

Éditorial/Editorial

Blaine E. Hatt

There is an adage in Education that is attributed to John C. Maxwell (2014), an American author and leadership expert, that affirms, “Students don’t care how much you know until they know how much you care.” This adage, which I have used on numerous occasions while working with pre-service teachers, is extremely applicable to the articles that constitute this issue of Canadian Journal of Education. Maxwell’s assertion embodies the essence of pedagogical relationality and speaks directly to the role that the pedagogue, as adult, has to the vulnerability of the child. Such vulnerability calls upon the pedagogue to act with appropriateness, intentionality, and responsibility to value, validate, and vouchsafe each child. van Manen (2012) suggests that such contact emanates from teachers who possess pedagogical sensitivity and translates “into the pedagogical practices of care, respect, worth, responsibility, and love” (p. 25).

Specifically, it is the practice of care that undergirds the article written by Jansen, Levine and Sutherland, entitled: *Improving educational experiences for children in our care*. The authors address the issue of children in care being displaced from their homes and communities and often being dispossessed by a school system that is paradoxically intended to support them. Children in care are often further victimized by the educational system which manifests itself in disruptive behavioural problems and student withdrawal or disconnection resulting in low academic achievement and high dropout rates. The early exit of children in care from school translates into fewer children in “our” care graduating and/or entering into colleges or universities. The authors advocate an ethic of hospitality that is foundationally based on an ethical engagement between educators and children characterized by dialoguing, listening, and learning from the Other.

Falkenberg and Krepski’s article, *On conceptualizing child well-being: Drawing on disciplinary understandings of childhood*, advances the thesis that the wellbeing of children should be conceptualized differently from that of adults. The authors develop an integrative view of childhood drawn from an examination of four disciplinary understandings (psychology, sociology, philosophy, and child rights movement) and conclude

that as adults, our understanding of childhood ‘matters’ to our understanding of child wellbeing and that understanding directs our engagement with children. A salient point that the authors make is that childhood is not confluent with adulthood or variations thereof and that ‘childhood matters in its own right’ and should be viewed and valued as such from an interdisciplinary perspective.

Yee and Butler, in *Decolonizing possibilities in special education services* contend that colonial contexts detrimentally shape the experiences of Indigenous students, particularly those diagnosed, often erroneously, as special needs students. A lack of care supplants the Indigenous concept that knowledge is constructed from an identity of a person in a place, that it is highly subjective, personalized, and contextualized with a Western educational belief, and that knowledge is objective, removed from the vicissitudes of personal and contextual factors. The influence of colonialism negates the Indigenous notions that emphasize the contribution of the individual to the community and the contribution of the community to the individual. The authors present a series of recommendations that might well lead to a possible solution of systemic exclusion practices directed toward Indigenous students, especially those with special needs, including holistic measurement practices that privilege Indigenous cultural perspectives and decolonizing teaching approaches.

The concept of pedagogical relationality and the call of the vulnerability of the child on the adult is given an antithetical twist in the article written by Jackson, McLellan, Frey and Rauti entitled, *Are there types of academically entitled students?* The answer to their rhetorical inquiry is found in their research and the identification of five clusters of entitled students: entitled narcissists, entitled non-narcissists, unobtrusive entitlement, not entitled, and performance avoidance. This paper presents an interesting perspective for educators who have experienced first-hand the vicissitudes of student entitlement. The authors maintain that entitlement manifests itself in different forms, from a demand for higher grades based on a consumer model of post-secondary education, to passive-aggressive behavior(s) as a way of coping with the stress and anxiety of higher education, to fear of failure as a result of surface learning as opposed to deep learning, or, to an over-confidence in academic and scholarly abilities. Whatever the impetus for entitlement behaviours or expectations, the contact within the pedagogical relationship dramatically shifts as the child, now young adult, camouflages her/his vulnerability and insists the pedagogue, now andragogue (one who employs methods or techniques to educate adults), acquiesce to the pressures of entitlement.

The paper written by Milley and Butler, entitled *Teacher candidates' policy agenda to reframe the meaning of citizenship in Ontario secondary school curriculum* structures its discourse around the lived experiences of four pre-service teachers teaching Canadian and World Studies 9 and 10. Policy agenda refers to the latitude pre-service teachers take in shaping content and instruction to reflect their own professional judgement, values, and beliefs. In the context of citizenship education, each of the four pre-service teachers through the implicitness of their teacher lived curriculum explicitly impact the worldview of their students' lived curricula. The authors identify five dimensions of citizenship – political, public, cultural, juridical, and economic and illustrate that despite the requirements of overall expectations and specific expectations within the civics course, pre-service teachers, individually, creatively use the mandated curriculum to achieve their own ideas of citizenship education. This introduces a subjective element into the pedagogical relationality where content and pedagogy are not necessarily aligned to meet the required needs of the students but the exclusive needs of the educator.

As can be seen from the foregoing, each of the papers in this issue of *Canadian Journal of Education* examines in varying degrees the element of vulnerability in the pedagogical relationality between adult and child. Together, they present to the reader informed and informing perspectives of the varying degrees of pedagogical sensitivities that are requisite in adult to child/young adult contact. Enjoy the read(s)!

References

- Maxwell, J. (2014). Inspiring quotes teachers jar preview. Free Spirit Publishing. Retrieved from <https://www.freespirit.com/files/original/Inspiring-Quotes-Teachers-Jar-preview-1.pdf>
- van Manen, M. (2012). The call of pedagogy as the call of contact. *Phenomenology & Practice*, 6 (2), pp. 8-34.