

## Chapter 2

# About Pedagogization: From the Perspective of the History of Education

Marc Depaepe, Frederik Herman, Melanie Surmont,  
Angelo Van Gorp and Frank Simon

*Es ist die Überzeugtheit des Rechts zur planenden Manipulierung des 'ganzen Menschen' unter dem Aspekt und der Verantwortung der 'Bildung' und 'sozialen Gerechtigkeit'. Das 'Totalitäre' darin ist die Pädagogisierung des Menschen und der Gesellschaft, die hier als selbstverständlicher Anspruch vorgetragen wird.<sup>1</sup>*  
(Schelsky, 1961, p. 161)

For history researchers, it is not a needless luxury to consider from time to time the content and the significance of the basic concepts they use, certainly if they have the ambition to interpret and/or explain history in addition to purely describing it. This self-reflection, compelled by the annually recurring dialogue with educational philosophers (cf. Smeyers & Depaepe, 2006),<sup>2</sup> need not necessarily place an emphasis on philosophical abstraction but can just as well start from an examination of the history of one's own research. Such an approach need not succumb to navel-gazing. Instead, such historical self-reflection possibly points to the creeping (and thereby largely unconscious) shifts in meaning that accompany various fashions (consider the swirling 'turns' of recent years), which affect the social scientific vocabulary (historiographic, philosophical, pedagogical, psychological sociological, etc.).

By rendering such developments explicit, the epistemological wrestling with the stream of experiences we call 'history', a process that can be chaotic, may in the future perhaps be somewhat less sloppy. Admittedly, even the most critical concepts that emerged from our own work (which is discussed here) were not always used with methodological care and/or theoretical purity.

### 2.1 Pedagogization as a Container Concept

It is generally felt that the concept of 'pedagogization'<sup>3</sup> appeared at the end of the 1950s and was coined by the sociologist Janpeter Kob while working in Germany (see Höhne, 2002, 2004). He wanted to indicate, from an educational perspective,

---

M. Depaepe (✉)  
University of Leuven, K.U. Leuven, Belgium  
e-mail: Marc.Depaepe@kuleuven-kortrijk.be

the trend that had emerged within virtually all societal institutions of a modernizing society. The Western welfare state revealed itself primarily as 'pedagogical'. This characteristic was related to professional groups' corporatist hunger for power and has been criticized by Helmut Schelsky (1961) and others. They would have aimed, among other things, for the expansion of pedagogical power because of the better prospects for employment. In contrast to related concepts such as 'industrialization' and 'bureaucratization', the concept initially had difficulty in securing acceptance. In German pedagogical historiography, it was only granted legitimacy in the 1980s (cf. Giesecke, 1996).

By the same token, pedagogization has only recently been accepted as a legitimate term within the Dutch-language arena, where the *Belgisch-Nederlandse Vereniging voor de Geschiedenis van Opvoeding en Onderwijs* (BNVGOO: The Belgian–Dutch Society for the History of Education) elevated 'pedagogization' to the central topic of a congress that took place on 14 and 15 November 1985 in Amsterdam. Judging from the title of the collection of congress texts (*Pedagogisering*, 1985), the intention was to investigate what this phenomenon had meant for the two countries in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. When using this relatively new but primarily fashionable term, the organizers were (by implication) referring to the increasing attention being given to the educational aspect of many sectors of everyday life and (in relation to this) the increasing significance of professional assistance. Nevertheless, the term 'pedagogization' did not appear in the definitive publication of some of the conference papers (Dekker, D'hoker, Kruithof, & De Vroede, 1987). Some Flemish educational historians for instance doubted if there was really any place for such a concept within their discipline (Hermans, 1987). As a consequence of the work of the German educationist Ulrich Herrmann, who in the meantime had devoted an almost 'programmatic' contribution in a standard work on the social history of the child (Herrmann, 1986), the concept soon appeared again in Dutch-language pedagogical historiography.

In regard to the reemergence of the term pedagogization, the contribution of our research group can hardly be denied. Since the late 1980s, we have used the word in the titles of our work. Frank Simon was the first to do this (Simon & Van Damme, 1989, 1992; Simon, 1994) followed by Marc Depaepe (1995, 1998a, 1998b). This occurred without too much attention being given to either the definition or demarcation of the concept. We tended to use the term 'pedagogization' as a label, an umbrella word to indicate the steady expansion and increased depth of educational action during the nineteenth and particularly the twentieth centuries. The Interbellum, in which child-raising, formation and education became the field *par excellence* on the ideological market and the social polarizations, served in this regard as the key period in the formation of the 'pedagogized' society (Depaepe & Simon, 1999).

More or less in conformity with the double line that Herrmann describes, the understanding of pedagogization that appeared in our work had both quantitative and qualitative aspects. Thus, as we saw it, the idea of expansion as it pertained to educational action not only concerned the increase in the number of child-raising and educational governmental bodies and the greater range of the child-raising and

educational processes but also encompassed the ever-increasing central role of the pedagogical in society. More pedagogical concern and more pedagogical care also sharpened qualitatively the specificity of pedagogical intervention. Of what did this consist? Generally speaking, it presented itself as a shift in the behavioural repertoire of the child-raiser, the educator and the teacher: physical compulsion (which naturally was also accompanied by psychological pressure) had to give way to a more psychological ‘treatment’ of the child. This might be understood as the ‘disembodiment’ of educational intervention that served to intensify emotional manipulation (see also Herman, Depaepe, Simon, & Van Gorp, 2007a).

This trend was seen as the result of an increased expertise that had emerged, thanks to the scientization (and the accompanying academization) of pedagogy and the pedagogical sciences. And to the extent that increased professionalism also provided strategies for the solution of problems that initially did not belong to the professional field of educators, psychologists, etc., it naturally also yielded territorial gains for the professional groups concerned. In this sense, the phenomenon of pedagogization differed little from, for example, that of medicalization, where analogous annexation and colonization mechanisms led to status gains (Nys, De Smaele, Tollebeek, & Wils, 2002).

A good example of such ‘pedagogization’ is, in our opinion, the ‘educational punishment’ (read: training), which was provided in the Netherlands in the mid-1990s at the behest of the Ministry of Justice for the parents of persistent truants (Tönis & Zonneveld, 2000). By providing specific educational interventions to deal with ‘new’ groups and categories of problem cases, as a consequence, new markets were constantly being opened up in the professional field. From that market perspective, the evolution from special to inclusive education, *inter alia*, can be readily understood. Both the initial ‘exclusion’ of ‘abnormal’ pupils (from the end of the nineteenth century on) and the ‘inclusion’ of problematic (or better, newly problematized) pupils in ordinary education (at the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first centuries) are ultimately expressions of the same phenomenon (that, at least in Dutch, can also be described as ‘orthopedagogization’): educational specialists first demanded segregation of all problem cases, which had to be taken care of by professionals in special institutions. This ‘exclusive’ market became saturated and the movement towards integration commenced. This coincided with the detection of ever more specific behavioural and learning problems among ‘normal’ (or ‘ordinary’) children (such as ADHD, gifted, dyslexic children) (see, for example, Elst-Van Den Bergh, 2005).

Although pedagogization as a ‘neutral’ concept intends to describe these phenomena as a sub-process of the ‘modernization’ of the society, the content orientations of that process (and the internal contradictions or paradoxes that accompanies it) meant that the concept of pedagogization started to acquire negative connotations. The consequences of ‘more’ training, education and pedagogical care, were often described in terms of increased dependence, tutelage, patronization, mothering, infantilization, pampering and so on. Pedagogization could therefore be read in oppositional terms to pedagogical projects that aim for autonomy, liberation and independence. In this respect, pedagogization looks like a concept that is not

dissimilar to ‘medicalization’. A greater supply on the medical market does not necessarily lead to a more healthy society but can significantly increase the consumption of and dependence on health care. The irony that accompanies the concept of pedagogization can be illustrated by two examples. The first is taken from the 1980s, the second, two decades later.

For the French philosopher Jacques Rancière (1987, pp. 221–222), the paradox of pedagogization unfolded with the ideas of the Enlightenment that were propagated by the Republicans:

*Il suffirait d’apprendre à être des hommes égaux dans une société inégale. C’est ce que veut dire s’émanciper. Mais cette chose si simple est la plus difficile à comprendre surtout depuis la nouvelle explication, le progrès, a inextricablement mêlé l’une à l’autre l’égalité et son contraire. La tâche à laquelle les capacités et les coeurs républicains se vouent, s’est de faire une société égale avec des hommes inégaux, de réduire indéfiniment l’inégalité. Mais qui a pris ce parti n’a qu’un moyen de le mener à bout, c’est la pédagogisation intégrale de la société, c’est-à-dire l’infantilisation générale des individus qui la composent. Plus tard on appellera cela formation continue, c’est-à-dire co-extensivité de l’institution explicatrice et de la société. La société des inférieurs supérieurs sera égale, elle aura réduit ses inégalités quand elle sera entièrement transformée en société des explicateurs expliqués.<sup>4</sup>*

There can be no emancipation, apparently, without infantilization and pedagogization. Inversely – so instructs an Austrian reader edited by Erich Ribolits & Zuber (2004) – pedagogization does not lead to emancipation but to the subjection of the spirit. Instead of adapting the society to people, the process of pedagogization (which constitutes the logical response to globalization and modernization) leads to the adaptation of the people to the neo-conservative society. The result is, therefore, the domestication of thinking and not emancipation. Pedagogization, as the title of their work expresses, is the art of making people ever more ‘stupid’ via learning. Here, the frequently praised notion of ‘permanent education’ comes to mind.

## **2.2 Pedagogization as the Pedagogical Basic Semantic of a Didactic Grammar**

It was against the background of such paradoxes that, in our later work, the concept of pedagogization gained a more concrete place. Intrigued by the great sense of continuity that characterized pedagogical action, our research in the 1990s focused on the study of the everyday practice in primary education in Belgium from about 1880 to 1970 (Depaepe et al., 2000), a research interest that, moreover, paralleled similar research in Spain (see, among others, Viñao Frago, 2001a, 2002). The intention of this research was, among other things, to find an acceptable explanation for the great resistance to renewal that characterized the world of education and the output of educational experts. We wanted to account for the reasons why such resistance continued without historical reverberation (see also Viñao Frago, 2001b). While doing this, we came close to entering the vicinity of research conducted by authors such as Larry Cuban, David Tyack and William Tobin, who had detected the existence of the irony surrounding the ‘grammar of schooling’ (Cuban, 1993<sup>2</sup>;

Tyack & Tobin, 1994; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Rather than the pedagogical innovations changing education, these innovations were ‘adapted’ by education itself to the stubborn structure of running a school.

We found the notion that educational practice was controlled by a set of rules that are often not rendered explicit but are rooted in historical practice extremely convincing. Didactic and pedagogical renewals were constantly adapted or, better, appropriated and integrated according to the logic proper to the educational system, which explained both the conservative outlook *casu quo* the conservational character of that system. Nevertheless, we had a problem with the content orientation that was given to the internal dynamic of running a school. We felt that these North American initiatives, taken to identify a virtually universal ‘grammar of schooling’, were a product of an all too behaviourist view of what actually took place on the work floor. Indeed, they only took account of the externally observable didactic behavioural patterns (such as the extent to which the teacher and/or pupils were speaking), without devoting much attention to the pedagogical, let alone the cultural, context in which that educational behaviour is embedded. Hence, we have conceived the concept ‘grammar of schooling’ – which we have invariably translated as the ‘*grammatica van de verschoolsing*’ (i.e. the ‘grammar of scholarization’ in the sense of making schools more and more ‘schoolish’) – in our study of the Belgian primary school as a didactic exposition structure that, at the very least, had to be related to the pedagogical semantic (here moral, ethical and thus also social finality) in which it functioned. Teaching (that is, the transfer of knowledge via subject matter) could, particularly since the Enlightenment, no longer be separated from the formation project (and formation objective) from which it derived its meaning and significance (Herrmann, 1993). In our opinion, therefore, the didactic grammar of ‘schooling’ was complemented by a pedagogical grammar of ‘pedagogizing’ – an English gerund that ultimately involved an attempt (perhaps a rather awkward attempt<sup>5</sup>?) to translate and interpret the German concept of ‘*Pädagogisierung*’. Of course, it is not a chance occurrence that these two concepts had arisen within Anglo-Saxon and German contexts, respectively.

It is in the conjunction of these two traditions that we saw the greatest merit of our work. The behaviourally conceived phenomenon of ‘schooling’ was situated there as a component of a broader pedagogization and modernization (*casu quo* globalization) of society. This facet of our work went unnoticed by critics of *Order in Progress* (see Depaepe, 2004). Critics of this book tended to read our interpretation of events as conforming to naïve progress models of ‘the longer the more’ and ‘the longer the better’, to which the often normative association with the pedagogical past in the training of teachers more than once gave rise via the course on the ‘history of education’. For us, the educational teaching processes generated via the curriculum ultimately followed a more complex pattern. Pedagogical and didactic interventions and forms of thought were essentially diverse, multiple, mutually overlapping (and generally often complementarily but sometimes also contrarily) active discourses. Thus, the language of the new school was used by the proponents of ‘progressive’ education in Flanders in order to emphasize the time-honoured wisdom of schoolmastership and therefore secure the genesis of meritocracy conceived

in neo-conservative terms. Jozef Verheyen, of whom we analysed the educational discourse in one of the former books of the Research Community (see Depaepe, Simon, & Van Gorp, 2006), is an obvious example. Teaching, in any event, turned out to be imbedded in the pedagogical barter trade with social consequences that had taken form in Belgium primarily during and after the last quarter of the nineteenth century: moralization (and the socialization, disciplining and domestication that flowed from it) was exchanged for knowledge acquisition, the lever par excellence for achieving autonomy and emancipation within a class society tinted by neo-capitalism. Paraphrasing Eric Berne's transactional analysis (Berne, 1964), we can conclude that pedagogization thus concerned the 'educational' game that was played in the classroom and school. What was at stake in this game (in part specified by social origin) was the increased level of cultural capital held by pupils and by implication, their greater chances for success in later life, which they had to redeem primarily with obedience and subjection to the pedagogical authority of teachers and the administration.

But probably the phenomenon of pedagogization is still much more complex than what the tension of such binary conceptual models (*grammar of schooling* versus *grammar of pedagogization/educationalization*, or even *bettereducationalizing*) or combinations thereof would allow one to suspect. Ultimately, for the operationalizing of these concepts, we have focused on the unravelling of the pedagogical–didactic interaction in the classroom whereby the teaching (the didactic) was seen as a process that took place via the subject matter, while the formation (the pedagogical) took place via interventions of the administration (for example, punishment, see Herman, Depaepe, Simon, & Van Gorp, 2007a) set apart from the prescribed curriculum. The question, of course, is whether or not any other dimensions were involved within pedagogization. Our analyses of textbooks (Depaepe & Simon, 2002) and exercise books (Herman, Depaepe, Simon, Surmont, & Van Gorp, 2007b) in the meantime can lead one to suppose that the formatting of scientific knowledge content into 'subject matter' occurred, just as much, in accordance with its own logic. In regard to this situation, Tom Popkewitz (2004) spoke about the alchemy of school subjects. Perhaps, there is here a 'grammar of knowledge transfer' involved, for we can imagine that, for example, the reduction and simplification that generally accompanies the conversion of knowledge into school knowledge, irrespective of the content of each subject, follows certain stereotypical patterns (see, e.g., Matthes & Heinze, 2007).

And what about the wave of ethnohistorical and school-archaeological research, which in recent years has been catching on primarily in Spain and Latin America (see, e.g., Ferraz Lorenzo, 2005; *Historia de la Educación*, 2006), and the material school culture (Lawn & Grosvenor, 2005; Escolano Benito, 2007) that is trying to interpret it, hermeneutically and otherwise, by evoking its experience? Still, apart from the fact that the rich Latin traditions cannot be ignored in the development of contemporary educational historiography, it is definitely the case that the architecture of the space in which the educational interaction took place and the material objects that were used in it can teach us much about the nature and content of schoolish behaviour. Can we say that these 'artefacts' from the educational past

(wall charts, textbooks, notebooks, and the like) do not act as contingent components of the educational strategy of emotional pressure, infantilization, and compulsion? Do they engender just as much interiorization of values and norms in the children and teenagers? Certainly, for what concerns the transition from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, it takes little effort to read the internal renewals in education as the expression of a bourgeois civilization offensive (cf. Lenders, 1988), that is, as the incorporation of children into the mills of the refinement of behaviour (which Elias called the process of civilization) and the initiation into the complex world of the behaviour determining time associated with it. For us, surely, there is sufficient reason for wanting to delve more deeply into the formal rules of that educational ‘game’ at school via a new ethnohistorical research project, which, by means of the applied technique of oral testimony, immediately implies a shift of emphasis towards the second half of the twentieth century (Depaepe, Simon, Surmont, & Van Gorp, 2007).

### 2.3 Pedagogization as a Component of a ‘Historical’ School Theory

That research (which, because of the controllability of the context focuses on the Flemish primary school of the 1960s) is now being worked out in detail<sup>6</sup> and the first results have in the meantime been published in a number of intermediary papers and communications at congresses. These concern some of the aspects of the school culture mentioned above. But the ultimate objective of our research remains, with a view to historical theory formation from within (Tenorth, 1996), the identification of the structuring elements around which educational behaviour has been settled historically in the school. What we ultimately want to expose is, as it were, the morphology of the school. This has become ‘genealogical’, the pillars around which the everyday action patterns of education have taken form in the course of the years and made the school into a ‘school’: a theoretical model that thus encloses at the same time a structure (in the sense of isolated factors) and dynamic (in the sense of processes that flow out of the conjunction of these factors) and moreover also offers space for statements on the identity of the school that are both horizontal-generalizing (*in casu* rising above the history) and vertical-diachronic (*in casu* related to chronological development).

In this last respect, therefore, such a ‘historical’ school theory differs fundamentally from the organograms that previously developed and still do in the framework of didactics, didactic theory, school pedagogics or educational theory (as concerns the Flemish portion of Belgium, see, for example, De Corte et al., 1972; De Block & Heene, 1986; for the German context: Zierer, 2006). However, because of their nomothetic obsession, such organograms firmly continue to deny their own historicity. On penalty of denying the uniqueness of historiography, pedagogical or otherwise, the historical school theory here envisioned cannot be inversely assigned a delivery role in the construction of such models or in the construction of any

contemporary formation science whatsoever (Depaepe, 2001; Priem, 2006). Its relevance is restricted to a pure, cultural–historical relevance, even though an apparent contradiction seems, on first inspection, to emerge from this claim, for every theory has ambitions, irrespective of the existing cultural–historical differences in origin or object, of achieving universal knowledge.

In order to be able to do justice to the multi-coloured pallet of cultural contexts in which the institution ‘school’ has become a school, concretization in specific historical situations still remains necessary. The construction of a historical school theory presumes more than the construction of a meta-narrative on the basis of the existing literature. Insight into the ‘becoming’ of the institution of the school can, ultimately, only be obtained by good historical research into clearly delineated situations. Time-resistant action patterns in connection with interpersonal relations (such as the pedagogical–didactic interaction in the school and the classroom) come to light primarily by examining longitudinal cross-sections over time. As an epistemological category, the concept of ‘non-contemporariness’ assumes the contemporariness of historical situations; both are, like text and context, inevitably related to each other: non-contemporariness can only be conceived by abstracting from the very concrete, historical backgrounds in which it is anchored. Arguing that the Jesuits were already present at the foundation of the present-day grammars of schooling and pedagogization (Depaepe, Simon, & Van Gorp, 2005), for example, implies, of course, the omission of historical redundancy (cf. Hamilton, 1989).

This is why the concept of pedagogization is best defined within such a historical school theory in function of a developmental perspective, in particular as the increase of what is presented within the educational game in the classroom and the school as that which is specifically pedagogical. But with this, we have got ahead of ourselves in regard to what still needs to be discussed. Before a further examination of the dynamics of the pedagogization process, we must first come back to the structuring components of our historical school theory; their constellation probably constitutes the motor behind the self-guidance of this relatively autonomous sector of modernization.

In any case, from the analysis of the available literature, we recall the dimensions of ‘space’ and ‘time’ (Viñao Frago, 1996; Escolano Benito, 1992; Compère, 1997). It was on these axes that the delimitation of the school as distinct from ‘life’ was given form. Within this institution, there arose a specific pattern of behaviour with its own rituals and interpretations – some even call it a ‘choreography’ (Eggermont, 2001), which focused on the development of a power machine for disciplining the ‘social body’ (Kirk, 1998). Such a development was not, however, immune to flexibility. On the contrary, those who had the power over this development continuously constructed and reconstructed time and space on behalf of those who had to endure it (Perrenoud, 1994).

De facto, the regime of ‘time-practices’ regulated in large measure the daily life at school. This involved the adoption of long-term and middle-term perspectives on the curriculum as regards year classes and year programs, which alternated with long and short holidays. We might also note the short-term perspective of alternating lessons, recesses and other temporally recurring activities (Depaepe et al., 2000).



In combination with school time, various spaces within the school also had their own social logic and dynamic, thereby contributing just as much to the essence of the school dynamic. Classrooms, refectories, playgrounds, gymnasiums and so on received their significance not only via certain elements of the real topographical space they occupied or from their own morphological structure. They also (primarily) received their significance from the architectural ordering of objects that were brought together in them with a view to pedagogical and didactic interaction. Moreover, the social-abstract idea of a school or classroom building, a school refectory, a school playground and so on owes its existence primarily to the ‘mediatorial’ (that is, mainly, communicative, see below) function that was associated with them (Geppert, Jensen, & Weinhold, 2005). *Mutatis mutandis*, the same applies for the ‘mental’ school spaces, which, for example, were created by the painting of lines on the playground so that each row of pupils could be formed according to the class they belonged to. The same thing can be said for the red margins in school notebooks that regulated demarcation between the place provided for the schoolwork of the pupils and the space used by the teacher to evaluate their work. In short, within the public space, the school was conceived and pre-structured by adults as an educationally oriented space for children (see De Coninck-Smith, 2005). This does not necessarily imply that the children always responded to this space in accordance with such a power perspective (Van den Driessche, 2002).

Thus, the gate of the school might, in a certain sense, be thought of as the symbol with which the social subsystem of education was closed off from the rest of the world (Rockwell, 2005). However, it certainly did not function as a watertight seal. As we have already noted (Depaepe et al., 2007), the contrast between ‘life’ and the ‘school’, which came in handy in the binary discourse of the ‘new’ education, was primarily a matter of rhetoric. In everyday life, the school perhaps constituted a pedagogical island, but that island was situated in the midst of life itself and not outside it. With a nod to Hector Ruben Cucuzza (2007), the school gate might better be thought of as a revolving or ‘swinging’ door. Here, we might think of the swinging doors of a bar that keep moving for a while after one has gone through and do not so much ‘close off’ a space than mark a territorial border.

From a historical perspective, the genesis of the institution of ‘school’ as a material result of a mental fact – the topical identification of what attending school actually involved – was anchored in ‘Western’ culture. As Pierre-Philippe Bugnard (2006) has convincingly demonstrated, the social identity of the school recalls inevitably the religious project of church construction and Christianization, both at a structural and at a cultural level. School is more or less a secularized variant of the values and norms, the rituals, symbols and usages that were observed there. Obedience, respect, submission, control and discipline were enforced via activities such as singing, reciting, memorizing and repeating. These were all activities in which children were ‘dealt with’, admittedly simultaneously, but in which the influence of social origin, commitment, diligence and so much more played decisive roles. However, as modernization intensified, the school received a more stereotypical appearance both as a pedagogical work floor and as a socially segregated space (in which curricular differences were linked to social origin and class). The

'broad' pedagogical space of a church or palace was restricted to the limited model of a 'classroom' with exercises, discipline and examinations whereby one may well wonder about the extent to which it was still suitable for transmitting such fundamental values.

By assessing this situation we have come to consider the dimensions of pedagogical–didactic interaction and communication that we, together with Antonio Viñao Frago (1996) and others, consider to be just as essential for examining the particular nature of schoolish institutions. Here a distinction can be made between the verbal and the non-verbal environments inhabited by pupils. As regards verbal factors, the construction of a 'pedagogical' language was, naturally, decisive. In this regard, Fritz Osterwalder (2006) has pointed out that this language cannot be seen apart from the traditions of the theology and faith praxis out of which it arose. The empathetic-pedagogical language usage continued, even in the secularized version of the Enlightenment (Depaepe, 2006), to refer to the elevated pastoral task of the educator: he/she had to help the children learn to find their place in the society and help them to discover the meaning of their existence. Where could this meaning be found if not in the unfolding of the child's own personality? The teacher could help to foster harmony and internal happiness. He/she could lead the child to feel satisfied with himself and his 'natural' (in the sense of being willed by God) place in society? From the end of the nineteenth century, the message of pedagogical salvation marked the discourse of the New School Movement. This message took on a new religious élan, which reflected simultaneously its complex and paradoxical relationship with advancing modernization and secularization. Could this be explained as the result of primarily feminine religiosity filling the vacuum Darwin had left behind? However true that may be, the divinization of the child as well as the ideal image of the new person to which it had to be raised was often recurring elements of 'reform pedagogy' (or the so-called 'New Education'), as Meike Sofia Baader (2005) has plainly demonstrated. The apparent rejection of faith (men took the lead here!) generated a need for new saints, even if those saints had to emerge from the circle of pedagogical innovators (cf. in this regard the 'canonization' of Ovide Decroly into a saint of New Education: Depaepe, Simon, & Van Gorp, 2003).

Last, but not least, the non-verbal form of pedagogical communication can be easily read as a schoolish liturgy (Depaepe et al., 2000). The classroom was a pedagogical sanctuary, the chalkboard the altar on which the schoolish liturgy of the didactic could be performed. Wall charts, maps, photographs of king and queen, globes, time lines, measures of volume, and the like, together with desks set up in rows and the accompanying slates, slate pencils, ink pots and so on constituted the quasi-universal decor in which this pedagogical high mass had to be celebrated (Foulon, 1985). Essential to this, of course, is the question of how this *mise en scène* concretely influenced the history of pedagogical practice. Which continuities and discontinuities did it lead to as regards the behaviour of teachers and pupils? (Fend, 2007) How, in other words, were material objects concretely inserted into education? What changed, what did not change and why did things change/not change? These are questions that not only allow themselves to be answered from

the history of these very objects but presume a complementarity of the sources to be studied (not only visual or oral but also written, such as the journals for and by teachers, cf. Catteeuw, Dams, Depaepe, & Simon, 2005; Depaepe & Simon, 2002, 2005) and of the research techniques to be applied (whereby, for example, it must become possible to distinguish in the traditionally normative sources about education, the ‘normality’ of the everyday from the ‘normativity’ of the prescriptive, cf. Dams, Depaepe & Simon, 2001).

The fact is that the ‘pedagogical’ (in essence panoptic) figure of the ‘pastor’ was reiterated by an entire arsenal of pedagogical movements and gestures, from the raised finger of the schoolmaster through to the encouraging pat on the back. The ‘teacher’ stood on a podium, literally a step above the pupils, which emphasized the asymmetry of the educational relationship. The teacher incarnated the pastoral compulsion as regards ‘training’. As source of authority, wisdom, good behaviour and morals, he/she acted as the pilot in the educational adventure to which the pupils were subjected while in the classroom. He/she knew the way that had to be followed and the techniques that could best be applied (Depaepe et al., 2000).

The relationship noted above between pedagogical behaviour and religion is, therefore, anything but a chance occurrence. In education, as with religion, the principal concern was to ‘save’ the child (cf. Dekker, 1985, 2001, 2006) to offer it help so that it would not meet with disaster (admittedly in the case of the former, this had little to do with the struggle for the hereafter but was more concerned with life as it is lived: *Hilfe zur Selbsthilfe*, as one reads in Pestalozzi). Therefore, for a considerable period of time, ‘pedagogization’ was bound up with ‘moralization’ (Depaepe, 1998a; Depaepe, Simon, & Van Gorp, 2005). The increased attention on the pedagogical sphere was meant to lead to the moral elevation of the people. This understanding of pedagogy encompassed the vision of harmonious and organic development of all human forces, which could be steered in the right direction by means of *Selbstbildung*. ‘Self-discipline’ and ‘self-control’ were (for the philanthropists at any rate, who succeeded in pedagogically codifying the desiderata of the bourgeois society like no other group) the spearheads of each pedagogical intervention. Before a person could assume responsibility for himself/herself in society, his/her character had to be trained and strengthened while residing on the pedagogical island that was the school (preferably a boarding school). This preparation would become ever longer over the course of time and would foreshadow the process of pedagogization. Also, at the qualitative level, the intervention of the Philanthropists may be considered paradigmatic in regard to the phenomenon of pedagogization. In the class, they wanted to bring the pupil to the point at which he/she would strive for ‘the good’, not because it was offered or rewarded (or the inverse, forbidden and punished), but ‘because he himself wants it’.<sup>7</sup> With this, they indicated – almost a century and a half before Norbert Elias – the essence of the civilization process: external pressure or social coercion that is transformed into internal pressure or coercion of the individual psyche.

In both the mythologized educational ideology of progressivism and the Reform Pedagogy upon which countless believers came to rely, pedagogization increasingly gained the appearance of ‘child-orientedness’. Therefore (and this was not

without infantilizing traits), a more strongly determined stress came to be placed on 'self-fulfilment' and 'self-development'. As a consequence of the increasing secularization and looser life style of the post-war years, these terms were increasingly stripped of the compulsory demands of the normative frameworks in which they had arisen.

The articulation of a child-oriented pedagogy was the interpretation of a hope or desire that one would be able to devise, on the basis of scientific research, forms of education that would be better adapted to the child. The child became the bedrock upon which pedagogization and medicalization came together. Much effort was oriented towards the exploration of the child. This orientation towards the child legitimated the school's involvement in a multiplicity of both medical and pedagogical networks resulting in a merger that might best be thought of in terms of medical/pedagogical networks. Our exploration of Ovid Decroly's networks (Van Gorp, Depaepe, & Simon, 2004), whereby his achievements in educational practice were taken as the starting point, is illustrative in this regard: to his network belonged, among other things, professional medical organizations and educational organizations as well as organizations that were situated on the cutting edge of educational practice and pedagogy, *in casu* pedotechnics.

In line with the positivism and the experimental-research orientation in education to which Decroly and other pedagogists and/or educational reformers gave expression (around the beginning of the twentieth century), the educational objectives of the last few decades are no longer derived from one or another ideology. Instead, they emerge from the perspective of developmental psychology. Pedagogical correctness is becoming less determined by ethical coercion and/or social expectations of the person to be formed. As the legitimating science, psychology has increasingly come to replace theology. Pedagogical interventions are legitimated primarily in reference to the notion that they may do no harm nor generate frustration in the individual. In connection with the role of the educator, the metaphor of the shepherd came to be replaced by that of the gardener (which, as is well known, goes back to Fröbel's work on the kindergarten). By the same token the image of the 'guide' metamorphosed into the figure of the 'animator'. With these changes, offending and brutalizing elements of physical violence are replaced (at least in the rhetoric surrounding the 'art' of education) by the sweet smile, which emanates from the (forced) sphere of harmony and pleasure (that, if need be, is imposed on everyday reality using psychological threats. However, that phenomenon belongs to another discourse).

## 2.4 By Way of Conclusion: The End of Pedagogization?

Is this softer pedagogical mentality based on 'empathy' and 'negotiation', ushering in the end of pedagogization (cf. Giesecke, 1996, who speaks of the 'entpädagogisierte Schule')? Or was it the case that psychological discernment and empathy were already essentially present in Enlightenment pedagogization? And did that phenomenon constitute in essence a component of a broader form of 'psychologizing'?

and/or ‘modernizing’, which in its turn was related to the increased privatization of the ‘self’ in modern and postmodern society (does this engender new paradoxes?)<sup>8</sup>? Does it concern a certain kind of personality that flourishes in the new economy and (with reference to Bauman’s (2000) concept) thrives in ‘liquid modernity’, a personality oriented towards itself, not looking back, thinking only of the short term (cf. Sennett, 2007)?

The critics of pedagogization in the German language area cited above have, in the meantime, come to analogous conclusions. According to Ribolits and his colleagues (Sertl, Höhne, Erler, Geißler, Orthey, Gruber, & Schandl, in: Ribolits & Zuber, 2004), the phenomenon of pedagogization spread steadily, thanks to the neo-conservative context.<sup>9</sup> In this context, the self constantly has to prove its market value by means of ‘employability’, ‘adaptability’, ‘flexibility’, ‘trainability’ and the like. This led to not only the erosion of the idea of permanent education – all creativity is subordinated to the regulatory discourse of the knowledge economy and technology – but also of learning itself, which is reduced to a ‘*krisentaugliche Veränderungsroutine*’ (Orthey, 2004, pp. 74–75). Postmodern court jesters know only the ideology of the silly illusion of work to which they are being prepared by means of universal change and the ‘solution’ model of flexibility. At present, the motto for learning might be summed up as ‘*die Vorbereitung auf die Selbstanpassung an den Wandel*’ (the preparation for self-adaptation to change, Gruber, 2004, p. 98).

In the meantime, the question that emerges concerns whether or not the detection of this ‘aberration’ will suffice to stop it. Of course, thinking in this way depends on accepting both that the trend described here is a derailment and that the ‘problems’ we have identified have been correctly described by the conceptual approach employed in this article.

## Notes

1. “It is the conviction of having the right to plan the manipulation of the ‘whole person’ under the aspect and the responsibility of ‘education’ and ‘social justice’. The ‘totalitarian’ here lies in the *pedagogization of the person and of the society*, which here is presented as a self-evident entitlement.”
2. Since the 1990s, Leuven has been home to the framework of the activities of *FWO-Vlaanderen*, an international research community dealing with the philosophy and history of the educational sciences. It has laid the foundations not only for this publication but also for the series in which it will be appearing.
3. Originally as *Pädagogisierung*, of which the English translation is rather problematic. In our former studies we have also used ‘educationalization’ as ‘pedagogization’, and even ‘educationalizing’. A search on the Internet showed that ‘pedagogization’ is used more frequently than ‘educationalization’. Therefore, we have chosen this term as the overall concept for this article.
4. In English translation, the quotation runs as follows: “It would suffice to learn to be equal men in an unequal society, which means to be emancipated. But this so simple thing is the most difficult to comprehend, certainly since the new explanation, progress, has inextricably mixed the one with the other, equality with its contrary. The task to which the Republican

abilities and hearts dedicated themselves was to make an equal society of unequal men, to reduce inequality forever. But those who took on this task had only one way to achieve it: the integral pedagogization of the society, that is, the general infantilization of the individuals that compose it. Later on, one would call that continuous education, that is, the co-extensiveness of the explaining institution and the society. The society of inferiors/ superiors will be equal; it will have reduced its inequalities when it will be entirely transformed into a society of explained explainers.”

5. The word ‘educationalizing’ also appeared recently in ‘Bushisms’ which documented the pronouncements of the president of the United States. The term was castigated on the Internet, albeit not so much for its own absurdity but because of other associated linguistic blunders such as this statement made before Congress: “Mathematics are one of the *fundamentaries* of educationalizing our youths.”
6. Cf. OT.O6.24 of the *Bijzonder Onderzoeksfonds* of the K.U. Leuven: “*Ethno-history*” of the primary school: the key to the explanation of the pedagogical paradox; cf. FWO-Aspirantschap of M. Surmont (1.1.211.07.N) *The experience of school time and school space in the 1960s. An ethnohistorical research*.
7. As cited by Christian Gotthilf Salzmann in the *Ameisenbüchlein* [ant booklet] of 1806.
8. Cf. in this regard the increased culture of the “I” with the removal of the autonomy of the subject and the emergence of the ‘self’ in the framework of postmodern philosophy.
9. Also on the basis of Basil Bernstein’s essay *A Totally Pedagogised Society*, which is actually the transcription of an interview via videoconferencing recorded in the summer of 2000, a few months before his death, and published in his compilation, *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity* (2000). See Sertl, 2004.

## References

- Baader, M. S. (2005). *Erziehung als Erlösung: Transformationen des Religiösen in der Reformpädagogik*. Weinheim: Juventa.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Berne, E. M. D. (1964). *Games people play. The psychology of human relationships*. Hammondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Bugnard, P.-P. (2006). *Le temps des espaces pédagogiques: de la cathédrale orientée à la capitale occidentée*. Nancy: Presses universitaires de Nancy.
- Catteeuw, K., Dams, K., Depaepe, M., & Simon, F. (2005). Filming the black box: Primary schools on film in Belgium: A first assessment on unused sources. In U. Mietzner, K. Myers, & N. Peim (Eds.), *Visual history. Images of education* (pp. 203–231). Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Compère, M.-M. (1997). *Histoire du temps scolaire en Europe*. Paris: INRP & Economica.
- Cuban, L. (1993<sup>2</sup>). *How teachers taught: constancy and change in American classrooms, 1880–1990*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College.
- Cucuzza, H. R. (2007). La doctrina, la liturgia y los ejercicios espirituales. Los cuadernos escolares en la religiosidad patriótica laica. Paper presented at the International Symposium: Quaderni di scuola. Una fonte complessa per la storia delle culture scolastiche e dei costumi educativi tra Ottocento e Novecento, Macerata, September 2007.
- Dams, K., Depaepe, M., & Simon, F. (2001). By indirections finding directions out: Classroom history, sources and objectives. In W. Jamrozek & D. Zoladz-Strzelczyk (Eds.), *W dialogu przeszloscia. Ksiega poswiecona Profesorowi Janowi Hellwigowi [Dialogue with the Past. To Professor Jan Hellwig in Memoriam]* (pp. 57–92). Poznan: Adam Mickiewicz University Press.
- De Block, A., & Heene, J. (1986). *Inleiding tot de algemene didactiek*. Antwerpen: Standaard.
- De Coninck-Smith, N. (2005). The panopticum of childhood: Harold E. Jones’ Child Study Center, Berkeley, California, 1946–1960. *Paedagogica Historica*, 41, 495–506.
- De Corte, E., et al. (1972). *Beknopte didaxologie*. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.

- Dekker, J. J. H. (1985). *Straffen, redd en opvoeden. Het ontstaan en de ontwikkeling van de residentiële heropvoeding in West-Europa, 1814–1914, met bijzondere aandacht voor Nederlandsch Mettray*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Dekker, J. J. H. (2001). *The will to change the child. Re-education homes for children at risk in nineteenth century Western Europe*. Frankfurt am Main [et al.]: Peter Lang.
- Dekker, J. J. H. (2006). *Het verlangen naar opvoeden. Over de groei van de pedagogische ruimte in Nederland sinds de Gouden Eeuw tot omtrent 1900*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.
- Dekker, J., D’hoker, M., Kruihof, B., & De Vroede, M. (Eds.). (1987). *Pedagogisch werk in de samenleving. De ontwikkeling van professionele opvoeding in Nederland en België in de 19de en 20ste eeuw*. Leuven: Acco.
- Depaepe, M. (1995). De pedagogisering voorbij? Lessen uit de geschiedenis van opvoeding en onderwijs. In B. Raymaekers & A. Van De Putte (Eds.), *Lessen van de 21ste eeuw* (pp. 265–274). Leuven: Leuven Universitaire Pers/Dauidsfonds.
- Depaepe, M. (1998a). Educationalisation: a key concept in understanding the basic processes in the history of Western education. *History of Education Review*, 27(2), 16–28.
- Depaepe, M. (1998b). *De pedagogisering achterna. Aanzet tot een genealogie van de pedagogische mentaliteit in de voorbije 250 jaar*. Leuven: Acco.
- Depaepe, M. (2001). A professionally relevant history of education for teachers: Does it exist? Reply to Herbst’s the State of the Art Article. *Paedagogica Historica*, 37, 631–640.
- Depaepe, M. (2004). How should history of education be written? Some reflections about the nature of the discipline from the perspective of the reception of our work. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 13(5), 333–345.
- Depaepe, M. (2006). Dealing with the historical paradoxes of a globalised educationalization – a way to write the “New” Cultural History of Education? In M. Cintje-Van Enckevort, M. George, & S. S. Scatolini Apóstolo (Eds.), *Proceedings from University of St. Martin – Educational Conference: Rethinking education in the Caribbean: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. A local imperative in a global context*. Papers on education and/or the Caribbean (Vols. 1–2). Philipsburg (St. Martin): University of St. Martin.
- Depaepe, M., et al. (2000). *Order in progress. Everyday education practice in primary schools – Belgium, 1880-1970*. Louvain: Leuven University Press.
- Depaepe, M., & Simon, F. (1999). La conquista de la juventud: una cruzada educativa en Flandes durante el período de entreguerras. *Historia de la Educación*, 18, 301–320.
- Depaepe, M., & Simon, F. (2002). Schulbücher als Quellen einer dritten Dimension in der Realitäts- und Mentalitätsgeschichte von Erziehung und Unterricht. Über neue Konzeptionen in der historisch-pädagogischen Schulbuchforschung. *Zeitschrift für pädagogische Historiographie*, 8(1), 7–15.
- Depaepe, M., & Simon, F. (2005). Fuentes y métodos para la historia del aula. In M. Ferraz Lorenzo (Ed.), *Repensar la historia de la educación. Nuevos desafíos, nuevas propuestas* (pp. 337–363). Madrid: Editorial Biblioteca Nueva.
- Depaepe, M., Simon, F., Surmont, M., & Van Gorp, A. (2007). Menschen in Welten. Ordnungsstrukturen des Pädagogischen auf dem Weg zwischen Haus und Schule. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 52, 96–109.
- Depaepe, M., Simon, F., & Van Gorp, A. (2003). The canonization of Ovide Decroly as a “saint” of the New Education. *History of Education Quarterly*, 43(2), 224–249.
- Depaepe, M., Simon, F., & Van Gorp, A. (Eds.). (2005). *Paradoxen van pedagogisering. Handboek pedagogische historiografie* (met bijdragen van J. Briffaerts, K. Catteeuw, R. Christens, T. De Coster, B. De Munck, M. Depaepe, M. D’hoker, B. Henkens, D. Leyder, F. Simon, G. Thyssen, J. Tyssens, H. Van Crombrugge, M. Vandenbroeck, R. Vanderstraeten, A. Van Gorp, E. Vanhaute, B. Vanobbergen, & P. Verstraete). Leuven/Voorburg: Acco.
- Depaepe, M., Simon, F., & Van Gorp, A. (2006). The ‘good practices’ of Jozef Emiel Verheyen – schoolman and professor of education at the Ghent university. A case of using educationally correct discourse at the right place and right time. In: P. Smeyers & M. Depaepe (Eds.), *Educational research: Why ‘what works’ doesn’t work* (pp. 17–36). Dordrecht: Springer.

- Eggermont, B. (2001). The choreography of schooling as site of struggle: Belgian Primary Schools, 1880–1940. *History of Education*, 30, 129–140.
- Elst-Van Den Bergh, L. (2005). *Van exclusie naar inclusie: een historisch verhaal van (ortho-)pedagogisering van het buitengewoon onderwijs?* Non-published licentiate thesis, K. U. Leuven, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences.
- Erler, I. (2004). Selbstdisziplinierung des flexibelen Menschen. “Schmiermittel ... eines zukünftigen Akkumulationszyklus”. In Ribolits & Zuber, op. cit., pp. 45–51.
- Escolano Benito, A. (1992). Tiempo y educación. Notas para una genealogía del almanaque escolar. *Revista de Educación*, 298, 55–79.
- Escolano Benito, A. (Ed.). (2007). *La cultura material de la escuela. En el centenario de la Junta para la Ampliación de Estudios, 1907–2007*. Berlanga de Duero: Soria, CEINCE.
- Fend, H. (2007). Die Grammatik des Bildungswesens und die “Logik” des Lehrerhandelns. In R. Casale & R. Hörlacher (Eds.), *Bildung und Öffentlichkeit. Jürgen Oelkers zum 60. Geburtstag* (pp. 247–261). Weinheim/Basel: Beltz.
- Ferraz Lorenzo, M. (Ed.). (2005). *Repensar la historia de la educación. Nuevos desafíos, nuevas propuestas*. Madrid: Bibliotheca Nueva.
- Foulon, R. (1985). *Le maître d'école*. Bruxelles: Paul Legrain.
- Geißler, K. (2004). Bildung und Einbildung. In Ribolits & Zuber, op. cit., pp. 60–72.
- Geppert, A., Jensen, U., & Weinhold, J. (2005). *Ortsgespräche. Raum und Kommunikationen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Giesecke, H. (1996). *Das Ende der Erziehung. Neue Chancen für Familie und Schule*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta-Verlag.
- Gruber, E. (2004). Pädagogisierung der Gesellschaft und des Ich durch lebenslanges Lernen. In Ribolits & Zuber, op. cit., pp. 87–100.
- Hamilton, D. (1989). *Towards a theory of schooling*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Herman, F., Depaepe, M., Simon, F., & Van Gorp, A. (2007a). Punishment as an educational technology – a form of pedagogical inertia in schools? In P. Smeyers & M. Depaepe (Eds.), *Educational research: Networks and technologies* (pp. 203–219). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Herman, F., Depaepe, M., Simon, F., Surmont, M., & Van Gorp, A. (2007b, September). Remembering the schoolmaster’s blood-red pen. The story of the exercise books and the story of ‘the children of the time’ (1950–1970). Paper presented at the International Symposium: Quaderni di scuola. Una fonte complessa per la storia delle culture scolastiche e dei costumi educativi tra Ottocento e Novecento, Macerata.
- Hermans, A. (1987). Omtrent verantwoordelijkheid en deskundigheid inzake gezinsopvoeding In Dekker, D’hoker, Kruithof, & De Vroede, op. cit., pp. 19–38.
- Herrmann, U. (1986). Die Pädagogisierung des Kinder- und Jugendlebens in Deutschland seit dem ausgehenden 18. Jahrhunderts. In J. Martin & A. Nitschke (Eds.), *Zur Sozialgeschichte der Kindheit* (pp. 661–683). Freiburg i.B.: Alber.
- Herrmann, U. (1993). *Aufklärung und Erziehung. Studien zur Funktion der Erziehung im Konstitutionsprozess der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft im 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert in Deutschland*. Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag.
- Historia de la Educación - Revista Interuniversitaria* 25 (2006).
- Höhne, T. (2002). Pädagogisierung sozialer Machtverhältnisse. In T. Dörfler & C. Globisch (Eds.), *Postmodern practices. Beiträge zu einer vergehenden Epoche* (pp. 115–130). Münster: Lit Verlag.
- Höhne, T. (2004). Pädagogisierung sozialer Machtverhältnisse. In Ribolits & Zuber, op. cit., pp. 30–44.
- Kirk, D. (1998). *Schooling bodies. school practice and public discourse, 1880–1950*. London/Washington: Leicester University Press.
- Lawn, M., & Grosvenor, I. (Eds.). (2005). *Materialities of schooling: Design, technology, objects, routines*. Oxford: Symposium Books.
- Lenders, J. (1988). *De burger en de volksschool. Culturele en mentale achtergronden van een onderwijshervorming Nederland 1780-1850*. Nijmegen: SUN.



- Matthes, E., & Heinze, C. (Eds.). (2007). *Elementarisierung im Schulbuch*. Bad Heilbrunn: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt.
- Nys, L., De Smaele, H., Tollebeek, J., & Wils, K. (Eds.). (2002). *De zieke natie. Over de medicalisering van de samenleving, 1860–1914*. Groningen: Historische Uitgeverij.
- Orthey, F. M. (2004). Zwielfichtiges lernen. Über Grenzen, Zumutungen und andere Seiten des Lernens. In Ribolits & Zuber, op. cit., pp. 73–86.
- Osterwalder, F. (2006). Die Sprache des Herzens. Konstituierung und Transformation der theologischen Sprache der Pädagogik. In R. Casale, D. Tröhler, & J. Oelkers (Eds.), *Methoden und Kontexte. Historiographische Probleme der Bildungsforschung* (pp. 155–180). Göttingen: Wallstein.
- Pedagogisering van de samenleving in Nederland en België in de negentiende en twintigste eeuw* (1985). Utrecht: Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht. Faculteit voor Sociale Wetenschappen.
- Perrenoud, P. (1994). *Métier d'élève et sens du travail scolaire*. Paris: ESF.
- Popkewitz, T. (2004). The alchemy of the mathematics curriculum: Inscriptions and the fabrication of the child. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(1), 3–34.
- Priem, K. (2006). Strukturen – Begriffe – Akteure? Tendenzen der Historischen Bildungsforschung. *Jahrbuch für Historische Bildungsforschung*, 352–370.
- Rancière, J. (1987). *Le maître ignorant. Cinq leçons sur l'émancipation intellectuelle*. Paris: Fayard.
- Ribolits, E. (2004). Pädagogisierung – Oder “Wollt Ihr die totale Erziehung”? In Ribolits & Zuber, op. cit., pp. 9–16.
- Ribolits, E., & Zuber, J. (Eds.). (2004). *Pädagogisierung: Die Kunst, Menschen mittels Lernen immer dümmer zu machen!* Innsbruck: Studienverlag.
- Rockwell, E. (2005). Walls, Fences and Keys: the enclosure of rural indigenous schools. In M. Lawn & I. Grosvenor (Eds.), *Materialities of schooling: design, technology, objects, routines* (pp. 19–45). Oxford: Symposium books.
- Schandl, F. (2004). Eine irre Ideologie. Aktuelle Notizen zum Arbeitswahn. In Ribolits & Zuber, op. cit., pp. 114–126.
- Schelsky, H. (1961). *Anpassung oder Widerstand? Soziologische Bedenken zur Schulreform*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.
- Sennett, R. (2007). *De cultuur van het nieuwe kapitalisme*. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff.
- Serfl, M. (2004). A Totally pedagogised society. Basil Bernstein zum Thema. In Ribolits & Zuber, op. cit., pp. 17–29.
- Simon, F. (1994). Opvoeding en onderwijs. De pedagogisering van de massa. In H. Baltazar, et al. (Eds.), *De jaren '30 in België. De massa in verleiding* (pp. 178–195). Brussel: ASLK.
- Simon, F., & Van Damme, D. (1989). De pedagogisering van de kinderlijke leefwereld. De “Ligue de l'enseignement” en de oorsprong van enkele para-scolaire initiatieven. In E. Verhellen, F. Spiesschaert, L. Cattrijsse, & L. Apostel. *Rechten van kinderen. Een tekstbundel van de Rijksuniversiteit Gent naar aanleiding van de Uno-Conventie voor de Rechten van het Kind* (pp. 151–181). Antwerpen: Kluwer.
- Simon, F., & Van Damme, D. (1992, September). *La 'pedagogización' del mundo infantil. La Ligue Belge de l'Enseignement y el origen de algunas iniciativas paraescolares, en Education, Physical Activities and Sport in a historical perspective*. Paper presented at the International Standing Conference for the History of Education (ISCHE XIV), Barcelona, Generalitat de Catalunya.
- Smeyers, P., & Depaepe, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Educational research: Why 'what works' doesn't work*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Tenorth, H. E. (1996). Lob des Handwerks. Kritik der Theorie – Zur Lage der pädagogischen Historiographie in Deutschland. *Paedagogica Historica*, 32, 343–361.
- Tönis, I., & Zonneveld, A. (2000). Kinderen spijbelen? Ouders op cursus! In H. De Frankrijker, J., Kuipers, J., Scholtens, & R. Van Der Veer (Eds.), *Gezin, morele opvoeding en antisociaal gedrag. Thema's uit de wijsgerige en historische pedagogiek* (pp. 76–81). Amsterdam: Uitgeverij SWP.

- Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tyack, D., & Tobin, W. (1994). The grammar of schooling: Why has it been so hard to change? *American Education Research Journal*, 21, 453–479.
- Van den Driessche, M. (2002). *Verblijven in het Alledaagse. Henri Lefebvre vs. De Certeau*. Non-published licenciate thesis, U. Gent, Faculty of Engineering.
- Van Gorp, A., Depaepe, M., & Simon, F. (2004). Backing the actor as agent in discipline formation: An example of the “Secondary Disciplinarisation” of the educational sciences, based on the networks of Ovide Decroly (1901–1931). *Paedagogica Historica*, 41(5–6), 591–616.
- Viñao Frago, A. (1996). *Espacio y tiempo. Educación y historia*. Morelia (Mexico): IMCED.
- Viñao Frago, A. (2001a). Do educational reforms fail? A historian’s response. *Encounters of Education*, 2, 27–47.
- Viñao Frago, A. (2001b). History of education and cultural history. Possibilities, problems, questions. In T. S. Popkewitz, M. B. Franklin, & M. A. Pereyra (Eds.), *Cultura history and education. Critical essays on knowledge and schooling* (pp. 207–241). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Viñao Frago, A. (2002). *Sistemas educativos, culturas escolares y reformas*. Madrid: Morata.
- Zierer, K. (2006). Was bedeutet “Schule als Lebensraum”? Sechs Thesen zu einem “pädagogischen Programm”. *Pädagogische Rundschau*, 60, 49–59.