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Abstract

Pedagogical patterns as defined in the specialized dictionaries set the main direction in the achievement of education, reflected in the level of didactical and extra-didactical process, the instructional method or the constitutive parts which represent the main focus of the didactical projects established at the scale of the whole educational system. There is an education policy fundamentally different under the historical conditions which allowed for the assertion, both in theory and practice of the school system, of some paradigms which focus on: a) the teacher, teaching, guided learning – the magistro-centric paradigm; b) student’s individual psychological needs- the psychocentric paradigm; c) society’s needs as well as economical, civic, cultural, political, religious, community needs - the sociocentric paradigm; d) the technology of education, the didactic methodology, types of organization in instruction, etc. – the technocentric paradigm; the goals of education designed according to level of the educational system and process- the paradigm of the curriculum. Our study proposes three objectives: 1) defining the concept of pedagogical pattern; 2) application of the concept of pedagogical pattern throughout the history of pedagogy in order to understand the paradigms which were promoted in the course of time; 3) examining some pedagogical patterns/ paradigms which foreshadow the progress in the evolution of pedagogical thinking both at a global level (John Dewey) and at a national level (Spiru Haret).
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1. Introduction

Application of the notion of pattern in pedagogy may be of use to the examination of the specific subject-education- thoroughly studied from the standpoint of each educational science, from the fundamental ones (the fundamentals of pedagogy/ the general theory of education, the theory and methodology of instruction/ general didactics, the theory and methodology of the curriculum, the theory of pedagogical research/ the theory of educational research), to the most recent, developed...
intrdisciplinary (the theory and methodology of assessment, the theory of effective communication/ of effective teaching, the theories of learning, the theory of civic education, etc.) and interdisciplinary (the psychology of education/ the sociology of education, the management of education, the management of school organization, classroom management/ lesson management, etc.)

2. The Concept of Pedagogical Pattern

The concept is defined in the specialized dictionaries as: a) didactical pattern, learning pattern; b) the pattern of pedagogical conduct specific to educators; c) global pattern of systemic approach in education/ instruction as it was historically promoted, through “the pedagogical processes, methods and reasoning” known as “chosen solutions” meant to exploit the relation teacher – student. (Dictionnaire de pedagogie, 2010, pp. 80, 132-133).

2.1 Pedagogical pattern as a didactical pattern, learning pattern

A pattern which has always been sought by theorists and practitioners throughout the history of pedagogy. It occurs in the traditionalist prescientific premodern pedagogy as a magistro-centric pattern.

In the modern scientific pedagogy it is known as a “psychocentric pattern”, focusing on the child or the student’s psychological needs, and as a sociocentric pattern, centred on society’s needs in regard to education and the educated. The pattern of the curriculum, is proposed in postmodern pedagogy, a pattern which focuses on the goals of education (educational goals, objectives) based on the organic relation between the psychological expectations (see the student’s abilities) and society’s needs. (see the scientific, moral, technological, artistic, etc. contents to be learned). Another example of highly appreciated didactical pattern nowadays is the constructivist pattern.

What we take into consideration here, it is the genetic structuralist pattern Jean Piaget, more specifically the constructivist sociocultural pattern, first designed in the 1930s by the great psychologist Leg Vigotski, which was exploited since the 1970s and up to the present time by the curriculum developers from the U.S. and Europe. The matter under consideration suggested by the constructivist didactical pattern is the one represented by the relation between development and learning.

The constructivist genetic structuralist pattern, drawn up by the great Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget, considers that the stadial development (preoperational, concrete operational and formal operational) determines learning.

The constructivist sociocultural pattern, drawn up by Lev Vigotski, suggests a revolutionary pedagogical solution: learning can precede development if organized accordingly in a socio-cultural environment created by the adult (parent, teacher, etc.) and which is favourable from a formative perspective.

This pattern is based on two principles: a) the structural principle of building optimum formative relations between the adults and the child (the student), in an appropriate socio-cultural environment; b) the projection of learning onto the zone of proximal development principle which defines “the existing difference between the level of problem solving under adult supervision and support and the one reached by the child or the student “on their own”. (Vigotski, 1972, p. 80).
2.2 The pedagogical pattern as a pattern of conduct specifically related to educators

Such pattern was historically launched ever since the Ancient Times. The one in question here is the maieutic pattern, suggested by Socrates, and even currently applied in the school system in the form of heuristic conversation method. It provides a specific unique connotation onto the teacher’s conduct in the primary and secondary, as well as in the higher education school system (see the Socratic dialogue, applicable in the academic seminar).

In contemporary pedagogy two of the didactic conduct patterns are confronting each other: a) a pattern which focuses on transmitting knowledge, according to concrete objectives, using some methods of learning and assessment; b) another pattern focuses on building learning through the use of the student’s psychological resources and the resources of the socio-cultural environment. An increasingly greater role is attributed to the pattern focusing on computer-based instruction. Whatever the context, the quality of the didactic conduct pattern of the teacher depends on his/her ability to correlate with the “goals, knowledge and methods” of the curriculum. Concrete objectives are not the only objectives one must take into consideration. Concrete objectives must be related to the superior, specific and general objectives as well as to the macro-structural goals (the aim of education and its general goals). (Dictionnaire de pedagogie, 120 notion–cles. 320 entrees. Classement thematique, 2010, p. 133).

2.3 The pedagogical pattern as a global pattern of systemic approach in education/instruction

It is a pattern, historically asserted, as: a) traditional pattern; b) pattern of the new education, of the active pedagogy; c) pattern of effective learning, of pedagogy through objectives; d) pattern of global education and rendering autonomy. The four patterns suggest a specific kind of approach in the pedagogical process, the pedagogical methods and the pedagogical reasoning:

a) the traditionalist pattern (XVI-XIX Centuries). The process of transmission, imitation, reproduction. Formal patterns. Pedagogical reasoning based on the teacher’s activity.

b) the pattern of the new education, the pattern of active pedagogy (1900-1975). A process based on the student’s activity. Methods are natural, based on experience and pedagogical innovation. Pedagogical reasoning focuses on the student and classroom activity as well as on learning through practical activities. (Dewey)

c) the pattern of effective learning, of pedagogy achieved through objectives (1975) a process based on the “pedagogical organization: objectives, competencies, project and assessments.” these methods are based on differentiation and learning in context. Pedagogical reasoning is centered on learning in concrete situations.

d) the pattern of global education and rendering autonomy. A process based on autonomous knowledge gathering. These methods focus on searching for information and student’s individual activity. Pedagogical reasoning is centered upon the student’s activity, on his reflective and self-reflective capacity.

In conclusion, historically asserted pedagogical patterns, sustain a certain relation between goals-knowledge-methods. This relation is particularly reflected in the didactical process – Pedagogical
methods (of teaching, learning, assessment) – Pedagogical reasoning, in the projecting process and establishing connections between the teacher and the student.

3. Application of the Concept of Pedagogical Pattern in the Course of the History of Pedagogy

Application of the concept of pedagogical pattern throughout the history of pedagogy, may help us to grasp the paradigms which occurred in the course of time, in different historical epochs. (Cristea, 2010)

The paradigm represents a model in approaching the scientific theory, historically asserted, in the course of many historical stages (Kuhn, 1999). From a pedagogical perspective, the subject in question is represented by the paradigms which suggest different patterns in approaching pedagogical theory, asserted in the course of history, acknowledged by the scientific community and applied in the school education process. The main components of the pedagogical theory/theory of education are taken into account: the goals, the contents, the methods, the assessment, which maintain the relationship between the educator and the educated, between the teacher and the student. Depending on the component considered to be primordial or central, lots of paradigms acknowledged throughout the history of pedagogy could be distinguished (Cristea, 2010, pp. 42-44).

A) The magistro-centric paradigm is typical of the traditional prescientific pedagogy. It is centred on the teacher’s activity, on teaching and controlled learning.

B) The psycho-centric paradigm is typical of modern scientific pedagogy. It is based on the psychological needs of the student. It first came into being at the edge between the XIXth and XXth century with the book “The century of the child” (1900). The author, Ellen Key, asserts that ‘we must take a bow before his/her highness, the child.’ Another representative book is the one written by Alfred Binet (1910). The author aims at knowing the student through tests in order to achieve an individualized education system. A special contribution is owed to the representatives of the New Education movement: Dewey, Montessori, Decroly, Claparede, Freinet, etc. who consider that education must be based on the exploitation of children’s/students’ motivation (interests, needs, etc.).

C) The sociocentric paradigm is a reply to the psychocentric paradigm, with which it was in dispute in the course of the XXth Century, in the context of modern scientific pedagogy. The sociocentric paradigm was launched and supported in terms of doctrine by Durkheim (1922). He suggests a definition of education typical of the sociocentric paradigm. Education represents “the methodical socialization of the young generation” facilitated by the mature generation. Socialization can be achieved in different versions which focus on the politicization, technicisation, polytechnicalisation of education, etc.

D) The technocentric paradigm lies at the heart of education the education technology, which is achieved on the basis of educational objectives. In this context, “pedagogy through objectives” which foreshadows the paradigm of the curriculum, is promoted. Educational technology is not restricted to the educational methods or to the didactical methods. It refers to projects which take into consideration the connection between objectives and methods, between contents and learning tools, etc. on the one hand, it exploits the thesis of the psychocentric paradigm, developed from the perspective of cognitive psychology. On the other hand, it considers the resources of social learning, of importance from the perspective of the sociocentric paradigm.
E) **The paradigm of the curriculum** is typical of the postmodern pedagogy. It was initiated in the middle of the XXth Century, by R.W. Tyler (1949). It lies at the heart of education the goals and objectives of education which reflect the connection between the psychological needs (emphasized by the psychocentric paradigm) and the social needs (emphasized by the sociocentric paradigm). The curriculum, has been continuously evolving as a paradigm up to the XXIst Century. It contributes to the development of many educational sciences launched from the psychocentric perspective (pedagogical psychology, psychology of education, psychological pedagogy, differential pedagogy, age-appropriate pedagogy; the psychology of the curriculum, the school psychology) and that of sociocentric paradigm (social pedagogy, pedagogical sociology, work pedagogy; mass-media pedagogy). On the other hand, it contributes to the assertion of some new sciences of education: the theory of the curriculum, the theory of assessment, the management of school organization, classroom management, the policy of education, education planning, the sociology of the curriculum, intercultural pedagogy, etc.

4. **The Analysis of Some Patterns which Foreshadow The Progress of Pedagogy**

We shall analyze two patterns which foreshadow the evolution of pedagogical thinking on a global level (John Dewey) and on a national level (Spiru Haret).

John Dewey (1859-1952), considered by historians to be a representative of modern pedagogy, contributed to the launching of the New Education movement (Stanciu, 2006). Analysis of Dewey’s work demonstrates that Dewey can be associated with the paradigm of the curriculum, developed in the second half of the XXth Century, up to the XXIst Century. Ever since Dewey (1899) suggested a synthesis between the expectations of the psychocentric-sociocentric paradigm, by means of which he sets out the bias of the paradigm of the curriculum. Education must be centred upon the child’s inner psychological resources as well as on society’s needs which contributes to the exploitation of psychological resources (1899).

In the famous work, J. Dewey (1902) shows the lead to be followed in building the syllabus which we call today curricular – relating the contents of science, culture, art, etc. To the child or the student’s life experience. The idea of exploiting student’s experience as well as guiding him/ her based on some “positive goals” conceived as inner rather than outer goals.

In “Experience and education” Dewey refers to education as a reconstruction of experience based on some “positive goals”, observing two principles which we can consider as principles of the curriculum or principles of school curricular project: 1) the principle of ensuring continuity between the students’ experience and the content of the syllabuses; 2) the principle of interaction between the inner (the student’s) circumstances and the outer conditions (those of the syllabus and the teacher’s) within any learning activity.

Spiru Haret (1851-1912) is honoured in the history of pedagogy as the minister who designed the school reform at the edge between the XIXth –XXth century. In those times traditional spontaneous reforms considered only a partial change, separately made at each level of the school system. (Bîrzea, 1976). The historical contribution of Spiru Haret resides in the fact that he surpassed this tendency specific to the partial traditionalist reforms. The reform that Spiru Haret between 1896-1910, is a “structural reform”. By his way of thinking, Spiru Haret was ahead of his times in terms of policy of
education, as well as that of social pedagogy. He may be considered as a representative of social modern pedagogy, who foreshadowed the interdisciplinary research typical of the sociology of education, which has been developed throughout the entire XXth Century.

In Spiru Haret’s view, the school reform is a reform of the school system and education. It was “conceived by Spiru Haret (in collaboration with C. Dumitrescu-Iasi) and put into practice through a “set of laws” which promoted innovation at all stages of the school system”. The three laws of the reform – “The law of the primary school system” (1896, 1901), “The law of the secondary and higher education school system” (1898), “The law of vocational school system” (1899) - as well as “The law for preschool institutions” (1909) and “Circular for primary school teachers to set up courses for adults” (1907), confirm the fundamental contribution made by Spiru Haret the making of the modern education system at the edge between the XIXth—XXth Century”.

The historical value of the reform done by SpiruHaret, acknowledged throughout the entire interwar period, comes from: a) the clarity of goals assumed in relation to the national goal; b) the coherence of the principles it promoted in the spirit of the reform – education seen as a “cultural unit”, patriotic education, both realistic and practical, extracurricular education; c) the realism of organizational and content-based structures, also open to the idea of adult education” (Cristea, 2001, p.326). From this perspective, Haret’s reform foreshadows the educational policies established by UNESCO after the years 1970-1980 and up to the present day.
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