

CHAPTER ONE

AN ESSENCE ANALYSIS OF THE SITUATION OF EDUCATING

W. A. Landman

1.1 INTRODUCTION: *The fundamental pedagogical structures*

The teacher has educating children as a calling that is entrusted to him(her). To be able to do this he(she) must understand what educating is. This means that he(she) must know what the *real essences* of educating are. That is, he(she) must know what *preconditions* have to be fulfilled before educating can be. What realities make educating possible? Asked differently: What are the real essences of an educative situation? Thus: what are the *fundamental* pedagogical structures and their essences?

When a pedagogical structure is described as fundamental, this means that it must necessarily be present before an educative situation can exist. These structures are essential characteristics that cannot be reasoned away, i.e., they are universally valid preconditions for, grounds, or fundamentals of the educative situation.

In an educative situation (pedagogic situation) educator(s) and educand(s) enter a particular relationship. They become involved in *educative relationships*. These educative relationships are:

1. the pedagogical relationship of trust,
2. the pedagogical relationship of understanding, and
3. the pedagogical relationship of authority.

These three relationships are also known as pedagogical *relationship structures* because if they are not realized an educative situation does not exist and educating is not possible. Realizing these real pedagogical essences is a precondition for an educative situation to

progress meaningfully. The event progresses in an educative situation as follows:

1. The pedagogical association,
2. The pedagogical encounter,
3. Responsibility for educative interference (engagement),
4. Pedagogical interference,
5. Return to pedagogical association,
6. Periodic breaking away.

The progression from the one event to the following one is known as the sequence of the educative event; it proceeds as mentioned (1-6) and is also known as the pedagogical *sequence structures*. The realization of the pedagogical relationship and sequence structures by an educator is known as *educative activities*.

In an educative situation, because of his need for support, a child is a child-in-need. He has a need for support of an adult who is able to enter into educative relationships with him as a child-in-education and to carry out educative activities. In other words, an educator is someone who can realize the pedagogical relationship and sequence structures with a child. This occurs with an eye to realizing the *aim* that the educator has with the child. Thus, the educative activities are directed to realizing an *educative aim*. This means that these activities are aim-directed. Being aim-directed presumes knowledge of the aim that must be realized. *Aim-knowledge* is a precondition for effectively educating. Hence, the educative aim is also a fundamental pedagogical structure, thus a real pedagogical essence.

Thus an educative situation is characterized by the presence of pedagogical relationship and sequence structures that are realized with an eye to the educative aim. In other words, the pedagogic situation has as fundamental structures the pedagogical relationship, sequence as well as *aim structures* (educative aim).

The pedagogical aim structures, that form the really essential, universally valid contents of being human to which the child is on the path, i.e., *adulthood*, are the following:

1. Meaningful existence,

2. Self-judgment and self-understanding,
3. Human dignity,
4. Morally independent choosing and acting,
5. Responsibility,
6. Norm identification,
7. Philosophy of life.

The educative activities of an educator are:

1. Realizing the pedagogical relationship structures,
2. Realizing the pedagogical sequence structures,
3. Realizing the pedagogical aim structures; i.e., the aim of the educative activities is educating a child [to adulthood].

An educator who wants to educate in a responsible way will *reflect on* his educative activities. He wants to understand them clearly. This means he must be in a position to describe and interpret them and be able to do so in understandable terms. Hence, he *reflects* on his activities and *verbalizes* them. This thinking about and verbalizing bring to light these educative activities as they essentially are. The educator keeps himself involved with thoughtfully verbalizing them. To verbalize means to show, to let appear, to listen to, to bring to light how a particular phenomenon (e.g., the educative activities) essentially and really is. Particular *words* are necessary for this to occur. Consequently, in verbalizing his educative activities not just any word(s) are used by the educator but only those *particular words* that will allow the real essences of his activities to appear. These particular words that he uses in his thoughtful verbalizing are called *categories*. Categories are *means of thinking* by which educative activities are *illuminated*. Those (pedagogicians) who practice pedagogics as a form of science are continually in search of *pedagogical categories* without which it is impossible to really understand the educative activities. The following are possible pedagogical categories:

1. Giving-meaning-with-*increasing*-responsibility,
2. *Gradually*- breaking-away-from-lack of exertion,
3. *Exemplifying-and-emulating* norms,
4. *Pedagogic*-venturing-with-each-other,
5. Gratefulness-for-*pedagogic*-security,

6. Responsibility-for-*educative*-relationships,
7. Hope-for-*future-adulthood*,
8. Designing-possibilities-for-*adulthood*,
9. *Gradual*-fulfillment of destination (adulthood),
10. *Increasing*-respect-for-human-dignity,
11. *Becoming-adult*-through-*increasing*-self-understanding,
12. *Conquering*-responsible-freedom.

Now it is also obvious that an educator who wants to act responsibly will continually try to *evaluate* his educative activities. Are they beneficial to a child's becoming adult? I.e., are his actions in educative situations pedagogically accountable? An educator will not be able to answer this question if he does not have at his disposal *criteria for evaluating* his actions. These criteria are also fundamental pedagogical structures because they are preconditions for insuring that the educative activities will progress meaningfully. These fundamental pedagogical structures (real pedagogical essences) are known as *pedagogical criteria*. These pedagogical criteria are nothing other than pedagogical categories that are used as evaluative criteria. This means that an educator now sees and understands the *evaluative significance* of the pedagogical categories and then applies them to evaluate his educative activities.

In summary: The fundamental pedagogical structures or the real pedagogical essences are:

1. the pedagogical relationship structures,
2. the pedagogical sequence structures,
3. the pedagogical aim structures,
4. the pedagogical categories and criteria.

Pedagogics is *essence-pedagogics*. This means that a scientist (a pedagogician) who studies the pedagogical situation will search for the *real essences* of the fundamental pedagogical structures or, in other words, for the real essences of the real essences of the pedagogical situation already mentioned (1-4). A pedagogician will try to find answers to the following questions, among others:

1. What are the real essences of each pedagogical relationship structure?

2. What are the mutual connections among the pedagogical relationship structures?
3. What are the real essences of each pedagogical sequence structure?
4. What are the mutual relationships among the pedagogical relationship and sequence structures?
5. What are the real essences of the pedagogical aim structures?
6. What are the real essences of the pedagogical criteria?
7. How are pedagogical criteria applied?

It is clear that everything said above has relevance for the *participants* in a pedagogical situation. Thus, a pedagogician must also inquire about the real essences of being-an-educand (seeker of support) and of being-an-educator (provider of support).

1.2 THE PEDAGOGICAL RELATIONSHIP STRUCTURES:

1.2.1 *The pedagogical relationship of trust*

A child has need for an adult in whom he has trust. He wants to be understood and supported in his situation of need by a trustworthy adult. He wants to experience emotional security and yearns for safety. A precondition for this experiencing and responding to his yearning is an adult who awakens trust in him, thus an adult who can establish a relationship of trust. Educating requires a sphere of trust, i.e., the presence of an adult who can protect a child against dangers but at the same time can support him in shifting the boundary of this safe space, thus an adult with whom he can enter the future.

There are at least two preconditions for a child to have trust in an adult:

1. Acceptance of the child as he *is* (i.e., unconditionally and without bias) and acceptance of what he can, will, must and ought to become (namely, an adult).
2. Respect for his dignity as a person (respect-for-dignity).^{*}

^{*} This will be discussed with the pedagogical aim structure *and* with the pedagogical categories.

The real essences of a pedagogical relationship of trust then are acceptance and respect-for-dignity. A pedagogician also searches for essences of essences. Thus, he searches for the essences of *acceptance*. When educators accept a child this means they are prepared to enter a particular relationship with him (an educative relationship) and that they intend to care for him. Consequently, two real essences of acceptance are:

1. Willingness to constitute a relationship, and
2. Intention to care for (take care of).

When the essence “willingness to constitute a relationship” is now analyzed more closely, the following essences of this essence are found: Educators are persons who are in a position and who also are prepared to *accept* a child in educative situations. This means they are prepared to pedagogically influence a child to progressively comply with the demands of propriety as an adult does. Further, they are prepared to influence the child with the way they exemplify adulthood (the norm-image of adulthood) to him so that he can emulate it. In addition, this means to make it possible for him to assume all of the responsibility that he is prepared to take. Thus, it is clear that the *active acceptance* of the educators occurs with a particular *aim*, i.e., to *bond* with a child so that they can support him to adulthood. Bonding is a precondition for educative relationships (relationship structures) to be intimate and for being able to accept real *responsibility* for a child’s becoming adult. By addressing a child as a “child” it is acknowledged that bonding is accomplished, that responsibility for him is accepted *and* that *co-existentiality* will be shown to him. This means that he will experience that he is welcome and that he is accepted with his potentialities without unworthy human motives playing a role. Acceptance also means that a child is addressed and listened to by an adult and that he addresses and listens to an adult so that they can go together into the future (*future-directedness/futurity*). Consequently, in an educative situation, an accepted child is regarded as *being-a-partner* (“Come stand by me so that I can help you”) and hence as *being-accompanied/guided* (“Now go with me on the way to adulthood”). *Regarding* a child as a partner and as accompanied are preconditions for him to want to properly exercise

his *being-a-participant*. An educator supports him to increasingly and progressively participate in the adult world with its particular demands of propriety. (The *italicized* words can be viewed as real essences of the pedagogical essence “willingness to constitute a relationship”).

Similarly, what are the real essences of the pedagogical essence “intention to care for”? Even before his birth a *caring space* is prepared for a child and the home (and school) remain a caring space up to and including his [eventual] independence from his educators. Within this caring space, *situations of acceptance* can now be created, i.e., opportunities can arise and also be created by which a child can experience that he is accepted (e.g., help with his problems, pocket-money, etc., etc.). Thus, in a situation of acceptance a child must experience that his educators lovingly care for him and are concerned about him because they have love for him. *Caring-out-of-love* then leads to *acting-in-love*. Various activities are carried out because an educator has love for a child. These activities are all real essences of pedagogical action-in-love. The following can be distinguished:

1. *Making-a-home*. There is a place in which a child feels at home. It is a space that is lovingly prepared *for him*.
2. *Establishing-nearness*. The distance between educator and child disappears. He is not distanced impersonally but is deemed to be a fellow person (a co-existence). Nearness is established in a pedagogical encounter.
3. *Admitting-into-our-space*. A child is accepted as a participant in an educative situation *along with* other participants. We-ness (being-us/we/our) is practiced and in an authentic educative situation the word “we” is often heard: *our* house, *our* church, *our* responsibility, *we* do so, etc.
4. *Turning-to-in-trust*. A child turns himself to an educator in whom he has trust. Turning-away is evidence of mistrust. A child turns himself to an educator and an educator turns himself to a child because both are *bearers of faces*. Only a *person* can turn his face to another *person*. An educative relationship is a face-to-face relationship.
5. *Accessibility*. An educator embraces (includes) a child with his loving acceptance. He is near a child and available when a

child has a need for him. He is ready and willing to establish a relationship with a child and wants to realize his intention to care for him.

6. *Belongingness*. An accepted child experiences the following: “I belong by you and you belong by me.” What emerges from the the adult’s educative intention to care for him is: “I belong by you for your sake.” The child experiences: “I belong by you primarily for my sake.” A pedagogical situation will then be characterized by “we belong by and with each other for our sake”. Then the educative aim, with the *norms* that speak through it, can become clearer.

1.2.2 *The pedagogical relationship of understanding (relationship of knowing)*

An educator must have knowledge of the essence of a child. This implies that he must know what the real essentials of child-being mean. In a pedagogical relationship of understanding (knowing) this involves pedagogical knowledge, i.e., knowledge of what the real essentials are of a child-in-education. This includes knowledge of a child-in-education at various levels of his becoming toward adulthood, e.g., knowledge of a toddler-in-education, an adolescent-in-education, etc. For example, he must know how a child sees the structure of his childlike lifeworld, what the role of educating is in the course of his becoming, what his essential activities and discoveries involve and how he attributes and experiences meaning in his being-on-the-way-to-adulthood. In addition, he must have knowledge of the learning child in a didactic situation, how he establishes and experiences social relationships, etc.

The relationship of knowing is more than a mere *knowledge-relation*, thus a relationship in which an educator is cognizant of certain dispositions of a child. In its real essence it is a *relationship of understanding*. He must understand the essence of being-a-child. This means that by knowing the essence of a child he will also have respect for his dignity. Consequently, he respects and understands the otherness of each child, that each child is someone who himself wants to be someone (Langeveld). The pedagogical relationship of knowing is a relationship of understanding when an educator understands that each child has the right to be an individual, i.e., to

be a being who is different from others and must be different (Langeveld). A child is not a “typical this” or a “typical that” but a unique person with a yearning to be-someone-himself.

The relationship of knowing also means that an educator must understand what a child’s destination is (adulthood). This implies that he must understand what the aim is of his educative work. He must also possess aim-knowledge, i.e., know and understand the universally valid contents of adulthood as the form of being human to which a child is on the way. He must also be able to interpret these contents in light of the level of becoming that a child has reached. For example, what does living the demands of propriety of adulthood mean from the perspective of a toddler? How and to what degree ought an adolescent live the norm image of adulthood?

The above implies that there is still another aspect of the relationship of knowing that requires attention: a child must increasingly arrive at an understanding of what being an educator involves. This means he must gradually understand what it is the educator refers to in an educative situation, thus what it is the educator represents in that situation. He must gradually understand that in the person of the educator there is representation of a selection from the world as it is (e.g., knowledge, subject matter knowledge) *and* as it ought to be (the normative, demands of propriety, the norm image of adulthood). He must understand that he is referred by the educator to the world with its demands of propriety, to the future with its demand-making design, especially the demand to perform tasks, and a readiness to accept responsibility.

1.2.3 The pedagogical relationship of authority

A child yearns for authority and sympathetic, authoritative guidance (Oberholzer). When two persons are with each other and one is seeking support and the other possesses the means to support him, a relationship of authority appears. In a pedagogical situation it is a relationship of pedagogical authority that for a child is of fundamental significance because he is not yet adult: the obligation to be obedient has a central place in his moral life.

Educating without authority is unthinkable (Langeveld). A relationship of authority is not only a precondition for the existence of a pedagogical situation but also guarantees its continued existence until a child lives the norm image of adulthood. In a relationship of authority a child is addressed by an educator and is called to responsibility. An educator is the representative of the demands of propriety and initially educative authority is coupled with his own person. A child first looks to his example as the authority figure but gradually he turns himself to the norms themselves and to the authority that is expressed by them.

Obedience is acceptance of authority and by obeying authority security is possible. In a pedagogical situation as a situation of security an educator provides sympathetic, authoritative guidance. Only when he is in a position to guide sympathetically and authoritatively can he realize educative activities and awaken a child's confidence.

Langeveld explains that educating to moral independence is educating to an authentic acknowledgment of authority. This acknowledgment includes obedience to the obligation to assume one's own responsibility to the extent that this is possible on the basis of a child's potentialities, age, schooling, etc.

Oberholzer explains this as follows: "There are those who want there to be no authority in educating; there are others who award it such a prominent place that educating really is synonymous with the exercise of authority. Whoever says educating means authority, and whoever will have no authority present may not speak of educating. There are prominent thinkers in the field of pedagogics who view the element of authority as precisely the characteristic of educative action. This does not mean that only a child is placed under authority; rather, also and especially an educator places himself under it. As one who obeys authority, via acknowledging it he can do nothing other than also lead and support an educand to increasing obedience. The authority is there to "protect" the freedom that a person is in such a way that the freedom that he must master will never impair his dignity."

1.3 THE MUTUAL CONNECTIONS AMONG THE PEDAGOGICAL RELATIONSHIP STRUCTURES

The pedagogical relationship structures are the relationships of trust, knowing and authority. It was already shown that each of these structures is a precondition for a pedagogical situation to exist. However, these fundamental pedagogical structures are not only preconditions for the possibility of an educative situation but each is also a precondition for the actualization of the other two. The actualization of the relationship of knowing is a precondition for actualizing the relationships of trust and authority, the relationship of trust for the knowing and authority relationships, and the relationship of authority for the relationships of knowing and trust.

Because of a relationship of knowing, educator and child accept each other as being-together in a pedagogical situation. A knowing educator accepts a child as exerciser of authority and a child accepts an educator as obeyer of authority. An educator engages because he *knows* who, to where and how he ought to engage, a child engages because he does not know but through the relationship of knowing he discovers that he does not know and the educator does know. Therefore, he can accept the educator as an authoritative guide.

A child ventures with an adult in whom he has trust because the adult understands him in his being a child. He trusts that an understanding adult will protect him and accept him with the aim of supporting him to adulthood. Hence, a relationship of knowing is a precondition for the possibility of a relationship of trust.

An adult appeals to a child to assume responsibility. If a child now understands this appeal within a relationship of authority and chooses to answer positively then his response is co-carried by a relationship of knowing such that he knowingly entrusts himself to the educator in a committed obedience to authority (Viljoen).

In an educative situation educator and child come close to each other and they have the opportunity to learn to know each other. Because of the relationship of trust that is already there this

knowing is a knowing-in-appreciation (Viljoen). Thus, a relationship of trust is a precondition for understanding, especially an appreciative understanding of each other.

1.4 REAL ESSENCES OF THE PEDAGOGICAL SEQUENCE STRUCTURES

1.4.1 *Introduction*

An educator is someone who is able to allow something to happen in an educative situation. He carries out a series of activities in which one arises from another. These are educative activities and are purposeful. Each educative activity is an attempt to support a child on his way to adulthood. Educative activities that promote a child's becoming adult are known as educating and they are given value. However, an educator's activities can fail and a series of failures can lead to a movement away from adulthood and then there is no mention of bringing up [educating] but of a pulling down (Langeveld).

It can also be said that the aim of each educative activity in an educative event is to promote actualizing the immediately following activity. The quality of the actualization of each also largely determines the quality of actualizing the following activities. For example, if pedagogical association is actualized on a low level or not at all there cannot be a progression to a pedagogical encounter, or it will result in such a weak pedagogical encounter that educative moments will scarcely or even confusedly show themselves.

Thus an educator tries to allow an educative event to take the most effective course possible. In other words, he provides for an adequate actualization of the pedagogical sequence structure.

1.4.2 *Pedagogical association*

In a pedagogical association or situation of pedagogic association an educator and an educand are *by* each other at the *same time* and in the *same place* and they are *aware* of the *presence* of each other. Langeveld calls this association a pedagogically preformed field because it is a precondition for the eventual purposeful pedagogical

interfering by an educator. It is a necessary step in the direction of interfering pedagogically.

In a pedagogical association educating is present because the association already gives an *indication* that pedagogical interfering can follow. This indication is the educator's becoming aware that he must accept responsibility for the further course of the educative event if this should appear to be necessary.

In a pedagogical situation of association educative moments (reasons for purposeful educative interfering) are not yet authentically or very clearly observable because a precondition for this is a progression from associating pedagogically to encountering pedagogically. Even so, there is already a *general controlling and direction-giving*, and thus educative influencing, because everywhere an adult and a not-yet-adult are in relationship with each other a relationship of authority is involved and where pedagogical authority appears so does educating (Langeveld); eventually purposeful pedagogic interfering becomes possible. Thus, it is for this reason that someone such as Perquin does not view pedagogical association merely as a pedagogically preformed field [i.e., precondition] but as a fundamental component of educating itself. By speaking of "association" instead of "*pedagogical* association" (in order to emphasize that it has to do with an educative situation), the non-purposeful (unintentional) "educative" influencing that an educator brings about is underestimated. Thus, it is also erroneous to say that a "situation of association progresses to an educative one". A situation of pedagogical association is *already* an educative situation although it must progress to the intimacy of a pedagogical encounter before reasons for pedagogical interfering (educative moments) will become genuinely observable.

1.4.3 *Pedagogical encounter*

The being-*by*-each-other of educator and educand (in pedagogic association) must necessarily progress to the being-*with*-each-other of a pedagogical encounter if eventual purposeful pedagogical interfering is to be possible.

A pedagogical encounter or situation of pedagogical encounter, by its pedagogical closeness, turning-to-in-trust, presence-in-trust, encircled-by-authority, experience of belongingness and accessibility, creates the possibility for educative moments to become observable.

In a pedagogical encounter, educator and child are sincerely attuned to each other and the child, as educand, is subjected to the educative aim. Pedagogic interfering with the educative aim in view is an event that has pedagogical encounter as a precondition. Langeveld explains that a child cannot be supported pedagogically if he is not encountered. The educator must encounter him personally and give guidance to him in the form of co-experiencing, giving examples, explaining, supporting, acting together and self-experiencing.

Oberholzer explains that a pedagogical encounter is characterized by a conspicuous and surprising attraction between educator and child and by a deeply rooted fondness of an educator for a child. There is a spontaneous readiness and continual willingness to be accessible to a child and to answer his call of distress. A pedagogical encounter succeeds when a child experiences safety and that the educator is willing to be *with* him and intends to care for him.

Consequently, a pedagogical encounter creates an intimate, spiritual attunement, a pedagogic atmosphere, the possibility for educative moments to become visible and thus the *possibility* to interfere pedagogically.

1.4.4 Pedagogical engagement (Assuming-responsibility-for-interfering)

In the immediately preceding section there is mention of the *possibility* of interfering pedagogically after educative moments have become visible. This means that an educator will not necessarily continue to give a course to the educative event. An educative event (realizing the pedagogical sequence structures) is not a “process” and thus does not follow a mechanical course. This means that pedagogical intervention does not automatically follow

when the educative moments become visible, i.e., after reasons for pedagogical interference have become clear. For example, an educator *may* not have noticed the educative moment(s). He can act as if he has not seen them or he might have noticed them but does not want to deal with them. However, he *might* not do the latter. The sequence moment in the educative event that now becomes clear is also a moment of “might not” [avoid], thus might not avoid assuming responsibility for interfering pedagogically. This moment is known as *engagement* or responsibility-for-[the]-relationship-[with-a-child]. Then an educator gives evidence of an awareness of his personal responsibility for a child’s becoming adult (Oberholzer) and the child is given the opportunity to show his awareness that he is a co-worker in his becoming adult. Thus, *engagement* means an encounter within which both [or all] of those involved in the course of an educative event take responsibility for what results from their pedagogical encounter. Without a conscious engagement the educative aim cannot be realized (E. Weniger). An educator who practices engagement sets for himself the task of purposefully interfering with a child, if necessary, and in this context it obligates him to be available for a child-in-education.

1.4.5 *Pedagogical interference*

The realization of the pedagogical relationship structures, pedagogical association, encounter and engagement make pedagogical interference possible on the basis of educative moments that have become visible. All of these actualized structures are *educative activities* that make possible a particular educative activity, i.e., pedagogical interference. It is confusing to speak of this sequence moment that follows after educative moments become visible as an educative activity, as certain pedagogicians do. This is because *all* of the activities of an educator that precede this moment are educative activities because each promotes the realization of the aim of educating. Consequently, the particular educative activity that follows when the educative moments become visible and engagement is accepted must be named in a particular and distinctive way; i.e., *pedagogical interference*.

Pedagogical interference can be of a two-fold nature. *First:* The educator shows disapproval of that which is in conflict with the

preference of values held (philosophy/view of life). The experience that he must express that he objects to what is disapproved forces him into the foreground. The notion of a new way of living that must be followed appears along with the question of how to proceed in order to allow the idea to break through to the child that what occurred must not be repeated. How must action be taken in a pedagogically permissible or proper way to make the new way of living permanent and firm? In this context a decision must be made because action must be taken. Objecting and merely putting a stop to the objectionable that occurred is not sufficient. Particular advice of a positive nature must be given; something positive must be suggested. The progression of what occurred and is objectionable must be interfered with and eventually eliminated but at the same time something positive and feasible must be put in its place. The educand must experience that the improper that he had done is in violation of the authority of the demand of propriety. Then the unconditional validity of the authority of norms becomes increasingly clearer and there is a clear breakthrough to idea of what is proper. Knowledge of good and bad, of what is proper and objectionable arise and connected with this is the idea and will to choose and act differently (Oberholzer). The form of pedagogic intervention just described can be known as *pedagogical intervention*.

Second: However, an educator does not only intervene pedagogically, i.e., only by objecting to the objectionable. He must also express his approval when a child acts positively to the pedagogical intervention motivated by his deviation from a particular value preference. Further: it is also a meaningful and necessary educative action to give approval to the approvable actions of a child: *pedagogical approval* is a pedagogically proper requirement. An educator must express appreciation when a child acts in accordance with the demands of propriety.

1.4.6 *Return to pedagogical association*

After the pedagogical interference is realized, its purposefulness is ended and there must be a return to pedagogical association (Langeveld) as quickly as possible and for the following reasons:

- i) This association creates the opportunity for the child to be himself and to become. He yearns to-be-someone-himself irrespective of his dependence on adults (Langeveld). He must be given the opportunity to assimilate the pedagogical interference and continue with the flourishing of his being-someone-himself.
- ii) A situation of pedagogical association creates the atmosphere in which a child can experience freedom. In reality what he experiences is partly being free and partly being bound. Eliminating this freedom leads to him not being independent. In the association he must be given the opportunity to assimilate valuations etc. from the educator's influences (Langeveld). He also must have a share in the educator's non-intentional educative influencing.
- iii) The association is the most natural milieu in which a child acquires his personal knowledge, his knowledge of social relationships, his involvement with nature and human creations. With all of this he acquires self-knowledge (Langeveld).

1.4.7 *Periodic breaking away*

There is the possibility that a child can and must withdraw himself completely from the educator's presence, e.g., by playing with his friends, doing his homework in isolation, etc. This event can be described as a breaking away from an educative situation. It is a separation for a shorter or longer period of time. In 1972, D. L. Hattingh, a student of the author, gave attention to the educative significance of such separating in a dissertation: 'The meaning of periodic breaking away from the pedagogical situation'. The following are a few excerpts from this dissertation.

1. Separating as periodic breaking away

The word "separate" is derived from the Greek "schizo" that means chasm, divide, separate, split or excise. It indicates that what belongs with each other is separated from each other.

Periodic breaking away means a particular separating. "Periodic" stems from the Greek word "periodos". "Peri" means "around" and

“hodos” means “way”. The verb has the meaning of “moving around everywhere”, “to complete a revolution” or “to study diligently”. From this it is indicated that this period is not an empty space but that something happens, indeed something significant in the sense of new experiences being acquired. “Periodic” is closely connected to the adjectival noun “periodicos” meaning “to acquire in wandering”, “recurring, non-permanent”. Included here is the idea of repetition. Thus, this is not a permanent separation but a separation that implies that what was separated in due course is brought together. This is in contrast to separation where there is no prospect of a reuniting such as in the case of a death or the dissolution of a marriage.

First, periodic separating creates the opportunity for periodically *practicing separation* so that the meaningful practice of a later total separation becomes possible. In practicing breaking away there is mention of a new mobility and disassociating although they are only partial because the child himself [must still learn to] take responsibility for what happens to him when someone else does not act as his own conscience. As a child progresses to greater independence and freedom he also arrives at a more authentic self-discovery.

Second, the significance of periodic breaking away is in the opportunity that is created for a child’s *wanting-to-be-someone* to thrive. Owing to his uniqueness, a child has his own way of being in the world. He wants to be himself, but someone who wants to be someone himself must necessarily think about the self that he wants to be and, what is more, he must practice being that self.

Because his being-someone-himself thrives in terms of norms, here there also is mention of the flourishing of his being-a-person. Periodic breaking away, then, is an opportunity for him to appropriate and actualize independently and on his own accountability his connectedness with reality and to do so in a stylish and normative way. Although this event cannot be limited to periodic breaking away, it can come to expression more fully during it and this emphasizes its necessity.

Third, periodic breaking away also gives rise to what can be called a creative pause. This is a pause within periodic breaking away in which a child comes to rest, to a standstill and thinks and in doing so assimilates, even deepens and thus creates for himself. What really happens is that he puts his personal stamp on things and events within his world but at the same time his horizon broadens/shifts. The pause is especially creative because he lingers with the uncertainties and non-predictabilities by which he creates new potentialities for himself that also strengthen his affective life because in this way he acquires more stability and confidence. This is why the educator, in resuming the educative relationships, discovers that the child has become different and this creates new possibilities for educating and it becomes more dynamic. Without this creative pause the event of educating will stagnate.

Fourth, it is also during periodic breaking away that a child comes into contact with unfamiliar things from the outside and his *preparedness* is put to the test. For an educator the value of this is that the degree of preparedness for [dealing with] unfamiliar influences is a criterion for the successfulness of his educating but it also is an indication of that to which he must give more attention. The educator must then be in a position when he again is involved in a conversation with the child in an educative situation to allay the confusions the child experiences and to put them in the correct perspective. In resuming his conversation with the child after the periodic breaking away, the educator must find out how this stands with the child, i.e., in what perspective he must place the demands of propriety which also means that he must evaluate what disposition the child manifests.

It is precisely under the influence of the unfamiliar, among which are mass-communication media, that a child intensely experiences his becoming morally independent when he is cast back on himself and is dependent on his own powers to pass moral judgments. Now there is not only an appeal made to his knowledge of the demands of propriety but also and especially to the degree that he can apply these demands as criteria (norms).

The authentic actualization of the fundamental pedagogical structures provides a child with a certain defense against anti-

pedagogical and anti-philosophy of life influences from outside and this defense or preparedness is strongly determined by his primary identification with his parents. If an educative situation is unsuccessful a child will receive a variety of signs from a very large area and he will identify with what is generally approvable but without a distinct personal conscience or feelings of guilt. Instead, there will be a vague anxiety and yearning, a fear really directed to nothing, as well as a fear of falling out of step with the masses and a continually urge to “adapt”, join the masses and gain experience.

Even so, to be a person-who-is-becoming is a way of being-in-the-world and it is necessary that a child be exposed periodically to a variety of influences to exercise deciding so that later he can practice what he firmly believes. In other words a child must have the opportunity to emancipate himself from the demands of propriety so that later, as an adult, he can responsibly implement the norms [themselves].

2. Leaving and saying farewell

Leaving is a *reciprocal* way of separating. For example, in an educative situation an educator releases himself from the child and the child releases himself from the educator. Thus, periodic breaking away is allowed. The child yearns to be released periodically but he leaves this choice and permission for this to the educator although he also acknowledges to the educator his yearning to be released. It is his wanting-to-be-someone-himself that allows this yearning to thrive.

Reciprocity refers to mutual *trust*, mutual respect for *dignity* and *acceptance*. In an educative situation this also means a *similar disposition* with respect to the objectionable and the allowable.

Unanimity with respect to particular demands of propriety is reached at a certain stage in an educative situation and this means a similar striving for that which is deemed to be worth pursuing. Reciprocity in this sense is also a test of whether or not it is advisable to allow the leaving to occur. In other words, in order to determine whether the breaking away indeed will be a leaving and not a fleeing. Unanimity with respect to the demands of propriety does not mean a unanimity regarding all of the demands of

propriety the educator represents but rather as much unanimity as is possible with what the educator has had in mind. Absolute unanimity is impossible because educator and child are both human beings and also because the child is on the way to adulthood.

Mutual trust means that the child trusts that the educator will not harm him but will lead him to the proper and that the adult has the trust that it is possible to lead him to what is proper.

Reciprocity as similar disposition regarding the demands of propriety means that a child is in agreement with the demands of propriety in so far as it is possible for him in his stage of becoming and understands and obeys what the demands the educator intervenes with. In other words, that he clearly accepts the unconditional validity of the authority of the norms presented to him and that there is a clear breakthrough of the idea of propriety and a will to properly choose and act.

Reciprocity as mutual acceptance and respect for dignity means that each has respect for the other's being different and potentialities. What is especially important here is that a child, as would be the case with breaking away during the educative interference, must not experience the feeling of pushing aside his freedom or his wanting to be someone himself. This also means respect for the fact that a child wants to and has the right to be alone. An educator has the obligation to urge the not-yet-adult to be alone momentarily.

The reciprocity of leaving is observable in the *greeting*. One who flees does not greet; taking leave with a greeting belongs to leaving properly. With the parting greeting it is made known *that* the one and *how* the one was and is for the other. A cold, antagonistic, polite, friendly, genial, etc. greeting is an indication of the degree of unanimity or reciprocity.

Leaving is characterized by a greeting indicating that being-together is temporarily ended such as with the words "goodbye", "see you soon", "until we meet again". A greeting also indicates that the educator continually is and will be accepting of the educand when he again returns to the educative situation.

The parting greeting of an educator is characterized by wishing the child well because in the period of absence he can no longer protect and care for him. The well wishing of a Christian educator is to entrust the child to the protection of God.

With the well wishing as also expressed by the greeting—“may it *go well* with you”—it is acknowledged that the greeter is familiar with the anti-pedagogic and anti-philosophy-of-life possibilities that are contained in the periodic breaking away. The situation during the breaking away is not predictable or always free of danger and not without meaning and also cannot be avoided because it must necessarily occur. The significance of maintaining norms in creating a safe space is thus factually transferred to the situation of periodic breaking away through the greeting.

Gradually a child learns to know the demands of propriety and knows how to maintain himself during the periodic breaking away. This occurs until he is ready for a final separation (to adulthood).

3. Fleeing as an indication of the failure of the pedagogical (educative event)

When fleeing is the way of leaving this means that the educator, along with the child, has not succeeded in actualizing the fundamental pedagogical structures. Then there can be shortcomings in the pedagogical relationship structures, the pedagogical sequence structures can go wrong, the pedagogical activities can be unauthentic or the pedagogical aim structures are not realized. These structures are so interwoven with each other that a failure in one area can play havoc with actualizing the other structures. When a child flees this also has many implications for his way of being involved during the periodic breaking away because it is just this situation that creates the opportunity for him to flee from his task of becoming a proper adult.

There are a variety of gradations and nuances in the experiential world of a child who flees. In this regard, the feeling of insecurity, rejection and being unwelcome certainly dominate and especially point to the failure of actualizing the relationship structures.

The one who flees also shows certain tendencies that indicate a failed pedagogical situation such as a lack of authoritativeness, mistrust, a labile affective life, aggression, lack of self-criticalness, aimlessness or a lack of perspective that proceed to an experience of one's own existence as meaningless.

4. Leaving as periodic breaking away from the educative situation

It has been indicted that leaving refers to mutuality between educator and educand and because of this the not-yet adult feels attracted to the adult and is attuned to a re-encounter while the educator continually makes himself pedagogically available. Because the educand does not flee and the educative relationship is not reduced to coercive disciplinary measures, for both the leaving is a timely elimination of the educative situation. With the prospect of reuniting and the transfer of the educative aim into the situation of breaking away, there also is mention here of periodically breaking away.

When there is mention of leaving as periodic breaking away, the positive significance of breaking away is stressed especially where it includes a necessary complement to the concrete educative situation. This also means that when a child flees, in the true sense of the word, there cannot be mention of periodic breaking away but rather of a separating where the child's resistance strongly enters the foreground and the period of breaking away is really an opportunity for fleeing during which very little of pedagogical significance can occur.

There are various reasons why educator and educand will take leave from each other and each reason can make a different contribution to the significance that periodic breaking away has for a child.

- a) *Leaving because of being satiated.* Leaving is separating because of satiation. Both educator and educand can experience that, for the time being, they "have had enough" of their educative togetherness. Thus, they are satiated and this creates a distance that can move to over-satiation and even to aversion if periodic breaking away is not allowed. Authentic leaving also presupposes mutuality and thus a satiation with the educative situation from both participants.

“Having had enough” appears when *fulfillment* and a *desire to be apart* appear.

Fulfillment can be described as that stage in the course of the educative event when a child *accepts* the demands of propriety as *obvious*. Satiation can change into over-satiation when an adult continues to discuss those demands of propriety that the child already accepts as obvious.

Desiring to be apart indicates that at a particular stage the not-yet adult for the time being no longer has a need for an adult to allow himself to feel safe and welcome.

To get an answer to the question of when periodic breaking away must be allowed it must also be determined at what moment satiation arises, i.e., when fulfillment and a desire to be apart appear. The introduction, interpretation and examination of norms first appears when there is purposeful interference with respect to particular norms by intervening and approving; that is, after educative moments have become visible. By approving it is affirmed that a child has made the right choice or by intervening he is introduced to what should be emulated. Only after normative choices have been made can a child, through further explanation, accept the norms as obvious. Thus it seems that, following these criteria, in each case allowing breaking away to occur can only be meaningful after there has been pedagogical interference. A child must also give evidence that he accepts the norms as obvious and this will only be possible after there is a return to pedagogical association when he is free to express himself about the matter.

- b) *Leaving out of necessity*. Leaving out of necessity arises from unforeseen circumstances or those out of the control of the educator. The normal course of the pedagogical event is then interrupted by an outsider or an unrelated event and breaking away is necessary. Authentic leaving in the sense of a mutual attunement regarding norms or of satiation is not done justice. Indeed, the pedagogical remains unfulfilled and the child experiences his need for support more intensely. A

continual interruption of the pedagogical event to such a degree that its course is not actualized, this eventually gives rise to pedagogical neglect. Then there is neglect, not because of unwillingness but because of impotence. Contemporary hurried life often encourages this state of affairs. A pedagogical crisis arises when periodic breaking away no longer functions as a necessary complement to the pedagogical but betrays the not-yet adult because of faulty educative situations.

5. The welcoming greeting as discontinuing the periodic breaking away [and returning to association]

It is meaningful that a return to associating be ushered in with a greeting because a greeting makes one's presence known. The manner of the greeting indicates how willing the adult is to be accessible, willing and available. A friendly greeting definitely will have a different effect on the course the pedagogical association than will a grumpy snarl. The latter makes an educative association impossible and awakens in the child a yearning to continue with the breaking away.

In the manner of greeting, the tone already determines a large variety of possible relationships. The greeter already involves the greeted in a particular relationship that awakens certain expectations in him. Thus, an impersonal greeting indicates a neutrality by which it is acknowledged that the greeter does not have a particular aim with his presence and the initiative for any further involvement is left to the one greeted. In contrast, a benevolent or considerate greeting is a particular indication of an aim by which a strong invitation is given to be close together. This greeting allows the greeter to entertain the expectation that there is the prospect of an affectionate-being-together and has the immediate aim of eliminating distance.

A pedagogical greeting includes more than making it known that someone is present. It especially refers to acknowledging a separated world and the desire to resume giving support in a temporarily interrupted relationship.

The greeting returned by the not-yet adult apprises the educator of his attitude toward the adult and also in this way informs him about how things went during the periodic breaking away. It is clear that an emotionally impeded child who withdraws from an emotionally charged situation will reveal in an unmistakable way that all is not well. For example, a deviant, meek, cold or stiff response already puts the educator on his guard. It is the task of an educator with a reunion after the breaking away as quickly as possible to find out how things are with the child, what “new” meanings he has given and if he is struggling or wrestling with something.

The disposition of a child toward the educator is also manifested in his returned greeting. For example, a polite and courteous greeting indicates that the relationships of authority and trust have not become shipwrecked during the breaking away. Through his greeting a child can also give evidence of his disposition toward the adult, his yearning or need for a re-encounter.

6. Returning to an educative situation

During breaking way other things have beset the child, other matters have become important, old experiences have been evaluated and new meanings have emerged. These changes are expressed in the degree of intimacy of the conversation. Intimacy is closely related to the degree of reliable knowledge of another person. This intimate knowledge again puts the educator in a position to interpret the meanings the child has given to his recently acquired experiences. Listening to what a child has to say enables the educator to reestablish their interrupted relationship of “we-ness” and continue it.

The success of the educative event with the return of the educand is going to depend on the degree of mutuality that has been attained. The mere fact that during periodic braking away a child has new experiences, that the “new” continually appears in his stream of thought, that new experiences acquire additional permanent meaning in the light of supporting experiences all bring about change. All of this prevents a mere repetition of something that remains the same. What is repeated is no longer the same and can no longer be restored in the present as it was. Perspectives have changed, what was merely on the horizon has moved to the center

of attention. Previous opportunities are actualized or appear to be impossible. Briefly, a child who re-enters the educative situation does so as a changed person and the educator who ignores this meaning of periodic breaking away cannot fully educate.

1.5 THE MUTUAL CONNECTIONS AMONG THE PEDAGOGICAL RELATIONSHIP AND SEQUENCE STRUCTURES

In the previous pages a description and explanation were first given of the pedagogical relationship structures and then of the pedagogical sequence structures. Now this does not mean that in a pedagogical situation the relationship structures must be realized before the sequence structures. Actualizing the pedagogical relationship structures is already educative activity. An educator allows these relationships to be realized as a precondition for his giving support to a child. The realization of the pedagogical relationship structures is only possible *while* the educative event is underway. An educator realizes the relationship structures to an increasing degree as the course of the educative event progresses.

The pedagogical relationship structures emerge in a *pedagogical association*. Here it begins to become clear that the educator will be prepared to take the responsibility for actualizing the pedagogical relationship structures. During the pedagogic association one notices an intensification of their actualization. It is precisely this intensification that makes a fundamental contribution to proceeding from pedagogical association to pedagogical encounter.

In a *pedagogical encounter* a further development of the pedagogical relationship structures is possible. An educator's responsibility for properly actualizing them is fulfilled and it is now possible for reasons for pedagogical interference to be noticed: educative moments become visible within the framework of the pedagogical relationship structures. The quality of actualizing these structures will determine the quality of the appearance of educative moments as well as the educator's further actions.

At this stage in the course [sequence] of the educative event an even more intense appearance and actualization of the pedagogical relationship structures is noticed and the educator experiences and

accepts the pedagogical *engagement* which leads him to *interfere pedagogically*. The appearance of educative moments and the acceptance of the obligation to interfere pedagogically in a still more intense way brings forth the pedagogical relationship structures even more intensely for actualization. The pedagogical interference then is realized in the light of pedagogical relationship structures that have been maximally actualized.

The schematic representation on the following page is an attempt to summarize what in this chapter has been described and explicated as real pedagogical essences.

1.6 THE STRUCTURE OF THE PEDAGOGICAL

A scientist begins his scientific practice by delimiting for himself a particular area from the human lifeworld. Thus, he proceeds to make the lifeworld thematic in a particular way. In this way a particular aspect or facet of daily life becomes his area or field of study. Consequently, the human lifeworld is at the root of each science. Each science selects a particular reality for study. Hence, the lifeworld makes a science possible and is thus a primordial foundation of all sciences: the lifeworld is a pre-scientific world. A scientist thematizes for himself that aspect of the pre-scientific world about which he wonders intensely (Plato, Aristotle, Marcel) and that most amazes him (Marcel). His scientific practice begins as soon as he searches critically, systematically and by applying a particular method(s) for real essences, i.e., in thinking he searches for structures that have universal validity. He reflectively searches for the preconditions for the possibility of that reality that he wants to study.

AN ESSENCE ANALYSIS OF THE EDUCATIVE SITUATION TO
SHOW ONE POSSIBLE WAY THAT ITS COURSE (SEQUENCE)
MANIFESTS ITSELF

First possible educative activity:

PEDGOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Pedagogical relationship structures appear
Intensification of the actualization of these structures

Second possible educative activity:

PEDAGOGICAL ENCOUNTER

Further thriving of the pedagogical relationship structures

EDUCATIVE MOMENTS BECOME VISIBLE

Educative moments become visible within the framework of the pedagogical relationship structures
Further intensification of the actualization of the pedagogical relationship structures

Third possible educative activity:

ENGAGEMENT

Further intensification of the actualization of the pedagogical relationship structures

Fourth possible educative activity:

PEDAGOGICAL INTERFERENCE

Pedagogical interference in the context of the pedagogical relationship structures

Either PEDAGOGICAL INTERVENTION or ASSENT

Purposefulness of pedagogical interference decreases

Fifth possible educative activity:

RETURN TO PEDAGOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Sixth possible educative activity:

PERIODIC BREAKING AWAY FROM THE PEDAGOGICAL SITUATION

In other words, each science views the lifeworld from a particular *perspective*. The Latin *perspicere* means to penetrate, to look through, to attentively investigate. *Perspectivus* again means “clear”, or “transparent” while *perspectare* means “to continue to look until the object viewed is clear, bright and transparent”. A scientific perspective then has as its aim a thinking, illuminating penetration into the examined facet of the lifeworld in order to disclose and know possible real essences there.

A pedagogician is a scientist who wants to thoughtfully investigate the educative event appearing in educative situations from a

pedagogical perspective. He wants to thoughtfully search the lifeworld for those structures that are necessary for educating, i.e., that necessarily must be present if an adult will educate. Hence, he searches for the essential characteristics that cannot be thought away and are obvious and that unquestionably belong to all educative situations. If these structures are not present, the pedagogical is not authentically present. Thus, they are universally valid preconditions for educative situations. In other words, they are fundamental pedagogical structures and have previously been described in this chapter. The object of study (area of study) of pedagogics is the educative phenomenon that manifests itself as an educative event in educative situations in order to bring to light its fundamental preconditions.

Pedagogics is the result of taking a pedagogical perspective on the lifeworld. Thus psychological, sociological, theological, didactic, historical, philosophical, etc. perspectives on the lifeworld are also possible.

Now it is possible and also necessary that a pedagogician with his pedagogical perspective converse scientifically with practitioners of some of the other perspectives. However, such a conversation will always be conducted under the jurisdiction and accountability of the pedagogical perspective. Jurisdiction means that in this conversation the pedagogical continually maintains its autonomy, thus will independently decide what thought findings of the other perspectives on the lifeworld are significant for it and can be useable. Here accountability means that questions will be asked in a scientifically accountable way and also that the answers received to the questions must be handled in accountable ways.

From a pedagogical situation, thus from a pedagogical perspective, a scientific conversation can be carried out with practitioners of a psychology that is acceptable to a pedagogician. Such a conversation can result in a thinking viewing of the lifeworld of a child from a psychopedagogical perspective. This thinking is a directed search for real essences of the psychic life in a pedagogic situation and is the task of *psychopedagogics*. *Didactic pedagogics* will bring to light didactic (teaching) essences in a pedagogic situation; *sociopedagogics* will disclose and understand the essences

of social life in a pedagogic situation; *historical pedagogics* will describe and interpret the real essences of child images and educative aims through the centuries and evaluate contemporary child-being against this background, while *orthopedagogics* involves itself with the real essences of a child-in-education who is dealing with particular distress. *Vocational orientation pedagogics* will uncover and implement the real essences of the child-in-education in his increasing self-determination of the vocational future that is approaching.

Fundamental pedagogics (philosophical pedagogics, theoretical pedagogics, philosophy of education) is a philosophical perspective on the reality of educating. It inquires into how such a human phenomenon as educating is possible. That is there is an inquiry into the *preconditions* for educating, thus into its *fundamental* pedagogical structures. Hence, fundamental pedagogics is a core scientific area (core discipline) of pedagogics and it also accompanies the other pedagogical perspectives in their thinking.

Each of the pedagogical perspectives on the lifeworld mentioned are a particular, independent perspective of an autonomous pedagogical perspective. This means that each of these pedagogical areas of science necessarily is a constitutive aspect of pedagogics.

Pedagogics is a science with possibilities of application, thus with the possibility of being employed post-scientifically in the lifeworld with its concrete situations of educating. That is, pedagogical thinking (reflection) that has its origin in the lifeworld returns to it. Then a post-scientific refinement occurs that is a consequence of scientific practice. The science of pedagogics directs an appeal to a practicing educator (pedagogue/teacher) that if he decides to apply its findings he does so in a pedagogically permissible, proper way. Pedagogics has brought to light what is appropriate for *all* pedagogical situations. However, an educator is a particular person in a particular educative situations and thus in the presence of particular children. Thus an educator who is Calvinist-Protestant is in the presence of such a child. This means that such an educator listens to an additional appeal, i.e., the appeal to properly implement his philosophy of life. This implementation is the philosophy of life contents that are given to the fundamental

pedagogical structures and to the actualization of them in particular educative situations. There also must be consideration given to this particular furnishing of contents by which life is awakened in the fundamental pedagogical structures. This is a task for a pedagogue's post-scientific thinking and is known as *educational doctrine*.*

* See chapters five and six.