

# Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

This text is published on [www.ece-in-germany.info](http://www.ece-in-germany.info).  
Early Childhood Education Germany provides information  
on basic pedagogical approaches and current topics in  
early childhood education in Germany. All texts are freely  
accessible and can be downloaded for free as PDF files.

Early Childhood Education Germany –  
Professional learning resources is a project of  
FRÖBEL e.V. and Alice Salomon University of  
Applied Sciences (ASH). Early Childhood  
Education Germany contributes to the reflective  
practice of early childhood professionals.



**Alice Salomon Hochschule Berlin**  
University of Applied Sciences



**FRÖBEL**  
Kompetenz für Kinder

# Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

---

## ABSTRACT

Open pedagogy is a relatively new concept in early childhood education. It emerged around 30 years ago, and its influence has continued to grow since then. This is perhaps surprising as it began as a grass-roots movement. But open pedagogy is now being adopted by growing numbers of providers and teams because it has clear benefits and promises an education that is adapted to children's interests and needs. However, this growing popularity goes hand in hand with problems. These can be solved if the concept is applied pragmatically.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. A brief history of the emergence of open pedagogy
  - 2.1 On a key concept of open pedagogy, the “house for children”
  - 2.2 A model for a “house for children” from Reggio Emilia
3. Consequences for open pedagogy in large facilities
4. Internal differentiation of open pedagogy by forming “units”
5. Problems of combining age mixing and open pedagogy
6. “Age differentiation” in the care of children under and over three years
7. Opportunities for open pedagogy
8. Conclusion
9. Questions and further information
  - 9.1 Questions and tasks on engaging with the text
  - 9.2 Bibliography and recommended further reading
  - 9.3 Glossary

## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

### ABOUT THE AUTHOR

**Angelika von der Beek** holds a Diploma in Education and served as an educational consultant to municipal full day childcare centres in Hamburg for many years. Today she works as a freelance trainer and quality development consultant across Germany and in Luxembourg, Austria, South Tyrol and Switzerland. She collaborated with a carpenter and with early childhood professionals to develop the “Hamburg Spatial Design Concept”.

## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

### 1. Introduction

“Open pedagogy. New concept in Berlin childcare centre causes controversy” reads the headline of an article in the *Berliner Tagesspiegel* on 26 March 2018. The article concluded with, “Participation – that is what this conflict is about. But who does it refer to? The children? The early childhood educators? The parents? The parents are afraid that an atmosphere will develop in which the children are unable to internalise fundamental democratic values”. As can be read in the article, the provider based its proposal to introduce open pedagogy in its facilities on the idea of democracy. “It’s about more participation – for the children. participation as a living school for democracy”, said a representative of the provider. “Unfortunately, we didn’t get around to communicating this to the parents”.

#### The public debate on open pedagogy

It is probably rare for an educational concept for full day childcare centres to make headlines in a daily newspaper in the German capital. The article is illustrative for several reasons, not least because open pedagogy has been controversial since its beginnings. “Participation” or “co-determination” – by children, early childhood educators and parents – are key concepts that are “nebulous” to outsiders (Lill 2006, 3). They are reflected in the account of the apparently contradictory conflict in which the parents and the managing director of the provider were opposed to each other, but based their arguments on the same ideas. The private childcare provider for its part is representative of the broad spectrum of individuals and organisations that promote open pedagogy today. This spectrum extends from recently established private providers and long-standing social welfare agencies to teams and individuals. It includes the processes introduced by educational advisors in youth welfare offices in which all the municipal childcare centres within their sphere practise open pedagogy (cf. Gruber & Siegel 2008). The slight confusion that the article leaves behind is especially characteristic. What is open pedagogy?

#### The key characteristics of open work

*Open work is a form of child-centred education whose origins lie in a grass-roots movement that emerged from the criticism of existing conditions (in childcare centres). It revolutionised group education in group rooms through a very simple idea – namely turning functional corners into functional spaces – that can be implemented in any childcare centre.*

## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

From stationary to moving  
kindergartens

## 2. A brief history of the emergence of open work

The starting point for open pedagogy was the desire in the 1980s, grounded in the importance of psychomotor development, to move away from “stationary kindergartens” and replace them with “moving kindergartens”. Open pedagogy was and is a response to the **changing living conditions** of children and families. Above all, it seeks to overcome egotistical group thinking and to replace it with a vision of a **“house for children”**. Early childhood educators are seen as **attachment figures**, but ones that the children can seek out. In open kindergartens, they become **specialists** who see it as their responsibility to consciously design content as educational tasks. One of the early childhood educators’ important tasks is to support the relationships that **children form with other children**. Teamwork is fostered with a brief, daily meeting; a so-called **“lightning round”**. **Rules** are important. However, they should be drawn up jointly with the children. **Free play** is prioritised; it consists of the “four freedoms”, namely that I can decide what, where, with whom and for how long I play. A new element is the redesign of interior spaces to form **functional spaces** and the high value placed on maintaining **proximity to nature in the outdoor areas**, alongside the importance of employing **everyday, natural** and **free** materials. An absolutely essential requirement is the **involvement of the parents** – and the provider – in the conceptual development as the facility becomes an open kindergarten (cf. Regel 1988; Regel & Kühne 2001; Regel & Wieland 1993).

The best mode of work  
for independence and  
self-education

This outline alone points to some of the stumbling blocks that mark the limits of open work. Or to put it another way, it sheds light on the points that require further attention if open work is to fulfil the standards that it sets itself, especially with regard to fostering good development in all children. However, advocates of open work, such as Gerlinde Lill (2006, 5), refer to other stumbling blocks in open work, first and foremost the problem that early childhood educators and teachers often find it difficult to see children as “actors in their own development”. As many studies on the issue of mindset in open work have been published (cf. Regel 2006; Regel & Santjer 2011), I examine other stumbling blocks in this article, focusing on ones in which the “triumph” of open work in recent years plays no small part. On this point, Gerhard Regel and Sonja Ahrens note: “From what was previously described as a grass-roots movement, a new development has emerged in recent years: openness is now being recommended from outside childcare centres. While in some cases this stems from the desires of the provider, or even the guidance that it issues, elsewhere some curriculums (Bavaria, Saxony-Anhalt) emphasise that open work is the best mode of work for fostering independence and self-education” (Regel & Ahrens 2016, 8).

## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

### 2.1 On a key concept of open work, the “house for children”

**The whole team takes  
responsibility for all  
children**

It is true that the “loneliness of the early childhood educator”, as Loris Malaguzzi, the “father” of the Reggio Emilia educational philosophy described it, must be overcome by firstly making two early childhood educators (who stand on an equal footing) responsible for each group and then making the whole team responsible for all children. However, it is equally important to consider the underlying conditions for this. In order to realise the vision of a “house for children”, the question of whether there are two, four, six or even more groups in the “house” is far from irrelevant. There is the organisational aspect of the number of groups, which is usually not based on educational principles – or what educational principles are there for having one- or six-group facilities? But besides this aspect, the architecture plays a crucial role in a “house(!) for children”. As long as the children are cared for in groups, it is not of primary importance whether the facility for three groups has one floor or more, whether six groups are cared for in an elongated building, in an L- or U-shaped building, or around an atrium, or whether the paths between the various group rooms are long or short, or whether it is easy to orient oneself in the building or not.

**Spaces with functions are  
replaced with functional  
spaces**

What is important for group education in group rooms is how these rooms are furnished and how agreements are reached about the use of the additional rooms, such as the sports hall. As soon as the “house” is opened to the children, questions that were once simply not significant become important. By taking the simple step of transforming group rooms with “functional corners” into “spaces with functions or focus areas”, the **whole** facility can be made available to the children. Yet as ingenious and as simple to implement as this idea may be, just as inevitably problems arise that previously did not exist or only in an understated form. The most important factor is the size of the centre. As a rule, it is administrative and financial reasons that lead municipalities to favour a particular size of childcare centre for efficiency reasons, or an analysis of the demand situation may lead a private provider to opt for a certain size. Due to considerations such as these, in every case, the reasons underlying the size of a childcare centre are not educational. These considerations are, of course, legitimate, but they are of no relevance to the educational concept. For this reason, group education concepts – that is to say, all the concepts developed by educational reform movements, from the Montessori, Waldorf and Freinet philosophies to the situational approach – do not see the use of the building as a problem in principle, as each group works independently.

## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

### 2.2 A model for a “house for children” from Reggio Emilia

#### A “house for children” in the Reggio Emilia educational philosophy

An exception to this is the Reggio Emilia educational philosophy (cf. Knauf 2017), which, despite its group education ethos, sees a close link between the building and education because it follows a particular organisational principle. Since its beginnings in the 1960s to this day, the *scuola dell'infanzia*<sup>1</sup>, a childcare centre for three- to six-year-olds, has been formed of three groups, no more and no less. There are several reasons in favour of establishing “houses for children” with three groups. In the Reggio Emilia approach, the most important factor is that it is necessary to have one building for three different year groups so that the childcare centre can be organised into same-age groups for children aged three to six. This is because the children move rooms with their early childhood educator each year; hence, three rooms plus additional rooms are required for three year groups. It follows that two rooms (plus additional rooms) are insufficient for three year groups, and similarly that four or five rooms (plus additional rooms) are not economically expedient for just three year groups. While there are educational reasons for the three-group limit in the Reggio Emilia approach, the number of children in the groups is determined based on administrative requirements. In 2018, these requirements resulted in 27 children, hence 81 in total, being cared for in the elementary groups, with two early childhood educators overseeing each group. A consequence of the three-group limit is that the six early childhood educators – who are all on an equal footing – and the *atelierista*<sup>2</sup> form a team that is easily manageable. In addition to these members, there is also a cook in every facility and the assistants.

### 3. Consequences for open pedagogy in large facilities

#### The link between the size of the building and open work

Drawing on the experiences gathered with the Reggio Emilia educational philosophy over more than five decades on the link between the educational concept, organisation, the size of the facility, its team and architecture, specifically working in three groups, the following conclusions can be drawn for the discussion of the limits of open work: the three-group limit restricts the number of children that are cared for by a team and the number of early childhood teachers in such a way that a group capable of interacting is formed.

1 Directly translated, this means “school for childhood”

2 An *atelierista* is an art teacher or artist who leads the *atelier*, the art studio that can be found in every childcare centre. As this teacher is not responsible for group work, he or she assumes something akin to an informal leadership role, given that there is no on-site management level in Reggio Emilia childcare centres and crèches. Instead, the supervisory role is assumed by the *pedagogista* (educational advisor), who oversees four to five facilities.

## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

It thus avoids having a large number of actors who must make daily arrangements and form a team. The number of rooms available to the three groups is also clearly conceivable. By limiting the number of groups to three, the architecture can easily be designed with a room configuration that enables the children to orient themselves easily.

The Reggio Emilia example demonstrates that both recommendations for the construction of new builds and in particular for existing large facilities can be drawn from it if open pedagogy is to be practised in these centres. In order to limit the number of children and to ensure that the team members are able to interact and that the children can orient themselves in the space, “units” should be formed in large facilities, for instance those with five groups. Three groups and two groups would then come together to practise open work, or, where there are six groups, two groups of three would work together. If there are four groups, it should be considered whether it would be better to divide them into two groups of two that practise open work together, especially if the facility has two or more floors. However, this example clearly reveals that giving general recommendations is difficult in the light of the widely varying underlying architectural and organisational conditions in German kindergartens and childcare centres.

### 4. Internal differentiation of open work by forming “units”

#### The organisation of open pedagogy

More than 20 years' experience in initiating and facilitating open pedagogy processes in childcare centres in Germany and other German-speaking countries have shown that it is considerably easier to practise open pedagogy in small facilities than in larger ones. It is advisable to form units that practise open work; these units should be based on the ages and the number of children, but also on the facility's architecture. It would not be advisable to attempt open pedagogy across several floors where functional spaces have been set up. This would mean that the children would have to go from the ground floor to the first floor to build, for example. In a two-storey facility with one group on the ground floor and two groups on the first floor, it could therefore make absolute sense for just the two top groups to practise open work in the functional spaces while the children on the ground floor are given the opportunities for group education that they need to meet their basic needs. In concrete terms, this means that the children on the ground floor would not have to go to the first floor in order to paint, build or engage in role play. Instead, they have these opportunities on their own floor, as is the case in a “traditional” group room. However, the mindset of the early childhood educators in an open pedagogy



## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

facility allows the children from the ground floor to go to the first floor to look for other playmates, another adult attachment figure or other play opportunities, and vice versa. However, if this freedom of movement results in the children spending the majority of their time in the staircase, it is time to ask what is not working in this setting.

### Age differentiation

This example of a combination of group education and open pedagogy in a single facility is a good opportunity to discuss the issue of age differentiation. Children aged from one to three, or from two to three, or from two to four, could be cared for on the ground floor. Here, too, the conditions are so varied – due to usually externally imposed factors, such as the age and number of children and the related calculation of the adult-to-child ratio in childcare centres – that a wide range of solutions can be found.

## 5. Problems of combining age mixing and open pedagogy

### Group education for children under three

In order to meet the special needs of the youngest children, it has been shown that continuing to practise group education with children under three is the best approach. This means that children under three are cared for separately from children over three, and that – as a general rule – open pedagogy is not practised with children under three. There is a need to distinguish between open work and age mixing. The concept of mixed-age groups has been a characteristic feature of the “situational approach” since the 1970s (Zimmer 1992, 257 ff.)<sup>3</sup>. However, age mixing was initially applied only to kindergartens, where same-age groups of three-, four- and five-year-olds were replaced with mixed-age groups of children aged from three to six.

### Reasons for age mixing in the situational approach

By adopting mixed-age groups, the situational approach advocated a “barrier-free kindergarten”, arguing that all children from a town district or municipality should go to their nearest kindergarten, without having to take forming a structure of same-age groups into account. The approach focused in particular on breaking down barriers to admitting disabled children into kindergartens or the joint care of disabled and non-disabled children, which is easier where there is a large age mix. “Age mixing” played an important part in the modernisation of the kindergarten and strengthened the rights of children and women. It emphasised, firstly, that children have a right to be cared for in communities of children, not just in their families, and secondly, that it is only childcare institutions that enable women to reconcile family and working life. To this end, the “opening up” of the kindergarten was promoted: by moving from half-day to extended opening hours, it was to be transformed into a full day kindergarten, and it should cater for both children under three and

<sup>3</sup> This remains rather unusual to date. Back in 1997, Ingeborg Becker-Textor and Martin Textor discussed “broad age mixing” in their book on the “diversity of forms” in the “open kindergarten” (cf. Becker-Textor & Textor 1997).

## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

schoolchildren.

This pragmatic solution of extending the hours during which care is offered in existing kindergartens and removing age limits did indeed dismantle former “barriers”, but it also created new problems. Anyone who observes practice carefully will see small groups of

children of – more or less – the same age immersed in intense play. They will hear the early childhood educators’ complaints about the problems of working with the little ones alongside the big ones, and their concern that they are not offering either age group enough.

### 6. “Age differentiation” in the care of children under and over three years

#### Limits to age mixing in open pedagogy

“Age mixing”, for instance a mixed-age group of two- to six-year-olds, becomes an issue when children’s self-directed activity is central to the educational concept. When such an approach is adopted, it becomes clear that age- or development-specific characteristics determine not only the spaces and materials used but also the daily routines and opportunities for forming groups. Moreover, the relationships offered by the early childhood educators and the engagement with topics that they facilitate depend on the children’s developmental level.

Bensel, Haug-Schnabel and Aselmeier noted the following in their 2015 study on age mixing, commissioned by the education trade union GEW Baden-Württemberg: “However, caring for a mixed-age group also poses challenges. Children aged one or two have different needs, developmental tasks and forms of thinking to kindergarten-age children. A significant amount of preparation time is needed to plan the day’s structure for different age groups. Given the demands of caring for younger children, not losing sight of the more independent older children and their needs requires a completely different kind of attention.

Furthermore, younger children have different needs in relation to the structural and personal characteristics of childcare centres, such as the spaces or adult-to-child ratio” (Bensel, Haug-Schnabel & Aselmeier 2015, 6).

#### The link between group work and open pedagogy in the same centre

The authors state all the relevant factors that must be considered if younger and older children are to be cared for together. It follows from this that attempts should not be made at great effort to meet the different needs in a single group or through open work. Rather, the younger and older children should be cared for separately so that, in the same facility, group work with children under three can be combined with open work with children over three.

## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

The above study on age mixing for GEW Baden-Württemberg also refers to the falling proportion of mixed-age groups for children under three: “To avoid the high demands of mixed-age education, increasingly a ‘practical’ solution is chosen. Between 2007 and 2012, the proportion of mixed-age groups within the possible group types in childcare centres for under-threes fell significantly from 57 per cent to 49 per cent (Bertelsmann Stiftung 2013). By contrast, the number of purely crèche groups rose in the same period from 36 to 43 per cent.

This indicates that providers are aware that, given the existing underlying conditions, the process quality is not sufficient for properly facilitated age mixing. As a consequence, providers are making increasing use of crèche groups in which fewer mixed-age stimuli are available” (ibid., 31).

### Educational spaces for the youngest instead of “nests”

One solution proposed by advocates of open pedagogy to the problem of caring for children under three in open work (Lill 2006, 23 ff.) is to create “nests”. These “nests” appear problematic if they are used only for the settling-in period and quiet time, and at all other times, the younger children are to engage in activities alongside their older peers. Instead, it would be advisable to provide the children with a “base station” in the educational rooms (von der Beek 2014). This entails furnishing the rooms in such a way that the children can meet their basic needs for food, sleep, movement, play and creativity there. A connection to the rooms for children over three – hopefully an architecturally successful one – can be used to enter the older children’s open area at their own pace. But if only a small number of children under three are admitted in order to maintain a minimum service or for needs-based reasons, and hence the question of whether the childcare centre can continue to practise open work is raised, a “nest” for these children could be a sensible solution. It should be furnished to make it as stimulating as possible so that the children do not flee the nest out of boredom.

One contribution to furthering the discussion on combining age mixing and open work that is worth noting is the findings of the study by Bensel, Haug-Schnabel and Aselmeier: “Open work often, although not necessarily, goes hand in hand with age mixing as open work can also be found in same-age<sup>4</sup> crèche and kindergarten groups. Age grouping (mixed-age or same-age) and group structure (open or fixed groups) have (statistically) independent influences on process quality. The best process quality can be found in same-age groups with an open concept, and the lowest quality is found in mixed-age groups with a fixed group structure” (Bensel, Haug-Schnabel & Aselmeier 2015, 32).

4 “Same-age groups” is used here in a way that runs counter to my understanding. In this case, it refers to groups of children aged from nought/one to three years, and from three to six.

## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

### 7. Opportunities for open pedagogy

**Achieving higher process quality through open pedagogy**

The first and only comprehensive empirical study on the educational quality of German childcare centres to date (NUBBEK) was conducted in 2013 and involved around 2,000 children and their families. In the study, Tietze et al. reach the following conclusion: “Where open work is practised with kindergarten-age children, a higher process quality can be observed on both the KES-RZ and the KES-E scales than in centres where group-based work is practised. The differences are statistically significant for both measures; [...] Older children clearly experience a more differentiated offering and hence higher process quality where open work is practised” (Tietze et al. 2013, 78). This finding came as a surprise to many experts who had not considered open pedagogy before, and it brought great pleasure to open work practitioners. It demonstrates that quality improvements are being made in childcare centres, even without a “rolling reform” from the top as the “situational approach” advocated, and that these improvements stem from a grass-roots movement. These initiatives by individuals and teams were supported from the beginning – and here, too, support came from “below” – by individual educational consultants, trainers and supervisors and through peer observation and network building (cf. Braun & Dörfler 2018, 23 ff.) Whereas the first part of this article focused on stumbling blocks in open work, the following section discusses the opportunities for positive change in greater detail.

**More participation for children and more opportunities for creativity for early childhood educators**

Right at the beginning of her reflections on “Open Pedagogy: Prerequisites, Opportunities and Challenges”, Ursula Rabe-Kleberg makes “space” her central focus. “What space – this must be the question – do we give children in our society, how is it furnished, what opportunities for participation and creativity do children have within it, and what measures can childcare centres take to design a space for children that fosters education and movement, play and fun, and last but by no means least, participation in society and the community – or at least does not hinder it?” (Rabe-Kleberg). In her view, open pedagogy is able to remove or alleviate the restrictions that children are subject to in our society. By this, she refers first and foremost to the practice of driving children out of public spaces and in particular the shifting of activities from outdoors to indoors, the raising of so-called “indoor children”. On this point, she makes the following observation: “Across the world, children today are much less fit than their parents were at the same age. The structurally imposed lack of exercise, which goes hand in hand with the raising of ‘indoor children’, leads to obesity, diabetes and general problems in coordinating physical abilities in many children” (ibid.). The following section examines this reflection on children’s opportunities for participation and creativity in open work in practical terms by focusing on outlining the changes that can result from a different form of organisation and use of space. Open pedagogy is the only way in which loud activities can be separated from quiet ones.

## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

Open pedagogy is the only way to allow children to move as much as they want to, including outside the spaces traditionally provided for this purpose, such as the exercise room and the outdoor area, without it being an annoyance. It achieves this not only by allowing them to stand up and walk about, but also by giving them choices and allowing them to settle where they feel comfortable and can immerse themselves in play.

This is why open pedagogy must place special emphasis on the spatial design and selection of materials so that the children do not just, for example, run about. If the rooms encourage children to cavort about and the early childhood educators tolerate it, this is not responding to the children's needs but inadequate spatial design. Children do not want to cavort about. They want to engage; to this end, adults must offer them opportunities.

### The central importance of spatial design and selection of materials for work in functional spaces

Unlike work in group rooms, open work in functional spaces is the only way to create a space for movement everywhere – including where no such space was originally intended. A group room's function can be adapted without needing to fund an extension. However, having an exercise room serves no purpose if there are no early childhood educators in this room all the time and they cannot stay there when working in groups, or at least not for long enough. Open pedagogy is the only way in which an early childhood educator can oversee an exercise room without having to recruit additional staff. Otherwise, the children will do physical exercise in this room in groups only at specified times, or only a few children from each group will be allowed to romp about with foam blocks.

Open pedagogy is also the only way to allow all early childhood educators to specialise. If one expert in the childcare centre focuses on exercise, which is sometimes not easy, this traditionally neglected area will achieve the importance it deserves. This is because, as a rule, it is the exercise room – together with the outdoor area – that is the children's favourite. If the children are allowed to choose, they will "vote with their feet". For this reason, there is an internal logic to the spatial concept for open work that was developed in Hamburg: two or three groups share a dining room, which, in turn, means that the tables and chairs can be removed, and with just some small changes, completely normal group rooms can be transformed into stimulus-rich spaces for movement, making, building and role play (cf. von der Beek 2014).

### More time and space for movement

Yet if a childcare centre is to be redesigned based on the concept of open pedagogy, it is not enough to create an additional room for exercise or to turn a sports hall into an attractive exercise room. All the other rooms must also be adapted to children's needs to move both their own bodies and objects. It is therefore vital to consider which materials are body-friendly, to observe what the children like and what they do not, and to search for the right concepts for preparing the environment in the educational areas. Here, centres in search of suggestions can look to the idea of the "exercise building site" by Klaus

---

## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

Miedzinski (Fischer & Miedzinski 2006) for the exercise room, the idea that children “invent mathematics” when provided with “the same material in large quantities” (Lee 2010) for the building room, to the idea of “jeux dramatiques” or “dramatic games” (Frei 1990) for the role play room, and the wealth of ideas for the *atelier* (Seitz 2006; van Dieken, Effe & Metzler 2010).

### Children should be able to think as independently actors

The children should be able to use their bodies everywhere in the childcare centre and “think as actors” (cf. Schäfer & von der Beek 2013, 113 ff.). They should be able to think creatively and narratively everywhere by leaving traces and forming patterns, by expressing themselves and representing things, and by telling stories. Specialisation is intended for the adults, and here there should be only as much expertise as is necessary. By focusing on one area, the early childhood educators can acquire knowledge that enables them to foster intensive learning processes in the children. The children generally do not specialise; instead, they will quite naturally form connections between building and mathematics, for instance, or experiment with water and physics without being aware of it and without being able to give a name to it.

### Expert knowledge for early childhood educators

Thanks to their expert knowledge, the early childhood educators are better able to recognise how much mathematics there is in children’s buildings on the one hand and can provide more imaginative stimuli for further building activities on the other. Everyday practice shows that, after a while, early childhood educators with expert knowledge establish similar connections to those that the children form. They do not remain pigeonholed in an expert role; instead, they experience the full spectrum of their sphere. In the *atelier* for example, this could extend from drawing and painting to three-dimensional design. At the same time, they can discover the close links between areas such as creativity and expression, for instance by working with their colleagues who specialise in role play. It follows from this that early childhood educators can change expert roles – but in some cases only after a few years.

## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

### 8. Conclusion

#### Open to many concepts

Open pedagogy has diverse traditions that it rarely calls upon. They include the anti-authoritarian alternative childcare movement and the situational approach. Since its psychomotor beginnings and the pilot led by Axel Jan Wieland in Cuxhaven in caring for disabled and non-disabled children jointly, it has been committed to inclusion. However, it also incorporates many other concepts, such as those of Emmi Pikler, Elfriede Hengstenberg, Montessori, Freinet, Korczak and Marte Meo as well as learning stories. While this openness towards other approaches is logical, it also makes defining the nature of open work more difficult. Given that open pedagogy shares a fundamental humanism and child centricity with all the other approaches mentioned, this article focused on the genuinely new idea – one that is ingenious in its simplicity and far-reaching in its consequences – of transforming functional corners in group rooms into functional spaces. It is hoped that the account here will further the necessary discussion on the limits and opportunities of open pedagogy.

### 9. Questions and further information

#### 9.1 Questions and tasks on engaging with the text



##### QUESTION 1:

Is the distinction between open work and age mixing as organisational forms clear to you? Whether your answer is yes or no, give reasons for your response.



##### QUESTION 2:

What is the proposed solution to the problem of large facilities in open work?



##### TASK 3:

Describe the opportunities for open work set out in the article.

## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

## 9.2 Bibliography and recommended further reading

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Becker-Textor, I. & Textor, M. (1997): *Der offene Kindergarten – Vielfalt der Formen*. Freiburg, Basel, Vienna: Herder Verlag.
- Bensel, J., Haug-Schnabel, G. & Aselmeier, M. (2015): "Prozessqualität in verschiedenen Formen der Altersmischung in der Kindertagesbetreuung – Macht's die Mischung?" Studie im Auftrag der GEW Baden-Württemberg, Stuttgart.
- Braun, R. & Dörfler, M. (2018). "Geschichte(n) der Offenen Arbeit." In: Gruber, R. & Siegel, B. (eds.): *Offene Arbeit im Kindergarten*. Weimar and Berlin: verlag das netz, pp. 23-30.
- Fischer, K. & Miedzinski, K. (2006): *Die neue Bewegungsbaustelle*. Dortmund: Borgmann Verlag.
- Frei, H. (1990): *Jeux Dramatiques mit Kindern*. Oberhofen: Zytglogge.
- Gruber, R. & Siegel, B. (eds.) (2008): *Offene Arbeit im Kindergarten*. Weimar and Berlin: verlag das netz.
- Knauf, T. (2017): "Reggio-Pädagogik". Available online from: <https://www.kita-fachtexte.de/de/fachtexte-finden/reggio-paedagogik>, accessed on 09/10/2018
- Lee, K. (2010): *Kinder erfinden Mathematik. Gestaltendes Tätigsein mit gleichem Material in großer Menge*. Weimar and Berlin: verlag das netz. Betrifft KINDER extra.
- Lill, G. (2006): *Einblicke in offene Arbeit*. Weimar and Berlin: verlag das netz.
- Rabe-Kleberg, U. (2017): "Offene Arbeit: Voraussetzungen, Chancen und Herausforderungen." Fachimpuls auf der Eröffnungsveranstaltung zum Projekt „Offene Arbeit in sächsischen Kindertageseinrichtungen“ Dresden, 09/02/2017. Available online from: [http://oa-sachsen.de/tl\\_files/oais/Bilder/Rabe-Kleberg\\_Fachvortrag.pdf](http://oa-sachsen.de/tl_files/oais/Bilder/Rabe-Kleberg_Fachvortrag.pdf), accessed on 28/11/2018
- Regel, G. (ed.) (1988): *Psychomotorik im Kindergarten II*. Hamburg: E.B.-Verlag Rissen.
- Regel, G. & Ahrens, S. (2016): *Offene Arbeit in der Kita*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Regel, G. & Kühne, T. (2001): *Arbeit im offenen Kindergarten*. Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder.
- Regel, G. & Wieland, A.J. (eds.) (1993): *Offener Kindergarten konkret*. Hamburg: E.B.-Verlag-Rissen.
- Regel, G. (2006): *Plädoyer für eine offene Pädagogik der Achtsamkeit*. Berlin: EB-Verlag Dr.Brandt.
- Regel, G. & Santjer, U. (eds.) (2011): *Offener Kindergarten konkret in seiner Weiterentwicklung*. Berlin: E.B.-Verlag Dr. Brandt.
- Schäfer, G.E. & von der Beek, A. (2013): *Didaktik in der frühen Kindheit*. Weimar and Berlin: verlag das netz.
- Seitz, M. (2006): *Kinderatelier*. Seelze-Velber: Kallmeyer.
- Tietze, W., Becker-Stoll, F., Bensel, J., Eckhardt, A. G., Haug-Schnabel, G., Kalicki, B. & Leyendecker, B. (eds.) (2013): *NUBBEK. Nationale Untersuchung zur Bildung, Betreuung und Erziehung in der frühen Kindheit*. Weimar, Berlin: verlag das netz.
- van Dieken, C., Effe, B. & Metzler, B. (2010): *Kinderkunstwerkstatt*. Weimar and Berlin: verlag das netz.
- von der Beek, A. (2014): *Bildungsräume für Kinder von Null bis Drei*. Weimar and Berlin: verlag das netz.
- von der Beek, A. (2014): *Bildungsräume für Kinder von Drei bis Sechs*. Weimar and Berlin: verlag das netz.



## Open Pedagogy – Opportunities and Limits

by Angelika von der Beek

von der Beek, A. (2016): *Kindergarten im Wandel*, verlag das netz, 2016, DVD Zimmer, J. (Hrsg.) (1992): *Enzyklopädie Erziehungswissenschaft. Vol. 6. Erziehung in früher Kindheit*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.

### RECOMMENDED FURTHER READING

Rabe-Kleeberg, U.(2017): "Offene Arbeit: Voraussetzungen, Chancen und Herausforderungen." *Fachimpuls auf der Eröffnungsveranstaltung zum Projekt „Offene Arbeit in sächsischen Kindertageseinrichtungen“* Dresden, 09/02/2017. Available online from: [http://oa-sachsen.de/tl\\_files/oais/Bilder/Rabe-Kleberg\\_Fachvortrag.pdf](http://oa-sachsen.de/tl_files/oais/Bilder/Rabe-Kleberg_Fachvortrag.pdf), accessed on 28/11/2018

von der Beek, A. (2014): *Bildungsräume für Kinder von Null bis Drei*. Weimar and Berlin: verlag das netz.

von der Beek, A. (2014): *Bildungsräume für Kinder von Drei bis Sechs*. Weimar and Berlin: verlag das netz.

## 9.3 Glossary

**Open work** is a form of child-centred education whose origins lie in a grass-roots movement that emerged from criticism of existing conditions (in childcare centres). It revolutionised group education in group rooms through a very simple idea – turning functional corners into functional spaces – that can be implemented in any childcare centre.

The series *KiTa Fachtexte* is a collaboration between Alice Salomon University, the FRÖBEL Group and the professional development initiative for early childhood practitioners *Weiterbildungsinitiative Frühpädagogische Fachkräfte (WiFF)*. The series aims to support teaching staff and students at universities and practitioners in crèches and childcare centres by presenting the latest articles for study and practice. All the articles in the series are available online at: [www.kita-fachtexte.de](http://www.kita-fachtexte.de)

#### Suggested citation:

von der Beek, Angelika: Open Work – Opportunities and Limits.  
Available from: <http://www.kita-fachtexte.de> XXXX (Insert the full URL here).  
Accessed on DD/MM/YYYY