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4. A SUBJECT-THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE ON TRANSFORMATION LEARNING AND TRANSFORMATIONAL BILDUNG

Transformative Bildung as a Research Strategy on the Processes of Bildung

The German theory on transformative Bildung (Koller, Marotzki, & Sanders, 2007; Koller, 2012; Nohl, 2014) deals with transformation processes in human thinking. Bildung is defined as self and world reference, causing change in the fundamental orientation of people in the course of their biography. Processes of self and world reference include the individual’s attempts to find orientation in society through appropriate knowledge and reflection on the individual’s interests and social position in society. This type of research does not view Bildung as developing inner powers in a substantial manner but as a response to imbalances in the existing individual’s structure of knowledge (Koller, 2007, p. 71).

Process research on Bildung (Bildungsprozessforschung) (Koller et al., 2007; Koller, 2012) presents a theoretical framework with which transformation processes in the sense of processes of Bildung can be examined. The aim is an improved empirical foundation of processes of Bildung. The empirical reconstruction of processes of transformation intends to improve access to Bildung, to illuminate contradictions and constraints in the process of Bildung and, furthermore, to reduce the general oblivious attitude towards the philosophy of Bildung.

The philosophical discussion on truth, concerning the core of Bildung, has, in the past, failed to sufficiently take into account the difference between the aims of Bildung on the one hand and their social realization on the other. The empirical research on social conditions, opportunities and obligations has receded into the background (Anhalt, 2009, p. 33). Anhalt calls for an analysis of the empirical social conditions whilst taking the concept of learning into account. This contribution will concentrate mainly on the concept of learning, on the research on learning processes and the connection with transformative Bildung.

In contrast to the sociological and psychological empirical research on Bildung — which views processes of Bildung as a black box — the theory of transformative Bildung aims to examine the processes of Bildung. The research concerning processes of transformative Bildung examines the subject’s processes of understanding oneself and the world, and the associated double relationship of the subject with society: the
relationship towards social-functional performance and the associated social ability to act on the one hand and criticize social conditions on the other.

In this paper, the theory of transformative Bildung (Koller, 2012) will be presented as far as its central aspects are concerned. Furthermore, it will examine to what extent the theory of transformative learning can offer solutions for the problematic aspects of transformative Bildung. Concluding this, the subject-theoretical perspective (Holzkamp, 1993) on the examination of processes of Bildung will be presented. It will be shown that by using the subject-theoretical perspective not only does the retrospective analysis of processes of Bildung become possible but also the analysis of current processes of Bildung.

When the theory of transformative learning (Mezirow, 1991) is referred to in the course of this paper, it is as a learning theory and not as a theory of adult education. The following contribution concerns learning, not teaching or education. The point of interpretation is a subject-theoretical point of view (Ludwig, 2014). This primarily implies a certain understanding of the category of meaning. Nevertheless, all three theories (transformational learning according to Mezirow; transformative Bildung according to Marotzki, Koller & Nohl; subject-theoretical theory of learning according to Holzkamp and Ludwig) place the category of meaning in the center of their observations. They argue that meanings as interactive attributions are generated, changed and differentiated by the learners in the course of processes of learning and Bildung. From the perspective of a subject theory of learning, meanings are not only seen as being constructed interactively but also as the result of social, cultural and economic processes of production and reproduction.

Is There a Difference between Bildung and Learning?

Whenever this paper refers to Bildung, processes of understanding oneself and the world are meant. In the German-speaking world, the term “Selbstbildung (self-Bildung)” is used, expressing the idea that a person can only transform (bilden) himself or herself in relation to the world surrounding him or her. Both terms of Bildung (used here in the sense of understanding oneself and the world) and learning refer to different processes in the eyes of some authors (Marotzki & Koller). They form a stage model where learning is the lower process and Bildung the higher one. This is the main reason the theory of transformative Bildung can be strictly isolated from theories of learning. In this paper, however, the thesis will be presented that various problems concerning the theory of transformative Bildung can be solved with reference to theories of learning which understand learning both as a social action and as a cognitive operation.

The relationship between Bildung and learning as defined by the stage model is understandable if one considers the mainstream psychological theories of learning. According to mainstream psychology, learning is viewed as an inner psychic operation according to the information processing model and to which memory and updating functions are primarily attributed (Ludwig, 2012a, p. 84). Learning is considered on the whole to be a conditional process. Psychological learning research aims to optimize the potential to control learning. Thus, it becomes understandable that Bildung is distanced from this concept of learning.

However, the idea that learning and Bildung are empirically two different and distinguishable processes is disconcerting. In reality, the terms Bildung and learning refer to the same process. A quick look at the history of the terms of learning and Bildung shows that it is more a case of different discourses in which both terms are sometimes used for the concepts of gaining insight and self-reflection (Lorenz & Schröder, 2007; Göhlich & Zirsas, 2007, p. 61).

Instead of defining learning and Bildung using a stage model with the intention of empirically distinguishing both processes, it seems more appropriate to view Bildung and learning as different discourses on the same process of understanding the world and oneself. This relationship between Bildung and learning, which can be characterized as a difference in perspective, is possible using theories of learning that view learning as a social action. These theories of learning follow phenomenological, pragmatic (Mezirow, 1991) or, in the case of subject theory of learning (Holzkamp, 1993), a historic-cultural, tradition. Learning according to these theories is understood as a social action in which contextual meanings can be acquired and changed, and not as an intrasubjective cognitive process.

The Theory of Transformative Bildung and Its Unanswered Questions

Bildung is seen as a responsive process from the view of transformative Bildung. The process begins when something that is not understood or is unknown puts the existing structure of knowledge into question. Following this, the question arises as to how experiences of the unknown can be observed empirically (Koller, 2012, p. 15). Koller, with a strong biographical perspective on processes of Bildung, proposes answers on four dimensions: (a) on the structure of the relationship with the world and oneself; (b) on the occasions for processes of Bildung; (c) on processes of Bildung that lead to the formation of the new; and (d) on the methodological challenges of empirical research (Koller, 2012, p. 19).

On the Structure of the Relation to the World and the Self

Koller’s thoughts on the concept of transformative Bildung closely follow the work of Kokemohr, who came to two important conclusions. He understands Bildung as a process in which individual experiences “resist the subsumption amongst figures of a given concept of the self and the world” (Kokemohr, 2007, p. 21). This means that the individual experience cannot explain a social or natural phenomenon with existing knowledge and meanings. As a result the self and world references become critical. Secondly, he defines Bildung as a change in the fundamental figures in the concept of the self and the world (loc. cit. 14). This attribute of the fundamental or
categorical is the difference between learning and Bildung according to Kokemohr and Koller (by using a stage model of learning and Bildung). The transformation of the relation to oneself and the world is seen as a bundle of world views, identities, fundamental orientations and manners of speech.

Bildung primarily comprises complex attitudes towards society that are relevant for individual identity, for example, the courage to come out as a homosexual as opposed to hiding one’s own sexual identity (Kleiner & Koller, 2013). The subject of the relationship between oneself and the world is, according to Kokemohr, “social-referential” (Kokemohr, 2007, p. 22). With this category he wants to distinguish the person from self-referential conceptions which view the individual as autonomous and independent, and second the constitution of the subject through communication and language.

Process research on Bildung can integrate many approaches. In this manner, Koller adopts the concept of habitus from Bourdieu “as a type of connecting link between the objective conditions of existence and subjective action” (Koller, 2012, p. 26) in an attempt to understand the relative stability of the world orientation. Furthermore, identity-theoretical, psychoanalytical and power-theoretical references are made to conceptualize the ambivalence of the world orientation between stability and fragility. These concepts indicate that during processes of Bildung individual identity is always ambivalent. The identity is stable when confronted with new experiences on the one hand and fragile and in transformation on the other. In this manner, the fragility of identity can be seen as an occasion for Bildung and as a process which can be reconstructed (Koller, 2012, p. 44).

The structure of relationship between the self and world leaves more questions to be answered. The social-referential view of this relationship seems plausible from the point of biographical research, which Koller’s research on Bildung represents. Biography research is primarily concerned with self-examination and comprehensive patterns of interpretation. Koller (2012, p. 156) himself critically comments that biography research can be accused of forgetting the world. The relationship between the self and the world remains darkened on the part of the world as opposed to the subjects’ part. Questions concerning power, forms of recognition and social normalizations, which come to expression in individual attitudes, are, nevertheless, accounted for. However, the objects of economic, political and cultural processes of production and reproduction and the interests associated with these, which can be the occasion and object of educational processes, are not dealt with.

The needs, interests and intentions of people during their participation in society are not reflected upon. It seems the reference to Humboldt includes only the formal personal development. The understanding of the world would indeed remain dark according to this formal understanding of Bildung. If the idea of humanity according to Humboldt is to be preserved, the Bildung living and learning conditions, in both their empowering and restricting manifestations should be included in the empirical analysis of the transformation of subjective views. Social processes of selection can be found in manifest and latent forms in schools but also at institutes for further education. These processes of selection hinder people in their processes of Bildung, the development of themselves and their relationship with the world.

A further question can be asked in relation to fundamental orientations. Koller focuses especially on the stability of fundamental orientations and looks for difficulties in transforming them through Bildung. The matter in question is thus one of changing basic, fundamental views of the world. However, what is fundamental as opposed to non-fundamental? My views on peace, ecological sustainability in the world and social questions of gender would most likely qualify as being fundamental. But are my concerns about the vulnerability of my personal privacy also to be seen in this light? Legal, economic or political information in newspaper articles concerning the sale of WhatsApp to Facebook have the potential to make me question and change the way I use messaging services. They make me change the way I view privacy and the digital world. Is this not fundamental? Did Freire not initiate the change of the world views of the people who were affected by the processes of alphabetization? Where the line should be drawn between processes of information, learning and Bildung? Learning processes are also able to transform the self and world reference— not only biographical processes.

How does Mezirow view the relation to oneself and the world in his theory of transformative learning? Does the theory of transformative learning include the potential for solving some of the problems which are connected with transformative Bildung? As a researcher who belongs to the Anglo-American discourse, Mezirow does not differentiate between Bildung and learning. He does, however, differentiate between different forms of learning, which for him represent forms of reflection with which a person may relate to the world and create meaning. With meaning, a person gives sense to his or her experiences (Mezirow, 1997, p. 9). “Learning is understood as the process of using prior interpretation to construct a new or revised interpretation of the meaning of one’s experience as a guide to future action” (Mezirow, 2000, p. 5). Learning is the development of new meanings.

Mezirow views the category of reflection as equally important as the category of meaning. Transformative learning belongs to the high level of reflection able to change one’s perspectives of meaning. Meaning perspectives and meaning schemes have a formative influence on our thinking. Therefore transformative learning is basically for one’s thinking. Reflective learning (as opposed to non-reflective learning) inspects the problem itself, the process of solving the problem and the premises for acting (Mezirow, 1997, p. 88). The aim of reflective inquiry is the exposure of errors during learning. Although learning is conceived as a social action it remains primarily a rational operation.

Mezirow’s theory of transformative learning is inspired by social constructivism. Society may be seen in its social context but remains uncritical in its function. Individual experiences are only abstractly accounted for in their social reference (Clark & Wilson, 1991). The relation between the subject and the prevailing social boundaries and processes of selection is not elaborated upon. This is shown in the phases of transformation as described by Mezirow (1997, p. 143).
On the Occasions for Processes of Bildung

Koller and Kokemohr view processes of Bildung as responsive processes which, in view of the relative stability of the relationship between the world and the self, have their origin in experiences of crisis. Such experiences can be caused either socially or individually (Koller, 2012, p. 72). A large number of processes of Bildung are at work in everyday life. With these processes the subject is able to approach the world in a new manner of understanding. Starting in everyday life these processes are not necessarily independent of any pedagogical interventions but are also valid without any teaching.

The question remains open as to who initiates the occasions of Bildung. Here, Koller points to both the subject and society. This does not seem plausible. Society may be able to enforce constraints and have expectations, but only the subject can create the occasion for processes of Bildung.

Mezirow defines dilemmas as occasions for learning processes in a similar way to Koller. The process of transformation begins with a dilemma and develops in this manner “as false assumptions in structures of meaning are transformed by critical reflection” (Mezirow, 1997, p. 125). Additionally, although Mezirow refers to Adorno’s negative dialectic, he only addresses the aspect of the rise of an imbalance between perception and reality in a formal manner and not the historically specific social conditions or the individual experiences of society.

On Educational Processes and Methodical Challenges

Koller relates processes of Bildung to the formation of new knowledge. He refers to Oevermann, Gadamer, Derrida and Butler in order to find theoretical explanations and interpretational frameworks for the empirical reconstruction of processes of Bildung as the emergence of new knowledge. Thus the process of Bildung is bound to the generation of new knowledge. Asking what Bildung is equated with the development of new knowledge, it gains a positive definition by way of new knowledge (Koller, 2012, p. 167).

But is all knowledge that is new to a particular person always Bildung? Knowledge that enables people to suppress others can hardly be viewed as Bildung. It is almost impossible to positively determine Bildung because Bildung includes — with reference to Immanuel Kant — the mediation between the particular subject and society in general. For this reason it is better to define Bildung as a problematic term and to ask how Bildung becomes possible (Tenorth, 1997, p. 975). In this sense, the process of Bildung should be interrogated concerning conditions that hinder Bildung instead of binding Bildung to a particular knowledge of something.

If processes of Bildung encompass the mediation between the individual subjects with society in general, then far-reaching consequences for empirical research arise. If, finally, subjective meanings are always to be created in relation to social structures, then this will affect the methodical design. At this point it is not adequate to focus only on social structures as Koller (2012, p. 112) does when referring to Oevermann. Empirical research has to analyze the relation between subjective meanings and social structures and not solely the social structures.

A third bottleneck is created by the fact that Koller approaches process research on Bildung from a biographical perspective. The biography research includes the retrospective but not current processes of Bildung such as research on learning. The transformation of one’s fundamental orientations could be reconstructed in its current processes if process research on Bildung would be able to go beyond the biography, and also take actual transformations of meaning into account as research on learning currently does. The condition for this is a theory of learning that defines learning as a considered social action and analyzes learning as an understanding of oneself and the world, i.e., as a process of mediation between the individual and society. In this way, overpowering social and individual constraints could be reconstructed in biographical and actual transformations of meaning.

The subject-scientific theory learning continues here. Within this theory, learning is understood as social action which creates meanings in economic, political and cultural contexts. Furthermore, the possibility arises of analyzing learning not just as a rational process but as a socially framed action guided by interest and governed by historical and social possibilities and limitations.

A SUBJECT-THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE ON TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING AND BILDUNG

The following section provides an indication of how the subject-theoretical learning theory is able to solve some of the problems of transformative Bildung described earlier.

On the Structure of the Relation to the World and the Self

The point of departure in Holzkamp’s (1993) subject-scientific theory of learning is the “worldlessness” of psychological theories of learning. He seeks to overcome the worldlessness of behavioristic and cognitive theories of learning. Holzkamp explains learning as a possible “access of the subject to the factual-social world of social schemes of meaning” (Holzkamp, 1993, p. 118). He summarizes this access to the world as an “understanding of the self” (Holzkamp, 1995, p. 834) of people in their social context. Although Holzkamp (1983) does not use the term Bildung in his theoretical reflections on learning, all his thoughts are dedicated to the concept of the subject’s relation to the world and the self. The structure of the relation to the world and the self is characterized by the subject’s point of view and the associated participatory interests, as well as the concept of meaning.

The subject’s point of view is a social position from which the learning subject — guided by interest — relates to the possibilities of participation, i.e., the ability to act in society. Both aspects, the subject’s point of view and the concept of meaning,
enable learning to be reconstructed as a process in which a person transforms his or her relation to the world. The subject's point of view designates the biographical place where the person in question is considering his or her situation in life and social position and from where he or she sees the world with a view on possibilities for participation. The subject's point of view describes a social position and a relationship of the subject, underlain with interests, towards the participatory possibilities and limitations of society. This social position and personal situation means some horizons of meaning are accessible and some are not. Therefore the constitution of one's meaning is a social process and not only a cognitive or interactive one (Holzkamp, 1993, p. 264).

The relation to the world and the self is constituted by the acquisition and changing of meanings. Meanings are not only the result of alternating expectations of action but simultaneously an expression of the cultural, political, social and economic disposition of society. Subjects achieve participation in society through the use and constitution of meanings and only then are they connected to society as such social subjects. “Accordingly, the subject’s point of view is not just my point of view but “each mine” point of view; it is, as a generalized point of view of the subject, a special modality of the social and factual understanding of reality” (Holzkamp, 1996, p. 118), a modality that is characterized by the relation to the world, the self and the associated social positioning. It now becomes clear that the relationship between the world and the self changes biographically, not only over years, but also gradually along the many short processes in which the individual acquires and changes meanings.

“My” subjective possibility does not oppose social structures, but can only be comprehended and understood as in relation to the social existence/constellation of meanings. Individuals find themselves in relationships of possibility with the social structures of meaning and to themselves and therefore have the freedom to choose alternative forms of action. “My” relative ability to act describes the relation between available and non-available societal possibilities to act (Holzkamp, 1983). During the learner’s attempt to gain fuller participation in society and living conditions he or she has to deal with options and obstructions, which are historically influenced. The obstructions can be found both in external interests and in the individual, in his or her orientation, habitus etc. and therefore in his or personal situation. Holzkamp’s reflections are, at this stage, not just compatible with Bourdieu’s but also with numerous theories that do not view socialization as a polar concept between the individual on the one hand and society on the other.

The subject matter of the empirical analysis of learning processes is therefore the constitution and changing of meanings including the associated social possibilities and obstructions. Holzkamp is interested in the question of whether learners bow to existing social constraints and only learn defensively because of fear of reprisals (e.g. the fear of failing a test) or if they realize their own interests through learning, revealing obstructions and constraints and thus expanding the ability to act (e.g. learning interesting subjects at school or involvement in a social initiative).

Holzkamp calls the first form of reasons for learning defensive, the latter expansive. This expansive learning is the idea of Bildung, the connection between the particular individual action and society in general. Expansive learning is a leading idea and not an empirical definable fact (Holzkamp, 1990).

The concept of expansive learning is defined in a similar way to Bildung. Both cannot be empirically defined as a positive norm. In contrast, restrictive reasons to act or defensive reasons to learn (i.e., learning to pass an examination, not to extend the own ability to act) can be reconstructed empirically, because they limit the process of Bildung and refer to concrete individual or societal constraints or contradictions. Insofar as this reconstruction shows how the subject overcomes any constraint leading to a broader view of the situation, expansive reasons for learning can be assumed, but not be proven empirically. Expansive learning and Bildung are concepts which include more possibilities not only for the individual learner but also for society (for all people in a generalized sense). However, this cannot be empirically defined.

Holzkamp views learning as a specific manner of acting with the intention of overcoming constraints and to widen the social possibilities of action that are at the subject’s disposal (potentially expansive reasons to learn). The reconstruction of these learning processes as an analysis of reasoning on meanings, shows how the learner handles contradictory interests in teaching situations or in learning situations during everyday life. In this manner learning is analyzed as a process that always encompasses a relationship between the individual and society and which relates to social contradictions.

The different interpretations of the world or points of view of people can become “tangible as different forms of subjective realization of common possibilities of societal access” (FGL, 2004, p. 11). Holzkamp views learning as an expression of the „experience of the personal temporality and historicity” (Holzkamp, 1983, p. 336) of my own biography. These experiences define “my” personal subjectivity as an intentionality center.

Personal subjectivity as an intentionality center defines how societal possibilities to act and one’s own ability to act are experienced: as either a threat or constraint or as a space full of possibilities. The ability to act represents from the subject’s point of view a sufficient stand on the living conditions (Holzkamp, 1987, p. 15), which the subject represents as an individual horizon of meaning or knowledge about the world. A knowledge from which satisfactory premises to act can be derived.

In contrast, individual problems of acting are an expression of restricted access to the social possibilities. This can come into existence if people have not experienced specific social constellations of meaning or domains of knowledge or if these have been kept from them. It should be taken into consideration that not all people have the same access to social possibilities, depending on their social position. This extends to relations of power in which people are kept away from certain knowledge and societal possibilities to act by manifest and latent structures. Which social meanings are accessible depends mainly on the social position of the person which finds its expression in the relation to the world and the self.
This relation between subjectivity and societal possibilities and constraints is the central implication for research on transformative learning and Bildung. This relationship provides the possibility of analyzing learning as a reflected social process.

Occasions for Learning

Holzkamp agrees with many other learning theories or theories of Bildung that learning departs from dilemmas, conflicts and problems of action. Learning starts when the learner transforms her or his problem of action into a problem of learning. Learning, accordingly, does neither begin with the other peoples’ expectations to learn, nor with the order of the educational system, but only when the subject transforms its problem of acting into a problem of learning.

The individual can avoid problems of acting that arise on the basis of everyday life, in which she or he stays trapped in the immediacy of the situation (restrictive ability to act); or she or he can attempt to overcome the contradiction and problem through learning (generalized ability to act). Learning is understood as a specific form of reflected social action in which the original and primary general action becomes the action of reference. The action of learning is distinguished from the action of reference which has become problematic by a specific attitude of learning, i.e., the aim of the action becomes suspended, and distance and decentralization from the action are gained (Holzkamp, 1993, p. 184). Learning, in this light, is a specific, reflected form of a social act within which the problem of acting resulting in staying trapped in the immediacy of the given living conditions, should be overcome.

If any indication to the overcoming of subjectively experienced action problem is found in the individual reasons for learning, then it can be assumed that expansive reasons for learning (with the intention of a general ability to act) will dominate the learning actions. If learning is only to avoid restrictions, then defensive and contradictory reasons for learning will dominate (restrictive ability to act). Learning will lead to the abolition of the learning process if the pressure to learn is decreased.

The problem of action or the learning problematic is comparable with the crises providing the occasion to learn in the concept of transformative learning or transformative Bildung. The problem of acting or the problem of learning is, on a lower order than the term “crisis” as a point of departure for learning and, on the other hand, transcends the disappointment in the context of an individual “horizon of experience” (Koller, 2012, p. 77). This is because the emotionally founded restricted ability to act and the problem of participation are the objects of learning and not only the cognitive horizon of meaning.

Empirically, the most interesting question is to understand which conditions a problem of learning. Holzkamp conceives the answer as an “experience of action” (Holzkamp, 1993, p. 211) in the context of the primary discrepancy which has a specific quality of experience, a sense of inability to act (Holzkamp, 1993, p. 214) and which simultaneously creates an anticipation of being able to act in an improved way.

If, for example, someone repeatedly experiences conflicts with his or her senior but, whilst annoyed, notices that other colleagues are able to handle similar conflicts with more success, then an emotional state of mind can be induced which initiates learning. The experience of the discrepancy between an insufficient ability to act, and an expectation of being able to improve societal actions in a societal manner, can (but need not necessarily) form the point of departure for an action of learning which behaves as a learning “loop” (Lernschleife) towards the primary action of reference.

The example of the theoretical conception of the occasion for learning shows that Holzkamp’s theory of learning is very general. The theory can be applied in the sense of a heuristic for reconstructing real learning processes. With the heuristic idea of the concept of discrepancy, typical occasions for learning and resistance to learning can be reconstructed in various societal fields of action. The research currently available which continues Holzkamp’s line of thought mainly reconstructs these occasions for learning. An overview of this research can be found in Ludwig (2012b).

Learning Processes and Methodical Challenges

The process of learning can be understood in two categories, first, the specific determination of the learner belonging to a social position, second, the access to the structure of meaning belonging to the object of learning.

Holzkamp (1993) understands the specific determination of the learner as the result of the biography of the learner as well as his or her physical and language competency. The discussion on physicality and language are fairly rudimentary and more suited to serving as markers for further theoretical debate.

The biographical context of the learner is put into relation with the experience of one’s temporality and the classification of social position. The focus is on the personal situation seen as a result of biographical development and the associated experience of the world and the self (Holzkamp, 1993, p. 263). The relation to the world and self as a sum of biographical experiences and current position can be seen as a framework that admits certain actions of learning but not others. The question of research on learning is as to what can become the object of learning for the learner in his or her personal situation. The reasons for learning processes are to be found in both the factual-social meanings of the object of learning and in the learner’s personal situation (Holzkamp, 1993, p. 267). The contradictions associated with the personal and social situation are especially interesting for research on learning processes.

The learning process – providing as it does access to the structure of meaning belonging to the object of learning – can be expressed by a ratio between shallowness and depth. On the one hand the learning process can proceed on the surface without detecting deeper underlying structures. On the other hand changes are possible,
which are fundamental changes from the shallowness to deeper structures of social meanings belonging to the learning object. This change is normally called Bildung. From a subject-theoretical view, deepness of transformation is what Koller calls fundamental transformation. Learning processes can include both: deepness and shallowness. Both the learning object and the learning process can be touched by transformation.

The process of learning is characterized on the aspect of contents in a manner which renders the process of learning one of shallowness and depth in relation to societal knowledge. In this way, we can reconstruct how the learners, by their own accord, understand the object of learning in its factual and social context from a situation in which the world is accessible. In this manner, processes of learning and Bildung can be reconstructed during the act. In terms of the methodical design, longitudinal analysis, which is capable of recording the transformations, is necessary. The conditions and processes of analysis must be adequate for the object in question, i.e., it must be possible to relate the subjective reasons with the structures of meaning that exist in the situation of learning and acting. Although Holzkamp's learning theory offers this option for empirical research, there are currently no results from longitudinal analysis. Future research would be necessary in order to produce these results.
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