

GRUSCHKA, Andreas: *Pädagogische Forschung als Erforschung der Pädagogik. Eine Grundlegung*, Opladen, Berlin Farmington Hills, Mich.: Verlag Barbara Budrich, 2011, 370 págs.

The initial point of Andreas Gruschka's "pedagogical research as exploration of pedagogy" is formed by the objective of the realistic turn in the German educational science, which was already postulated by Heinrich Roth in 1962: it is essential to do a kind of research, where the pedagogical „facts themselves are to be found and detected by doing scientific fieldwork." Parallel to that impulse Gruschka intends to "discover the methods, which allow to bring the intuitive hermeneutic of the reality of education, which will always be the crucial point, on to a scientifically sound empirical base."¹. Gruschka's subtitle announces a "grounding", what could be regarded as a kind of reaction on the "existential crisis" of the educational science and as a specific revision and systematic re-founding of a scientific approach to the structural historical problems of academic pedagogy:

„The subject is facing the task, either to work on its own facts as a research based discipline, or to perish as a independent form of reflexion and distinct social praxis in the maelstrom of the alliance of politics and sciences, which enforced and established the trend towards a production of knowledge, which is closely related to concepts/goals of controlling and management.”(4).

Starting from that point of view Gruschka shows in an empirical perspective, how pedagogy can be seen as an specifically structured social praxis with an own internal logic, and to what extent a specific pedagogical scientific form of reflexion corresponding to that inherent structure does exist. With that focus Gruschka discusses the research concepts of current educational science and their problems.

Seeing that, Gruschka's book can be read as an introduction into pedagogical research methodology, which starts with placing his own research position in the historical context of its development (part 1). He continues with didactical and epistemological reflection combined with thoughts on research policy (part 2) and develops the exploration of pedagogical facts along with questioning the epistemological interests, which are preforming the access to that topic (part 3). As a central subject matter Gruschka points out the question, what kind of "basic operations of scientific insight (...) are available for an empirical clarification of the pedagogical problems" (part 4). To answer this, Gruschka is working out the "grounding cate-

¹ Heinrich ROTH, "The realistic turn in pedagogical research", *Neue Sammlung* 1962/3, p. 481-490; quoted after Gruschka 2011, p. 1

gorical terms” of social research in general (part 5) and there “constitutive adaptation (...) as pedagogical” ones in particular (part 6). Reflections on experiences with the reality of current everyday research pragmatics (part 7) complete this uncommon methodological reflection on pedagogical research.

At first Gruschka shows the phases of formation of his project in the context of the history of educational research since the early 1970s, which permits transparency to the readers, how and why he developed his academic aim of providing an empirically grounded “pedagogical research as exploration of pedagogy”. At the beginning of his academic career Gruschka highlights the approach of action research as an important influence, because it promised to allow “enlightening social praxis in the medium of science” as a possibility to act pedagogical while doing research. The linkage of “action and research” seemed to be the perfect instrument to make it possible to “change the educational system towards justice and discretion” (page 5-6). But regarding at the realization of this approach, Gruschka argues, that there had been more “action” than “research”, what turned out to be a problem concerning scientific objectivity. With Mollenhauer and Rittelmeyer Gruschka advocates the disjuncture of research and action which brought up the central question, whether and in which perspective an independent pedagogical method or methodology of pedagogical research is after all possible to develop or not. Gruschka shows this former fundamental discussion as an important historical mark for the further development of pedagogic empiricism (page 7). As a member of Herwig Blankertz research-team which accompanied a school pilot project in the german federate state NRW called “Kollegschulversuch”, Gruschka shows the methodological turn towards a “action-orientated accompanying research”, which started to be the initial point of bringing forward a solution of the problem named above (8). By trying to understand the formative processes of the participant students by cause and effect diagrams this project revealed, that this methodological model is not able to explain the self-will of the individual differing processes of formation (11). Since then it turned out to become the central point of Gruschkas academic work, “to follow the priority of reality, to be guided by her, instead of engrossing her with ready-made models of measurement” (12).

In this perspective Gruschka criticizes the ongoing import of theories and methodologies into the educational science, because these are used as “normal methods” to circumvent the discussion of their validity (43). The methodological borrowings from social sciences and psychology are shown as part of the mislea-

ding path away from the fundamentals of pedagogy as a specific subject. Therefore Gruschkas aim of “pedagogical research” emphasizes the “priority of the object”, which he defends in the tradition of Adornos part in the positivism dispute.

„Pedagogy is not only one under a million of other arbitrary social facts, to which you may just bear down on with an adjustable spanner. She has her own specific weight and is objectively constituted in a distinct way.” (204).

Gruschkas perspective on the specific of pedagogy follows the question of Schleiermacher: “What does the elder generation actually want with the younger?” Referring also to Herbart, Gruschkas research is focusing on studies, in which he reconstructs the material antithetic unity of the endemic pedagogical terms of education, didactic and self formation. He explicitly emphasizes his goal of bringing on a kind of a realistic turn, which enables pedagogy to understand and defend her own inherent structural logic against behavioristic psychological models on the one hand and stochastic types of social research on the other (209).

In favor of that challenge, Gruschka shows the specific pedagogical subject area in a historical and systematical perspective, which helps to understand the “basic problems of pedagogy as ones of a specific historical form of social transmission of ought and being.” (209). Gruschka shows, that the promise of didactic, to provide according to Comenius formula a “quick, pleasant and thorough” transfer of knowledge, has its specific structural problems (211). He also refers to the conflicts of education, understood as the „cultivation oft the infantile nature“ – since Franckes pietistic model of education discovered the main topic of educational praxis in the reflected fight with the renitency, with witch the pupils react on the educational demands addressed to them by their teachers (221). Both, didactic and education, are exposed as structurally inevitable connected with the significatum of the German term “Bildung”, which Gruschka plots in the sense of a self formative process of generating cognitive structures of understanding, aesthetic differentiation an practical, moral development. Under recourse to Humboldt, this model of self formation is understood as “an opposite position to the utilitarian pedagogy” (219) and as an inaccessible, individual act of understanding.

At the same time, Gruschka doesn´t take these pedagogical categories of “education, self-formation and didactic (...) as an external benchmark of evaluation”, but on the contrary he finds them in the “inherent structure of teaching” (29). Ipso facto, Gruschka intends to present a empirically grounded object theory of teaching. Against the background of PISA, Gruschkas studies are to be read as a

prominent part of the empirical research, which is done to document the “change of school”, which is by its representatives postulated to be a successful improvement of public schooling. Taking this promise for serious, Gruschka's research is a kind of a reality check of the factual consequences of this broad intervention in public education.

To get hold of the empiric facts of every day teaching, Gruschka doesn't use the method of “ethnographical description of the phenomena”, but a “micrological analytic procedure”, which allows to reconstruct the specific “structure-generating regularity” of the documented social interaction of school lessons (26-27), like he worked out in several Studies during his time as university professor at the “Goethe-University” in Frankfurt am Main (f.e., see PAERDU). Against the technological promises of success in the model of “instructional and training psychology” as a model of teaching and learning and against the corresponding economic model of “offer and usage” and against both of their unpedagogical propositions, Gruschka works with the qualitative method of social research called “objective hermeneutic” after Oevermann (37 etc). With that instrument Gruschka reaches for the reconstruction of the lessons as cases, in which it is possible to see the “coincidence of normative expectations and their disappointments, the opening of real opportunities and their closings” in the documents of teaching, in order to get to know, how and why public school lessons does “function” in actual facts or how and why they doesn't (32). Because there is “not so much a deficit in the nomination of positive factors, but a massive deficit of explanation of the unsatisfying processes and effects”, Gruschka insists on questioning, why pedagogy does not achieve her own goals (88). What is going wrong has to be seen from that perspective of immanent critique. That's why the research on the phenomenology of the different empirical shapes or occurrences of institutionalized teaching can be understood as the central matter of Gruschka's pedagogical studies.

The quality of his research isn't at least founded in the question “how does reality through protocols, data and artefacts become an object of research?” (154). Gruschka points out, that this question is vital to get to a clear categorial definition of what we do want to know for what reason and with what kind of implications. Highlighting the quality of the documents of the social interaction in the lessons (155), Gruschka emphasizes, how only they can provide information about repetitive or changing patterns of action and their potentially or factually existing dynamics of development. (155-156). In contrast to the subjectively collected and

noted observations in ethnological observation including the personal involvement of the researchers in the field, Gruschka's "pedagogical research" uses the opportunity of automatic recordings of the social interaction. Their transcription respecting public known rules, makes it possible to get "natural protocols" of the recorded social praxis, which are of an intersubjectively revisable reliability (156). How precisely teaching can be explored depends on the quality of the protocol. Against the individual and spontaneous notation in the ethnological field studies resp. against the pre-scaled international test-batteries and their preformation of scientific access to the action in the field, Gruschka points out the advantage of automatic audiovisual recordings as much more "objective" than any other methodological approach. Due to this, Gruschka exposes the question, whether the "PISA-scaling" is to be understood as a prototype of normative research, "with which an external target deployment sets the criteria for the measurement of what is demanded from the pupils." (178) Gruschka questions the adequacy and the origin of these standards, because their implicit logic of international comparison of just more or less of some points on an international scale doesn't seem to be suitable to explore new facts about teaching. Instead of bringing light on to the details and the quality of teaching, PISA would lead towards a modus of blindness concerning the real problems and the diverging modes of coping with them, by promoting a spectacle of national concurrence. Opposed to that, Gruschka asks for the interpretive patterns of the pedagogical tasks, which inherit the individual modes of teaching. Through the objective hermeneutic interpretation of the teaching-protocols Gruschka works out the explorative potential of protocolized experience of the pedagogical praxis (226-227, 248-249).

Finally Gruschka marks the limits of pedagogy, which are to be understood respecting the knowledge of the specific structural antagonism in educational, didactical and self-formatonal processes and caused by the institutional framing of them (265 ff.).

Rahel Hünig

rhuenig@gmx.de

Sascha Kabel

Eberz@em.uni-frankfurt.de