

Radovanović, I. & Tadić, A. (2012). The concepts of classroom discipline and student freedom in individual pedagogy. *Didactica Slovenica - pedagoška obzorja*, Novo mesto: Pedagoška obzorja; Ljubljana: Pedagoška fakulteta & Novo mesto: Visokošolsko središče, 27 (5), 80-93.

DIDACTICA SLOVENICA

pedagoška obzorja

2012 letnik 27

5

Izdajatelj *Published by*

- Pedagoška obzorja d.o.o. Novo mesto
- Pedagoška fakulteta Ljubljana
- Visokošolsko središče Novo mesto

Glavni in odgovorni urednik *Editor-in-Chief*

- Dr. Marjan Blažič

Uredniški odbor *Editorial Board*

- Dr. Jana Goriup, Maribor, Slovenija
- Dr. Milan Matijević, Zagreb, Hrvaška
- Dr. Nikola Mijanović, Nikšić, Črna gora
- Dr. Nikola Petrov, Skopje, Makedonija
- Dr. Cveta Razdevšek Pučko, Ljubljana, Slovenija
- Dr. Jasmina Starc, Novo mesto, Slovenija
- Dr. José Manuel Bautista Vallejo, Huelva, Španija
- Dr. Boško Vlahović, Beograd, Srbija
- Dr. Milena Valenčič Zuljan, Ljubljana, Slovenija
- Dr. Maria Wedenigg, Celovec, Avstrija

Tehnični urednik *Technical Editor*

- Boštjan Blažič

Lektor *Proofread by*

- Peter Štefančič

Prevodi *Translated by*

- Mag. Neža Rojko

Naslov uredništva in uprave *Editorial Office and Administration*

- Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja, Na Loko 2, p.p. 124, SI-8000 Novo mesto, Slovenija

Spletna stran revije *Website of the Journal*

- <http://www.pedagoska-obzorja.si/revija>

Elektronski naslov *E-mail*

- urednistvo@pedagoska-obzorja.si, editorial.office@didactica-slovenica.si

Revija Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja je indeksirana in vključena v

Journal Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja is indexed and included in

- Social Sciences Citation Index[®], Social Scisearch[®], Journal Citation Reports / Social Sciences Edition (Thomson Reuters services)
- American Psychological Association (PsycINFO)
- International Bibliography of Periodical Literature / Internationale Bibliographie geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlicher Zeitschriftenliteratur (IBZ)
- Internationale Bibliographie der Rezensionen geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlicher Literatur (IBR)
- Elsevier Bibliographic Databases (SCOPUS, Embase, Engineering Village, Reaxys)
- Co-operative Online Bibliographic System and Services (COBISS)

Izdajanje revije sofinancira Javna agencija za raziskovalno dejavnost Republike Slovenije.

The publication of the Journal is co-financed by the Public Research Agency of the Republic of Slovenia.

Naklada *Circulation*

- 500

Tisk *Printed by*

- Littera picta d.o.o. Ljubljana

CONTENTS

- Irena Lesar, Ph.D.,
Ivan Čuk, Ph.D.,
Mojca Peček Čuk, Ph.D. 3 TEACHERS ON BEHAVIOURAL
CHARACTERISTICS OF MARGINALISED GROUPS
OF PUPILS
- Mihaela Zavašnik Arčnik, Ph.D. 19 LEADERSHIP FOR LEARNING THROUGH THE
LENS OF THE CANDIDATES FOR HEADSHIP
- Nada Vilotijević, Ph.D.,
Danijela Vasilijević, Ph.D. 36 ELECTRONIC TEXTBOOKS IN THE FUNCTION OF
INDIVIDUALISATION
- Marija Švajncer, Ph.D. 51 THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE
PHILOSOPHICAL EDUCATION OF PRE-SCHOOL
TEACHERS
- Branislav Brojčin, Ph.D.,
Slobodan Banković,
Nenad Glumbić, Ph.D.,
Simona Weiss 66 EFFECTS OF COOPERATIVE TEACHING IN
INCLUSIVE EDUCATION
- Ivica Radovanović, Ph.D.,
Aleksandar Tadić 80 THE CONCEPTS OF CLASSROOM DISCIPLINE
AND STUDENT FREEDOM IN INDIVIDUAL
PEDAGOGY
- Slavica Čepon, Ph.D. 94 THE NEED FOR CONTINUITY IN FOREIGN
LANGUAGE TEACHING: THE IMPORTANCE OF
GRAMMAR
- Marija Kristan 110 TEACHING ENGLISH AT THE LOWER PRIMARY
SCHOOL LEVEL USING SONGS
- Nataša Rizman Herga,
Samo Fošnarič, Ph.D. 123 DIMENSIONAL-ANTHROPOMETRIC ANALYSIS
OF THE SCHOOL INTERIOR IN EARLY
ADOLESCENCE
- Dejan Kopold, Ph.D. 138 EMPIRICAL LANGUAGE ANALYSIS OF GERMAN
BLOGS

The concepts of classroom discipline and student freedom in individual pedagogy

Pregledni znanstveni članek

UDK 37.013.14+37.091.5

KLJUČNE BESEDE: individualna pedagogika, razredna disciplina, svoboda učenicev, pravice in odgovornosti učenicev in učiteljev

POVZETEK – Cilj dela je razumevanje razredne discipline glede na dojetanje pojma svobode pri predstavnikih individualne pedagogike (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Ellen Key, Maria Montessori, Alexander S. Neill) v sodobni pedagoški teoriji in praksi. V njihovih koncepcijah vzgoje se svoboda otroka različno tolmači in določa, toda vsi oni svobodo razumejo kot spoštovanje svobode drugih, to je nedotakljivost pravic drugih. Vprašanje svobode je neločljivo povezano z vprašanjem discipline, če disciplino dojemamo kot urejenost i spoštovanje pravil. To dejstvo opravičuje kvalifikacijo razredne discipline kot procesa vplivanja na vedenje učenicev s ciljem, da se pouk in učenje nemoteno odvijata. Posameznik ima v takšnem konceptu razredne discipline popolno svobodo v mejah dovoljenega, vnaprej usklajenega ali pojasnjenega. Mehanizme razredne discipline treba oblikovati in umestiti v toku vzgojnega procesa, toda ne neodvisno od njega, s sodelovanjem vseh udeležencev vzgojnega procesa.

Author review

UDC 37.013.14+37.091.5

KEYWORDS: individual pedagogy, classroom discipline, student freedom, students' and teachers' rights and responsibilities.

ABSTRACT – The aim of this paper is the understanding of the concept of classroom discipline compared with the concept of freedom among the representatives of individual pedagogy (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Ellen Key, Maria Montessori and Alexander S. Neill) in modern educational theory and practice. In their concepts of education, child freedom is interpreted and defined differently. However, for all of them freedom means showing respect for other people's rights, i.e. inviolability of other people's rights. The question of freedom is inextricably linked with the question of discipline, if discipline is to be understood as order and respect for the rules. This fact justifies the definition of classroom discipline as a process of influencing the behaviour of students with the aim of achieving undisturbed processes of teaching and learning in the classroom. In such a concept of classroom discipline, an individual is given full freedom within the limits of what is considered tolerable, preconcerted and well substantiated. The mechanisms of classroom discipline should be formed and implemented throughout the process of education, not independently of it, and with the presence of all participants of the educational process.

1. Introduction

Theoretical discussions about student discipline are based on different positions, which has brought about clear-cut divisions and opposition in experts' opinions about numerous open questions in this field of pedagogy. Trnavac (1996) distinguishes the following as the crucial questions: is student discipline an external framework and a prerequisite or an integral part of the educational process (the question of teaching

process organisation), is it a tool of management (guidance) or support in emancipation, is it school regulations that protect, liberate or subdue a student, is discipline only a precondition and means of the educational process or its aim too, is school education possible without pedagogical and disciplinary measures and means? The term *discipline* causes controversy as it is usually associated with the repressive and negative meaning (it includes coercion, punishment and excessive emphasis on obedience). Tauber (2007) sees *classroom discipline* as fundamental and essential for all other issues in the class and says that this term implies maintaining order in the classroom, or behaviour in accordance with the rules and regulations, including the respect for the rights of others. What seems to be indisputable is the definition of classroom discipline, which is seen as the process of influencing the behaviour of students with the aim of achieving undisturbed processes of teaching and learning in the classroom.

There is no doubt that the issue of classroom discipline actually means talking about the educational conceptual issues. Today, we insist on the preparation of future teachers and the formation of the educational concept, to be followed by a study of possible models of classroom discipline and the selection of the model which best fits our own convictions (Tauber, 2007). In that sense, it is important to study the educational concepts of the individual pedagogy representatives who were obliged to take a stand towards the phenomenon of discipline once they *gave freedom to the individual*. Individual pedagogy was a very powerful and popular movement in the early decades of the 20th century, and it lasted in different versions and with unequal intensity through much of the 20th century. It appears as a critique of and opposition to the dominant herbartian pedagogy, school etatisation, the establishment of common general goals and tasks of education, the prescribing of identical curricula for schools and all students, teachers' inviolable authority and all forms of suppression, impediment or sacrifice of a child's personality. Its starting point is not solely of pedagogical nature; it is also a testimony of the social commitment of these theories.

Regardless of the equality or great similarity, when the basics are concerned, one could not claim that individual pedagogy is a homogeneous pedagogical course or movement. Jean-Jacques Rousseau is considered to be the founder of this movement. He undoubtedly inspired many future educators who are now seen as belonging to the broad movement of individual pedagogy recognisable by its strong demands for respect of the child and his or her right to freedom within the educational process, freedom related to the society, its institutions and the entire world of adults, which is seen as a prerequisite for the formation of free people (Spevak, 2009). Directly or indirectly, individual pedagogy gave rise to several pedagogical directions: personalist pedagogy, pedology, progressivist pedagogy, pedocentrism, the theory of free education and others. Particular attention in this paper will be devoted to the ideas of some of the most important representatives of individual pedagogy (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Ellen Key, Maria Montessori and Alexander S. Neill), which can still be considered topical, as well as to the needs and opportunities for finding ways of applying modern conceptions of pedagogical practice.

2. Relationship between an individual and the community

Rousseau wrote that education and its practical organisation should be freed from any regulation, prescription, standardisation, frontal and group work, all patterns and moulds, and rather redirected to the individual, their natural strengths and differences, and ensure to everyone steady individual development (Potkonjak, 2003). He believed that contemporary culture is the negation of the nature and, thus, claimed that people should return to the nature – to freedom and equality. Ellen Key was a very active campaigner for children's rights, their natural education and the new school, as well as for the emancipation of women. In her vision of future education, the child was the pivot of the educational process and the measure of all things. She believed that human nature cannot develop if it is under constant pressure and that the change of the society must be preceded by a new kind of pedagogical education of young generations. She criticised the social ideal of conservatism: total subordination of the individual under a state concept which advocates obedience and self-control at the expense of the *self-determination initiative*. She wrote that the aim is to “free and not bind or break the power of the individual” (Key, 1914, p. 28) and was convinced that the educational system of that period only broke the individual strengths of the child. The central place in the pedagogy of Maria Montessori also belongs to the child, which is best proven by her request for us *to follow the child, and they will show us the way*. She insisted on such conditions provided for children (of preschool and early school age) that would help them meet their needs and interests and on the conditions that would help them develop independently and freely. Alexander S. Neill, the founder of the *Summerhill school*, which is considered by some as one of the most important pedagogical experiments of the 20th century, attempted to answer the questions of how people become unhappy, how this evil destroys human lives and how children should be brought up in order to be *happy*. He maintained that the happiness of children, as well adults, consists of unlimited enjoyment of their freedom. *Summerhill* is a school that provides an opportunity for children to discover themselves, understand their own identity and discover their own interests under the umbrella of self-management and in a democratic environment (Neill, 2003). He made it clear that he did not care so much about *what the child knows*, but rather *what the child is*.

3. Child's nature and freedom

The representatives of individual pedagogy foreground the *child's nature*, and their starting point is synthesised in Rousseau's call for a *return to nature*. The nature of the child is always good and just needs to be given full freedom to express itself (*freedom is the precondition of education*). Rousseau believed that such freedom is risk free “... because every child (individual) is good by nature (nature does not make mistakes in that). *The skill of education (or absence of education) lies in creating the*

conditions for each individual to develop fully in accordance with their own nature” (Potkonjak, 2003, p. 58). Emphasising the importance of educational freedom among most representatives of individual pedagogy often serves as the starting point for taking a stand towards basic educational problems, although it should be noted that different authors offer different interpretations and definitions of freedom. Rousseau demanded that children should not be limited or hindered in their natural development. His main goal in education is the *education of a free man* who appreciates freedom above all, which is why education should also be free in its methods and organisation. He wrote: “All our wisdom lies in slavish prejudice, all our habits are only subjugation, restriction or coercion. Every citizen is born, lives and dies in slavery: at birth the man is strapped in swaddling clothes and bandages, and when he dies, he gets nailed in a coffin; as long as he has the form of a man, he is chained in our regulations” (Rousseau, 1950, p. 16). The treatment of children at the time led to the fact that the first notions which they acquired were the notions of power or slavery. He wrote: “First we rock the child, and cuddle him in order to appease him; then we threaten and even beat him in order to silence him. We either do what he likes, or demand that he does what we like; we either subjugate our own desires to his or his to ours, no middle way, the child must either command or be commanded.” (Rousseau, 1950, p. 25). He believed that the *first good in the world is not authority but freedom*. Ellen Key was also dissatisfied with the way school treated children (she called the school the killer of children’s soul), starting from the dressage and moulding done in the school, through punishment, to disregard of students’ personality (Potkonjak, 2003). She thought that up to the age of ten only the family is capable of educating the child without coercion, cliché, levelling and command. Only the family shows respect for the *sanctity of a child’s personality*. Her *idealistic view of the child’s nature* is also noticeable in her belief that the parents have to bow *to its highness – the child*. As other representatives of individual pedagogy, Neill also believed that children are by nature good, wise and realistic. He bitterly criticised bureaucratic school and authoritarian education. In a school with no coercion, fear, teacher authority, punishment, examination or assessment, what should prevail is free atmosphere, friendly relations and solidarity. When explaining his notion of a free child, Neill talks about the child’s right to live freely, without pressure from external authority in the psychic or somatic sense.

4. Educator’s role

Contrary to the idea of shaping the behaviour of a child by the teacher, Rousseau felt that it was best to avoid direct pedagogical education and rather create conditions for every child to freely develop its nature through their own activity. The role of the teacher is to create the most favourable conditions for a child’s development and his acquisition of a growing range of skills and instruct the child about the *natural consequences* of his actions. However, Rousseau’s demand for freedom in education

is not unequivocal or one-sided, as one might think. What he requires for the child is *organised, prepared and pre-arranged freedom*, which consists of pedagogically regulated situations (Spevak, 2009). Later, there were many more teachers, especially Maria Montessori, striving for *pedagogically regulated environment*. Therefore, it was not a call for the omission or lack of pedagogical education but rather indirect education that Rousseau insisted on. Ellen Key also thought that it was best not to educate children directly. She wrote: "Quietly and smoothly, we should allow the nature to be self-supportive and let the circumstances facilitate the work of the nature – that is education" (Key, 2000, p. 76). She criticised direct educational methods and procedures used to restrain the child's nature in order to impose certain order and inculcate in them certain traits, habits and values. Education needs to support and facilitate natural development and should have only indirect influence, through the provision of adequate conditions, so that none of the child's individual features are throttled. A teacher should focus on creating an environment that enables the child to grow and mature and should support children in their need to differ from others rather than tend to fit them into a common framework equal for all.

As a child involves all their senses to explore the environment in which they grow up, Montessori believed that their environment should be enriched with special materials that allow the child to acquire basic knowledge in a natural way. Apart from being of great importance for learning, such materials helped children free themselves from the autocracy of adults. *Children's Houses* (It. Casa dei Bambini) which she founded were the environment especially adapted for children, where they are able to grow and develop an *individual sense of responsibility*. Children were expected to act responsibly in this environment and fulfil tasks by creating and maintaining order (Röhre, 1994), crossing one level after another on their way to self-realisation. An educator must provide such basic conditions that will enable the child's free activity to give results, as it is only in a free community that the child will be able to develop individual strengths and abilities. The role of the teacher is to help the child hear the call of the *natural instincts of industriousness* that they carry within themselves and find in its environment the right material "and offer it to the prompted industriousness" (Montessori, 1928, p. 1030). She did not consider the objects (materials) from the environment to be only the matter of cognition, but she rather saw dealing with these materials as the first step on the way towards *discipline*, which she described as an inner voice that shows the child the way through life. She considered this inner voice as a forerunner of the child's voluntary obedience to the ones that he or she is surrounded by.

Given that the aim of the school in *Summerhill* is the happiness of students, and not their preparation for future professions, it is dominated by emotional rather than working education. Neill wrote: "We have no new teaching methods, because we think that teaching, as such, does not have much significance" (Neill, 2003, p. 23). Students are free to choose activities that they will participate in, inside the classroom and outside, and teachers are only there to help them exercise their choice. The teacher is expected to organise classes so that children can hardly wait to come

to each their lesson, where they will actively participate in the work. He emphasised the importance of creating and maintaining the environment in which all community members can co-exist in harmony and harmonious relationships while maintaining freedom.

5. Disciplinary rules and measures

In order to understand the attitude of individual pedagogy towards the phenomena of freedom and discipline, it is important to analyse their understanding of disciplinary rules and measures to be taken in case of their violation. Rousseau harshly criticised the view that childhood is the right time for the correction of a *man's bad inclinations* and found that the child should not be tied by social laws, "but by the chains of necessity" (Rousseau, 1950, p. 236). He believed that the teacher "should not give a student the rules, but should rather train him to find them himself" (Rousseau, 1950, p. 30). Forbidding should be rare but adamant (a wall which the child will not try to tear down); on the other hand, what we allow them to do should be done at first word, no nagging, no pleading, and especially no conditions imposed. In accordance with the theory of natural upbringing, he recommended the discipline of natural punishment, i.e. *natural consequence*. Punishment should always come "as a natural consequence of their misconduct" (Rousseau, 1950, p. 103). What lies in the basis of this disciplinary measure is to develop a child's responsibility for his own actions.

Ellen Key wrote that adults have no right and power to enact "new laws for this new creature" (Key, 2000, p. 121). Even if hundreds of little rules to maintain order and discipline in school were reduced to a fourth, she would still consider it to be pressure that requires uniformity. She wrote that it is better for children to face such pressure as late as possible, when their ability to resist it is higher. She insisted on punishment through natural consequences, although she was aware that they may be harmful to the health of the child in some cases, whereas in others their effect could be too slow. She emphasised her belief, which Tolstoy elaborated on (Malešević and Tadić, 2012), that evil does not eliminate evil, but that "evil can only be overcome with goodness" (Key, 2000, p. 143) and she resolutely opposed to physical punishment, coercion and commanding over children.

In Montessori pedagogy as well, the teacher is a guide rather than an instructor; he uses special materials, observes children and their activity trying to support the child's natural development. Punishment and reward, in her view, should not result from the teacher's will, but should rather be the *natural consequence* of a child's misconduct. Her central idea, revolving around the relationship between discipline and freedom, is that *freedom is only possible if a man obeys the established rules*. Children are actively involved in shaping the living environment as well as shaping the disciplinary rules. She thought that discipline can only be achieved by perfecting an individual; discipline is not to be imposed by means of physical punishment or giving

orders, or preaching (the external discipline of traditional school), but rather indirectly – through *industriousness and referring one to work* (internal, natural discipline that represents the end point of pedagogical education).

An important characteristic of Neill's *Summerhill school* are *school meetings* where decisions are made by voting on everything related to common life, including the punishment for social norms violation. This is where the school laws are created or modified and they represent the school policy (by majority votes). Participants are both students and school staff and they both have an equal right to speak and vote value. The equality of students and teachers is reflected in the fact that, at the meetings, no member of the school staff can independently implement sanction against a student, or vice versa, because they all have the same treatment and status. Neill wrote that "... none of the defendants in Summerhill ever shows signs of defiance or hatred of community authority. I am always surprised by the obedience with which our students accept punishment" (Neill, 2003, p. 69). He argued that the only school which can be considered progressive, and in which freedom cannot be achieved unless children feel that they are completely unconstrained in managing their own social life, is a school with implemented self-government and school ruled by compromise. He believed that the individual should not be required to abide by the rules simply because they are rules, but that children should be taught how to distinguish between reasonable and arbitrary rules. He believed that the right families and schools are those in which children and adults have equal rights, that all external prohibition is wrong, and he emphasised the importance of internal limits.

6. Inviolability of the rights of others

We have already said that freedom is interpreted and defined in different ways by different authors. However, for all of them freedom means showing respect for other people's rights, i.e. inviolability of other people's rights. In several places in his *Émile* (Fr. *Émile, ou de l'Éducation*), Rousseau points out that we should not allow a child to abuse his freedom, we cannot allow him to rule other people (he opposes leniency). He wrote: "As soon as people can be considered as a tool of their environment whose use depends on their will, they use them to satisfy their urge and to compensate for their own weaknesses. Then they become boring, cruel, domineering, malicious, reckless ... it does not take long to realise how comfortable it is to work other people's hands, and how little move of a tongue is enough to put the universe in motion" (Rousseau, 1950, p. 54). In the same context one should understand his words that "the only moral lesson which befits childhood, and which is of the utmost importance for all ages, is to never do harm to anyone" (Rousseau, 1950, p. 109).

Speaking about freedom in education, Ellen Key says that the restriction of liberty lies only in the inviolability of freedom of others. She thought it was a *natural restriction of a man's freedom*, which a child should be taught to from the very first day.

Writing about the purpose of future education, she states that there should be such a beautiful world created “in which a child will be free to move until it reaches the clear boundaries that protect the rights of others” (Key, 2000, p. 77). The new teacher needs to teach a child to take his place in life and assume *responsibility* for everything that surrounds him. It is important that education should arouse a sense of independence, revive and strengthen it and inspire courage for stepping away from the norm in cases where it does not violate the rights of others, and that it is not all just about drawing attention to oneself. Starting from the principle of diversity of individuals, she wrote that it is important for the path of personal freedom, which does not violate the rights of others, to contain as few obstacles as possible and keep or even increase constraints where the rights of another may be violated. She emphasised that children have *rights and responsibilities* just like all others. On the other hand, parents must show respect for children the same way they teach them to respect others. The child should be taught from an early age what freedom is and what risks one’s own choice carries with itself, i.e. “what are rights and responsibility of one’s own will” (Key, 2000, p. 169). Children are confronted daily with the reality, they reveal their own small pleasures, and punishments as well, because their parents never prevent them from experiencing the effects of what they do.

One of the basic principles of Montessori pedagogy is a free *choice* of activities that faces a child with an alternative and helps them become independent. Only a free choice gives the child a chance to decide according to their needs and interests, which is much better than the teacher determining what is proper or good for them. Although considered one of the most important representatives of individual pedagogy, Montessori, who considered the child as a social being, emphasised the *importance of social activity* in the early stages of development. The main goal of *Children’s Houses* was “to instil discipline in children” (Röhrs, 1994, p. 174). Children choose freely and spontaneously a material that they will be working on and they themselves decide how long to work. In a situation where one child uses a material, another child who wishes to take the same material would have to wait. Children can share a material only if there is a mutual agreement upon that. A child is not forced to share a material, but if it is the matter of interest of the whole group, then the group takes precedence over the individual need of one child. If a child takes some material spontaneously, there is intense concentration, and the task execution creates a sense of satisfaction. Such concentration, resulting from internal motivation, contributes to the development of *working discipline* along with children’s freedom. She wrote: “A community in which everyone is busy with their work – when the job is done or abandoned spontaneously – is a free, but disciplined community” (Montessori, 1928, p. 1028). In a Montessori kindergarten or school, children’s *discipline is a result of their full dedication to the work*, and free intellectual work is the basis of self-discipline. The development of practical skills and practical work which she insisted on should be viewed in the context of disciplined behaviour. Although in everyday usage the terms freedom and discipline are mainly used as antonyms and the presence of discipline often automatically implies lack of freedom (and vice versa), Montessori’s *understanding*

of the relationship between freedom and discipline was completely different. She pointed out that it is wrong to equate freedom with lack of discipline, because lack of discipline is actually a mess. She wrote: "If one searches for the best way to impose freedom, he will naturally stop at perfectly maintained discipline, and if he explores the best way to impose discipline, he will find that there is no means for that other than giving children freedom" (Montessori, 1928, p. 1027). Independent children's activities which Montessori advocated included their freedom, which cannot be separated from discipline and responsibility. Freedom and discipline are in interaction and the basic principle is that neither of them can be independently reached. As she wrote, being disciplined means being one's own master who can, therefore, govern himself by acting in accordance with the rules. What Montessori saw in discipline, order and abiding by the rules and laws is not just duty but a vital need as well. In this regard, she wrote: "Being disciplined should become a common form of life, the secret of the world's harmony, which brings so much admiration, is a matter of life" (Montessori, 1928, p. 1029). She thought that it was only by means of discipline that the man could rise to a higher level of natural and universal life. She did not detach the encouragement of natural development, systematicity and order in practical expressivity from imposing steady discipline.

What makes Neill no different from the rest of the representatives of individual pedagogy is the attitude that "you cannot have a good mankind if we act toward people with hatred, punishment and conscious repression" (Neill, 2003, p. 132), supported additionally by his conclusion that the only way is the *way of love*. He believed that no child should be forced to do something that they do not want to do, and opposite this ideal he sees a disciplined child (with no rights) and an unruly child (with all the rights). In the preface to the *Free children of Summerhill*, Erich Fromm pointed out that in Neill's concept of education *freedom does not mean an absence of rules*. "This very important principle which Neill emphasises means that respect of a person has to be mutual. The teacher does not use force against the child, but the child neither has the right to use coercion against the teacher. The child cannot disturb an adult just because he is a child, nor can he exert pressure in any of the many ways in which they typically do" (Neill, 2003, p. 9, in the preface). Neill deemed punishment necessary when all the attention and tolerance fails to lead to the desired result, and he states that "we cannot subordinate the entire community to one individual" (Neill, 2003, p. 72). An essential feature of Neill's concept of free education is the criticism of insisting on children's obedience. He says that *everyone has the freedom to do what they like, as long as it does not violate the freedom of others*, which is a goal attainable in every community. The arguments which Montessori used to show that freedom and discipline are inseparable, as they are based on respecting the rights of others, were used by Neill to present freedom and discipline as diametrically opposed and incompatible phenomena. The reason for that is that by the term discipline he obviously means the negative meaning typically attributed to this phenomenon, as he talks about *military-style discipline* based on coercion, force, threats, fear and physical punishment.

7. Conclusion

As already noted, the standpoint of the representatives of individual pedagogy that *students' freedom cannot be absolute*, but is always rather limited by the freedom of others, is quite clear. Unlimited freedom usually turns into intractability and violence, whereas creative freedom is *naturally limited* by the demand for the respect of others. We consider it equally unreasonable to identify classroom discipline with imposed uniformity, fostering conformity, stifling individuality or with violence. The issue of students' freedom is inextricably linked to the issue of classroom discipline (based on respect for the rights and freedom of others). Discipline does not mean prescribing what people should do and how; it is rather an attempt to build harmonious relations in the community where *everyone knows exactly what children are not allowed to do*. It is a process of maintaining order by assisting students to discover the value, usefulness and necessity of complying with reasonable policies and procedures and take responsibility for their own behaviour. Therefore, an individual has full freedom within reasonable pre-agreed or substantiated limits.

If we tried to assess the importance and influence of these conceptions of individual pedagogy in today's pedagogy, it would be easy to conclude that they have left a profound imprint. Numerous individual, pedocentric concepts which emerged in the 19th and 20th century, with a greater or smaller theoretical and practical influence, resulted in a request for the activation of the student in the school, with the respect for his interests and abilities. For many decades now, people have been discussing how teachers should be trained to make educational work an interactional process of working together with students as well as fostering collaborative relationships and democratic climate in the classroom.

In recent years, *emancipatory pedagogy* has been expressing more fully the positive side of individual pedagogy. This anti-authoritarian and non-repressive pedagogical concept foregrounds personality as the bearer of all pedagogical value and sees the basis of education in freedom and creativity. Modern pedagogy seeks to derive the issue of regulation of mutual relationships within the educational process from the *common interests* of the participants in education. Only in this case can one avoid management by external means, i.e. proclamation of participants who hold supremacy, dominance and privilege (Trnavac, 2005). Today's models of maintaining classroom discipline are generally proactive, involving all participants as creators of their own behaviour in the teaching process (Gasic-Pavišić, 2005). It is consensual discipline that is participatory and personalised. Classroom discipline mechanisms should be created and installed during the educational process and not independently of it, with all participants in the educational process included. The *democratic relationship* so commonly emphasised in contemporary literature implies the equality of participants in the educational process in terms of *rights and obligations*. Each of them has the right for a choice, a decision, an opinion, a suggestion and dissent to the extent that it does not endanger others. Everyone is responsible for their own deeds, actions and

behaviour. Equality and mutual respect are achieved on the basis of democratic procedures and principles: acceptance of the will of the majority, the right for choice and decision, taking responsibility, tolerance, coordination and compromise (Pavlovic-Breneselović and Pavlovski, 2000, Radovanovic, 2005). An important condition for the development and maintenance of such relations is the establishment and elaboration of a democratic procedure which makes it possible, that is, disciplinary rules and norms of behaviour. Disciplinary rules should be understood as *creative participation* and not as prohibition which implies denial or refusal. Creative communication implies the absence of imposing one's own views and opinions, various opportunities are presented within it and respect is shown for the freedom of choice, the consequences of every possible choice are known in advance and in that way freedom is truly taught. Such rules do not restrict freedom, but make it real and possible. They *initiate the responsibility for each other*. Such an insight into and the understanding of students' freedom in the context of responsibility excludes anarchy and nihilism. Classroom discipline in today's conditions should be based on an agreement that involves restricting some freedoms in the name of general freedom for all. In that sense, we cannot talk about a competently effected learning process if the students are not developing the skills of taking responsibility for their own learning and behaviour. The teacher who makes sure that discipline is maintained exerts the greatest responsibility, and potential self-will should be replaced with an agreement.

Dr Ivica Radovanović, Aleksandar Tadić

Dojemanje razredne discipline in svobode učencev v individualni pedagogiki

Razredna disciplina predstavlja enega od najbolj spornih pedagoških problemov, ker je za pojem disciplina običajno rezerviran represiven in negativen pomen. Po drugi strani je vprašanje svobode učencev neločljivo povezano z vprašanjem razredne discipline, če disciplino dojemamo kot urejenost in spoštovanje pravil. To dejstvo opravičuje kvalifikacijo razredne discipline kot procesa vplivanja na vedenje učencev s ciljem, da se pouk in učenje v okviru učnega procesa nemoteno odvijata. Danes se vztraja pri pripravi prihodnjih učiteljev in pri oblikovanju vzgojnega koncepta, po katerem bo sledilo učenje mogočih modelov razredne discipline in izbira modela, soglasnega z lastnimi prepričanji. V tem smislu je zelo pomembno analizirati koncepte vzgoje predstavnikov individualne pedagogike, ki so se morali dajajoč svobodo posameznikom izreči tudi glede fenomena discipline.

V prispevku obravnavamo razumevanje razredne discipline glede na dojemanje pojma svobode pri predstavnikih individualne pedagogike (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Ellen Key, Maria Montessori, Alexander S. Neill) v sodobni pedagoški teoriji in praksi. V njihovih koncepcijah vzgoje se svoboda otroka različno tolmači in določa. Pred-

stavniki individualne pedagogike so menili, pod močnim vplivom idej Rousseau-a, da je pri vzgoji in v praktični organizaciji le-te treba zapustiti vsako predpisovanje, normiranje, standardizacijo, frontalne in skupinske oblike dela, vse šablone in modele in da je treba iti od individuuma, njegovih naravnih moči, razlik in da je treba vsakomur zagotoviti skladen razvoj. V Rousseau-jevi koncepciji vzgoje je v ospredju otroška narava, ki je vedno dobra in ki ji je treba omogočiti popolno svobodo, da bi se izrazila. Vsa večšina vzgoje je v tem, da se ustvarijo pogoji za maksimalen razvoj vsakega individuuma v skladu z njegovo naravo. Rousseau je zahteval, da se otrok v svojem naravnem razvoju ne omejuje in ne zavira. Njegov glavni vzgojni cilj je vzgoja svobodnega človeka, ki nadvse ceni svobodo, zaradi česar mora tudi vzgoja biti svobodna v svojih metodah in organizaciji. Rousseau poudarja, da otroku ne smemo dovoliti, da zlorablja svojo svobodo in da mu ne moremo dovoliti, da upravlja druge ljudi.

E. Key otroka postavlja v središče vzgojnega procesa, la-ta postaja merilo vseh stvari. Meni, da je cilj osvoboditi, ne pa vezati in lomiti individualno moč in bila je prepričana, da tedanji vzgojni sistem pravzaprav lomi individualno moč otroka. Bila je zelo nezadovoljna z odnosom šole do učencev, začevši z dresiranjem in šabloniziranjem, ki se dogajata v šoli, od kaznovanja pa do nespoštovanja osebnosti učenca. Poudarjala je, da edino omejitev svobode predstavlja nedotakljivost pravic drugih.

Tudi v pedagogiki M. Montessori središčno mesto pripada otroku, o čemer govori tudi njena zahteva, da se moramo obrniti se k otroku kot svetilniku naše prihodnosti. Menila je, da bi šole morale biti okolja, posebno prilagojena otrokom, v katerih bodo rastle in razvijali individualni občutek odgovornosti. Vzgojitelj mora zagotoviti osnovne predpostavke, ki bodo omogočile, da bo svobodna aktivnost otroka dala rezultate, ker otrok samo v svobodni skupnosti lahko razvije individualne moči in sposobnosti. Disciplina otrok je rezultat popolne predanosti poslu s strani otrok, svobodno intelektualno delo pa predstavlja osnovo samodiscipline.

A. Neill je menil, da srečo otrok tvori neomejeno uživanje njihove svobode. Šola mora dajati možnost otrokom, da odkrijejo sebe, razumejo lastno identiteto in odkrivajo lastna zanimanja pod okriljem samoupravljanja in v demokratični sredini. V šoli, v kateri ni prisile, strahu, avtoritete učiteljev, kazni, izpitov in ocen bi morali vladati svobodno vzdušje, pristrčni odnosi in solidarnost. Ko pojasnjuje svoje razumevanje svobodnega otroka, Neill govori o pravici otroka, da živi svobodno, brez pritiskov zunanje avtoritete v psihičnem in somatskem pomenu besede. Poudarjal je pomen oblikovanja in vzdrževanja sredine, v kateri lahko vsi člani skupnosti soobstajajo v harmoniji in v skladnih odnosih in da pri tem obdržijo svojo svobodo. Tudi v Neillovi koncepciji vzgoje svoboda ne pomeni odsotnosti pravil. Navaja, da bi moral vsakdo svoboden delati to, kar ima rad, če s tem ne ogroža svobode drugih.

Za vse navedene teoretike vzgoje je značilno stališče, da ni treba vzgajati neposredno, ampak je treba ustvarjati pogoje, da vsak otrok svobodno, z lastno aktivnostjo razvija svojo naravo. Vloga vzgojitelja je, da ustvarja čim bolj ugodne okoliščine za razvoj otroka, da usmeri svojo pozornost na ustvarjanje okolja, v katerem otrok raste, da ponuja podporo tendenci pri otroku, da se razlikuje od drugih, namesto da

teži k temu, da gojenca umesti v okvirje skupnega, enakega za vse. Predstavniki individualne pedagogike so menili, da svoboda učenca ne more biti absolutna, ampak je le-ta vedno omejena s svobodo drugih. Vprašanje svobode je neločljivo povezano z vprašanjem razredne discipline. Discipliniranje je proces vzdrževanja reda, s pomočjem učencem, da odkrijejo vrednosti, uporabnost in nujnost spoštovanja pravil in procedur in da prevzamejo odgovornost za lastno vedenje. Torej, posameznik ima popolno svobodo v mejah dovoljenega, vnaprej usklajenega ali pojasnjena.

V sodobni literaturi je pogosto poudarjen partnerski odnos pri vzgoji, razumljen kot enakopravnost udeležencev v vzgojnem procesu glede pravic in obveznosti. Vsakdo od njih ima pravico na izbiro, odločitev, lastno mnenje in nestrinjanje v obsegu, s katerim ne ogroža drugih. Vsakdo je odgovoren za lastne akcije, postopke in vedenja. Enakopravnost in vzajemno spoštovanje se ustvarjata s spoštovanjem demokratične procedure in principov: sprejemanje volje večine, pravice do izbire in odločitve, prevzemanje odgovornosti, strpnost, usklajevanje in kompromis. Važen pogoj za razvoj in vzdrževanje takšnih odnosov je izgradnja in izdelava demokratične procedure, s katero se to omogoča, to je disciplinskih pravil in norm vedenja. Disciplinska pravila morajo razumljena kod ustvarjalno sodelovanje, kar predstavlja odsotnost vsiljevanja osebne opredelitve in mnenja. Učencem se predočajo različne možnosti in spoštuje se svoboda izbire in na ta način se resnično privzgaja svoboda. Takšna pravila ne omejujejo svobode, ampak jo naredijo resnično in možno, le-ta sprožajo odgovornost enih do drugih. Takšno gledanje in razumevanje svobode učencev v kontekstu odgovornosti izključuje anarhijo in nihilizem.

REFERENCES

1. Gašić-Pavišić, S. (2005). Modeli razredne discipline. Beograd: Institut za pedagoška istraživanja.
2. Kej, E. (1914). Mladi naraštaj. Beograd: Izdanje Savića i Komp.
3. Kej, E. (2000). Stoljeće djeteta. Zagreb: Educa.
4. Montessori, M. (1928). Disciplinovanost i sloboda. Beograd: Učitelj, vol. IX, br. 4, str. 1027–1030.
5. Nil, A. (2003). Slobodna deca Samerhila. Beograd: Logos-Art.
6. Pavlović-Breneselović, D., Pavlovski, T. (2000). Partnerski odnos u vaspitanju. Beograd: Institut za pedagogiju i andragogiju – Centar za interaktivnu pedagogiju.
7. Potkonjak, N. (2003). XX vek – ni vek deteta ni vek pedagogije: ima nade – XXI vek. drugo dopunjeno izdanje. Novi Sad: Savez pedagoških društava Vojvodine.
8. Radovanović, I. (2005). Ponašanje nastavnika kao faktor socijalne klime u razredu. Beograd: Inovacije u nastavi, vol. XVIII, br. 4, str. 34-46.
9. Ruso, Ž.Ž. (1950). Emil ili o vaspitanju. Beograd: Znanje – Preduzeće za udžbenike Narodne Republike Srbije.
10. Röhrs, H. (1994). Maria Montessori, The quarterly review of comparative education. Paris: UNESCO – International Bureau of Education, vol. XXIV, br. 1-2, str. 169–183. Preuzeto dana 01.06.2009. sa sajta <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/International/Publications/pubhome.htm>
11. Spevak, Z. (2009). Kratak pregled poštovanja – odnos prema detetu od Kvintilijana do Djuja. U: Potkonjak, N. (ur.). Buduća škola. Beograd: Srpska akademija obrazovanja, str. 27–39.
12. Malešević, N., Tadić, A. (2012). Školska disciplina i sloboda učenika u koncepciji slobodnog vaspitanja Lava Nikolajeviča Tolstoja, Beograd: Inovacije u nastavi, vol. XXV, br. 1, str. 57–67.

13. Tauber, T.R. (2007). *Classroom Management – Sound Theory and Effective Practic*. Westport–London: Preager.
14. Trnavac, N. (1996). *Fragmenti o disciplini učenika*. Beograd: Institut za pedagogiju i andragogiju.
15. Trnavac, N. (2005). *Disciplinska lestvica kao indikator nivoa i kvaliteta vaspitnog delovanja nastavnika*. Beograd: *Inovacije u nastavi*, vol. XVIII, br. 4, str. 5–20.

*Aleksandar Tadić (1981), teaching assistant for pedagogy at the Faculty of Education in Belgrade.
Address: Kraljice Natalije 43, 11000 Beograd, RS; Telephone: (+381) 011 268 67 87
E-mail: aleksandar.tadic@uf.bg.ac.rs*

*Ivica Radovanović, Ph.D. (1957), full professor of pedagogy at the Faculty of Education in Belgrade.
Address: Kraljice Natalije 43, 11000 Beograd, RS; Telephone: (+381) 011 268 67 87
E-mail: ivica.radovanovic@uf.bg.ac.rs*