of being suppressed, if not eliminated. Pathic understanding is “not primarily gnostic, cognitive, intellectual, technical – but rather ... is ... relational, situational, corporeal, temporal, actional” (van Manen & Li, 2002, p. 219). The noncognitive nature of the pathic cannot be addressed through cognitive insight. It must be recognized that within the relationality of the transactional classroom, human beings, be they adult or child, have an implicit felt understanding of themselves and others. As it relates to teaching, attending the pathic is the direct and logical extension of the practice of relationality in the creation of a community of learnership. To more fully understand the pathic it is necessary to examine the adult to child role which inheres in pedagogy and to examine how the pathic presents itself in the lived experiences of teaching by those who live it.

Defining pedagogy

My experience with Teresa, with other in-service teachers, and with pre-service teachers who struggle in the classroom has led me to seriously ponder the whole notion of pedagogy as it is understood and manifested in North American education. I do not subscribe to the tendency in education research literature to associate pedagogy with curriculum, with classroom teaching, with post-secondary teacher training, or professional development for in-service teachers; nor, do I subscribe to the tendency to equate pedagogy with praxis, with classroom management, with discipline, with behaviour modification, or with any other aspect of education that separates teacher from student or separates teaching from learning.

I return to the etymology of pedagogy for my working definition and for the contextual reference that situates pedagogy in education for me. Indeed, I am convinced that pedagogy is education and embodies the dualistic singularity of teaching and

learning. Klein (1971) states that pedagogue or pedagogy comes from the Latin *paedagogus* which is derived from the Greek word meaning: "the slave who escorted a boy from home to school and back again" (p. 543). The custodial nature of the caring relationship of adult to child was one of safety, security and stewardship. But, often, the companionship between the pedagogue and the boy was more familial, more connected with leadership, and extended beyond the role of guardianship to include other aspects of care and education of the boy.

I remember from my high school Ancient History instruction that the assigning of a pedagogue to a child marked the beginning of the child's school days. The pedagogue's main responsibility was to accompany the young boy everywhere he went outside of the home especially to school and the gymnasium. He was to carry his books and writing tablets, to provide basic assistance with the learning of lessons, to ensure his safety and protection at all times, to teach him social graces and if required administer appropriate discipline, including whippings in the absence of his father or schoolmaster.

As the adult, the pedagogue was charged with the responsibility to safeguard and protect the vulnerability of the child and to act, when necessary, in the place of the parent (*in loco parentis*). As the boy grew, the pedagogue or private tutor was responsible for teaching the child basic reading and writing skills and also preparing him for learning the important art of rhetoric, or public speaking. Such responsibility in the relationship between the adult and the child required the pedagogue to act with appropriate intention toward the child. The vulnerability of the child literally called upon the pedagogue to act in a responsible and intentional manner toward him. As the role of the pedagogue expanded, he became more of a tutor or teacher charged with being "a leader of a child" (Hatt, 2002).

The original Greek meaning of pedagogue is rife with the relational and intentional responsibility of adult to child and remains, today, imbedded in many North American Schools Acts or Education Acts. The vulnerability of the child is acknowledged in legislation as is the corresponding explicit duty of the adult to safeguard the child in his journey from home to the tutor (the source of instruction and learning) and from the tutor to home again. One might say that the vulnerability of the child calls forth a responsible, caring attitude from the adult that is appropriately directed toward right action; namely, the safety, well-being, and educational growth of the child. In present-day

context like that of ancient-day, the child cannot protect the adult even though s/he may be socially of a higher rank than the adult; it is the adult who is entrusted with a position of responsibility toward the child. The pedagogue's responsibilities to the child are three-fold: custodial, parental and instructional.

Legislation and policies that govern public schools legally delineate the pedagogue's custodial responsibilities. In particular, district and school administration are legally bound to ensure the safety and well-being of each child from the time s/he leaves home in the morning until s/he arrives at school; during the hours of instructional activity at school and during the time it reasonably takes for the child to return home from school in the late afternoon or early evening. The focus in Education or Schools Acts on school climate, partnership in education, or communities of learning while addressing issues related to classroom management and discipline also recognizes the parental aspects and responsibility of the pedagogue to act with due care and concern for a child and to administer discipline in an appropriate manner. However, instructional responsibilities as mandated by legislation or bureaucratic policy, although dependent on the custodial and parental responsibilities of the pedagogue, reinforce the state or provincial legal and jurisdictional right to demand systemic conformity to prescribed curriculum. In other words, public school officials; district personnel, school administrators, classroom teachers, are all required under law to instruct students in a state or provincially designed and implemented curriculum.

One of the major weaknesses inherent in prescriptive curriculum is the habituated indoctrination of field-based educators to regard curriculum merely as that which is regulated, planned, and required by the Ministries or Departments of Education. Another weakness is the tendency to view instructional responsibility as primarily associated with the transmission of content-based subject matter. But a more serious weakness of prescription as it directly affects children in the public education system is that: "Every prescription represents the imposition of one individual's choice upon another, transforming the consciousness of the person prescribed into one that conforms with the prescriber's consciousness" (Friere, 1971; 2002, p. 47). Thus the behaviour of the child in the classroom is a prescribed behaviour following, as is required, the guidelines of the teacher who is agent of the public education system and who is schooled in the principles and doctrine of effective, systemic, classroom management practice.

The description of the duties and responsibilities of the pedagogue was transliterated from the Latin *paedagogia* to the French *pédagogie* and eventually to the English pedagogy and came to generally be recognized as “attendance on children, education and culture” (Klein, 1971, p. 543). Gradually, the focus on attending (to stretch or extend in a specific direction) became lost as pedagogue became synonymous with teacher and pedagogy with teaching or any aspect that dealt exclusively with the primacy of the teacher and his/her role in the classroom. Instructional methods, classroom management and discipline including education psychology, and legal aspects of education as relational components in pedagogy have been fractionalized in North American thinking and are now taught as individual, and independent, courses of study in pre-service teacher education.

I recently conducted an exercise with one of my undergraduate classes as a follow-up to our discussion of trends and issues in the teaching of Senior Years English Language Arts (ELA). They were to investigate the use of the word pedagogy as it appeared in the education literature that they were currently reviewing. Their results were not surprising. They found that pedagogy in a North American context is essentially instrumental and refers primarily to training and/or instruction. In usage, it is equated with the formal study of education and the principles, methods and practice of teaching. The relational nature of pedagogy was largely eliminated from the literature and discourse that addressed pedagogy in our post-industrial society. Robert Tremmel (2001) states that the pedagogical information in the English education program at his university: “has a strong focus on teaching practice, including lesson and unit design, workshopping, collaboration, and classroom presentation.” He notes that improvement in the program could be achieved through “integrating assessment and evaluation, research, and critical thinking” (p. 23). It is therefore not surprising to me that a number, if not the majority, of education students in the universities that I have been directly associated with hold a conceptual awareness of pedagogy that is directly associated with instructional practice.

Traditionally such practice is manifested in a pedantic, dogmatic, severe and formal approach to teaching. In short, pedagogy as a technical-rational term is focused on the “howness” of the curriculum-as-plan and is only marginally concerned with the relational aspect of teaching and learning. Pedagogy is something that happens to rather than with children. It is in this context that phrases such as the following evidence the meaning of pedagogy in a post-industrial era: “...engage students in pedagogically

sound ways," "child-centered pedagogy," "sophisticated pedagogy," "...modifications to both curriculum and pedagogy to enhance accessibility," and, "...ensure consistency with new developments in pedagogical research" (Werner, 1995). Among these phrases, only the phrase "child-centered pedagogy" approaches the genesis of meaning for pedagogy and, even then, the repetition of pedagogy in the phrase renders it malapropos.

Reclaiming the relationality of the pedagogue

Intentionality, appropriateness and responsibility are qualities of association that originally distinguished the pedagogue in his role and service to the child. These qualities were endemic in the person-to-person contact of the pedagogue and child and were eventually replicated "en masse" to include more children in schooling. The role of the pedagogue was expanded to include a number of male children under his tutorage at the same time. The expanded role and function of the pedagogue led to a defining of pedagogy as "attendance on children." By direct association, education (from L. *educare* related to *educere* or *educere*) with its attendant meanings: "to lead out, to bring out, to bring up, to rear, to raise, or, to develop from a latent condition" and culture (from L. *cultura*) which meant "to cultivate, till, improve, or refine the land, the mind and/or manners" (Klein, 1971, pp. 501 & 383) were connected to and incorporated into the expanded definition of pedagogy.

The making of a common world of education is attained within the transactional curriculum or the curriculum of lived experience in the classroom. It is important that teachers do not dwell in the cognitive curriculum-as-plan where student academic achievement is perceived as the single most important reason for schooling. Students' lives are often ruled by strong emotions and feelings that are demonstrated in very positive or very negative attitudes towards home, siblings, parents, friends, and towards school, classmates, teachers and homework. Who among us as parents or experienced teachers has not heard: "Why do I/we have to do this?" "This is stupid!" "When am I ever going to use that?" or "This sucks!" Educators who dismiss or take only passing note of the lived curricula of their students do a great disservice to their students and their pathic or non-cognitive learning. Aoki (1993) positions the teacher in the curriculum landscape of the classroom as mediator between the language of curriculum-as-plan and the language of lived curricula. In this curriculum mismatch, students and teachers often fail to find a middle ground and miss each other relationally and thereby cognitively in the classroom. They are physically in the same classroom, but their needs are so different,

so at variance, that real communication often fails to occur especially if the learning is focused only on mastery of content.

The pedagogue as custodian, the pedagogue acting *in loco parentis*, and the pedagogue as educational leader are of primary importance in meeting the needs of children in the public school system. Inherent in each pedagogical role is the realization that in his/her responsible action, the pedagogue provides the child with companionship during his daily sojourns. If we substitute relationality for companionship and intentionality for responsible action we create a context within which pedagogy truly is praxis. Praxis is here defined as thoughtful action (van Manen, 1998) or attendance. Such attendance, in my estimation, is achieved in education through attending the pathic in the development of the transactional curriculum.

The importance of pedagogical (teacher) love

One of the ways that attending the pathic manifests itself in the transactional curriculum is through the dialogue of pedagogical love. Clark (2000) asserts that: “the ability to love children is the most critical characteristic a teacher can possess at any grade level” (p. 23). The dialogic relationship between and among teacher and students is an interaction of communication and intercommunication that is indispensable to the co-emergence of knowledge. Dialogue is an essential function of human beings in their quest for knowledge and it is elemental in the social nature of children and their teachers, as co-originators of learning in the transactional classroom.

Mr. K writes on the chalkboard $2/6 + 1/4 + 3/24 + 3/8 - 1/3 = X$ and then asks, “What’s X?” Almost before the students can begin to apply themselves earnestly to solving the problem, Carly, who is garrulous and given to bursts of enthusiastic expression, commands the attention of her classmates and Mr. K by announcing that the answer is $9/12$. Mr. K is somewhat taken aback by the suddenness of her response but is more interested in the immediacy of her answer and inquisitively asks: “How did you ever arrive at that answer?”

Carly, always eager to verbalize her knowledge, begins an elaborate but convoluted explanation of how she arrived at her answer. Confused, Mr. K simply states: “I don’t understand what you’re trying to tell me.” Her classmates simply respond with a collective “Huh?” Not wanting to risk humiliation, or have her answer mistaken for illogical thought, Carly proceeds to the front of the room and with chalk in hand begins to successfully diagram on the board how $9/12$ can be

an acceptable answer to the question posed by Mr. K. (Mr. K, personal communication, 09 October 2000).

In the social context of the classroom, Carly's response and follow-up actions may be viewed as self-assertive and arrogant. If this attitude exists in Carly, it might partially explain the dramatic announcement of 9/12 as a possible answer. But if such a quality does exist in Carly, Mr. K demonstrates through the tonal quality of his question to Carly that he chooses to ignore it. With genuine curiosity and a hint of amazement he inquires of her: "How did you ever arrive at that answer?" The significance of his question is rooted in the intentionality, appropriateness and responsibility of Mr. K, as pedagogue, to Carly, his student. Such qualities pre-condition the pedagogical love that he evidences for her through the tonal and linguistic quality of his inquiry. The evocative nature of his query to Carly reveals that he is aware that "response is not mere reaction...[it] involves [an] awareness of [self] as a center of force capable of action" (Johnson, 1987, p. 15).

In the "context-dependent know-how" (Varela, Thompson & Rosch, 1991, p. 148) of his classroom, Mr. K identifies those intelligences that Carly has and seeks to provide her with an opportunity to explain both herself and her imaginative cognizing. His question probes for clarification, interpretation and contribution, it is invitational and inquiring and seeks to receive not just Carly's imaginative response but Carly as well. What she says by way of explanation whether right or wrong matters because she matters. Mr. K, as pedagogue, is not seeking the answer as much as he is seeking the involvement of Carly as his student. In the true sense of the Latin definition of *educere*, his question draws out the Otherness in Carly; he calls forth that which is within her.

Mr. K recognizes that knower and the known, in this case Carly and her response, co-emerge through "mutual specification" (Varela, Thompson & Rosch, 1991, p. 150). One cannot and does not exist without the other. In the transactional curriculum of his classroom, Mr. K expands the centre of his personal force or power to call forth an appropriate action of knowledge from Carly. He enters a "caring relationship" as the "one-caring" for his student, Carly, the "one cared-for" (Noddings, 1984). Carly responds to his attending the pathic and through verbal and graphic means seeks to explain the process by which she arrived at her answer. By and through his questioning voice, Mr. K demonstrates, according to Foucault (1981), "that the exercise of power itself creates and causes to emerge new objects of knowledge and accumulates new bodies of information" (p. 51).

Relationality in the classroom cannot be diminutive, it cannot be rule-governed, nor autocratically controlled to the extent that conditions constrain students from making choices that will allow them to pursue their shared vision of learning in the transactional curriculum. If relationality were constrained in the classroom, it would negate the transformative power of teaching and learning which inheres in the gnoseologic nature of education. Power and knowledge are not only reciprocal but each is the articulation of the other, and “modern humanism is mistaken in drawing [a] line between [them]” (Foucault, 1981, p. 52). Pedagogical love directs that it is no longer acceptable for an individual student to remain self-contained and self-constrained to the extent that personal conformity to externally defined rules is guaranteed. Foucault (1981) reminds us that: “the individual is an effect of power, and at the same time, or precisely to the extent to which it is that effect, it is the element of its articulation” (p. 98).

Articulation in the classroom, for each participant, is not separate from relationality with Others, some of whom may be very difficult. Mrs. D-H, a middle years teacher relates that her relationship with one of her students, Amy: “...is one of the most meaningful connections in my life, I want it to continue; but it’s sometimes hard on the heart” (Mrs. D-H, personal communication, 28 June 2002). She realizes as does Mr. K that it is the pedagogical responsibility of the teacher to understand the nature of the constraints that would prevent student articulation and to posit alternative, significant, meaningful and imaginative learning experiences within the transactional curriculum of the classroom. Greene (1995) contends that there is an obligation on the part of those who devise curriculum “to make it possible for the young to perceive ranges of alternatives that are significant ‘possibles’ for themselves” (p. 141).

Such ‘possibles’ are brought into existence in the transactional curriculum. The life experiences of students become interesting, relevant and more imaginative because their inclusion is the result of purposeful action. In the transactional curriculum of the classroom, purposeful action is engendered by attending the pathic. It is action that is born out of respect, support, mutual understanding and inclusion of Other as self and is evidenced in the pedagogical relationship that exists between teacher and student. Purposeful action is also the recognition of the innate creative potential within each individual student made possible through freeing the self in the transactional curriculum.

To act imaginatively and in accordance with the pathic accommodation of self and Other is to achieve the actuated reality of the transactional curriculum. Through his query, Mr. K, addresses Carly as Other and he and her classmates are compelled out of

respect “to listen, without knowing why, before [they] know what it is that [they] are to listen to” (Readings, 1996, p. 162). He invites Carly to participate in the discourse of learning for he knows as pedagogue, that there is more to knowledge, more to understanding, more to the application of commonsense and wisdom than merely leading Carly, as learner, to the “threshold of [her] own mind” (Gibran, 1926, p. 26).

Carly accepts his invitation and seeks to communicate verbally her meaning. When words fail to convince, she imaginatively employs diagramming to illustrate the process of her thinking. Mr. K knows that the knowledge which she now seeks to communicate to the understanding of others, has, in part, had its origin in the pathic elements of the classroom including the love and respect which presently engulf her. Knowledge “depends on being in a world that is inseparable from our ... embodiment” (Varela, Thompson, Rosch, 1991, p. 140). Knowledge, for Carly, is a lived experience, a coalescence of gnostic (cognitive) and pathic (non-cognitive) meaning and understanding.

Mr. K acts in an ethically manner towards Carly, he acts responsibly and with appropriateness and intentionality. He does not give into any tendency to pick up on her garrulous behaviour. Instead of conflict or confrontation, he recognizes her imaginative thinking and invites her into the transactional curriculum of making mathematics by asking, “How did you ever arrive at that answer?” He fully accommodates Carly as a legitimate Other, he invites her to actively participate in the “generative mode” (Egan, 1992, p. 29) of meaning-making in and through mathematics. In so doing, he affirms her as a person and keeps open the possibilities of learning. And, this is what good teachers do; they “occasion learning” (T. Kieren, personal communication, 9 October 2000). Maturana (Maturana & Varela, 1980) presents the view that such occasioning in relation to another is an expression of love: “the seeing of the other as a partner in some or all the dimensions of living” (p. xxvi). hooks (1999) suggests: “think first about how you can love your students. Do this even before you think about how you’re going to teach them” (in Glazer, p. 125). Attending the pathic through pedagogical love is the full accommodation of Other, and the occasioning of learning through alternate ‘possibles’ is the essence of relationship in education. Arendt (1961) maintains that the condition for ‘possibles’ exists in education when:

we decide whether we love our children enough not to expel them from our world and leave them to their own devices, nor to strike from their hands their chance

of undertaking something new, something unforeseen for us, but to prepare them in advance for the task of renewing a common world (p. 196).

Mr. K, as pedagogue, understands that for his students imaginative learning and knowing functions best in a pathic environment. Their lived experiences in the transactional curriculum exist as actuated reality rooted in the dialogic and relational completion of 'possibles'. The ebb and flow of curricula and the give and take of discourse between and among the participants constitute the communicative power of imaginative learning, knowing, being and becoming. Attending the pathic mediates the confluence of all curricula within the transactional curriculum at any given moment in time. It invokes the development of a pedagogical relationship between teacher and student, and between student and students that makes possible the co-emergence of the cognitive and the non-cognitive in meaningful learning and knowing for all participants in the classroom. It evokes a community of learnership inspired by the actuated reality of achieving the imaginative 'possibles' of being and becoming.

The importance of a deep sense of calling

It's Grade 9 and I am beginning my career as a teacher. Monica is in my class and within the first 20 seconds, she tells me to self-copulate and I send her to the office. She is given a suspension and when she comes back to class the second week she continues the rude comments and behaviour. In a defiant tone she demands, "What's your problem?" and then declares "I'm not going to do any work today!"

"Who is this girl?" I think, "This is unreal!"

Grade 11 comes along and I have her in my English class. The first month it is test after test, her testing me all the time, pushing buttons and pushing more buttons. "I'm not going to do any work today, you okay with that?" "No," I reply, "If you don't do any work, you'll get zero for participation; but, that's up to you. If you want to do nothing, that's your choice but know what the consequence will be." Then she finishes an assignment and I write on it: "This is wonderful! I've always known you were capable but it's nice to see evidence that confirms my belief. Please keep up the good work because you're really smart and it would be a waste if you didn't."

Grade 12 arrives and I have Monica in my English class again this year. She works her butt off in this class. She confides in me: "I was ready to quit school in Grade 11. I was so ready to quit, I was on the verge of leaving but your

comments, your encouragement on my assignments gave me the courage to go on.”

It is May, the last month for student/staff awards in the school. I nominate Monica for the student-of-the-month academic award. We are in the school assembly in the gymnasium and Mr. M., the vice-principal, is announcing the final student award for the year, the Academic Student-of-the-Month Award. He begins: “This next award touches me greatly. When this student came to us in Grade 9 we really didn’t think she’d make it. She has faced a great deal of adversity in her life and has risen above it all to earn this prestigious Award.”

Mr. M. presents Monica with the Award, she cries. I cry. She approaches me, she is just bawling and through her tears she says: “This was your idea,” she just sobs. Together, we walk back to the classroom where the rest of the class has a little cake for her; they all knew of the Award before she did. She cries and all the students in the class applaud. She says: “ This is the only award I’ve ever won in my life!” (Rosalie, personal communication, 04 August 2002).

Verbal abuse, defiance, contemptuous remarks, in a word – attitude! What is it that acts within a teacher to allow her/him to not only withstand but to rise above the anger and the contempt of a student whose sole purpose is not to test but to break classroom limits? Monica’s celebrated success at the end of her high school career is in no small measure due to the patience, the fortitude and the charity which Rosalie, her teacher, possessed as she withstood the negativity that Monica directed towards her and transitioned that negativity into unprecedented personal growth and acknowledged accomplishment for Monica.

Another way that attending the pathic manifests itself in the transactional curriculum is through a pedagogue’s deep sense of calling. There is something in Rosalie’s nature as a teacher that transcends the limits of her praxis and experience as a beginning teacher. Her approach to teaching as calling as manifested in her genuine interest in Monica reaffirms the findings of Farkas, et al. (2000):

We found that the majority of new teachers possess at least one extraordinarily appealing quality: Their passion for teaching is striking. It is palpable, vastly underappreciated and a valuable asset...[They] are mostly motivated by the possibility of making a difference in the lives of at-risk students and by the hope that they would work with kids who are well-behaved and eager to learn

(http://www.publicagenda.org/research/research_reports_details_cfm?lst, retrieved 10 July 2004).

There is little doubt that Rosalie holds a deep sense of calling in respect of her teaching. She is passionate about her teaching and dedicated to helping Monica, an at-risk student, attain personal growth and academic success. She validates Monica's being, she invites Monica, as a valued young adult, to accept responsibility for her actions and in so doing develop respect for herself. She recognizes and honours Monica's Otherness in the genuine praise that she gives her for work done well: "This is wonderful! I've always known that you were capable but it's nice to see evidence that confirms my belief." Instinctively, Rosalie adds a note of encouragement that reinforces her faith and belief in Monica's ability and in her potential for success: "Please keep up the good work because you're really smart and it would be a waste if you didn't."

In her written comments on Monica's assignment Rosalie uses words such as: "wonderful," "capable," "evidence," and "confirm" that both describe, and call into existence, that which did not previously exist. The expletive statement "This is wonderful!" heralds the arrival, commends the existence, and maintains the ambiguity of that which was latent and which is now given presence. The antecedent reference of "this" is sufficiently ambiguous as to suggest multiple interpretations. Perhaps 'this' refers to the attainment of the 'possible' in the present with the hope that the potential for achievement will be sustained both academically and attitudinally. 'This' may serve as a threshold of pedagogical relationship in the present that conjoins the past and the future and allows each to penetrate the other. The strength of 'this' may be that it calls into appearance the imaginative: that which is, that which was and that which is to be. It is into this world of imaginative creativity and accomplishment that Rosalie invites Monica to enter.

"I've always know that you were capable" and "it's nice to see evidence that confirms my belief" are statements that empower. If we accept that there is in Western civilization a long tradition of seeing children, women, the insane and natives as being culturally marginalized (Kennedy, 2000), and as "embodying both deficit/danger and a connection with other worlds" (p. 520), it is refreshing to note in Rosalie's comments that there is no attempt to control, to manipulate or to transform the child into an adult through force or coercion. Rosalie's comments are a unique form of poetic invocation. Through her language, Rosalie seeks to inspirit, to empower the non-cognitive or pathic within Monica to assert its being in the presence of her work. The poetic nature of her

words calls Monica to create from within her potential a making that inheres in the possibility of success, both present and future.

Her final comment to Monica, “Please keep up the good work because you’re really smart and it would be a waste if you didn’t”, is both a plea and a reaffirmation of her bidding of Monica’s success. This is the calling forth that calls through in the pedagogical relationship between Rosalie and Monica and that calls them toward one another. This is a pedagogical calling that seeks to bring together within Monica both potentiality and possibility.

On an elemental level, it would appear that Rosalie evidences in her relationship with Monica what deMause (1974) refers to as an “empathic reaction.” She as adult, in deMause’s words, is able to “regress to the level of the child’s need and identify it with an admixture of the adult’s own perceptions. The adult must then be able to maintain enough distance from the need to be able to satisfy it” (p. 7). Explicit within deMause’s description is the notion of separation. The empathic reaction does not exist as a consequence of juxtaposing the child and the adult and identifying similar needs. Rather, the empathic reaction is made possible through a perception of need(s) attained through separation or the ability to “maintain enough distance” between the adult and the child. Distancing creates a gap between the adult and the child within which the adult is able to withstand the regressive influence of the child while effecting an evaluation and designing an appropriate course of action to meet the projected need(s) of the child. However, such a procedure does not adequately address Rosalie’s reaction to Monica nor does it adequately attend the pathic.

In the pedagogical context of the classroom, pathic refers to the sensitivity of thought and feeling within the sensibility and sensuality of lived relationships. Rosalie invites and through her consistent encouragement motivates Monica to enter the pedagogy of the classroom and contribute through her active participation to the lived experience of relationality not as a mirroring of the adult-teacher but as an illuminating child-student.

Pathic is antithetical to separation for it requires that one, as emotive self, connect with the emotive being of Other. Van Manen (1991) draws a close relation between the pathic and the lived experiences of adult and child within the pedagogical relationality of the classroom. The pathically attuned teacher is predisposed to perceiving the child in the world of the classroom not from a distance but from a connection; a feeling or an emotive modality of being. In her pathic reaction to Monica,

Rosalie, as self, touches and connects with the emotive being of Monica, as Other. Such touching removes the distance between the teacher and the student, passion is replaced by compassion which is “the most powerful evidence of growth in the inner being” (Clark, 2000, p. 22). Personal experiences grounded in the pedagogical relationality of the classroom become shared, fused in togetherness: “I was ready to quit in Grade 11. ...I was on the verge of leaving but your comments, your encouragement on my assignments gave me the courage to go on.” The heart of the teacher calls out to the heart of the student – to take courage – to go on against all odds.

Rosalie is both like and unlike Péguy in Merleau-Ponty’s (1962) description of his discovery at the end of *Notre Patrie*: “Péguy finds a buried voice which had never ceased to speak, much as we realize on waking that objects have not, through the night, ceased to be, or that someone has been knocking for some time at our door” (p. 362). In similar fashion to Péguy, Rosalie finds within Monica a buried voice but one, unlike that found by Péguy that has ceased to speak. Through her inspiring comments, Rosalie is able to call forth within Monica a voice that has lost its awakening, its reason to exist. She is able to perceive that Monica is capable of rediscovering her voice. Through her consistent and persistent efforts at reconstructing self-esteem, she is able to pathically instill in Monica the essential knowledge of herself and of her potential. Eventually, Monica is able to call her voice back into being. As pedagogue, Rosalie stands at the door of Monica’s world of inner being and knocks repeatedly until Monica is able to unlock the door and discover with Heidegger’s (1971) thinker as poet that “All our heart’s courage is the / echoing response to the / first call of Being which / gathers our thinking into the / play of the world” (p. 9).

Rosalie responds pedagogically to the vulnerability of Other in Monica. Her pathic reaction to Monica’s suffering inclines her to give aid or support, to be charitable in the full sense of the offering of love contained within that word. Van Manen (1991) describes such a pedagogical response succinctly: “When children call us, they call upon us” (p. 24). In attending the pathic, Rosalie epitomizes the pathic as an auspice of calling. She evidences a pedagogical reaction that transcends the empathic reaction as defined by deMause and attains the pathic reaction, as derived from van Manen’s (1991) description of the pedagogical relationship of adult and child within the classroom. For Rosalie, the call of pedagogue is to be educationally involved with students such as Monica and to empower or equip them to give shape to their life experiences – to be agents of action rather than passive receptors or victims of inaction.

Palmer (1998) contends that: “[d]eep speaks to deep, and when we have not sounded our own depths, we cannot sound the depths of our students lives” (p. 31). Rosalie is able to sound the depths of Monica’s life. Her interaction with Monica is not based on reciprocity; parity is not the principle of her calling. Her orientation is towards active learning and imaginative development as she seeks to empower Monica to achieve meaning in the learning process. Rosalie is intent on creating a rich learning environment where Monica is able to take risks in her cognitive and non-cognitive accumulation of knowledge and where she can form the desire to go on learning, which as Dewey (1938) reminds us “is the most important attitude” (p. 48). For Rosalie, Monica is text, and, as student, is deserving of whatever capacity for pathic understanding her own experience has given her as adult and as teacher. Clearly, for Rosalie, what she does as a teacher is not nearly as important as what her student Monica does after she is taught.

The importance of soul

Brandon doesn’t like me; he’s grown up with his Mom, and Grandma. He doesn’t like to take direction from a man at all. We are involved in a physical restraint in the time-out room. Brandon’s nose is bloody; there is blood everywhere - it is awful. Brandon is in front of me and I think, ‘I am angry with you, I am disappointed in you, but there’s something going on here and I have to wait it out.’ The blood dries on his face, I wait that long. Blood dries on the walls and on the floor, and still I wait. He looks at me and he cries; not one of those deep, sobby, something’s-not-right kind of cry, not an angry, frustrated cry but an I’m-very-very-hurt-here, for-some-reason-cry.”

He turns to me after a long, long time and says: “I feel that I’m losing a part of me.” “What?” “Things are happening in my life and I feel that you’re taking a part of me away from me.” I respond: “That’s not teaching, Brandon; that’s not what teaching’s all about. What am I doing that’s causing you to feel that I’m taking something from you?” Slowly, he replies: “I have no control, no choices, nothing.”

I take a cloth in my hand, rinse it in warm water, reach over and start to wipe his face. He doesn’t move, he doesn’t back away, he doesn’t say like he always has “Get away!” I wipe the blood off his face, I slowly take the warm cloth and wipe his face, clean his face off and he looks at me very differently for just a moment and then he turns away.

“What do you need?” I ask quietly. “I need to be able to leave the classroom when I need to. I need to be able to choose to push my chair in or not. I need to be able to go to the washroom when I need to without having to ask. I need to...” (Lance, personal communication, 28 June 2002)

Another way that attending the pathic manifests itself in the transactional curriculum is through soul, establishing a genuine and meaningful relational connection between the pedagogue and her/his student(s). Teaching is relational but unless there is a genuine desire on the part of the adult, as pedagogue, to respond to the vulnerability and “need” of the child, as student, then authentic, meaningful connection cannot occur. Brandon’s needs are simple and granting them would give him more power, more of a sense of personal worth, more feeling that he’s in control. The verbalizing of his needs to Lance transforms him in Lance’s perception from object to subject. He becomes Other to Lance and his Otherness requires not just acceptance but admission into Lance’s intrabeing. The process is violent and painful for Brandon but as it occurs he becomes person to Lance capable of instructing and assisting him to attain soul.

There are times when the relationality between teacher and student is fractured. Such is the case with Lance and Brandon. In their interaction we are introduced to a pedagogical relationship that has become violent to the point of physical pain and suffering. For Brandon, the conflict is a struggle for survival and an attempt to reclaim and preserve his sense of self-worth and dignity. He is searching for and desiring wholeness: “I feel that I’m losing a part of me.... Things are happening in my life and I feel that you’re taking a part of me away from me.” Brandon’s quest is simply and unequivocally stated, he is staking his claim as person and in so doing he introduces Lance to a life changing experience that reacquaints him with soul: “That’s not teaching, Brandon; that’s not what teaching’s all about. What am I doing that’s causing you to feel that I’m taking something from you?”

The answer to Lance’s question is to be found not in Brandon but in himself. We perceive Lance’s relationship with Brandon as both generative and illustrative of a teacher-centered power that contradicts the principles of pedagogical relationality (intentionality, appropriateness, responsibility) and sustains the decentering of students that has dominated traditional Western educational thinking and practice. Brandon as person is decentered, reduced to pieces that feel lost to him. Lance is not present to him in a constructive way, nor does he appear to be sensitive to his individual context and circumstance as a person. Brandon as object is helpless in the politics of identity, he is

marginalized as person in Lance's unique construction of pedagogical relationship and rendered powerless as he laments: "I have no control, no choices, nothing."

Lance seems to have forgotten that as *Homo sapiens* (knowing humans) we are distinguished from other species by our ability to learn and by our need to be social. We cannot survive as single beings, we need the company of others for survival and for our sense of identity and belonging. John Donne, writing in the 17th Century, clearly enunciated this central truth of human existence: "No man is an island entire of itself: every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main" (Meditation XVII as cited in Witherspoon and Warnke, 1957/1963, p. 68). Lance has failed to sustain meaningful connection with Brandon as a part of the main and to instill in him a sense of hope: a belief in his own inner potential. His intentionality, his appropriateness, and his responsibility toward Brandon, as student, are called into question and found wanting.

Soul is the unmediated deep connection that exists between the inner self of the teacher and the inner self of student when the pathic is present in their pedagogical relationship. hooks (1999) refers to soul as the spirit of "interbeing" (cited in S. Glazer, p. 121). The inner self is not physical, not metaphysical but spiritual in being and in existence. Parker Palmer refers to it as "the soil from which good teaching occurs" (1998, p. 2). He seems to imply that soul embodies both nature and nurture. This is affirmed in my discussions with pre-service teachers. When I ask them to use simple phrases to describe the qualities that distinguish their best teacher in school, invariably, the most oft-repeated refrains are: "He/she respected me/us," or "He/she cared for me/us." A respectful nature and an inclination to nurture seem to be two qualities that predominate in teachers who genuinely love children, who have a deep sense of calling, and who are able to establish and maintain soul in their teaching.

In the lived experience of his teaching Lance must confront his perception of himself as a consequence of the ugly, violent exchange that he has had with Brandon. His actions seem to confirm the assertion that: "...we humans seek to outwit and control each other not just because of some tangible goal in the outside world that we're trying to achieve, but because of a lift we get psychologically" (Redfield, 1993, p. 71). Varela (1999) labels such maneuverings "habits of ego-clinging" (p. 68). Foucault (1981) refers to them as "power relations" and maintains that, "in reality power means ... a more-or-less coordinated (... ill-coordinated) cluster of relations" (p. 199) that are constituted in the moment that an individual or a people no longer have rights. Such qualities of human character serve to negate soul in pedagogical relationality.

Lance's awakening to the need to change his pedagogical approach to Brandon evidences traces of the sacred. Palmer (1999) maintains that: "the sacred is that which is worthy of respect" and that a primary goal of education is "to reclaim the sacred at the heart of knowing, teaching, and learning" (in Glazer, pp.19-20). There is great change that takes place within Lance regarding the sacred in his relationship with Brandon, but the change, while transformative, is gradual. Lance is not immediately aware that his concern for Brandon, as Other, is mixed with his own sense of ego and has become confused with his need to satisfy his own cravings for recognition and self-actualization: "I am angry with you, I am disappointed in you...." His pedagogical relationship with Brandon is self-serving, it falters in its compassion, results in the violent shedding of blood, and eventually fails to honour the sacred in Brandon and in their relationship.

During the time that it takes for Brandon's blood to dry on his face, on the walls, and on the floor there is a perceptible, profound change occurring within Lance. It is a gradual awakening to the sacred that begins when the violence ends – "...there's something going on here and I have to wait it out." The passage of time in this situation provides for space and silence within which soulful healing and wholeness begins to take place. Silence is held to be one of the seven gateways to the soul of students. "Initiation, connection, meaning, joy, creativity, transcendence and silence" (Kessler, 2000, p. 160) combine to teach teachers to know that there are various ways to appropriately honour the sacred within students. Silence in Brandon's case is not provocative but invocative, it is not intended to incite but to invite. Palmer (1998), as mentioned above, posits that, "[d]eep speaks to deep" (p. 31); and, Brandon through the vulnerability of his deep silence calls Lance to be open in his capacity and willingness to accommodate the sacred and in so doing measure the depth of his integrity as a teacher.

Brandon's voice cries out in its vulnerability to Lance accusing him, indicting him of desecrating his selfhood – the Other that Lance is pedagogically charged with safeguarding, nurturing and developing. His words become sacred material to Lance, they are invested with body and form; they illuminate the path of soul as it begins its inward journey and they serve to remind Lance of the inappropriateness of his conduct. They invite Lance to re-institute pedagogical intentionality, appropriateness and responsibility into his teaching in a deep, meaningful and connective way. Silence compels Lance to make a genuine connection with his inner self and reclaim the capacity to nourish soul in his teaching.

The acknowledgement of conduct that is pedagogically inappropriate awakens Lance to a conscious knowing of his need to change: “What am I doing that’s causing you to feel that I’m taking something from you?” Lance implores Brandon to help him understand what it is that he is doing and what it is that he must now do to restore the sacred in their relationship. bell hooks (1999) has observed: “violence is not just physical aggression, violence can be making someone invisible; violence can be making someone other” (in S. Glazer, p. 125).

Pedagogically, Lance becomes aware that he has made Brandon an invisible other, the object of his egoistic need for dominance and for control. In the pedagogical relationship that existed between them Lance adopted a system approach that was more important than Brandon – one in which physical restraint became more important than pathic responsiveness. In the technical-rational model of public education, the systemic approach to discipline and instruction is independent of the particular; denigrating of the specificity of person. Glazer describes the various ways that systemic denigration of the particular occurs in the current education model:

through isolation and segregation – sorting by age, sorting by intelligence, by locking students indoors, in sterile and lifeless environments; by breaking the living world into meaningless pieces – grade, curricula, lesson plans, and busy work; by modeling and encouraging individualism and competition rather than community and collaboration; and by standardization and streamlining – creating structures of efficiency – that make no allowances for differences... (p. 133).

As Lance becomes aware of his denigration of Brandon he is moved to restorative action. He takes a warm cloth and wipes the dry blood from Brandon’s face. The washing may be seen as an act of soulful connection; emblematic of Lance’s desire to reclaim the sacred in their fractured relationship. Attending the pathic is reintroduced into their relationship in spirit and community – Lance is making an effort to fully Brandon in their relationship. In so doing, he is inviting a new definition of connection. He is at once the respondent and the initiator as he invites equilibrium into their relationship. Ellsworth (1997) explains the process in this way: “The teacher empowers the student by practicing, reciprocal, dialogical relations that equalize power relations among teachers and students” (p. 151).

Lance seems to have discovered that, “[t]he world,” as Merleau-Ponty (1962) reminds us, “is not what I think, but what I live through, I am open to the world, I have no doubt that I am in communication with it, but I do not possess it, it is ... self-discovery”

(p. xvii). Lance demonstrates in his renewed interaction with Brandon that teaching is a vibrant, active, soulful experience. Soul is an auspice of attending the pathic in teaching. Soul involves the pedagogue in attending the pathic within and from within and results in a genuine connection to self which is the source of personal honesty, humility, integrity, thoughtfulness, and diligence or the courage to daily perform the duties and responsibilities of a pedagogue in the classroom even in the face of opposition, criticism, or disrespect and to perform such duties with deep and consistent love, care and concern for one's self and for an Other. Soul involves the pedagogue in authentic and meaningful interpersonal relationship with her/his students. Kessler (2002) posits that deep connection to students, as Others, requires: "the ability to listen deeply to others, to their beliefs, dreams, and opinions; empathy and compassion; and respect for others who differ in any and all ways" (www.bridges4kids.org, retrieved 10 July 2004),

Silence opens Lance to the possibility of restoring community with Brandon. Silence with its accompanying stillness centers and awakens the inner being to an attentive awareness of the sacred within the rhythms of bodily living in self and in community with others. The Western mind is preoccupied with agitation – doing something all the time – and agitated minds create an agitated world which then creates more agitation and the vicious cycle turns on itself spiraling out of control. But silence especially when it is dedicated to serenity or the sacred can break the vicious cycle. The cultivation of soul in silence centers and harmonizes the mind and the heart in its self-discovery of the world and results in inner peace. Soul is a spiritual connection of the intimate in teaching and learning made possible in the transactional curriculum through attending the pathic.

Garnet, the protagonist in the novel *Keeper'n Me* (Wegamese, 1994) in his search for inner peace receives spiritual direction from the old man, the Keeper. He learns the necessity of human beings, including himself remaining centered as a precondition to attending other-centeredness; to achieving soul:

Anything that takes you away from your center is your enemy...Robs your spirit from you. Starts you livin' opposite to yourself. Livin' pretty soon outta your head instead a outta your heart. Old man told me one time he said, the head got no answers and the heart got no questions. Human bein' livin' by the heart's gonna live a good way. One livin' by the head's gonna come lookin' for a guide before too long lead 'em back where they oughta be (p. 77).

Brandon becomes the guide to lead Lance back to where he “oughta be.” As a direct consequence, he makes it possible for Lance to realize that if he is to re-establish the pathic within the community of their relationship then he must invite a return of soul into the heart of his teaching through attending the pathic.

Conclusion

Pedagogical love as practiced by Mr. K, a deep sense of calling as demonstrated by Rosalie, and the re-establishment of soul in relationality as evidenced by Lance, fly in the face of the eco-political pressures within postmodern education. Centralized control of prescribed curriculum, high-stakes evaluation, devaluation of the pedagogical in the teaching process, and an increasing movement toward a global education system based on standards of achievement and accountability, raises the awareness of pre-service and in-service teachers to the positivistic mindset prevalent in education today. It is a mindset that orients evaluation or assessment of teachers and their teaching effectiveness almost exclusively on their ability to produce and to maintain consistent student success on high-stakes tests. Kessler (2002) contends that an over-emphasis on “standards” can lead to a deplorable educational situation: “A school based exclusively on “standards” could easily become an arid, numerical, test-driven landscape that cannot nourish true learning, turning teachers into managers and students into robots” (www.bridges4kids.org, retrieved 10 July 2004).

Positivism in a post-industrial society values efficiency and accountability over the human and pathic qualities in teaching. Stein (2001) reminds us that: “Efficiency is not an end, but a means to achieve valued ends. It is not a goal, but an instrument to achieve other goals. It is not a value, but a way to achieve other values. It is part of the story but never the whole” (p. 6). Unfortunately, the positivistic evaluation of teachers and teaching in public education has effectively used efficiency “as an end in itself, as a value in its own right, and as the overriding goal of public life” (p. 6). In short, efficiency as it relates to the public good in education has become a cult dedicated to the advancement of a political agenda at the expense of educational design and intention.

Attending the pathic in the transactional curriculum of the classroom through pedagogical love, a deep sense of calling, and soulful connection creates a community of learnership that is based on cooperation, providing a safe and secure place for learning to occur, and providing a motivational, emotionally supportive climate for positive, imaginative risk-taking. When students pathically attend a task they are involved in learning. The non-cognitive or pathic domain emotionally links students to

learning by assisting them to recall from memory and experience sensory information that is evaluated, or re-evaluated, as either positive or negative. Such a process assists students to drive away fear, mistrust, anxiety or competition and aids in learning by ensuring that learning will be retained. Students learn best when presented with a balance between stress and comfort, between high challenge and low threat, and between the pathic and the gnostic.

Students are co-origators in the creation of learning within the transactional curriculum because the transactional curriculum is their life-world in the classroom and enactive learning is best accomplished in their life-world through feeling and by doing. Thoughts, intuitions, predispositions, and emotions operate simultaneously and interact with various modes of instruction as students are imaginatively challenged. They need to experience an environmental press that will activate and accentuate both cognitive and non-cognitive learning. Good teaching as evidenced by Mr. K, Rosalie, and Lance consistently addresses student's needs and as a result students respond favourably. Pedagogy that is motivated by attending the pathic and that empowers students to assist in the creation of the gnoseologic nature of education that rewards both students and teacher with enactive, transformative learning.

Transformative learning is made possible for Carly, Monica, and Brandon by teachers who, as pedagogues, attend the pathic in their relationships with their students. Pedagogical love, a deep sense of calling and authentic, and meaningful, soulful connection are essential relational ingredients in the creation of optimal learning conditions in the transactional curriculum. Teachers who attend the pathic within the transactional curriculum incorporate social, organizational, pedagogical, and emotional factors that are integral to the experience of place for each of their students. They orchestrate learning through attending the pathic in designing and creating communities of learnership. Such is the pedagogical success of Mr. K, Rosalie and Lance. They succeed in employing thematic, problematic, or issue-based activities that conjoin cognitive and non-cognitive, or gnostic and pathic knowing and understanding in the development of the transactional curriculum in their classrooms.

References

- Arendt, H. (1961). *Between past and future: Six exercises in political thought*. New York: Viking Press.
- Aoki, T. (1993). Legitimizing lived curriculum: Toward a curricular landscape of multiplicity. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 8 (3), 255-268.
- Clark, D. C. (2000). *The teacher within: A voyage of discovery*. Orem, UT: Granite Publishing and Distribution.
- Cohen, L. (1993). Anthem. *Stranger music: Selected poems and songs*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 373-374.
- DeMause, L. (1974). The evolution of childhood. In L. deMause (Ed.), *The history of childhood*. New York: Harper.
- Dewey, J. (1938, rpt.1997). *Experience and Education*. New York: Touchstone, Simon and Schuster.
- Egan, K. (1992). *Imagination in teaching and learning: The middle school years*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ellsworth, E. (1997). *Teaching positions: Difference, pedagogy and the power of address*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.
- Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Foleno, T., Duffett, A., & Foley, P. (2000) *A sense of calling: Who teaches and why*. http://www.publicagenda.org/research/research_reports_details.cfm?lst (Retrieved 10 July 2004).
- Foucault, M. (1981). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings (1972-1977)*. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Friere, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of the heart*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1971; 2002). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th Anniversary Edition). Trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. New York: Continuum.
- Gibran, K. (1926) *The Prophet*. London: Penguin Books.
- Glazer, S. (Ed.). (1999). *The heart in learning: Spirituality in Education*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.
- Greene, M. (1995). Notes on the search for coherence. *Toward a coherent curriculum: 1995 ASCD yearbook*. J. A. Beane (Ed.) Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 139 -145.
- Hansen, D.T. (1995). *The call to teach*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

Hatt, B.E. (2002). Heart in is heart of teaching. *Ecclectica (4): Voices of education* .911, December. <http://www.ecclectica.ca/issues/2002/4/> retrieved 13 April 2004.

Heidegger, M. (1971). *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Trans. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row.

hooks, b. (1999). Embracing freedom: spirituality and liberation. In Glazer, S. (Ed.), *The heart of learning: Spirituality in education*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam, 113-129.

Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: the bodily basis of meaning, imagination and reason*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Karolides, N.J. (1999). Theory and practice: An interview with Louise M. Rosenblatt. *Language Arts* 77 (2) 158-170.

Kennedy, D. (2000). The roots of child study: Philosophy, History, and Religion. *Teachers College Record* 102 (3), 514-538.

Kessler, R. (2000). *The soul of Education: Helping students find connection, compassion, and character at school*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kessler, R. (2002). Nurturing deep connection: Five principles for welcoming soul into school leadership. *The School Administrator Web Edition*. www.bridges4kids.org. (Retrieved 10 July 2004).

Kieren, T. (2000). Personal Communication, 9 October.

Klein, E. (1971). *A comprehensive etymological dictionary of the English language*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing Co.

Maturana, H.R. & Varela, F.J. (1980). *Autopoiesis and cognition: The realization of the living*. Boston: Reidel.

McCrae, J.C. (Minister). (1999). *Senior 3 English Language Arts: A foundation for implementation*. Winnipeg, MB: Minister of Education and Learning.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of perception*. (Trans. Colin Smith). London: Routledge.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: a feminine approach to ethics & moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Palmer, P.J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, P. (1999). The grace of great things: Recaliming the sacred in knowing, teaching and learning. In Glazer, S. (Ed.), *The heart of learning: Spirituality in education*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam, 15-32.

Readings, B. (1996). The scene of teaching. *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 150-165.

Redfield, J. (1993). *The celestine prophecy: An adventure*. New York: Warner Books.

Rosenblatt, L. (1985). The transactional theory of the literary work: Implications for research. In Charles R. Cooper (Ed.), *Researching response to Literature and the teaching of Literature*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing, 33-53.

Stein, J. G. (2001). *The cult of efficiency*. Toronto: Anansi.

Tremmel, R. (2001). Seeking a balanced discipline: Writing teacher education in first-year Composition and English Education. *English Education*, 34, (1), 6-31.

van Manen, M. (1991). *The tact of teaching: The meaning of pedagogical thoughtfulness*. London, ON: Althouse Press.

van Manen, M. (1998). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. The University of Western Ontario: The Althouse Press.

van Manen, M. (1999). The pathic of pedagogical practice. In Pertti Kansanen (Ed.), *Discussions on Educational Issues*. University of Helsinki Press, VIII, 75-97.

van Manen, M. & Li, S. (2002). The pathic principle of pedagogical language. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 18 (2), 215-224.

van Manen, M. (2002). Epistemology of practice.

<http://www.ualberta.ca/~vanmanen/epistpr.htm> retrieved 31 December 2002.

Varela, F.J. (1999). *Ethical know-how: Action, wisdom, and cognition*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Varela, F. T., Thompson, E. & Rosch, E. (1991). *The Embodied mind: cognitive science and human experience*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Wagamese, R. (1994). *Keeper'n me*. Toronto: Doubleday Canada.

Werner, W. (1995). Persistent curriculum issues. *Social change and Education in Canada*. Eds. R. Ghosh & D. Ray. Toronto: Harcourt Brace, 126-136.

Witherspoon, A.M. and Warnke, F.J. (Eds.). (1957/1963). *Seventeenth-century prose and poetry*. 2nd. Ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World Inc.