The parent-child/adult-child educative relationship:
The overlooked ground/foundation of educational theory and practice?[1]

George D. Yonge

Division of Education

University of California (Davis)

Draft 1989

Abstract

With the almost exclusive focus on schooling in the literature on education, a recognition of a parent-child/adult-child relationship of upbringing, rearing, educating a child to independent adulthood as the ground or foundation of educational theorizing and practice virtually has been overlooked. In fact, an integrative, comprehensive perspective on educating (including schooling) has not been found by this approach and only seems possible if this primordial educative relationship is taken as one's point of departure in studying educating. To take the formalized/institutionalized extension of upbringing, i.e., schooling, teaching and learning, as the main focus is to remain within a variety of perspectives that perpetuate the *ad hoc,* piece-meal nature of the study of "education" currently characterizing the Anglo-American literature. By taking upbringing as the point of departure and phenomenology as the primary method, categories or concepts essential to educating are disclosed that can serve as criteria for evaluating and improving the practice of guiding a child to adulthood, including educative schooling and for evaluating the educative relevance of particular psychological, philosophical and other theories and techniques assumed to be illuminative of and applicable to formalized practice while overlooking the original phenomenon of which educative schooling, e.g., is a formalization.

An evaluation of the Premack principle is presented as a concrete illustration of how a genuine pedagogical perspective on educating, rooted in a relationship of upbringing leads to a very different and even somewhat negative educative appraisal of a solidly established, practically useful psychological technique.

An important implication is that educating does not need to be prescribed to by psychology and other disciplines and that there is a need to become familiar with an authentic pedagogical perspective arising from and supported by the essential structures of this primordial relationship which already has been considered, particularly at the University of

Pretoria in South Africa, originating from, elaborating on and contributing significantly to the phenomenological findings by Langeveld at the University of Utrecht in the Netherlands in the mid 1940's.

The parent-child/adult-child educative relationship:
The overlooked groun/foundation of educational theory anpractice?

The parent-/adult-child relationship of upbringing as the source of an authentic educational perspective

In their studies of and commentaries on education, educational philosophers and especially educational psychologists typically do not take the primordial adult-child educative relationship as their point of departure or focus. Not surprisingly, this commonly overlooked relationship also is not evident in the literature dealing with teaching and teacher preparation. Instead, what one usually finds are books and studies dealing with the philosophy of schooling, which sometimes include a focus on learning, teaching, and curriculum from a philosophical perspective (e.g., Arnstine, 1967; Gowan, 1981; Peters, 1967; Wingo, 1974), with psychological principles applied to school learning and curricular content (e.g., Gage & Berliner, 1988; Gagne, 1985; Mayer, 1987), and with classroom teaching and teacher preparation (see, e.g., Wittrock, 1986).

One does not have to dwell in this literature very long to realize that most authors view educating, schooling, (teaching) and learning as almost interchangeable. Indeed, it is the exception when an author even bothers explicitly to specify what he/she means by "education." This view of educating as almost interchangeable with schooling and learning is not entirely unfounded because teaching and learning are essential for educating to occur; that is, they are conditions for the occurrence of educating but they *are not the phenomenon itself.* Furthermore, in contemporary societies, formal schooling is a strong correlate of educating but it is *not essential* to it. Up binging is given with human existence and schooling is not. In this regard, Langeveld (1968) refers to a child as an *animal educandum* or as an educand; Schmidt (1973), following Langeveld, says this implies that a human child is a being who

not only *can* be but *must* be educated (in the sense of upbringing). These ideas are pursued below.

Schooling is the pervasive and overriding theme of a great deal of the scholarly and practical research constituting the corpus of the Anglo-American literature on education. This theme certainly is important. However, the almost total domination of this theme has contributed to minimizing the fact that, in terms of human existence, schooling is a derived, second-order phenomenon.

To properly understand schooling in its most fundamental sense, one needs to take as one's point of departure the phenomenon of which it is a formalized, derived expression; that phenomenon is an adult-child relationship of upbringing. Because schooling is a derived event, it has not and, perhaps, cannot give rise to and sustain a comprehensive, coherent pedagogical perspective on educating. Indeed, some of the well-known philosophers of education who have sought uniquely educational concepts (criteria) by focusing on schooling are Dewey (1929), Hirst (1966), Peters (1963, 1967), and Scheffler (1963). None found such concepts or at least not enough of them to sustain a coherent "educational" perspective. Even Kieran Egan (1983), a most eloquent spokesman for the different interests of educators and psychologists regarding topics such as learning does not arrive at anything like a comprehensive educational perspective. I believe the main reason for this is his focus on teaching and learning, viewed developmentally and within a context of schooling. Even so, the advance that Egan provides over the other authors cited is that he recognizes that *educational theorizing must stand on its own next to, e.g., psychology,* whereas the authors cited above, in one way or another, fall back on the presumed foundational nature for education (schooling) of the findings of, e.g., psychology, of sociology, of ethics, and of philosophy. My point is that the foundation of schooling is upbringing itself. The results of psychology, e.g., cannot *merely* be assumed to be relevant to upbringing. To be justified as relevant, first they must be evaluated in terms of the structures

(categories, essences) of an adult-child educative relationship and be reinterpreted in that ligh.

With the above comments, I am not suggesting that those scholars who take schooling as their point of departure abandon their efforts. On the contrary. However, an implication of the above comments is that the literature on education, viewed as schooling, will tend to continue to be characterized as ad hoc, piece-meal and a-theoretical until educating, as an adult accompanying a child to adulthood, the ground from which schooling emerged and on which it rests, is our starting point. As our literature shows, starting from schooling has not resulted in categories emerging by which there can be an integrated, comprehensive pedagogical perspective on educating (which includes, schooling). Philosophical, psychological, anthropological, administrative, legal, financial and other perspectives on *schooling* tend to remove it even further from upbringing. Hence, when schooling is viewed from these perspectives, its essential connection with upbringing becomes obscured.

Overlooking upbringing is serious and points to a possible crisis in educational thought because, without an educative relationship as one's point of departure and focus of study, a truly "educational" perspective has not emerged. That is, it is precisely the study of this unique adult-child educative relationship that gives rise to a *pedagogical* perspective or point of view, as such. Indeed, as already noted, where this focus is lacking, the research of and commentary on "education" seem to be piece-meal and not comprehensively integrated across the philosophical, psychological, and teaching/curricular moments of educating and, for the most part, the literature is relatively a-theoretical with respect to illuminating the *nature* of educating itself. This is because upbinging is the primordial lifeworld phenomenon at the root of bringing up and schooling children. But overlooking the prinacy of an adult-child educative relationship leads to the nature of educating being distorted and obscured by perspectives rooted elsewhere than in the adult-child

relationship itself. This, of course, includes those perspectives rooted in schooling and the psychology of learning. The best protection against such an obscuring is to operate from within a perspective rooted in educating itself.

From such a perspective, one can evaluate and interpret the potential *educative* contributions and insights from other perspectives such as psychology in terms of the nature or essential structures (essences) of this relationship. Without a grasp of these structures, one does not have a fundamental and coherent system of categories and criteria for studying and evaluating the practice of educating. This lack leads directly to the a-theoretical, piece-meal nature of the educational research mentioned above.

If all knowing is perspectival and partial in that only *questions* inherent to it are addressed to a phenomenon while other possible questions remain in the background or are completely irrelevant. As Giorgi (1970) says:

> "To say that all knowledge is in perspective essentially means that every stance that we take up with respect to the world opens up some possibilities and closes off others, The possibilities that are closed off become limits for what we can say about the phenomenon that we want to describe, and they indirectly impose presuppositions on what we want to say, in the sense that we can only speak about what is directly revealed and its horizon of given possibilities. The establishment of the fact of perspectivity thus rules out the possibility of an absolute stance -- and this applies to a phenomenological perspective as well" (p.162).

Indeed, if all knowing is perspectival so is all relevant evaluating. Each perspective carries its own inherent values which require that anyone operating from within it uses certain categories, asks certain questions, looks for certain things, etc. In other words, every perspective has a value/normative dimension whose source is the nature of the

phenomenon as revealed through that perspective (i.e., through its questions). This means that if there truly is a pedagogical perspectivee through which one can evaluate, say, the quality of an educative relationship between a parent and a child, this is because there is in the relationship itself an essential structure(s); in turn, this implies that there is a range of possibilities as well as of limitations which, if exceeded, would distort if not destroy the occurrence of educating (see, e.g., Landman, Sonnekus & Van Wyk 1978).

Since one must choose some perspective through which to study a phenomenon of interest, it is of critical importance first to carefully select the phenomenon of interest (one's focus and point of departure) and then a methodology for studying it. As already noted, an adult-child relationship of upbringing (as it occurs informally at home and as formalized in school) is the phenomenon of interest here; phenomenology is the primary method chosen for its study. This focus on educating as upbringing and the use of phenomenology to study it has its clearest origin in Langeveld's (1968*) Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek* (Concise Theory of Education) which was first published in 1945. As a method, phenomenology is designed to *allow* a phenomenon to disclose a perspective that is grounded in the phenomenon itself and not imposed on it from elsewhere. That is, these essences define the possibilities and limitations of a particular phenomenon, i.e., its own inherent perspective for one to take.

Earlier it was stated that the phenomenon upbringing must be one's point of departure for a truly pedagogical perspective to emerge. This is because upbringing is the most fundamental or radical (radix = root) meaning of educating etymologically and, more importantly, existentially.

Etymologically, "education" is derived from the Latin educare which means to bring up or rear a child. It is not derived from the Latin educere which means to lead out; educere is the root of, e.g., "educe". In this context, Peters (1967) claims that "adherents of the 'child-centered' ideology often make the conceptual point that 'education' is connected

with educere = 'to lead out' ... thus molding the concept towards the development of what is within rather than imposition from without" (p. 11).

However, as a metaphor for "bringing out" or cultivating latent potentialities, educere is not quite appropriate because it refers to leading (a baby) out of the birth canal or assisting with birth.

Interestingly, in chapter 2 of *Democracy and Education*, Dewey (1966) acknowledges that "the word education means just a process of leading or bringing up" (p. 10). Although it is difficult to tell from this brief quotation, perhaps for Dewey "education" refers to both educere (bringing out) and educare (bringing up). However, it is abundantly clear that in this book he neglects education as an adult accompanying a child to adulthood. Consequently, I agree with Langeveld (1958) who says,

> "It is with good conscience that we go back again to his Democracy and Education as it is supposed to be an educational classic....I open this book again to discover what education is and to my astonishment, I find that the child, the home, the family, the parents hardly appear anywhere in the book" (p. 53).

The argument for educare or educere as the root of the word "education" cannot be resolved from the perspective of linguistic usage because, back to an earlier point, if upbringing is not one's point of departure, then some other focus necessarily is, and it will shape the way the word "education" is used. In this respect, I agree with Peters. However, a necessary proviso is that one recognizes that an "adult-centered" ideology need not be the commitment of one who sees upbringing as the root meaning of "education." In fact, a phenomenological or pedagogical fathoming of educating (in its existential sense, as an essential aspect of human existence) reveals it as a *norm centered* event. This means that it revolves around an adult representing norms and values to a child (Landman et al.,1982).

The point of departure of the present study is neither the etymological root of "education" nor a definition of it. These are not fundamental enough to serve as a solid point of departure. Indeed, above when I stated that upbringing is the root meaning of "education," I could claim this only because of a familiarity with the phenomenon to which upbringing points and which is prior to education as a stipulative definition (Scheffer, 1960; Soltis, 1978) or as an etymological argument. What is that phenomenon to which this word points?

The lifeworld phenomenon of basic interest and which serves as the point of departure for this study is revealed in the observation that no human being is born an adult, that a child needs considerable support and guidance to become an independent, responsible person (i.e., an adult), and that an adult (usually the parents at first) enters into a *relationship* with a child to bring him/her up to adulthood, i.e., educates him/her. In entering this relationship, an educational situation is created within which upbringing occurs.

Once this event is encountered as something worth studying, various questions arise such as: why is upbringing necessary, or is it; what are its beginning and end points, if any; what are the essential structures of the educational *relationship* between adult and child; what is the aim; what is the role and nature of teaching within educating a child; how must an adult support and guide (accompany) a child to adequately actualize the potentialities of his/her psychic life in education? These questions and others reflect the scope and complexity of educating a child. They also imply that educating must be studied from several angles or sub-perspectives. At this point, it is helpful to remember that questions both arise from and result in a perspective. The sub-perspectives, which cannot be separated from each other, are unified by the total phenomenon of educating to which they bring to bear different interests or questions, and disclose different *categories* regarding that phenomenon (e.g., didactic- (teaching), philosophical-, psycho-educational questions).

Different sub-perspectives also are required to delimit and make educating manageable for study. In the literature on pedagogics, *some* of these sub-perspectives of pedagogics (the systematic *study of* educating) are called fundamental pedagogics (philosophy of education), psychopedagogics (educational psychology), didactic pedagogics (curriculum and instruction), sociopedagogics (sociology of education), and orthopedagogics (remedial teaching and therapy) (see Nel, 1974). For theoretical reasons, the above terminology in brackets is not used. These sub-perspectives, required for the systematic and unified study of educating, form a comprehensive whole because each has the totality of upbringing as its point of departure, each uses phenomenology as its primary but not exclusive method, and of utmost importance, the practitioners of these sub-perspectives are in continual dialogue with each other and sometimes engage in collaborative (Landman, Van Wyk & Sonnekus, 1978) and individual (Sonnekus, 1977) research that transcends the boundaries of any of the particular sub-perspectives (i.e., since upbringing is the unifying foundation for the sub-perspectives, joint sub perspectives naturally arise such as a psychopedagogic-didactic pedagogic perspective).

In turning to the phenomenon and situation of upbringing with the phenomenological method, the purpose is to disclose, comprehend, and describe the essential structures of education as such. The phenomenological method, as noted above, is the primary method of pedagogics and its various sub-perspectives in that this method is designed to uncover the essential structures or categories of phenomena and of the situations in which they occur. The motivating or fundamental question for pedagogics is what is it that allows upbringing to be what it is (esse) and to be distinguishable from related but essentially different phenomena such as teaching, learning, and schooling.

When the occurrence of educating is studied phenomenologically, it is seen that teaching and learning (but not schooling) are essential to it (e.g., Van der Stoep & Louw, 1984, Sonnekus & Ferreira, 1979) but that they are not equivalent to it. Also, in our complex society we have had to

formalize and institutionalize the more spontaneous, intuitive teaching and learning that occurs between parents and their children. That is, a child's formal education - schooling - is a formalization of his/her formative upbringing (Van der Stoep and Louw, 1984). To overlook this is to bypass the full significance of educating as upbringing.

If schools were destroyed or closed, upbringing would continue because it is essential to being human whereas schooling is a derived, secondary activity, which of course does not detract from its importance as a contributor to formatively educating a child. One consequence of this derived nature of schooling is that a study of it will offer little of relevance to the primary (parent-child) educative situation, but a study of the primary situation points to a continuity, to a formalizing in school of what *already* has been and is going on between parents and children. Another consequence is that schooling is not an appropriate point of departure for the development of an accountable theory of educating as upbringing (not to mention a theory of educative teaching or learning) owing to its derived, second order nature.

As mentioned above, the systematic, primarily phenomenological study of educating as upbringing is called pedagogics (from the Greek pais-child; paido-boy + agein - to guide, accompany), and it has a literature extending over several decades, beginning in approximately 1945 with the publication of Langeveld's (1968) Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek (Concise Theory of Education). However, the purpose of the present study is neither to review this literature nor to describe pedagogics as a multi-faceted way of studying educating in is various forms. Rather, the purpose is to show that a phenomenological description of the educative situation, as upbringing, gives rise to and sustains a truly educational perspective that places pedagogics on an equal footing, as a human/social science, with, e.g., psychology and sociology. Because upbringing is the root category which gives rise to other sub-perspectives on educating, they can put one in a position to evaluate, educationally, the quality of a

concrete occurrence of educating, whether at home or at school. This is because the results of the pedagogical studies of it provide one with educational categories that can be used as criteria or yardsticks by which any occurrence of educating can be evaluated in terms of the essential nature of the adult-child relationship of upbringing; in addition, these same criteria put one in a position to judge the relevance of psychological facts and principles for educational practice, to judge the educational accountability of classroom management techniques, etc. They also provide one with a basis for developing guidelines regarding one's own educative actions (e.g., teaching) in behalf of a child (see Landman, et al, 1982). Alsi, it is important to note that this educational perspective provides a perspective (concepts, categories) for the further theoretical study of educating.

What are some pedagogical categories that can be used in the above practical and theoretical senses? Clearly, it is beyond the scope of the present study to describe the categories that have been disclosed by e.g., didactic pedagogics, ... psychopedagogics, and fundamental pedagogics. Consequently, only some of the categories disclosed by fundamental pedagogics are described. There is good reason for considering these categories if one is limited to one of the sub-disciplines. As Van Rensburg and Landman (1986) point out, "fundamental" is from the Latin *fundamentum* - ground, basis, foundation. What better place to begin than at the foundation of educating. Indeed, the fundamental pedagogical categories to be described provide a perspective on the basic context or situation within which educating as upbringing occurs as well as on the phenomenon of educating itself.

Therefore, in the next section some of the *fundamental pedagogical categories*, constituting a *partial* but truly pedagogical perspective on educating, are described. It is a *partial* perspective only because it doesn't include the categories disclosed by the other sub-perspectives of pedagogics such as psychopedagogics.

In the third section, I illustrate that these categories are, indeed, *fundamental* by using some of them to evaluate the relevance and appropriateness of a *psychological* principle, namely, the Premack principle (Premack, 1965), to educating as upbringing. By this example, I show that many educational psychologists are so immersed in a *psychological* perspective that they might easily fail to see the forest (educating) for the trees (the psychological). That is, I show that there is, in fact, a pedagogical perspective that is different from a psychological one. In this connection, cognitive science and information processing approaches are not educative approaches, even when they are applied to problems of schooling such as teaching a child to read; this is because these approaches essentially are rooted in categories derived from psychology and from computer science but not from bringing up a child to adulthood.

Fundamental pedagogical categories constituting a partial but truly educational perspective on upbringing

The philosophical child anthropology on which pedagogics is based stresses a child as intentionality, as existence. This implies that he/she is always in some situation. For a child, as *animal educandum*, the most primordial and fundamental situation is the educative situation of an adult-child educative relationship of upbringing (Langeveld, 1968).

What is such a situation/relationship? This question can best be answered by describing what such a relationship is in its *essential* structures. The *categories* resulting from this description then can be used to formulate *criteria* to evaluate the quality of any concrete educative situation/relationship as well as, e.g., of psychological research findings to decide whether they should be applied to a pedagogical relationship directly, with modification, or perhaps not at all.

Fortunately, a good deal of pedagogical research has focused on the question of what an educative situation/relationship is. The primary sources to which I refer are Landman et al. (1982) and his students (e.g.,

Viljoen & Pienaar, 1971; Kilian & Viljoen, 1974) who study educating from the sub-discipline of pedagogics known as fundamental pedagogics or what elsewhere often is called educational philosophy.

The educational situation as an adult-child educative relationship: a fundamental pedagogical perspective

To be clear about what situation is being described, it is helpful to follow Landman et al. (1982) who distinguish among an *educational*, a *pedagogical*, and a *pedagogic* situation. An *educational* situation is the lifeworld occurrence of upbringing. In this situation, an adult (educator) and a child (educand) are in a mutual relationship in which they interact with the aim that a child attain his/her own adulthood. This is the event of upbringing that is given with being human; this educating as upbringing is an anthropological fact that is consistent with Langeveld's (1968) understanding of a child as an *educand* or *animal educandum* and it occurs only in *educational* Situations which often occur in spontaneous, intuitive and sometimes trial and error ways (e.g., parents and children at hone).

One can approach this *educational* situation with a theoretical interest, as does pedagogics; then one's purpose is to study it to uncover categories that describe its *essential* structures. Note, this theoretical interest is directed to an *educational* situation/relationship as its object of study. As a theoretician, one is in a *pedagogical* situation and not an *educational* one. That is, as a theorist, one is not involved in   bringing up a child [in an *educational* situation], rather one is studying
it from within a *pedagogical* situation. The *categories* resulting from this study become available to others through publications, lectures, discussions, etc.

If someone studies the results of these *pedagogical* investigations of upbringing to gain a clearer insight into the nature of the *educational* situation (and the phenomenon of educating) to inform their own

practice of bringing up a child by applying these results, he/she is in a *pedagogic* situation. A *pedagogic* situation is essentially the same as an *educational* one, but with a few significant differences. For example, an *educational* situation is governed by intuitive, unsystematic knowledge whereas one in a *pedagogic* situation is governed by the systematic, reliable knowledge obtained from a *pedagogical* (theoretical) situation. Both an *educational* and a *pedagogic* situation includes the *practice* of educating a child, but the difference is that a *pedagogic* situation is theoretically informed; hence, one can say that *theory and practice meet in a pedagogic situation.*

The implication of the above is that an *educational* situation is the source of a pedagogical perspective on its occurance; the results (categories or essences) disclosed in a *pedagogical* situation form a *truly educational perspective* on educating and provide one with the tools to study further the reality of educating and develop this perspective. One in a *pedagogic* situation is using this *educational perspective* to guide his/her *practice*, to evaluate the quality of his/her practice, etc. That is, the use of pedagogical criteria is one of the ways in which the results of pedagogical studies are applied to an *educational* situation to transform it into a *pedagogic* one. Consequently, one of the ways in which theory and practice meet in a *pedagogic* situation is in the use of criteria inherent to the categories.

What categories (essences) of educating are disclosed by the sub-perspective of pedagogics called fundamental pedagogics?

Fundamental pedagogical categories or essential structures of an educational situation/relationship

In studying an educational situation from this perspective, four structures become apparent: those of an adult child *relationship*; the structurse of ithe*sequenc*e of its educative occurrences; the structures of the *activities* mutually engaged in by adult and child; and the structures of the *aim* which provide the direction of and meaning for the entire event of

upbinging. That is, educating only occurs within an adult-child relationship; it is a dynamic, moving occurrence; it requires the participation of both the child and the adult in activities designed to help and guide the child to become a morally responsible, independent adult (the aim).

<div align="center">

RELATIONSHIP STRUCTURES
[as the inter-personal axis of educating]

</div>

As just noted, educating occurs within an adult-child relationship in which the adult guides and assists the child to become an adult. This relationship is *foundational* to the other three structures of educating in that it is the relationship structue that is the axis around which the sequence, activity and aim structures turn and are essential moments for it to be an educative relationship. If the quality of this relationship is not positive, it is unlikely that educating will progress as it should. Thus, an adequate relationship is a precondition for upbringing to take an effective course. The essential structures (categories) of this relationship are trust, understanding, and authority. Although distinguishable, they always occur in an educational situation as an inseparable unity.

<div align="center">

1. Trust
[as the affective moment of educating]

</div>

Without a sense of mutual trust by which an adult and a child accept each other as persons, it is not likely that an adequate educative relationship can be established. In addition, for a child to become an independent adult, he/she must be willing to explore his/her open world. But without a feeling of confidence and security a child will tend not to explore and venture into the unknown. This needed confidence and security are cultivated within a relationship of trust where the adult provides the child with a secure, caring space, and makes him/her feel welcome, at home, and close to the adult. It should be clear that the issue here is *emotional security* which prepares the child to be willing and ready to participate in his/her own upbringing. This also prepares for intentional educating

where an adult occasionally must intervene in an accepting or correcting manner.

An essential moment or modality of trust is *acceptance*. This means that the adult must accept the child as he/she is and trust that he/she will become what he/she can and ought to be. (This is not a passive acceptance as is made abundantly clear in the discussion below of pedagogical authority). An adult should lovingly accept a child as a fellow human being. This means that an intimate bonding should be formed in which a child is related to and treated as a person and is accorded the dignity that being a person commands. But this also means that a child trusts and accepts an adult. If a child does, then he/she is accepting the adult as an image or model of his/her own future. That is, a child's acceptance of an adult is the precondition for his/her identifying with and wanting to be like (emulate) him/he, and this acceptance and identification are at the very core of incidental (spontaneous) education.

Mutual acceptance is the basis of a relationship of trust, and it is within the resulting emotionally secure sphere of the adult and child being together as "we" that educative actions take place. Even so, acceptance is but one side of the issue; mutual *commitment* also is required. For an adult, this commitment means to act in behalf of the best interests of a child, to help the child live a life worthy of a human being, to assist the child to become an adult, etc. But a child must also commit him/herself to an educator, and this is close to what has already been called identification. In a sense, a child must temporarily commit his/her future to a trusted adult.

Within this mutual commitment, at first an adult offers his/her way of life to a child as an example of the direction in which a child ought to become. And as the child becomes, an educator turns over more and more of his/her pedagogical responsibility to a child. Thus, for an adult, commitment really means *entrusting* a child with increasing responsibility for his/her own "education" and showing confidence in him/her as a fellow human being.

The above descriptions, as well as those that follow, can be changed to criteria by putting them in the interrogative form. For example, what is the quality of acceptance, of commitment, of feelings of security, of a child's willingness to explore?

2. Understanding
[the cognitive moment]

An educational relationship also requires mutual understanding. This means that an adult (educator) understands a child as a totality in his/her situatedness and as someone on his/her way to adulthood. It also means that a child has a notion that an adult is someone who can and will assist him/her to explore reality and thus help him/her learn about it.

At first a child does not have much of an understanding of him/herself and of the situations (reality) he/she is in. Therefore, an adult must take the responsibility to clarify and explain these as yet unknown life contents (reality) to a child. This clarification requires that a child participate by giving meaning to these situations so that he/she understands them and his/her position in them. By actively giving meaning to these situations via learning, a child makes them his/her own, and they become "situations-for-me." Adult assistance is required to the extent that a child is not in a position to come to adequately know these life contents on his/her own. It is precisely for this reason that teaching is an essential aspect of upbringing. Eventually, this at first concealed reality becomes the known, familiar lifeworld in which he/she and others move and live.

Adult assistance is required in this matter of clarification because it is an adult who already knows this lifeworld. But this clarification is not just a cognitive matter. It also is an affective (feeling) and normative (moral) matter. Indeed, the cognitive, the affective, and the normative are distinguishable but never separable (e.g., see Pretorius, 1972; Sonnekus, 1985). If a child were able to assume responsibility for guiding and

19

supporting him/herself (or someone else) intellectually, emotionally, and morally, that child would be no child but rather an adult (irrespective of chronological age). That is, to offer such guidance and support requires the maturity of an adult, especially with respect to the moral/ethical or normative aspect of educating (see Landman et al., 1982).

Back to the issue of clarification, which in fact is helping a child clarify and understand the lifeworld as we (adults) demand that it be lived, an educator's task is to select, reduce to its essentials, organize, and present life content to a child such that the lifeworld gradually becomes manageable and meaningful to him/her. Once again, it would be a serious mistake to limit these contents to cognitive, factual data. Education is not focused only on forming a child's intellect, but in fact it is primarily a matter of forming his/her conscience (see, e.g., Gunter, 1974, Nel, 1974).

From the above, it is seen that the relationship of understanding embraces a mutual understanding of child and adult as persons and their respective share in the educational situation; this relationship is also focused on intellectual, cognitive content to be learned by a child; and, regarding the moral, normative, it includes an adult emulating and discussing norms and values so a child can understand and *feel* them, and also it includes a child's accepting responsibility for gradually living his/her life in terms of but not enslavement to the norms and values he/she chooses to accept.

3. Authority
[the normative moment]

The relationship of authority implies that an adult has something to "tell"a child and since what is told is for his/her benefit, he/she should listen. But this telling and listening should take the form of a dialogue because a child is a full participant in his/her education, a person in his/her own right, no matter how dependent on an adult he/she may be.

To claim that one has something to tell someone implies that one understands that person and his/her need to know what is to be told. For one to be willing to listen, he/she must trust the teller. In other words, the trust and understanding moments of an adult-child educative relationship permeates pedagogical authority. Without understanding and trust, the exercise of authority becomes authoritarian and, thus, pedagogically unacceptable.

What does an adult have to tell a child? Some whimsical notion or content that he/she decides is "good" for him/her? No. That which an adult allows to give direction to his/her own life is what he/she "tells" a child. The valued and the values and norms for acting derived from them are what he/she tells a child about and shows him/her; this holds even when the main focus of the content is cognitive because all knowing and understanding implicate us in values (e.g., Grene, 1966).

It is critically important that an adult show a child that he/she accepts and lives in accordance with the authority of the *same* norms and values he/she is helping a child experience and give meaning to. In other words, an adult is a mediator or bridge between [particular] norms and [universal] values, on the one hand, and a child, on the other hand.

At first, in selecting and representing norms to a child, he/she cannot see past the adult to the norms per se. Rather, he/she responds to the *presence* and to the word of an adult in a *docile* way. The norms and the values they express have not yet been internalized and in an adult's absence, a child will not necessarily follow the norms. Docility occurs when a child *mis0takes* an adult as *the* authority. Gradually, however, he/she sees that an adult also is guided by the same norms and values he/she is addressing to a child. When a child's submission to authority no longer is docility in the presence of the adult but is an answer to the values represented by and through an educator's example (words and deeds), independent or *true obedience* becomes evident; the values then have become internalized by a child, and he/she now obeys the image of human dignity presented to him/her (see Langeveld 1968; Nel, 1974).

21

The above three moments of an adult-child educative relationship (trust, understanding, and authority) are distinguishable but inseparable essences of an educational situation. Since these essences have been disclosed from the sub-perspective known as fundamental pedagogics, they are called *fundamental pedagogical categories*. As already noted, they are the source of *pedagogical criteria* or guidelines for informing one's own practice of and for evaluating and even reinterpreting the potential contributions of e.g., psychology and sociology to that practice (Landman, et al., 1982). These and the following fundamental pedagogical categories put one in a position to take an *educational perspective.*

<div align="center">

SEQUENCE STRUCTUERES
[the rhythm of educating]

</div>

In addition to the adult-child relationship structures just described, the dynamic, moving, or rhythmic aspect of an educative event within an educational situation needs to be described. As an essential requirement for adequate upbringing, the educative sequence structures are six moments: associating, encountering, engaging, intervening (which includes approving and correcting action), returning to associating, and periodic breaking away from associating (Landman et al., 1982).

<div align="center">

1. **Associating**
[as being-BY]

</div>

Associating pedagogically is characterized by an adult and a child being *by* each other. They are aware of each other's presence at a shared time and place. Associating is the beginning of an educative event in that the mere presence of an adult has a directing influence on a child. In addition, during associating, indications of the necessity for intervening may arise. Also, an adult is setting an example, supervising, and indicating what is acceptable. Gradually, this relationship becomes more

intimate until the mere being by each other intensifies into encountering as a being *with* each other.

Cclearly, the sequence structures also refer to an adult-child relationship but under the aspect of its dynamics. Indeed, one should ask *how trust, understanding, and authority are related to associating*. It provides an opportunity for an adult and child to become familiar with and to get used to each other. This contributes to a relationship of trust and prepares for the possibility of an encounter. In *being by* and observing each other, mutual understanding also is enhanced. Here, the moment of authority is not prominent, although it is being exercised, but primarily in incidental ways such as by an adult setting an example.

2. Encountering
[as being-WITH]

Pedagogical encountering is characterized by an adult and child *being with* each other. Here an educator enters the world of a child, but this will not happen unless he/she trusts an educator and welcomes him/her into his/her world (see Nel, 1974). In an encounter, a child experiences a feeling of belonging, nearness, intimacy, accessibility with respect to an adult. Encountering is successful when a child feels protected and knows that an educator is willing to *be with* and to care for him/her.
From this brief description, it is seen that encountering presupposes an already established mutual trust. When an encounter does occur, it enhances mutual understanding and further develops trust. The authority aspect of an adult-child educative relationship is still relatively incidental Encountering evolves into the next phase called engagement or engaging.

3. Engaging
[as being-FOR]

The mode of adult-child presence here is characterized as being for each other. That is, in engaging there is a mutual commitment of both adult and child to actualize the educative event in a responsible way. Co-

responsibility is an essential moment of engaging pedagogically. An adult takes responsibility for intervening with a child when necessary and the child assumes responsibility for his/her share of this involvement. It is noted that engaging is simply a further development of encounter, a move from being with to being for each other.

Engaging *as being for* each other also reflects a further development of mutual trust (recall that commitment is an aspect of trust) and understanding. Commitment and responsibility, the central notions of engaging, are made possible by and are sustained by mutual trust and understanding. The implicit authority present in associating, encountering, and engaging prepares for pedagogic intervening where the explicit exercise of authority enters the foreground.

4. Pedagogic intervening
[as acting]

Intervening refers to an educative act by which an adult exercises pedagogic authority with the aim of assisting a child in his/her becoming an adult. Ordinarily, if authority (intervening) is exercised within an ongoing relationship characterized by a good quality of trust and understanding, a child will participate in a cooperative and inconspicuous manner.

Pedagogic Intervening takes two forms:
a. *approving* (usually by not interfering). The explicit or implicit acceptance of a child's actions conveys to the child that his/her behavior, way of living, is acceptable and that he/she is progressing to "proper" adulthood. Here an adult supports him/her in his/her doing what is proper. This occurs when an adult praises him/her for having *already* chosen to act in an acceptable way. (Praise or reward should not be held out to him/her as something he/she will receive if a particular valued action is engaged in). When an adult shows appreciation for a child's choice to act properly, and informs him/her that he/she must continue such proper behavior in the

future. The effects of all of this will be an increase in the clarity of a child's understanding of right and wrong (See Gunter, 1974, and Landman et al., 1982, for a discussion of the pedagogically accountable use of rewards and punishments).

b. *corrective action.* It is here that an adult acts to prevent a child from straying from the path to "proper" adulthood. Corrective acting or intervening requires that an adult indicate what is not acceptable and why, that he/she reject the unacceptable behaviors of a child and, in turn, that he/she accept an adult's opposition to what is improper. Also, it is necessary that an adult offer a feasible and acceptable alternative or alternatives to the improper and that he/she help a child move from the improper to that which is deemed proper. If this intervening succeeds, a child will see more clearly what is acceptable and proper behavior will thus be promoted.

These two forms of pedagogic intervening should result in an increase in a child's ability to differentiate between right and wrong. Also, pedagogic intervening provides the context, within the total educational situation, for considerations of discipline and, in schooling, classroom management techniques and procedures. If such issues as the use of reward (approval) and punishment in school or in the primary educational situation at home are not viewed within this context, they are likely to be pedagogically misunderstood and misused.

5. Return to associating
[as being-BY-again]

After intervening has run its course, there should be a return to associating (being by each other) as soon as possible. This is very important because it gives a child an opportunity to appropriate, in the presence of an adult, that which has occurred during associating, encountering, engaging, and especially intervening.

In returning to associating, a child can independently think about the intervention and decide whether he/she agrees with it (and thus either appropriates or rejects the content in terms of which the intervening occurred); a child finds an opportunity, apart from direct intervention, to be him/herself by taking a stand independently of an adult (who is present) and by concentrating on his/her self-actualization; he/she experiences freedom to think and to act but in close connection with an adult who is present; this experienced freedom is a freedom within limits because although an adult does not intervene directly with him/her, his/her presence in fact is a form of unintentional intervention in that it exercises a controlling influence; he/she is now depending on him/herself to acquire a better self-understanding because of what has happened during the preceding phases and within this one.

A return to associating also is important because it provides a child with a feeling of security in that he/she still finds him/herself in the presence of an adult. Although the adult has intervened, perhaps in a corrective manner, he/she has not rejected or abandoned the child and, in fact, remains accessible to him/her. This strengthens and reaffirms the relationship of trust. Also, a return to associating gives achild an opportunity to show the adult whether he/she understands the intervention and/or is willing to appropriate it. At the same time, the adult is in a position to help clarify things for him/her and possibly to intervene again if necessary.

Sometimes a return to associating will not occur as it should. For example, the intervention might be so exaggerated and overdone that it prevents him/her from the necessary participation in his/her own upbringing provided by a return to associating.

6. Periodic breaking away from associating
]as being-AWAY from each other]

It is the aim of an adult to become unneeded or superfluous as an educator since that occurs when a child has attained adulthood. Periodic

breaking away from associating is necessary for attaining this aim because it provides a child with the needed opportunity to act independently. That is, he/she must be given the opportunity to appropriate, in the physical absence of an adult, that which has occurred in the sequence of educative events to this point (i.e., from associating to a return to associating).

Here the issue is not a matter of abandoning him/her but rather of encouraging and even requiring him/her to practice choosing and acting in the physical absence of an adult. Independent choosing and acting will not occur automatically. They need to be practiced and cultivated by the child. At the same time, a child must understand that he/she can return to the presence and support of an adult at any time. As his/her independence increases, the educative bond between adult and child loosens, and the child's growing emancipation from adult guidance and support becomes evident.

Also, a child's growing freedom is acknowledged by the fact that he/she is increasingly allowed to act and choose on his/her own; and, along with this, his/her longing to act on his/her own, to be someone who can stand on his/her own, to be independent of an adult all are cultivated during the physical absence of an adult. However, while acting and deciding on his/her own, there will be many occasions (ever decreasing as he/she achieves his/her adulthood) when he/she will need to return to associating with an adult for additional support and guidance.

Clearly, effective periodic breaking away from associating must be founded on an adult-child relationship characterized by a strong quality of trust and understanding. Without trust, for example, an adult might not "let a child go to participate in his/her own becoming an adult. Without understanding, an adult can expect and demand too little or too much from the child. (Indeed, educative neglect in the form of too little or too much support and protection will tend to show itself in the poor quality or even the dysfunction of aspects of the sequence

structures such as, e.g., too little associating, too much or too little breaking away from associating).

Authority also is operative in periodically breaking away from associating, but here it is qualitatively different from its occurrence in the other sequences of the educative event. That is, to the extent that educating has succeeded, a child will show indications of acting and choosing in response to the authority of the norms of the values themselves rather than to an adult as representative of these values. This means that a child is becoming emancipated from adults (as docility) and is increasingly able to independently choose to be obedient to the authority of the norms themselves.

An important point is that a child's acting and choosing while in the presence of an adult (e.g., during a return to associating) cannot be judged unambiguously as docility or. independent obedience (i.e., is the child choosing and responding in a particular way because the adult is present or is he/she responding to the authority of the norms irrespective of an adult?). This can be decided only in the sequence called periodic breaking away. That is, periodic breaking away not only provides him/her with the opportunity to practice being independent (and thus to cultivate it) but, from an evaluative perspective, the degree to which he/she is becoming independent (truly obedient rather than merely docile) can be judged. This is the true test of upbringing in that the important issue is how he/she acts and chooses independently and not how he/she acts and chooses in the presence of an adult (whose very presence may indirectly influence him/her).

In summary, and viewed as a totality, the six phases of the sequence structures of the educational situation capture the dynamics or the rhythm of guiding a child to adulthood. That is, in associating there is a relaxed being by each other which on occasion intensifies and deepens into an encounter, as being with each other, and this leads to an engagement, as being for each other, as mutually accepting what needs to be done pedagogically. These three aspects prepare for effective

intervening, the most noticeable aspect of all (and for this reason it can be mistaken for the act of educating as such). Incidental educating, mainly by adult example, is occurring in aeach sequence structure (except, perhaps, periodic breaking away from associating) but especially in associating. Once the sequence structure has "come to a head", so to speak, in the intervening, it is necessary that adult and child "back off" and return to a more relaxed associating (being by each other once again). This is a time for sorting, mulling, appropriating, rejecting, questioning what has occurred to this point. It is important to note that associating after intervening is a qualitatively different being by each other than is associating before intervening. Finally, in periodic *breaking away from associating*, the adult-child relationship is the most relaxed of the entire sequence because now a child is on his/her own within the limits of his/her ability. It is here that a child applies to new situations what has been learned (at the very least, the situations are "new" because an adult is absent). tt is in this sequence that a child *truly practices* being an independent, autonomous, responsible person to the best of his/her ability.

ACTIVITY STRUCTURES
(as the mutual involvement of adult and child in upbringing)

To this point the educational situation has been described in terms of the adult-child relationship (i.e., trust, understanding, authority) and in terms of the rhythm or variation of that relationship during an educative event (e.g., associating, encountering). But the pedagogical relationship and sequence structures occur only because an adult and child are mutually involved in educative activities. Educating requires the mutual participation of both adult and child. They work together with the aim of helping the educand (child) gradually engage in certain activities with the attitude and competence of an adult (i.e., eventually to live as an adult). In other words, these activities lead to normative adulthood, the aim of upbringing.

Landman and Roos (1973) disclose twelve pedagogical categories that they refer to as the activity structure of the educative event. These twelve pedagogical categories can be arranged under four anthropological categories which are four modes or ways of being-in-the-world (an ontological category) of relevance to educating.

Specifically, activities one, two, and three below are subsumed under the anthropological category called *being-in-a meaningful world*; activities four, five, and six can be placed under the category referred to as *co-existence*; activities seven, eight, and nine are listed under *temporality*; and activities ten, eleven, and twelve are grouped under the anthropological category called *being-somebody-oneself.* These twelve pedagogical categories or activities are described as follows:

[BEING-IN-A-MEANINGFUL WORLD]

1. Giving meaning with increasing responsibility

A necessary task of an educator is to help a child give meaning to the world and to regard and deal with life in ways in which a responsible, independent adult would. For this to happen, he/she must deepen and broaden his/her knowledge and change many views, beliefs, and ideas in light of what has been conveyed to him/her through example and instruction. Also, a child must be helped to accept increasing responsibility for the meanings he/she attributes to his/her world. Under the guidance of an adult, he/she must give meanings to persons, things, events, etc. Then, he/she must determine, at first still under the guidance of an adult, if these attributed meanings are appropriate. In addition, he/she must be helped to make these meanings a functional part of his/her own way of living, to transform these meanings into actions. Finally, an adult has to help him/her give meaning on an ever increasing level in accordance with his/her level of becoming;

2. Gradually breaking away from lack of exertion

An adult must assist a child to break away from a virtually carefree way of living and increasingly to exert the effort to explore reality. He/she must be helped and encourage to do his/her best at what he/she engages in. An educand must move away from what he/she *is* to what he/she *ought to be*, as determined by the values and norms accepted by his/her educators as part of their philosophy of life. At issue is a movement from what is not yet proper to what is proper. He/she must exert the effort to explore reality and in doing so he/she gradually emancipates him/herself from a trusted, safe sphere of the home; through this exploring and venturing and eventually he/she is able to find his/her place in the adult world. A feeling of security is a precondition for this exploring and venturing, and a child's inherent wanting to be independent is the motivation for this.

3. Exemplifyting and emulating norms

An adult must try to make a child aware of human life as a normed life, and in a real sense this is what pedagogic intervention is primarily about. As already mentioned, for a child, initially norms are embodied in the person of an adult (docility). It is for this reason that an adult's example is so critical in educating. That which an adult exemplifies (by action and not merely by words) as worth emulating must be shown to a child as something meaningfully present in an adult's own life.   The fact that a child is expected to emulate norms in accordance with the norms by which an adult lives his/her life is what gives educative intervention its power and significance. Ultimately, a child him/herself must choose to (or choose *not* to) *internalize these norms into his/her life*.

As used in this study, norms (e.g., not stealing, not lying) are the concrete expressions of values (i.e., honesty). With respect to norms and values, an important distinction that needs to be made is between social conventions (societal norms) and moral norms and values (Nucci, 1982). Both types of norms/values are central to upbringing. Social conventions are *arbitrary* agreements among people (table manners, driving on a particular side of the street, dress codes, etc.) that facilitate everyday

living. As Nucci (1982) says, "Social conventional acts in themselves are arbitrary in that they do not have an intrinsically prescriptive basis; alternative courses of action can serve similar functions" (p. 94). In contrast to social conventions are moral values (e.g., respect for human dignity, honesty). In this regard, Nucci (1982) says, "The existence of a social regulation is not necessary for an individual to view an event as a moral transgression...moral issues are neither arbitrary nor determined by social regulations or social consensus. The individual's moral prescriptions are determined by factors inherent to social relationships as opposed to a particular form of social or cultural structure" (pp. 94-95). Social conventions are addressed more to the psychic dimension of a person while the moral is more of a spiritual issue (see Franki, 1969). Although educating is primarily concerned with moral values, social conventions provide important contents for an educand to learn in order to find his/her place in the adult world;

[CO-EXISTENCE]

4. Venturing (risking) with each other pedagogically

Educating is not a process that leads to precisely predictable results. What a child will become and how an educator is going to act cannot be guaranteed beforehand. Owing to this uncertainty, an educator and educand must venture together into the future.

A child's willingness to follow and to venture with an adult is based on trust. When upbringing is consistently and properly carried out, both educator and educand can confidently face the future because of the foundation provided by the resulting mutual trust;

5. Being grateful for pedagogic security

As has already been noted, a feeling of security is a precondition for effective educative intervention. A feeling of security stems from an atmosphere of loving care and warmth as well as from acceptance by an

adult. It is important that a child feels he/she is an accepted member of the family (or group) and that he/she feels safe because an adult shows a concern for him/her.

It is also important that an adult make a child aware, by word and by deed, that he/she ought to be grateful (thankful) for this feeling of security. If the child is not expected to show gratitude or appreciation, he/she may not yet understand the appropriateness of acknowledging help and support from others or of being responsible for oneself to others. Then he/she may come to believe that others owe him/her whatever is wanted or needed;

6. Being responsible for educative relationships

At first an adult is entirely responsible for a pedagogic relationship with a young child. However, as he/she becomes and is brought up properly by his/her educators, he/she becomes more independent and increasingly is able to act and choose on his/her own initiative in terms of the values and norms presented by an adult as worthy of being followed.

At first, this increasing initiative occurs in situations purposefully created by an educator so that he/she can show and practice independence (e.g., in a return to associating), but later this taking initiative occurs in situations where parents and other educators are not accompanying the child (e.g., periodic breaking away from associating). In the absence of an adult, he/she is forced to choose and act on his/her own and learn to take responsibility for those choices and actions.

In taking initiative and responsibility within a situation of formative educating (upbringing), he/she is given and assumes more and more responsibility for his/her share of an educative relationship. In addition, if he/she accepts co-responsibility (engaging) for maintaining a good relationship with his/her educators, it is likely that he/she also will take responsibility for his/her share in relationships established with others outside of an educative situation;

7. Longing for future adulthood

To a child the adult world is his/her future and because a human being is oriented to actualizing his/her own future, he/she wants to become an adult. From early on, a child is oriented to doing what older children and adults can do   But this orientation and motivation are not enough. An adult must appeal to him/her to actualize his/her potentialities (futurity) through self-initiative and personal effort. He/she must actively take up, work at, participate in his/her future to which he/she is directed and for which he/she longs. However, he/she needs the assistance and support of an adult to be able to do this; an adult can provide such accompaniment in a pedagogically accountable way, e.g., by talking with him/her about his/her future and especially by avoiding anything that might cloud this future, confuse him/her about it," or turn him/her off to it;

8. Actualizing potentialities for adulthood

It is necessary that an adult make a child aware of his/her positive human potentialities and assist him/her in actualizing and cultivating them. A precondition for this is a good quality of understanding between adultandchild; it is an understanding (and knowing) educator who can mosteffectively help him/her actualize his/her potentialities (e.g., by not demanding too much or expecting too little).

Gradually, with an adult's assistance (e.g., career/vocational guidance), a child discovers new potentialities and fields of interest. Here the main task of an adult is to provide him/her with guidelines and means for developing and cultivating these potentialities. This task is fulfilled in schools by vocational orientation pedagogics (see Joubert, 1980).

An adult aims to help a child form and cultivate his/her positive talents, and this requires that an educator encourage him/her to not want to live

in the past or to be satisfied with what he/she has already attained but to long for and strive for a better future. Thus, each accomplishment must be viewed and accepted by him/her as a new beginning for further improvement. In addition, he/she must be supported in controlling/mastering the potentialities at his/her disposal so they gradually can be fully cultivated;

9. Gradually achieving adulthood (destination)

with respect to educating, an adult's primary concern is to assist a child to reach or achieve his/her own adulthood. This means that gradually and progressively he/she must live the image (or idea) of adulthood represented to him/her by his/her educators. Of course, an adult must provide the required support and guidance for this to succeed.

In assisting a child to achieve adulthood, there are two main considerations. First, he/she must be helped to progress through actualizing several levels of values correlated with the levels of his/her becoming (e.g., sensory values such as bodily pleasure; vital values such as eating and drinking (health); psychic values such as happiness; spiritual values such as virtue). In this regard see Pretorius (1972) and Strydom (1977). Here the main task of an educator is to exemplify the "higher" values (i.e., the psychic and especially the spiritual) in such a way that a child is encouraged to internalize them and eventually to choose to follow and be responsible to them. Second, an adult must provide vocational or career guidance and support so he/she can fulfill his/her adulthood with respect to work because an adult is one who must pursue a career or occupation in a responsible way;

[BECOMING-SOMEONE-ONESELF]

10. Increasing respect for human dignity

An educator must assist a child to respect his/her own dignity (worthiness, value) and that of other persons. Each person differs from

all others and indeed is unique, and a child experiences these differences.
However, these differences are not a matter of degrees of worthiness or
human dignity and, hence, an essential lesson for him/her is that each
person must be able to command and receive respect for his/her human
dignity. That is, he/she must be brought up to respect his/her own
dignity and that of other persons-- irrespective of different talents,
disabilities, etc. (Nel, 1974). Of course, respect for human dignity does
not negate a personal preference for or an interest in a particular person
or persons. As individuals one person can be preferred over another,
BUT, as persons, we are all of equal dignity (value);

11. Achieving adulthood through increased self-understanding

S
elf-understanding means an understanding of who one is, of what one can
become, and of the demands of propriety (norms and values) which give
direction to being human. To increase his/her self-understanding, he/she
must be open to (i.e., trust) an adult because it is h/she who is in a
position to inform him/her about him/herself, especially regarding
his/her progress toward becoming an adult. This information helps a
child understand and accept him/herself because it provides him/her
with an indication of his/her positive potentialities and is a reminder that
he/she is going to be challenged in life to develop these personal talents
in a responsible way so he/she can use them for his/her own benefit as
well as for the benefit of others;

12. Conquering responsible freedom

The responsible exercise of freedom means to know and to
obey the authority of the norms and values emanating from one's
philosophy of life. A child-in-education is expected to show signs of
increasingly living as a free and responsible adult. In setting an example
of the responsible exercise of freedom, an adult must freely choose and
act according to the demands of propriety consistent with his/her outlook
on or philosophy of life. Consequently, in an educative situation, as

upbringing, an adult, representing independent freedom, encounters a child-as-becoming-freedom. An adult's task is to assist him/her to conquer or win his/her freedom by progressing through different levels or ways of being free which are correlated with his/her level of becoming.

The descriptions of the following levels of freedom are based on the commentary by Muller (1976) and Vandenberg (1971) which has its source in an article by Buytendijk (1953):

a) freedom of caprice.
Action follows the "whim" of the moment, and an infant's attention flits from object to object as he/she becomes satiated first with one object and then another. This "freedom" is primarily bodily - sensory centered. In fact, it seems that the infant is drawn to the objects, and initiative and choice are extremely primitive.

b} freedom of initiative.
Thanks to personal initiative, freedom is moved to a higher level. Here an infant is able to reach out for objects as he/she explores the lifeworld. He/she remembers certain objects and expects to experience certain qualities if he/she grasps a particular object (e.g., he/she expects to hear a noise when a rattle is picked up);

c) freedom of power.
A young child soon becomes aware that he/she can strive for and succeed in obtaining more than one thing. Through an increasing inner awareness of him/herself (which is strongly associated with his/her willing), freedom of caprice and initiative are transcended, and freedom of power is operative. For example, in a sandbox, Sally can grab Billy's shovel along with her own while saying of his shovel, "That's mine, I want it!";

d) freedom of choice.
Here he/she is able to choose among several objects and actions and decide which is more valuable in terms of some project or purpose. The

values inherent in his/her lifeworld begin to become ordered into a hierarchy of preferences and values for him/her;

e) moral freedom.

Once he/she has attained the level of freedom of choice, he/she needs educative guidance to learn that he/she is permitted to do some things and not others, and that he/she needs to learn to take other people into account when deciding. Gradually he/she can distinguish between what he/she *wants to do* and what he/she *is permitted to do*. Only when a child can make this distinction can he/she freely disagree with an adult and choose to disobey; only then can he/she truly obey.

An educator has the task of creating situations that allow a child to progress through the various levels or forms of freedom to moral freedom. In these situations, it is necessary that room be provided for him/her to disobey. According to Vandenberg (1971) this room for disobedience "maintains the tension between pedagogical authority and the pupils' freedom, between the pressure exerted on the pupil's existence by the norms present in the person of the teacher to whom he freely ascribes authority and his wanting-to-be-someone-himself" (p. 75). And Muller (1976) adds that Langeveld (1968) "emphasizes (sic) that authority creates freedom.   A child left to himself is unable to become free. He will drift into chaos, imagelessness and arbitrariness. Human freedom thus means being bound" (p. 36).

PEDAGOGICAL AIM STRUCTURES
(Normative adulthood as the aim of educating)

Relationship, sequence, and activity structures are the conditions which must be fulfilled for effective formative education to occur. That is, upbringing requires a special *adult-child relationship*, it has an identifiable *rhythm*, and it revolves around a variety of *mutual activities* engaged in by adult and child. But all of this is for a purpose. That purpose is to assist and accompany a child to his/her own adulthood; adulthood is the ultimate aim of educating. Of course, in the

moment to moment and day to day endeavors of educating him/her, his/her adulthood ordinarily is not in an educator's immediate focus. Here and now, he/she needs to be taught something or be helped to solve a particular moral dilemma. He/she needs to learn to spell this word, multiply these numbers, etc. However, these *immediate aims* or goals do not stand by themselves but open onto *intermediate aims*. For example, an intermediate aim might be for a child to become verbally and numerically literate and articulate. But why? Because in our culture it is to an adult person's advantage to be literate and articulate (since these allow him/her to live a fuller and richer life than would be possible otherwise). The important point is that the educative meaning (as upbringing) of immediate and intermediate aims is derived from the image that an educator holds regarding what, who, how an adult is. That is, immediate and intermediate aims contribute to and are steps on the way to a child's becoming and being an independent, morally responsible adult, which is the *ultimate aim* of educating. This means that immediate and intermediate aims must be consistent with and contribute to the ultimate aim of educating in order to be judge as accountable.

At this point, a question which naturally arises is what is an adult, or better, what is being-an-adult? Before trying to answer this question, it is important to keep in mind that being an adult, as the aim of upbringing, is not defined by age, and it is not a "state" of being. On the contrary, adulthood is a mode or way of being human. It is too dynamic to be described accurately as a "state". That is, as a mode or way of being, it needs to be continually sustained and reaffirmed by choices and actions. Thus, a person, irrespective of age, must work at being adult otherwise it is entirely possible that he/she will act "immaturely".

. Since adulthood is a mode or way of being human directed by norms and values (in terms of educating, adulthood is a *normative* and not merely a biological notion), educating, as bringing a not-yet-adult up to adulthood, has to do with accompanying and assisting someone who is in the mode of being a child gradually to arrive at and enter the mode of being an adult.

Now, what is adulthood? What are some of the *categories* (essences) descriptive of this way of being? Of course, there are many dimensions of adulthood that could serve as a point of focus (e.g., the esthetic, the social, the physical, the intellectual), but Landman et al. (1982) discuss six normative (and thus, spiritual) categories which indicate some of the specific aspects or contents of the aim of educating as the forming of conscience (also see Nel, 1974). A morally independent, responsible person (adult) ought to live his/her life in terms of the following categories:

1. Meaningful existence.

An adult is involved with a lifeworld full of meaning. He/she understands that he/she must answer meaningfully to the questions (demands) that life puts to him/her. The level on which a person actualizes meaning indicates the extent to which he/she has become an adult.

As noted by Crous (1979), B. F. Nel claims that an understanding of the meaning of life requires a large measure of responsibility. It is through the awakening of a child's conscience, notion of values, and sense of responsibility that he/she gradually arrives at an insight into the meaning of his/her life. Further, Crous (1979) states that according to W. Landman, an adult knows how to lead a meaningful existence and knows not to place demands on life. That is, responsibility implies that it is the *person* who must answer the demands of propriety by actualizing his/her positive potentialities for living as a "proper" adult. This actualization is accomplished by a child cultivating the contents of adulthood which, in a sense, amount to the *relationship* and *activity structures* described above;

2. Self-judgment and self-understanding

An adult is able to exercise self-judgment. He/she can judge choices and actions in terms of the demands of propriety; this means that an adult is able to use criteria or norms to do this. An adult is someone who can

make moral/ethical judgments about his/her own choices, actions, and aims in life. He/she understands and accepts his/her positive potentialities and limitations and has this self-understanding at his/her disposal. In addition, an adult is in a position to interpret this self-understanding in terms of the demands of propriety, occupational demands, and, in general, all that life demands of him/her;

3. Respect for human dignity.

An adult is aware that a human being is in a special position with respect to other living beings and that he/she should aim to promote all that is authentically human. Among other things, this means that an adult should respect the equal dignity (value) of others. Thus, an aim of educating is to help a not-yet adult cultivate his/her own worthiness (dignity) in light of norms and values expressive of a *philosophy of life* and to respect the dignity of other persons;

4. Morally independent choosing and responsible acting

An adult cannot only make a morally founded choice but can also stick to his/her decisions and accept responsibility for these choices and actions. An adult's choices and actions are consistent with the demands of propriety expressing a specific hierarchy of preferred values; to accept responsibility for one's obligations and to live up to one's decisions is a mark of a responsible adult;

5. Norm identification.

An adult is not someone who chooses and acts according to norms and values because someone expects this (docility) but rather because of the inherent value of those choices and actions. That is, an adult has an understanding of and follows the authority of particular norms and values because he/she has identified with and has internalized them so they are an integral part of his/her life. An adult must give

evidence, in the way he/she lives, of an identification with norms based on an independent, responsible understanding of what ought to be;

6. Outlook on life (philosophy of life).

An adult's choices and actions are a reflection of his/her commitment (but not enslavement) to a hierarchy of values. This hierarchy is experienced as the demands of propriety required by his/her philosophy of life. This hierarchy of values expresses his/her outlook on life, that which he/she holds as being of highest value for his/her life of choices and actions. He/she is able to show an outlook on life and to live by the demands of propriety flowing from it. One's philosophy of life "fills out" and gives concrete content to the normative categories of being an adult described above.

CONCLUSION

Below is a chart listing all of the fundamental pedagogical categories of educating described in this section of the present sudy. Also see the Appendix I for some of the essence of these essences. These categories are understood to be *essential* (*a priori*) structures of *any* educative situation (See Landman, et al., 1982). They are *not* the result of armchair theorizing or speculating that await empirical confirmation or disconfirmation. Indeed, they describe the preconditions for any (empirical) occurrence of educating, including educative schooling.

FUNDMENTAL PEDAGOGICAL CATEGORIES OF EDUCATING

A RELATIONSHIP STRUCTURES (as the inter-personal **axis** of educating)

Trust (as the affective moment of educating)
Understanding (as the cognitive moment
Authority (as the normative moment)

B SEQUENCE STRUCTURES (as the rhythm of educating)

Associating (being-by)
Encountering (being-with)
Engaging (being-for)
Pedagogic intervening (as acting)

Return to association (being-by again)
Periodic breaking away from association (being away from each other)

C ACTIVITY STRUCTURES (as the mutual involvement of adult and child in upbringing)

Being-in-a-meaningful educative situation requires:

Giving meaning with increasing responsibility
Gradually breaking away from lack of exertion
Exemplifying and emulating norms

Educative co-existence (being together) means:

Venturing (risking) with each other pedagogically
Being grateful for pedagogic security
Being responsible for educative relationships

Pedagogic temporality (futurity) points to:

Wanting to attain future adulthood
Actualizing potentialities for adulthood
Gradually achieving adulthood

Educatively becoming-somebody-oneself implies:

Increasing respect for human dignity
Achieving adulthood through increased self-understanding
Conquering of responsible freedom

D AIM STRUCTURES (Normative adulthood as the aim of educating)

Meaningful existence
Self-judging and self-understanding
Respect for human dignity
Morally independent choosing and responsible acting
Norm identification
Outlook on life (philosophy of life)

The practical value of these categories (essences) is that by changing them to evaluative questions or criteria (e.g., what is the quality and nature of an adult's example of living in accordance with a particular norm and a child's following that example? How does an adult exercise authority? Is he/she consistent? Does a child accept an adult's authority?) one is able to evaluate the adequacy of any educative situation (e.g., at home or at school) and see where and how that situation meets or falls short of these strictly *pedagogical criteria* (questions). [For a discussion of the difference between category and criterion, see Viljoen & Pienaar (1971)].

As a result of such an evaluation, for example, practical (orthopedagogic) plans of action can be developed and implemented to remedy dysfunctional situations [as so judged by fundamental-, psycho-, didactic-pedagogical criteria] (e.g., see Crous, 1979; Van Niekerk, 1982; Appendix II below). Also, such criteria are used to evaluate the *educative appropriateness* of well-accepted and validated *psychological techniques* such as the Premack Principle. Indeed, an evaluation of this principle from a *pedagogical perspective* will be presented in the next section.

Since a perspective is constituted and supported by the categories of that perspective, the use of the fundamental pedagogical categories presented above are required of anyone who wants to take a *truly pedagogical perspective* on upbringing; however, since the above categories are those of the sub-perspective of pedagogics known as fundamental pedagogics, the perspective on educating presented is a fundamental pedagogical one. To take a psychopedagogical or a didactic-pedagogical perspective on educating requires that one use the categories of these (or other) sub-perspectives; a presentation of these other categories is beyond the scope of this study.

An evaluation of the Premack Principle in terms of some fundamental pedagogical categories and criteria

The above essentials or categories of educating provide a basis for evaluating practices and theories from a *pedagogical perspective*. However, these categories should not be viewed as a checklist to be applied. For example, even though the following pedagogical/educative evaluation of the Premack principle indicates that it has serious limitations as an educative technique, this does not mean that it should be deleted from an educator's armamentarium. The following evaluation only indicates some of the educative shortcomings or risks inherent in the use of the Premack principle. Ultimately, it is an educator's/pedagogue's responsibility to decide whether to use this technique in the unique, concrete situation in which he/she finds him/herself.

The purpose of this evaluation is to show that a different understanding of the Premack principle is attained depending on whether it is viewed and evaluated from a pedagogical or from a psychological perspective. An important implication of this evaluation is that a *pedagogical perspective* is possible.   Since this perspective is constituted by using pedagogical categories (essences) and their coherence, this also means that a discipline of educational (pedagogical) scholarship and practice that is an academic discipline on an equal level with, say, psychology is possible. Indeed, such a discipline has been pursued, particularly in the Netherlands (Utrecht) and South Africa (Pretoria), for several decades.

After introducing the general model of the Premack principle, I describe a specific example of its classroom use provided by Gage and Berliner (1988). Both the general model and the specific example then are evaluated in terms of a few of fundamental pedagogical categories.

To keep this evaluation manageable, I limit myself to a category from the relationship structures, from the sequence structures, from the activity structures and from the aim structures that constitute a fundamental pedagogical perspective on bringing a child up to adulthood and that have been explicated above in detail.

Since the Premack principle is a psychological principle promoted as applicable to upbringing and to schooling by virtually every author of a contemporary educational psychology textbook, perhaps it should be evaluated in terms of psychopedagogical categories and criteria (See, e.g., Sonnekus, 1985). Then the evaluation would emphasize more the psychological moments inherent in educating. Indeed, a psychopedagogical evaluation of the Premack principle would be appropriate and worthwhile. However, my purpose is to show that the essentials of educating disclosed and described from a fundamental pedagogical perspective truly are fundamental and thus *ground* the pedagogical part-perspectives, including psychopedagogics. Consequently, it is necessary to show that fundamental pedagogical categories are relevant to the present evaluation.

What is the Premack principle?

The Premack principle is a reinforcement model of learning; even so, strictly speaking it is not an application of Skinner's (1953) model of operant conditioning. The principle, as formulated by Premack (1965), is that a more preferred (probable) response or activity (e.g., playing) can reinforce a less preferred activity (e.g., making one's bed).

The Premack principle is a straightforward psychological principle which has been confirmed by research as well as by generations of parents who have used this idea spontaneously and intuitively. Thus, when a parent says to a child, "make your bed and then you can go out and play", he/she is implementing the Premack principle.

A classroom Application of the Premack Principle

Gage and Berliner (1988) provide an example of the successful application of the principle to restore order in an out-of-control classroom. This example is instructive on several counts. First, it shows that this *psychological principle or technique* can be used to get a desired result. Second, in light of the educational evaluation to follow, it indicates that Gage and Berliner, not to mention Homme, the researcher who provided the example, and a host of educational psychology textbook authors, use a *psychological* and not an *educational perspective* to evaluate and to promote the use of this technique. Third, this concrete example can serve to clarify a difference between a psychological and an educational perspective.

The specific classroom example provided by Gage and Berliner is based on an account by Homme (1966) who, "while working with an out-of-control class and a distraught teacher" (Gage and Berliner, 1988, p. 244) became

aware of the value of the Premack principle for schooling. As Gage and Berliner (1988) present this example:

"Children were running, screaming, pushing chairs noisily, and doing puzzles. The teacher's requests for order seemed to have no effect on the class. Faced with the problem, Homme took the approach of making the running and other disruptive behaviors contingent on doing only a small amount of whatever the teacher wanted the students to do. For example, the pupils were asked to sit quietly in chairs and look at the blackboard. Then, almost immediately, they were told, 'Everybody, run and scream now.' This kind of contingency management enabled the teacher to take control of the situation" (pp. 244-245).

A Fundamental Pedagogical Evaluation of the Premack Principle

By presenting a few questions or criteria from the fundamental pedagogical categories of the relationship of *pedagogical authority*, the sequence phase called *pedagogical intervention*, the activity category referred to as *norm exemplification and emulation* and the category of the aim (adulthood) referred to as *norm identification* it becomes possible to use these criteria to evaluate the Premack principle and the above example of its application to a classroom from a *pedagogical rather than a psychological perspective*. The questions/criteria to be used are the following:

Pedagogical authority (relationship)
Is there *dialogue* between adult and child within which
an adult represents a valued behavior to a child?
Does an adult indicate to a child (by example) that
he/she behaves in accordance with the norms and values
(behaviors) he/she is asking a child to follow?
Is a transition from docile obedience to independent
obedience being promoted?

Pedagogical intervening (sequence)
Is a child's acceptable behavior approved by an adult?
In his/her approval does an adult praise a child
for having *already* independently chosen the acceptable.
Is unacceptable behavior rejected by an adult?
Does he/she offer feasible, acceptable alternatives
to a child?

Norm exemplification and emulation (activity)
Does an adult exemplify to a child the valued behavior?
Does a child emulate an adult's example (does he/she
want to be like an adult)?

Norm identification (aim)
Is a child's internalization of and identification with the valued
being promoted?
Is independent, responsible understanding of and choice of
what ought to be being fostered?

These closely related and somewhat overlapping criteria now are used to obtain a pedagogical perspective, first on the Premack principle, as such, and then on the example of its classroom application.

In terms of an adult-child relationship of *pedagogical authority*, the Premack principle is not centered on a *dialogue* between adult and child concerning the norms and values or acceptable behaviors at issue. Although it is not pursued here, this lack of dialogue has negative implications for the development of mutual trust and understanding. Certainly, there is some dialogue between adult and child in negotiating what activity will serve as a reinforcer for a child engaging in the behavior desired by the adult (i.e., the acceptable or "target" behavior). From a pedagogical perspective, however, this dialogue should revolve around the valued behavior being promoted by an educator. The Premack principle does not provide for this dialogue.

An adult's example to a child should convey that he/she freely chooses to engage in the acceptable behavior being promoted, and this is irrelevant to the Premack technique. This is an additional indication that this principle is not rooted in a pedagogical perspective rooted in the reality of accompanying a child to his/her adulthood.

Owing to the very structure of the Premack technique, *docility* is promoted at the expense of an *independent obedience* to the authority of the valued behavior. This is partly because the technique encourages a child to do what an adult values or wants *in order to* get (do) what he/she values. This undermines the intrinsic value of the behavior an adult wants to promote, and it encourages a child to be dependent on extrinsic rewards for his/her choices.

The independent, responsible choosing of what a child ought to choose is ignored or retarded by this technique. This is so even though Gage and Berliner (1988) insist that children can learn to reinforce themselves and thus be "weaned away from dependence on reinforcers of any given kind (for example, approval by a teacher) by having reinforcers of some other kind (approval by their peers) substituted" (parenthese are mine) (p. 256). The *educative point* is that extrinsic reinforces undermine the pedagogical authority of that which ought to be valued, as such, and not because it leads to something else (especially something else more valued by a child than the "target" behavior).

Gage and Berliner (1988) also address the issue of using positive extrinsic reinforcers as a form of bribery. Their comments, made from an ethical perspective, miss the point made from a perspective rooted in educating. They say that when "positive extrinsic reinforcement is used to promote honest and wanted behavior, with the students' awareness and cooperation, it cannot be considered bribery" (p. 255). Whether or not bribery is said to occur only when a person is influenced to do something dishonest or unfair is beside the point here. That is, from a pedagogical perspective (which essentially includes moral, ethical moments), the issue

is that the use of reinforcement undermines the pedagogical authority of what *ough*t to be valued for itself (Also, see Morgan, 1984).

With respect to the sequence structure called pedagogical intervening, in using the Premack principle, a child's acceptable behavior is being approved by an adult but *only indirectly* through the reinforcement. The way in which this approval (reinforcement) of the acceptable is given is not educatively accountable. That is, to promote the independent and responsible choice of what is valued, the approval (reinforcement) should not be held out as a promise to him/her that is contingent on certain choices but rather it might be given *after* he/she independently has chosen what is valued (by an educator).

In the absence of pedagogical dialogue, unacceptable behavior is indirectly rejected because the adult does not reinforce it, but the offering of feasible, acceptable alternatives only is brought forward through a renegotiation of the "contract" in the form of "if you now do x, instead of w, you will be allowed to do Y."

Applying the criterion derived from the activity called *norm exemplification and emulation*, again it is noted that if an adult exemplifies the valued to a child, it is done *outside* of the purview of this technique. The probability that he/she will engage in the behavior valued by the educator will be increased by the use of the Premack principle, but emulating what an an adult has exemplified is not what is occurring. Once again, it is seen that *docility* is encouraged and this is contrary to a child internalizing the valued for its own sake.

Finally, viewing the general model in terms of a criterion related to the aim moment of adulthood called norm identification, for reasons already noted, this technique does not promote identifying with the valued behavior, and this identification is a precondition for the independent and responsible choosing of what *ought* to be.

From an pedagogical perspective, and in terms of the criterion employed to evaluate it, the Premack principle is *not an accountable educative procedure* even though, from a psychological perspective it is a very "useful" technique for modifying the behavior of children--even in the direction of the behaviors valued by an educator. It should be stressed that the practical value (the usefulness and success) claimed for this technique is tied to a *psychological perspective* and criteria. In recommending this principle to a classroom teacher, Gage and Berliner (1988) show clearly that they are operating within a psychological and not a pedagogical perspective.

Without repeating the above evaluation in every detail, it is instructive briefly to look at the classroom application described earlier and which Gage and Berliner offer to their readers with no qualifications. The evaluation of this concrete example illustrates even further the educative inadequacies of this technique, and it underlines once again the "blinding" effect that a psychological perspective can have on one who is dealing with matters of educating as bringing a child up to adulthood.

As to the categories inherent to the relationship of *pedagogical authority*, the above evaluation of the general model can be repeated in every detail for this example. However, the educative absurdity of this classroom example clearly is brought to the fore when the criterion inherent to the sequence phase called pedagogic intervening is used. That is, the children's behaviors of running, screaming, pushing chairs noisily, etc. appropriately are rejected by the adult as unacceptable whereas sitting quietly in their chairs and looking at the chalkboard are offered as acceptable alternatives. The educative absurdity is introduced when the unacceptable behaviors are made "contingent on doing only a small amount of whatever the teacher wanted the students to do" (Gage and Berliner, 1988, p. 244). In other words, the children are told that if they briefly sit quietly and look at the chalkboard they then can run and scream! The unacceptable behavior that led to the judgment that this is a classroom out-of-control is the *very same* behavior now condoned and

encouraged (because it can reinforce the preferred behavior), provided it is *proceeded* by briefly engaging in the acceptable behavior.

Docility is promoted here because the value of the acceptable behavior now is reflective of the children's preference for engaging in the unacceptable behavior. That is, the inherent value of the acceptable behavior, which is a precondition for a transition from docility to independent obedience of the authority of that which is acceptable (valued), is undermined by using the Premack principle.

The pedagogical activity called norm exemplification and emulation simply is by-passed in this example. Here the adult seems to be an adversary and, therefore, the child's identification with the adult is hindered and so is his/her inte rnalization of the valued behavior. Consequently, the promotion of the aspect of adulthood (the aim) called norm identification also is not conspicious in this example.

From a psychological perspective, where the category or concept of a *change in behavior* is prominent, this example is viewed as successful and non-problematic because it does lead to a change in behavior. However, from a perspective rooted in educating, this is a clear example of the inconsistent and contradictory exercise of pedagogical authority.

For a docile child, perhaps this inconsistency is not particularly salient because he/she is attuned to following the whim of an adult and, indeed, this docility is precisely what is being encouraged. For a child who wants to understand and act on his/her own, this inconsistency can be nothing but confusing, and it almost is a command to "do as I say". Hence, in this example, docility is promoted because the adult fails to indicate to the child that the acceptable behavior is valuable in itself and because the teacher first rejects and then conditionally condones the unacceptable behavior. This type of inconsistent exercise of authority is at the core of many cases of dysfunctional educating (Van Niekerk, 1982).

Clearly, the Premack principle and the example of its classroom application are problematic when viewed in terms of some fundamental pedagogical criteria inherent to educating itself.

Finally, a broader implication of this study is that it indicates that primordial educating as upbringing has its own coherent categorical, and evaluative perspectives. This belies Hirst's (1966) classification of educational theory as a practical one (and not, e.g., the theory of a practice). According to him, it is a practical theory because it relies exclusively on the disciplines (e.g., psychology) for justifying practical [classroom?] activities. This claim not only is refuted in a concrete way in this study with respect to the Premack principle, but also it shows that, owing to the disclosed pedagogical categories, their coherence and criteria, fundamental pedagogics (and pedagogics in general) meet his criteria for being an independent discipline (form of knowing).

References

Arnstine, D. G. (1967). *Philosophy and education: learning and schooling.* New York: Harper and Row.

Buytendijk, F. J. J. (1953). Experienced freedom and moral freedom in the child's consciousness. *Educational Theory*, 3, 1-13.

Crous, s. F. M. (1979). *Pedoterapeutiese begeleiding van die affektief - versteurde kind.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria.

Dewey, J. (1929). *The sources of a science of education.* New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation.

Dewey, J. (1966*). Democracy and education.* New York: The Free Press. (originally published, 1916).

Egan, K. (1983*). Education and psychology: Plato, Piaget and scientific psychology.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Frankl, V. E. (1969). *The will to meaning: Foundations and application of logotherapy.* New York: New American Library.

Gage, N. L., & Berliner, D. C. (1988). *Educational psychology* (14th ed). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Gagne, E. D. (1985). *The cognitive psychology of school learning.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Giorgi, A. (1970*). Psychology as a human science: A phenomenologically based approach*. New York: Harper and Row.

Gowan, D. B. (1981). Educating. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Grene, M. (1966). *The knower and the known*. New York: Basic Books.

Gunter, c. F. G. (1974). *Aspects of educational theory*. Stellenbosch: University Publishers and Booksellers.

Hirst, P. H. (1966). Educational theory. In J. W. Tibble (Ed.), *The study of education* (pp. 29-58). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Homme, L. E. (1966). Human motivation and environment. *Kansas Studies in Education*, 16, 30-39.

Joubert, C. J. (Ed.) (1980). *Beroepsvoorligting op skool.* Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

Kilian, c. J. G., & Viljoen, T. A. (1974). *Fundamental pedagogics and fundamental structures,* Durban: Butterworths.

Landman, W. A., & Roos, s, G. (1973*). Fundamentele pedagogiek en die opvoedingswerklikheid.* Durban: Butterworths.

Landman, W. A., Sonnekus, M. C. H., & Van Wyk, s. (1978). 'n Ondersoek na die weghandeling van fundamentele pedagogiese essensies*. South African Journal of Pedagogy*, 12, 130-147.

Landman, W. A., Kilian, c. J. G., Swanepoel, E. M., & Bodenstein,H. C. A. (1982*). Fundamental pedagogics.* Johannesburg: Juta.

Langeveld, M. J. (1958). Disintegration and reintegration of "pedagogy." *International Review of Education*, 4, 51-64.

Langeveld, M. J. (1966*). Beknopte theoretische pedagogiek*. Groningen: Wolters - Noordhoff. (Originally published, 1945).

Meyer, R. E. (1987). *Educational psychology: A cognitive approach.* Boston: Little, Brown and company.

Morgan, M. (1984). Reward-induced decrements and increments in ntrinsic motivation. *Review of Educational Research*, 54, 5-30.

Muller, A. (1976). *Conscience and the adolescent: A psycho pedagogical in investigation*, Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

Nel, B. F. (1974). *Fundamental orientation in psychological pedagogics*, Stellenbosch: University Publishers and Booksellers.

Nucci, L. P. (1982). Conceptual development in the moral and conventional domains: implications for values education. *Review of Educational Research*, 52, 93-122.

Peters, R. S. (1963). Comments. In J. Walton and J. L. Kuethe (Eds.). *The discipline of education* (pp. 17-22). Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Peters, R. S. (1967). *Ethics and education*. Palo Alto: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Premack, D. (1965). Reinforcement theory. In D. Levine (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (Vol. 13, pp. 123-180). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Pretorius, J. W. M. (1972). *Kinderlike belewing*. Johannesburg: Perskor.

Scheffler, I. (1960). *The language of education*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.

Scheffler, I. (1963). Is education a discipline? In J. Walton and J, L. Keuthe (Eds.) *The discipline of education* (pp. 47-61). Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Schmidt, W. H. O. (1973). *Child development: the human, cultural, and educational context*. New York: Harper and Row.

Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York: Macmillan.

Soltis, J. F. (1978). *An introduction to the analysis of educational concepts.* (2nd ed.). Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Sonnekus, s. F. M. (1977). *The teacher, the lesson, and the child.* Stellenbosch: University Publishers and Booksellers.

Sonnekus, s. F. M. (Ed.) (1985). *Learning: a psychopedagogic perspective*, Stellenbosch: University Publishers and Booksellers.

Sonnekus, S. F. M., & Ferreira, G, V. (1979). Die psigiese lewe van die kind-in-opvoeding. Stellenbosch: University Publishers and Booksellers.

Strydom, A. E. (1977). Drug abuse as a problem of self realization. Pretoria: *Human Sciences Research Council*.

Vandenberg, D. (1971). *Being and education: an essay in existential phenomenology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Van der Stoep, F. & Louw, W. J. (1984). *Didactics*, Pretoria: Academica.

Van Niekerk, P. A. (1982). *The teacher and the child in educational distress*, Stellenbosch: University Publishers and Booksellers.

Van Rensburg, C. J. J., & Landman, w. A. (1986). *Notes on fundamental - pedagogic concepts: an introductory orientation*. Pretoria: N.G. Kerboekhandel Transvaal.

Viljoen, T. A. & Pienaar, J. J., (1971). *Fundamental pedagogics*. Durban: Butterworths.

Wingo, G. M. (1974). *Philosophies of education: an introduction. Lexington*: D.C. Heath and Company.

Wittrock, M. C. (Ed.). (1986). *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd edition). New York: Macmillan.

APPENDIX I

FUNDAMENTAL PEDAGOGICAL STRUCURES AND ESSENCES:
The fundamental stru
ctures of a pedagogical situation

I PEDAGOGICAL RELATIONSHIP STRUCTURES (mutual relationship between adult and child)

A. UNDERSTANDING (knowingly being together)

1. Understanding-child-being (the adult must know the child(ren) entrusted to him). This knowledge emerges in accordance with:
a. understanding otherness (each child is someone who himself wants to be someone; therefore, the adult must try to learn to know each child)
b. experiencing otherness (each child must feel and lived-experience that the adult takes into account the fact that he is different from others)
c. interpreting potentialities (the adult must assist the child to discover and to understand his potentialities)
d. developing potentialities (the child must be helped to exercise (control) his positive potentialities and in so doing allow them to develop)
e. valuing potentialities (the child must be helped to appreciate and to value the talents which he has)

2. Understanding-the-demands-of-propriety Both adult and child are subject to certain demands and the child must be helped to understand:

a. authority of the demands of propriety (to be governed by particular demands, they must be understood and accepted)

b. understanding the demands of being human (the requirements that must be satisfied in order to be considered a "proper" person must be understood and complied with)

c. understanding responsibility (the obligation to choose and act must be accepted and an account of this must be given)

d. understanding proper effort (the child must understand that he must always do his very best regarding the activities given to him)

e. understanding obedience (the child must know that if something is required of him, he must obey)

B. TRUST The being-together of adult and child in trust is characterized by the following:

1. Regard-for-the-dignity-of-the-child Respect for the child as a fellow-person must be shown by:

a. respect for otherness (observance of the fact that children differ from each other)

b. regard for actualizing values (regard for the child as a participant in making a reality that which is of highest value)

2. Acceptance Creation of a relationship with the child by showing:

a. willingness-to-relate Eagerness to create a relationship with the child which involves:

i. taking action (the child is influenced with the aim of supporting him)

ii. bonding (an intimate attachment is formed between adult and child)

iii. fellow-human (the child must always be related to humanly since he is no animal or thing)

iv. address-listen (the adult must speak clearly with the child and the child must listen thoroughly)

v. respect (the adult must handle with respect, appreciation and consideration the child's wanting-to-be-someone-himself)

vi. being-partners ("Come stand by me so that I can help you.")

vii. being-accompanied (guided) ("Now go further with me"; i.e., yet nearer to proper adulthood)

viii. being-a-participant (the child must be allowed to take an active part in valuable activities)

b. intention to care for (the child must experience that the adult gladly watch over him by making the following possible):

i. caring space (the child must experience that the home/classroom is a place where he is gladly cared for)

ii. situation of acceptance (opportunities are created for the child to experience that he is welcome)

iii. caring out of love (the child must experience that he is intervened with out

of good will toward him and not with ulterior motives)

iv. action-in-love A sincere kindness toward the child is evidenced by:

        a. making him feel at home (a place in which he feels at home--happy, at
        ease--is especially arranged for him)

b. establishing nearness (a personal nearness is established and feelings of
distance must disappear)

c. admitting into our space (the child is admitted into a place with
    someone with whom "we" can be mentioned)

C. AUTHORITY The living together of adult and child with the demands of propriety is
characterized by:

1. "Telling" (the adult "tells" what is proper and the child allows himself to be
persuaded by
what is said)

2. Being addressed (the adult talks clearly with the child about the demands of
propriety)

3. Being appealed to (an appeal is made to the child urging him to do what is proper)

4. Obedience (the child is willing to listen to and carry out meaningful directions)

5. Recognition of authority (the child sees in and gives to the adult the right to tell him
what is proper)

6. Complying with authority (the child must live up to the adult's explanation and
    example)

7. Acknowledgment of the authority of norms (the authority of the demands of
    propriety is acknowledged)

II PEDAGOGICAL SEQUENCE STRUCTURES The event of educating takes the following
course:

A. ASSOCIATION The being-together of adult and child is characterized by the following:

1. Being-by-each-other To be by each other means:

    a. temporality (adult and child are by each other at the same time, with
    enough time, and with no generation gap)

b. spatiality (adult and child are by each other in the same space)

c. being of the presence of each other (both adult and child know
and feel that they can communicate with each other at the same time and place)

2. The beginning of educating The being together of adult and child leads to:

    a. indications for intervention (indications can appear that possibly it will be
    necessary for the adult to intervene with the child's choices and actions)

    **b. general educative influencing by controlling (correcting) and
    giving direction** (because the adult immediately begins to set an example, to
    supervise, and to point out what is proper, there is mention of educating)

B. ENCOUNTER The being by each other of adult and child deepens according to:

1. Being-with each other To be with each other means to actualize:

    a. pedagogic closeness (adult and child experience no distance between them and that communication is possible)

    b. turning-to-in-trust (adult and child turn to each other so a face-to-face relationship becomes possible)

    c. presence-in-trust (because of the face-to-face relationship, it is possible to speak meaningfully with each other)

    d. experience of belonging (the child experiences, "I belong with you for my sake." The adult experiences, "You belong with me for your sake." Both experience, "We belong with each other for our sake.")

    e. experience of accessibility (the child and adult feel and experience that one is open to the other. Both are accessible and available to each other)

f. intimacy (sincerity, cordiality, and intimacy predominate)

2. Similar disposition If teacher and child communicate in the same frame of mind (disposition), this will be shown in:

    a. mutual attunement (adult and child act within a cooperative frame of mind. There is harmony regarding their being with each other)

    b. conspicuous attraction (adult's and child's attraction to each other is such that it can be noticed)

    c. surprising degree of attraction (their attraction to each other really comes from both sides and with the same goal, namely, authentic being-with-each-other)

    d. deep-rooted fondness (a good disposition and good will which are not superficial prevail, and this leads to both wanting to be with each other)

C. ENGAGEMENT The adult now assumes responsibility for the intervention with the child when he deems it necessary, and the child takes responsibility for his share. This will be evident if the following are actualized:

1. "might not" aspect (the teacher might not ignore the reasons which determine why he must intervene with the child's mode of living. The child might not try to escape the intervention)

2. accepting responsibility (both adult and child accept responsibility for that which must still occur)

3. pedagogic interference (awareness of educative aim) (clear awareness by the adult that progress must now begin in the direction of the aim which he has stated)

4. obligation to be available (the obligation to be available to each other is accepted: the child to be guided and the adult to give support)

D. PEDAGOGIC INTERVENTION The adult acts to prevent the child from getting on the wrong track. This action can be differentiated into:

Pedagogic disapproval

1. **Disapproval of objectionable values** (the adult indicates that he has a dislike for that which is not proper)
2. **Experience of being opposed** (doing the improper must be stopped)
   a. **the adult must oppose** (the adult appeals in explicit ways to the child to discontinue doing the improper)
   b. **child acceptance of the opposition** (the child accepts, usually gladly, that it is right that he be opposed when doing what is improper)
3. **Presentation of new modes of living** (something positive and feasible must now be considered in place of the improper)
4. **Change of direction toward new modes of living** (the child is helped to move from the improper in the direction of the proper whyich must replace the former)
5. **Break-through to the idea of propriety** (if the above succeeds, what is proper will be seen clearly and doing what is proper will be promoted)
6. **Increasing knowledge of good and bad** (the result of the above five phases is that there will be an increase in the child's ability to differentiate between right and wrong)

Pedagogic approval The adult acts in order to support the child in doing what is proper by allowing the following to occur:
1. **Acceptance of approved values** (words of praise are spoken to the child who does what is proper)
2. **Experience of being in agreement** (doing what is proper must be commended)
   a. **educator must be in agreement** (the adult shows regard for the child when he has chosen to act properly)
b. **child anticipates being in agreement** (the child hopes that the adult will approve of his proper choices and actions)
3. **Idea of persistence** (the adult informs the child that he must continue to do in the future what is proper)
4. **Appreciation of ways of living** (gratitude must be expressed to the child who persists
5. **Strengthening the idea of propriety** (if the above occur, the child's understanding of propriety becomes continually clearer)
6. **Corroboration of the knowledge of good and bad** (the effort of all of the above is that there will be an increase in the child's certainty about what is right and wrong)

E. RETURN TO ASSOCIATION The child must now find an opportunity to appropriate, in the presence of the adult, that which occurred in implementing sequences A through D. For this, the following are necessary:
1. **Assimilating the intervention** (the child thinks about the intervention and whether he agrees)
2. **Prospering of being someone oneself** (the child finds an opportunity, independent of direct intervention, again to be himself and to become)

3. Experiencing freedom (he experiences freedom because now he himself must think and   act, but he still experiences a close connection with the adult who is present)
4. Taking part in unintentional intervention (although the adult does not directly
        intervene with the child, he still exercises a controlling influence because of the
fact that he   is present)
5. Acquiring self-knowledge (because he is now dependent on himself, he learns to know
        himself better in light of what has happened immediately above)

F. PERIODIC BREAKING AWAY FROM ASSOCIATION The child must now find an
opportunity to appropriate, in the physical absence of the adult, that which occurred in
implementing sequences A through E. Therefore, the following are necessary:
1. Farewell (the child is bid farewell in a hearty way so he knows he can again
confidently   return later to the adult)
2. Practicing separation (gradually the child becomes competent to independently
choose   and act)
3. Loosening bonds (the bond of upbringing between the child and the adult gradually
        loosens as his independence increases)
4. Affirmation of freedom (the fact that he is allowed to leave the presence of the adult--
        and other adults--is an acknowledgment that he is involved in winning his
freedom)
5. Longing to be someone oneself (he yearns to himself practice and cultivate his
        independence in the physical absence of the adult)
6. Conquest of being dependent on support (to the extent that he succeeds in
        cultivating his independence, he conquers his dependence on adults giving
support to him)
7. Creative pause (during the absence of an adult, meaningful change is actualized as a
        change in his being on the way to proper adulthood)
8. Yearning to associate again (the child experiences and moves to a time when he again
        will have a need for the support given by adults, and he will then return to their
presence)
9. Welcome greeting (the friendly greeting from the adult, which arises from the
periodic   breaking away, gives an indication of the adult's willingness to once again
cover the path of   upbringing with the child)

III PEDAGOGICAL ACTIVITY STRUCTURES The following are twelve pedagogic activities
which must effect the child under consideration.

A. GIVING MEANING WITH INCREASING RESPONSIBILITY The child's world is everything
that is understandable to him, what has meaning for him. The practice of giving
meaning and the expansion of his world occur as the following succeed:
1. Attributing meaning (meanings are given to persons, things, events, etc.)

2. Testing meanings (the child must be helped to test if the meanings he attributes are
correct and appropriate).

3. Lived-experiencing meaning (the personal meaning--meaning-for-me--of what is
valuable must be accepted and felt)

4. Living meanings (the child must be helped so that what is really meaningful--
important,   valuable--becomes part of his way of life)

5. Meaningful acts (meanings, the valuable, must be transformed into acts, and in this
connection, the child must receive meaningful teaching)

6. Meaning elevation (the teacher helps the child give meaning on yet a higher level. He
must give meaning in accordance with his level of becoming)

B. GRADUAL BREAKING AWAY FROM LACK OF EXERTION The child must be helped to
use all of his power and to do his very best at everything he engages in, and this requires
that the following be actualized:

1. Movement toward exertion (lack of exertion must be abandoned for a willingness to
doing meaningful deeds)

2. Dynamic taking part (energetic and active participation in meaningful deeds must be
expected of the child)

3. Conquering passivity (to not want to proceed and act with others must be
disapproved, and the child's efforts to become involved must be agreed with)

4. Choice for exertion (by intervening when passivity enters and by agreeing when the
child chooses to be actively involved promotes a preference for exertion)

C. EXEMPLIFYING AND EMULATING NORMS To want to live--choose and act--in
accordance with particular demands of propriety requires that the following be done:

1. Unconditional norm identification (the child must accept and appropriate that which
is of highest value. He must be helped to live the acknowledged philosophy of or
outlook   on life)

2. Taking a view toward a philosophy of life (to an ever increasing degree, the child
must be helped to know, to support, and to apply a philosophy of life to his way
of living)

3. Judging from a standpoint (one's own choices and actions are viewed in light of a
philosophy of life. Increased knowledge of a philosophy of life by the child ought
to lead   to a more refined judging)

4. Living the demands of propriety (that which is highly valued--deciding what is
proper,   fitting, and reasonable--must be evidenced in the child's way of living)

D. VENTURING (RISKING) WITH EACH OTHER PEDAGOGICALLY The child must be helped
to venture with another (an adult) to a proper way of living. This means he must
attempt to do the following:

1. Co-meaning (to search with others, especially adults, for what is really meaningful--
valuable)

2. Living together according to the demands of propriety (to be willing to try to live in accordance with the proper examples set by others)

3. Courageously venturing with (with bravery and even boldness, together with the one who sets the example, the proper must be chosen, action must be in light of the proper)

E. BEING GRATEFUL FOR PEDAGOGICAL SECURITY To live with gratefulness, thankfulness, requires the following:

1. Experience of security (whenever he has the need for it, the child must have the opportunity once again to feel secure before he will again venture into reality)

2. Gratefulness for the experience of security (the child should be grateful to those who make the experience of security possible because he appreciates what they have done for   him)

3. Security because of acceptance (in reality, it is the acceptance of the child which leads to the experience of security. The essentials of acceptance must be actualized)

4. Loving presence (action-in-love which is characterized by being with each other and by   similar dispositions are appreciated by the child)

F. RESPONSIBILITY FOR EDUCATIVE RELATIONSHIPS The child must be helped in an increasingly responsible way to feel:

1. Respect-for-partner (the child should have respect for those adults who assist him. He   also must experience that they are ready to assist him with respect for his being human)

2. Respect-for-accompanier (the child should have respect for those adults who are ready to venture on his path of life with him and who always treat him in decent ways)

3. Experience of belonging together (there should be respect for those adults who always proceed with him in light of his own nature)

4. Obligation to be accessible (the child should respect adults who are open to and appreciate him and who appreciate his openness to them)

G. WANTING TO ATTAIN FUTURE ADULTHOOD The child expects that the adults will help him with the following, and he has trust in those who can rightly accomplish this:

1. Notion of the future (the child clearly anticipates what is possible and has an image of   the future approaching him)

2. Interpretation of the past (the child expects that an interpretation of the meaning of his own past holds true for the future life he wants to attain)

3. Direction to the future (the child anticipates being assisted to start moving in the direction of a future which holds only the best for him)

4. Discussions about the future in the present (the child anticipates help with the different decisions he must continually make regarding his future)

5. Working on the future in the present (the child anticipates help in his preparation for the future)

6. Understanding future demands (the child anticipates help in understanding the
     demands which might be made on him in the future)
7. Speaking about the future (the child anticipates that there will be discussions with
him   about the future--the immediate as well as the remote future)

H. ACTUALIZING POTENTIALITIES FOR ADULTHOOD The child must be helped to form
his positive potentialities (talents) with an aim to the future and, therefore, the following
are necessary:
1. Longing for the future (a desire to not want to live in the past or to be smug with
what   has been attained to date, but always to live better)
2. Reality as new possibility (each new milestone which is achieved must be seen and
     accepted as a new beginning for further improvement)
3. Using potentialities (the talents the child has at his disposal must be used. He must
     control them so they can be cultivated fully in the future)

I. GRADUALLY ACHIEVING ADULTHOOD Gradually and in an ever increasing degree, the
child must realize that he has a calling to fulfill, and the adults help him with this by
making the following possible:
1. Being directed by destination (the child's striving to let his potentialities adequately
     unfold must continually be nourished, and this is done by helping him see that
his talents   must be used)
2. Moving toward destination (the child's calling ultimately is to be a proper person and
     for this he must be helped in responsible ways)

J. INCREASING RESPECT FOR HUMAN DIGNITY For the child to increasingly feel respect
for the dignity of a person, he should have sufficient opportunity to experience the
following:
1. Acknowledgment of individuality (persons are not identical because each actualizes
     values in different ways and with a difference in responsibility. This difference
must be acknowledged)
2. Respect because of actualizing values (all persons are of equal dignity because all can
     actualize values)
3. Valuing a concern for values (the child is concerned with values and must not be
used   as a means to an end)
4. Meeting obligations (to fulfill obligations, thus to meet obligations with respect for
the   highly valued, is to live with human dignity)

K. ACHIEVING ADULTHOOD THROUGH INCREASED SELF-UNDERSTANDING Adulthood is
characterized by a high degree of self-understanding. Self-understanding is exercised
when the child has the opportunity to engage in:
1. Critical self-judgment (a clear look at one's way of actualizing the highly valued)

2. Understanding being called upon (a clear idea that he is called on to put into service his positive potentialities for the actualization of what is highly valued)

3. Understanding the demands of propriety (a clearer knowledge of the demands which actualizing the highly valued make on him)

4. Understanding obligations (an increasing understanding of his positive potentialities and the obligations these lay on him)

5. Refinement of self-understanding (an improvement in his self-understanding, especially from an understanding of how he can, in the best possible way, contribute to the   actualization of the highly valued)

L. CONQUERING OF RESPONSIBLE FREEDOM The conquering of freedom toward responsibility is characterized by:

1. Conquering freedom (without external compulsion, the highly valued must be lived on   the basis of one's own choices and efforts)

2. Freedom as being bound (to be bound to the highly valued makes enslavement by the unworthy impossible)

3. Being aware of freedom (the idea that it is possible and necessary to be free and to turn   from that which is unworthy)

4. Being aware of responsibility (the inescapable idea that to really be a person means to

5. Responsibly deciding (personal responsibility is assumed for the actualization of the highly valued)

IV. PEDAGOGICAL AIM STRUCTURES The aim of upbringing is proper adulthood which is characterized by the following:

A. MEANINGFUL EXISTENCE Someone who carries on a meaningful existence in an independent way gives evidence of the following in his way of living what is highly valued:

1. Awareness of the demands of life (a clear idea that it is the highly valued which poses the demands of propriety to persons)

2. Idea of being called upon (a clear understanding of the fact that in the first place a person has obligations and then privileges

3. Leading a responsible life (a clear understanding that a person's way of life must show   evidence that he practices what is highly valued)

4. Responsibility for taking part (a keen awareness of the fact that a person must give an account of his part in the actualization of the highly values)

B. SELF-JUDGMENT AND SELF-UNDERSTANDING Someone who, in an independent way, can give expression to his quality of life in light of the highly valued does the following:

1. Expression of moral judgment (he does not hesitate to seriously view his choices for and actions regarding the highly valued in terms of good and bad, right and wrong)

2. Criticism of what is objectionable (he judges the choice and the doing of the
　　　unvalued, that which lacks human dignity, as unacceptable)
3. Denunciation of what is objectionable (he is against any form of attack of that which
　　　is highly valued--by himself and by others)
4. Proceeding to self-intervention (he criticizes himself firmly and sincerely if he does
　　　not promote in adequate ways what is highly valued)

C. RESPECT FOR HUMAN DIGNITY The way of life of someone who actualizes what is
highly valued in an independent way, is characterized by the following:
1. Being aware of human dignity (he is aware that a person is not a thing or an animal
　　　and, therefore, must know and live the highly valued)
2. Pursuit of humanness (he aims to promote all that is authentically human, e.g., by
　　　actualizing values)
3. Knowledge of value actualization (he knows that to be a person means to be
　　　concerned with values and to use values as norms, as criteria)
4. Respect for the human dignity of others (respect for the equal dignity of others, who
　　　are just as involved in values as is he, is shown)

D. MORALLY INDEPENDENT CHOOSING AND RESPONSIBLE ACTING Someone who, in an
independent way, actualizes the highly valued shows in his choosing and acting the
following:
1. Fidelity in choosing (what is highly valued is chosen with a firm devotion and with a
　　　deep sense of duty and is transformed into action)
2. Choice in accordance with the demands of propriety (the propriety of choices made
is continually taken into account)
3. Acting in accordance with the demands of propriety Activity following proper
　　　choices is continually judged according to the following:
　　　　a. independent choosing (responsibility is assumed for making choices which
　　　　must promote the highly valued and for the actions which emanate from them.
　　　　This responsibility is thus not shirked or passed on to someone else)
　　　　b. independent acting
　　　　c. acceptance of responsibility for choices
　　　　d. aceptance of responsibility for actions
4. Choice for the demands of propriety (there are choices for the highly valued and
　　　against the unworthy)
5. Acceptance of personal responsibility (self responsibility and accountability for the
　　　above is accepted)

E. NORM IDENTIFICATION Someone who commits himself in an independent way to the
highly valued remains gladly involved in the following:
1. The pursuit of propriety in one's choices (without external compulsion, but from
　　　internal conviction, there is a choice of the highly valued)

2. Identification with particular norms (an unbreakable unity with particular norms, i.e., philosophy of life, being experienced and practiced)
3. Adequate knowledge of norms (adequate study of life philosophy is undertaken)

F. OUTLOOK ON LIFE (PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE) Someone who in an independent way holds and wants to live by the highly valued in a systematic way, continually works at the following:
1. Acceptance of the particulars of a philosophy of life (agreement with one's own
        philosophy concerning what is highly valued is not an "ism" but an undeniable
reality)
2. Awareness of the demands of a philosophy of life (knowledge and acceptance that
        the highly valued is ordered in a particular hierarchy of demands of propriety in
a   philosophy of life)
3. Knowledge of philosophy of life (a lasting study of the philosophy of life is
undertaken and the calling for such a study is accepted)
4. Perpetuation of philosophy of life (as an expression of the highly valued, a person's
life philosophy is protected against "isms" and other forms of threat. To be embraced by
the highly valued is not a mere viewing or contemplating of them but it is to   be
held by them. An adult does not have a view of life but rather a philosophy of life)

Translated from: W. A . Landman (1977) **Fundamentele pedagogiek en onderwyspraktyk: Metodologie. Fundmentele pedagogiek en lesstruktuur. Durban:** Butterworths, pp. 61-75.

APPENDIX II

CRITERIA FOR GUIDING A CHILD TO ADULTHOOD
BY MEANS OF PARENTING AND SCHOOLING
(Some possible fundamental pedagogical criteria:
An example)

I.   RELATIONSHIP STRUCTURES

A.   Trust

- Do the adult and child [parent and child; teacher and pupui] accept each other?
- Does the adult help the child feel confident and secure?
- Does the child feel emotionally ready and willing to explore and learn?
- Does the adult respect the dignity of the child?

- Does the child accept and identify with the adult as a model?
- Does the adult act in the best interest of the child?
- Does the child (temporarily) commit him/herself and his/her future to the adult?

B. Understanding

- Does the adult understand the child as someone in need of guidance?
- Does the child feel understood by the adult?
- Is the child responsive to the adult's understanding and knowledge?
- Does the adult take responsibility for selecting and clarifying aspects of reality (e.g., norms and values) for the child?

C. Authority

- Is the adult's intervention authoritative rather than authoritarian?
- Is there dialogue between adult and child within which the adult exemplifies a valued behavior to the child?
- Does the adult indicate to the child (by example) that he/she behaves in accordance with the same norms and values he/she is asking the child to follow?
- Is a transition from docile obedience to independent obedience being promoted?

II. SEQUENCE STRUCTURES

A. Association

- Are adult and child aware of each other's presence?
- Is the adult setting a positive example by indicating acceptable behavior?
- Is there an opportunity for adult and child to do things together and to become familiar with each other?

B. Encounter

- Does the child welcome the adult into his/her world?
- Does the child feel he/she belongs, that the adult is accessible and approachable?

C. Engagement

- Are the adult and child committed to each other?
- Do adult and child take responsibility for what needs to be done?

D. Pedagogic intervention

- Does the adult convey to the child that he/she supports his/her doing what is acceptable?
- Does the adult praise the child for already having chosen to act in an accountable way?
- Does the adult indicate what is not acceptable and why?
- Does the adult object to what is unacceptable?
- Does the child accept the adult's opposition to the unacceptable?

E. **Return to association**

- Does the intervention quickly evolve into adult and child being by each other again?
- Is the adult available to the child for clarification about the intervention?
- Does the adult overdo and exaggerate the intervention so the adult and child cannot return to beingby each other?
- Is intervention unnecessarily prolonged?

F. **Periodic breaking away from association**

- Is the child given the opportunity to choose and act independent of the adult?
- Does the adult trust the child to act properly on his/her own?
- Does the adult give the child assignments or tasks to be carried out away from the adult's presence?

III. ACTIVITY STRUCTURES

Being in a meaningful educative situation requires

A. **Giving meaning with increasing responsibility**

- Does the adult convey to the child through example and instruction knowledge, views, beliefs, values that will allow the child to live as an adult?
- Is the child helped to accept increasing responsibility for the meaning he/she gives to things, experiences, etc.?
- Is the adult helping the child give meaning to the world?
- When a child gives meaning to things, does the adult aid the child in determining whether these meanings are appropriate?
- Is the child being aided to change meanings into action?

B. **Gradually breaking away from lack of exertion**

- Does the adult help the child realize that effort is required to live life as one he/should?
- Is the child being assisted in breaking away from a carefree way of life?
- Is the child encouraged to make the effort to explore and learn?
- Is the child guided to make efforts to overcome present dependencies and to work at becoming independent and responsible?

C. Exemplifying and emulating norms

- Is the adult acting as a role model for the child?
- Does the child accept and follow the adult's example of the valued behavior?

Educative co-existence (as being-with) means:

D. Venturing (risking) with each other pedagogically

- Does the child trust the adult and the adult trust the child enough to risk participating in open-ended or unpredictable activities?
- Does the adult provide, through consistent and appropriate intervention, a stable relationship which serves as the foundation for venturing into the future?

E. Being grateful for pedagogic security

- Does the adult make the child aware, by word and deed, that he/she must be thankful for the security and acceptance he/she experiences?
- Is the child encouraged to acknowledge with gratitude the help and support received from others?

F. Being responsible for relationships

- Does the adult give the child opportunities for acting on his/her own and for taking increasing responsibility for his/her own activities in and outside of the educative situation?
- Is the child encouraged to establish relationships with others and to accept responsibility for these relationships?

Pedagogical temporality (futurity) points to:

G. Wanting to attain future adulthood

- Does the adult appeal to the child to actualize his/her potential through self-initiative and personal effort?
- Does the adult talk to the child about his/her future as something demanding but still something to look forward to?

H. Actualizing potentialities for adulthood

- Does the adult help the child realize his/her potential, e.g., by not demanding too much or too little?
- Does the adult help the child discover new possibilities and fields of interest?
- Does the adult provide guidelines and means for developing the child's potential?
- Does the adult provide the child with the guidance and opportunity for mastering and cultivating his/her potentialities?
- Is the child encouraged to cultivate new positive potentialities (a better future) and not to live in the past or to be satisfied with what he/she already has attained?

I. Gradually achieving adulthood

- Does the adult exemplify the "higher values" (e.g., moral values) to the child?
- Is the child encouraged to adopt these values as his/her own and to live by them in daily living?
- Does the adult provide vocational and career guidance so the child can fulfill adulthood with respect to work?

Educatively becoming-somebody-oneself implies
:

J. Increasing respect for human dignity

- Is the child guided to respect his/her own value (dignity) and that of others irrespective of talents or circumstances?
- Is the child taught not to discriminate against others?
- Is the adult showing the child, by word and deed, that being different does not mean commanding less dignity?

K. Achieving adulthood through increased self-understanding

- Does the adult help the child to understand his/her potential and how to develop it?
- Is the child helped to come to a realistic understanding of his/her positive potentialities?

L. Conquering of responsible freedom

- Is the child helped to see the difference between what he/she wants to do and what he/she is permitted to do?
- Does the child take others into account when making choices?

- Does the adult exemplify to the child that there is no freedom without responsibility?
- Does the adult give the child freedom of choice and action to an increasing extent?

IV. AIM STRUCTURES

A. Meaningful existence

- Does the child increasingly respond to the demands of life in responsible ways?
- Is the child gaining an insight into the meaning of his/her life?
- Does the child take the responsibility to actualize his/her positive potentialities for living as a "proper" adult?

B. Self-judgment and self-understanding

- Does the child understand and accept his/her positive potentialities and his/her limitations?
- Is the child able to make moral/ethical judgments about his/her own choices and behavior?

C. Respect for human dignity

- Does the child accept the equal dignity (value) of others?
- Does the child accept his/her own dignity?

D. Morally independent choosing and responsible acting

- Is the child able to decide for him/herself?
- Does the child accept responsibility for his/her choices and actions?
- Are the child's choices consistent with his/her hierarchy of values?

E. Norm identification

- Does the child choose and act in terms of norms and values because of their inherent meanings or because someone expects him/her to?
- Does the child understand why certain norms and values are worth following?
- Has the child made certain values and norms his/her own (does he/she identify with them)?

F. Outlook on life (philosophy of life)

- Does the child have a hierarchy of values that influences his/her choices and actions?

- Does the child live by the demands of propriety based on his/her philosophy of life?