

CHAPTER THREE

A CHILD AS A PERSON: HIS/HER NEED FOR SUPPORT

S. G. Roos

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter a further analysis is made of the educative phenomenon with reference to a child as a person. This is necessary because a child is a particular person who, on his/her way to adulthood, has a need for the support of an adult. In connection with providing support, there is a distinction among *educating*, *teaching* and *forming*. These different ways of providing support are also examined closely. Giving support must be viewed as help given to a child in his/her becoming [adult]. Thus, it is pedagogic help which qualifies as providing this support. The word pedagogic means accompanying a child, and whoever guides a child in his/her being on the way to adulthood is involved in providing support.

Childlike need for support shows itself as an appeal to an adult to provide pedagogic support. This means that this childlike need for support summons an adult to provide it. A child asks for support and, in this way appeals for educative support. Then, an adult creates particular educative activities. What are these activities which he/she designs? Answer: His/her educative activities are constituted by him/her allowing the fundamental pedagogical structures to appear so they can be realized in a pedagogic situation. Childlike need for support summons pedagogic support, and this begins by calling forth the fundamental pedagogical structures; that is, this need for support calls for the pedagogical structures to appear.

An immediate implication of the above is that a pedagogue (educator) must have knowledge of what the fundamental pedagogical structures are, and of their real essences. Pedagogical

knowledge is expected of him/her so that he/she can know which structures available for realization must be implemented in pedagogic situations, i.e., situations in which support is given to a child so that he/she can gradually and progressively overcome this need. Thus, a pedagogue must know that his pedagogic activities are constituted by him/her designing pedagogic relationship and sequence structures with an eye to eventually realizing the educative aim (aim structures). Hence, a pedagogue allows something to happen and what happens makes his/her pedagogic interference possible, and this interference results in decreasing a child's need for support. In other words, he/she allows pedagogic relationships and the pedagogic sequence to occur (happen) so that pedagogic interfering can take place. Then, what he anticipated occurs, i.e., a child's gradual becoming independent. If a pedagogue has not noticed this childlike need for support, he/she will not understand the necessity for pedagogic events; thus, it is really essential that a child is allowed, in his/her need for support, to appeal to an educator to realized the fundamental pedagogical structures. If children were born as independent practitioners of the norm-image of adulthood, it would be meaningless to allow the above pedagogic activities to occur, and the call for the pedagogic structures would not only be unnecessary but impossible. In other words, a pedagogue realizes pedagogic structures as his/her response to an educand's appeal to notice and support him/her in his/her striving to overcome his/her need for support.

In this chapter there is a further investigation to determine whether the pedagogical structures can be made to appear without a child's need for support. That is, it is examined whether it is the childlike need for support which allows a pedagogue to call the pedagogical structures into being. Before this can be done, brief attention is given to the concept "pedagogical structures".

Pedagogical structures refer to the realities without which a pedagogic situation cannot appear as it really is. In other words, they are essential characteristics which are preconditions for realizing pedagogic situations. Viewed in this light, the pedagogical structures must also be seen as fundamental structures from which the *structural character* (Oberholzer) of a pedagogic event is constituted. Landman describes these fundamental pedagogical

structures as general rules, constitutive unities or preconditions or carriers of meaning or what can be experience, and which necessarily belong to a pedagogic situation.

This chapter is an attempt to understand the pedagogical structures by penetrating them from the perspective of a child's need for support. The appearance of the pedagogic only acquires meaning through a child's need for support, as supplemented by the willingness of an educator to provide such support. Thus, there is an attempt to view the pedagogical structures and their essences considering a child's need for support.

Because of his/her inability to become what he/she ought to be without support, he/she directs an appeal to an adult. A support-giving adult responds to a child's distressful call by entering with him/her into *relationships of trust, knowing and authority* so that a space can be created within which the pedagogic can thrive and the child can respond on a continually higher level to the familiar fundamental anthropological question of what a person ought to do to be regarded as a human being (Kant). Langeveld indicates that a human being is a being who educates, is educated and is committed to education. This means it is not only a child who must receive educative support to be able to be considered a human being, but also that an adult must provide pedagogic support to be able to give meaning to his/her own existence as a human being. Thus, providing support refers to an involvement of a child as well as an adult. By giving support, an adult is also supporting him/herself in fulfilling his/her task and calling as an adult. By appealing to the educative-giving nature of an educator, a child also supports an adult in bringing forth his/her human dignity. Seen in this context, giving support is a connective force between adult and child. In this way, each supports the other in realizing his/her humanness.

By giving and receiving support, the pedagogic structures are realized. By trusting a child who is entrusted to him/her, on the one hand, and the trust of a child that he/she educates, on the other hand, pedagogic support becomes possible. However, this mutual trust is enhanced if there is knowledge regarding the essence and destination of a child so that both educator and educand can accept each other and also accept that the support given is directed to

meaningful and acceptable adulthood. Also, providing a child support to adulthood can only flourish where sympathetic, authoritative guidance is possible. As a result of his/her incompleteness, a child relies on what an adult shows and says to him/her, but he/she does this only if he/she, as educator, has a child's trust and acceptance as someone who has trustworthy and, thus, also authentic authority to lead him/her on his/her course of becoming. Such authority, as giving support, is only possible where there is understanding and trust. Once again, this emphasizes that each of the pedagogical relationship structures is a precondition for realizing the others.

In the following, each of the relationship structures is described and explicated so that it can be seen how a child's need for support calls them into appearance. Although each structure is dealt with separately, each is part of one pedagogic situation. Consequently, there must be an indissoluble mutual relationship among these real pedagogical essences. Through a closer analysis, it is seen that a child's need for support is one of the ligaments which binds the pedagogical structures into a genuine unity.

3.2 RELATIONSHIP STRUCTURES

3.2.1 *Relationship of trust*

1. Introduction:

Acceptance of support by an educand presumes that his/her relationship of encounter with an educator in an educative situation must be one of trust. Providing pedagogic support cannot occur without mutual trust between adult and child. However, it is not only trust between educator and child which is a precondition for pedagogic support. On deeper examination, or by reaching further back, it is seen that a pedagogic situation also presumes a mutual trust between educators [e.g., parents]. Without such trust, an educative situation cannot appear, or, at most, its appearance is disturbed. Long before a child's birth, a relationship of trust, as a caring space, is created when the parents promise to marry each other. This promise is solemnly asserted by the conjugal engagement (promise) and after that there must be a lasting affirmation of mutual acceptance in love and trust. If this promise

is violated while a child is still in need of support, his/her trust in his/her educators can be diminished to such a degree that his/her educating is also damaged. This aspect of trust as a precondition for giving pedagogic support, is dealt with here.

If a relationship of trust is further analyzed, two essences are found, i.e., (i) acceptance and (ii) respect-for-dignity. In turn, each of these essences has essences and *their foundation is in [a child's] need for support* and in the complementary giving of support, as one collective binding.

In this chapter an analysis is made only of acceptance as a real essence of a relationship of trust and in chapter four “respect-for-dignity” will be considered along with its additional pedagogical essences.

2. Acceptance

Acceptance, as a precondition for trust, indicates that educator and child must unconditionally accept each other as support-giver and as one needing support in a pedagogic situation. The real essences of such an acceptance by an educator are: (i) willingness to constitute a relationship and (ii) intention to care for (take care of). In the following, these essences are fully penetrated:

a) Willingness to constitute a relationship

An educator who accepts, shows a willingness to enter a support-giving relationship with a child. This willingness shows itself in the realization of the real essences without which this willingness would be unthinkable. Each of these essences is now analyzed in light of a child's need for support so that it can be seen whether they have any meaning or right to exist in the absence of this need:

i) Active acceptance

A child's need for support directs an appeal to an adult to *accept* him/her so that he/she can become what he/she ought to become, i.e., an adult. It is an active acceptance which can only be realized where there is mutual trust and acceptance between a giver of support and one who needs support because the one must *give* support and trust which the other *accepts*. On the other hand, the one in need of support will only *accept* the support offered if he/she

accepts the educator as a trustworthy giver of support. However, a child can refuse the support offered. It cannot be forced upon him/her. Forced support, and, thus, a forced acceptance of it, leaves no room for a pedagogic event. It is only through a mutually accepted trust that an educator accepts a child in need of support and enables the latter to be accepted. Thus, giving pedagogic support requires a mutual trust *of* each other, but even more so, a trust *in* each other. The giver and receiver of support must *accept* each other *in* trust before an authentic educative situation can arise.

Pedagogic support can only be given if an adult *accepts* a child and if a child *accepts* the adult as his/her educator. This active acceptance must be unconditional. An adult must be prepared to accept a child as he/she is so that he/she can support him/her to become what he/she ought to be. To accept a child as he/she is also means that he/she must be unconditionally accepted in his/her full presence. An educator must keep the one in need near him/her because it is only here that an educator can recognize, feel and listen to a child's needs, and then support him/her, if necessary. Also, it is only with and by an educator that a child feels safe and opens him/herself for support. An educator and child must be so close to each other that this can be qualified as an embracing or *encircling acceptance* (Landman) which means that an educator must make *room for* (Binswanger) a child in need of support in his/her life space so he/she can support him/her on his/her path of becoming. Viljoen points out that to accept also means to hold or *grasp*, thus, with a view to embracing. If a child is accepted in this way, this is evidence of an understanding which makes pedagogic interference possible.

However, nearness between educator and child has a much deeper meaning than a simple geometric closeness. Although the latter is a requirement for a pedagogic event, it is no guarantee that there will be a pedagogic encounter. Parent and child can dwell in the same geometric space, even be up against each other, and there nonetheless can be a chasm between them such that they live past each other and, in which case there can be no pedagogic acceptance and support. It is only if an educator *accepts* a child with the intention *to support* and *be supported* to overcome the need for support which a pedagogic space arises. Such an act of acceptance

is only possible if, in the beginning, there is mutual trust. If educator and child are able to accept each other in trust, then the distance between these two different individuals can shrink or even disappear so that providing support in a pedagogic sense becomes possible.

As appears from the above, active acceptance is also an active giving. An adult *accepts* a child in order to *give* support, while a child *gives* him/herself to be accepted so that he/she can accept the support offered. An educator who accepts a child and, thus, accepts him/her as he/she is, i.e., as in need of support, also gives him/herself to a child as an example to emulate, and in doing so, gives support in gradually overcoming the need for support. On the other hand, a child who accepts support also thereby acknowledges that he/she has trust in an adult as a giver of support. With this, he/she also unconditionally gives him/herself to an adult to be accepted until adulthood.

From this mutually active accepting and giving, mutual *trust* and *acceptance* speak clearly, and the basis for this is a child's need for support as the precondition for a pedagogically meaningful acceptance. Indeed, if a child were not in need of support then the mutual trust and acceptance between them are not necessary preconditions for their being together as being involved with each other. Thus, it is correct to state that it is a child's need for support which calls the educator to let this pedagogical structure appear.

ii) Intention

Pedagogic acceptance is an activity with a particular *aim*, i.e., supporting a child on his/her way to adulthood who is in need of that support. Whoever accepts a child as he/she is and attends to his/her life needs without the intention of supporting him/her so that he/she can become as he/she should, diverts him/her from his/her potentialities (Langeveld). A child has a right to be a child and also to be accepted as such, but he/she does not have the right to remain a child. If an educator wants to support a child to moral independence, then his/her initial and decreasing dependence must be accepted. Therefore, the aim of pedagogic interference is providing support to his/her becoming adult. In other words, a child must be accepted as he/she is with the aim that he/she ought

to become different: giving support in his/her becoming, as the aim of pedagogic interference. It is then through this/her intention that a readiness to enter a relationship, as an essence of acceptance, is called into being and realized.

Landman also indicates that an educator accepts a child with the intention of having someone he/she can address as “my child”. This intention indicates a readiness for an educative relationship with a child. Thus, with this intention, a teacher declares hi/herself ready to be a substitute parent. It is only when a teacher is ready for a parent-child relationship and, therefore, to be responsibly bound to it, that educating in a classroom can progress as efficiently and effectively as possible. Only then can a child in need of support reach his/her aim of morally independent adulthood.

It is because of a child’s need for support that an educator accepts him/her for this aim. Only if this occurs can the readiness to enter a relationship, as an essence of acceptance, arise. Consequently, a child’s need for support is seen as a precondition for intending to meaningfully support him/her, as a pedagogical essence.

iii) Bonding

In the previous section it is indicated that a genuine educator accepts a child in order to address him/her as “my child”. This way of addressing refers to a bonding. With this, an educator declares him/herself to be ready to forge a pedagogic bond between him and a child in need of support, a bond which indicates a close and intimate familial relationship, i.e., that between parent and child. It is a bonding appeal to a child with a deeper significance than to only have him/her bodily present. An educator’s trust and acceptance are expressed by his/her bonding with a child to a degree and it also brings about an obligation to accept him/her. This readiness to enter a bonding relationship obliges an educator to support a child in need of support at all times on his/her path of becoming [adult], even if this is sometimes unpleasant or even requires great sacrifice. The question which now arises is why an educator declares him/herself to be ready for such a bonding. The answer is obvious: it is a child’s need for support which speaks to him/her—even calls him/her—directs an appeal to him/her to give

support. As an adult, an educator can do nothing but answer this needful appeal by giving support and by providing support to the one in need of it, the pedagogical structures are realized. Hence, it is a child's need for support which allows bonding, as an essence of the pedagogical relationship of trust, to appear.

iv) Responsibility

It is also the case that pedagogical bonding puts responsibility on an educator. A child's need for support allows him/her to appeal for help and an adult answers by realizing the pedagogical structures. He/she must not only answer, but also will answer because he/she is an adult. Whoever refuses to answer the appeal of a child in need of support, at most can be considered an inhumane person. To give a positive response, an educator must and will carry a personal responsibility and, thus, also accept a co-responsibility for a child's becoming adult. As a person, an educator must be accountable not only to him/herself or others, but ultimately also to a Higher Authority for the response he/she gives to the appeal of a child in need of support.

According to Perquin, an educator must take responsibility for the care, protection and safety, the growing up and happiness of a child. Whoever *wants* to be considered an adult *must*, thus, be prepared to take responsibility for a child's personal becoming.

From the above, it is precisely a child's need for support which obliges an adult to take responsibility for the pedagogical care, protection and giving support to a child in his/her becoming on the way to morally independent adulthood. Thus, once again, it is a child's need for support which allows responsibility to be called forth as a real essence of the pedagogical structure of acceptance.

v) Caring

A child's need for support is evidence of his/her need for care, which is much more than the necessities of life. His/her incompleteness and, consequently, his/her inability to become without the support of an adult, calls for caring and, therefore, he/she must and will *entrust* him/herself to the care an adult. The "en" indicates a child's readiness to give him/herself *to* an adult in order to be *accepted* while "trust" refers to a trust in an adult who is

ready to accept him/her. On the other hand, an educator sees a child's "deficiency", but he/she also knows that a child is potentiality and, thus, also is future. However, he/she is aware that a child cannot realize his/her potentiality without support and, therefore, he/she is prepared to establish an educative relationship with him/her. He/she will care for a child entrusted to him/her to gradually overcome his/her need for support. This willingness to provide educative care is evoked by a child's need for support. Thus, once again, it is clear that without the need for support, caring, as a pedagogical essence, also cannot emerge.

From the above, the real essence "caring" is not isolated and there is a profound relationship among the pedagogical structures and their essences. It is a child's need for support which leads to an educator caring for him/her. By caring and, in doing so, making provision for a child's becoming, an educator allows the pedagogical structures to appear. Thus, a child's need for support is a precondition for pedagogic care and by caring, an educator allows the reality of educating to be. Seen in this light, caring must be viewed as a precondition for the pedagogic event.

vi) Co-existence (fellow-humanness)

Out of a readiness to care pedagogically, an educator's willingness to accept a *person* as in need of support appears. The relationship between educator and child can be nothing else than a co-existential relationship. Indeed, the pedagogical is a purely anthropological matter. However, this relationship can degenerate into a person-thing relationship in which, e.g., a child is used only as a means for reaching an aim, and not as an end as such. In such a case, a child, e.g., can be trained with the aim of increasing an educator's prestige as a teacher. But if a child's dignity is violated in this way, it is no pedagogic relationship. It is a precondition for the pedagogic that the child's dignity must be noticed, understood and respected. However, this in no way implies that this fulfills a pedo-centrism. If this occurs, then a child is not supported to overcome his/her need for support and, consequently, he/she stagnates in his/her becoming such that, in this case, he/she is deprived of his/her dignity, and there is no co-existential relationship in the true sense of the word. It is the *humanness* of a *child* in need of support who addresses an educator, which stirs him/her to establish a

relationship in order to accept a child—accept him/her with an intention—readies him/her to affirm a bonding—to accept responsibility for a child’s becoming adult and the resolve to care for him/her. If the one in need of support were something other than a becoming person, then perhaps an educator would provide help as, e.g., in caring for a little animal, but he/she could not decide or be ready to establish a pedagogic relationship with him/her. A human being is born as a being in need of support, and he/she cannot become an adult on his/her own, and his/her being in need of support speaks to an educator as a co-existent and he/she understands a child’s need and treats him/her humanely and proceeds to realize the pedagogical structures. Seen in this light, a child’s need for support is a precondition for co-existentiality, as a real pedagogical essence.

vii) Address-listen

Only human beings can express reality in words, and also it is only a person who is able to meaningfully interpret verbalized reality. However, there is something much more essential which a person can make meaningful with his/her words. He/she can give voice to the deepest grounds of his/her being human; for example, to his/her yearnings, joys, gratitude and trust. Thus, for example, the mode of address “my child” is something much more than the surface meaning of these words (Landman).

As one in need of support, a child has a need to be addressed about something by an adult and, because of his/her openness to the world, he/she is able to listen, and also to be obedient when he/she is addressed. Because he/she wants to be someone him/herself (Langeveld), he/she will increasingly be made aware of the demands of adult humanness, and he/she will progressively give expression to them. A child is not born with a hierarchy of preferred values and. Therefore, he/she must and will be addressed by an adult as a representative of the normative so that he/she can be supported to gradually become morally independent.

Also, an adult is ready to accept a child with his/her flaws (Binswanger), his/her influenceability to positively affect him/her so that he/she can become as he/she ought to. He/she does this by addressing a child, or as Binswanger says, by taking him/her by the

ear. This willingness on the part of an adult must be attributed to his/her understanding of a child's need for support because, otherwise, he/she would not have had the need to pedagogically address a child.

Thus, it is a child's need for support which directs an appeal to an adult to address him/her pedagogically, and it is also a child's need for support which makes him/her want to listen. In this light, a child's need for support is a precondition for the real essence of address-listen which, in its turn, is a precondition for the appearance of the other pedagogical structures.

viii) Futurity

An adult who accepts and takes a child as he/she is, knows that he/she is not yet what he/she ought to be. He/she accepts that a child is still “essentially *futurity*” and that because of his/her need for support, he/she still cannot meaningfully realize his/her future independently. Therefore, he/she is ready to meet the future with a child in order to support and assist him/her until he/she him/herself becomes superfluous as an educator and a child is no-longer-in-need-of-support and can progress further without his/her help and guidance.

Also here, it is essentially a child's need for support which asks for future-accompaniment and support, and the willingness of an educator's response indicates that he/she sees and understands a child's need for support. Thus, no other conclusion can be reached then that it is precisely a child's need for support which calls forth futurity as a real pedagogical essence.

ix) Regard

The readiness of an educator to support a child in becoming adult is evidence that he/she takes a child's need for support into account. Indeed, if this were overlooked, a child would be treated with little regard or even disdain as a non-adult or a not responsible person. In such a case, there is no educating because such a view of a child will create a distance between him/her and an adult. Then an adult will regard a child from a distance as someone beneath him/her. This, however, is not the case, because a child's need for support allows the distance between adult and child to decrease. Because of

his/her need for support, an adult regards a child as a fellow person who is not-yet adult and not-yet-responsible, but who must be supported to responsible adulthood. An educator will then also consider it to be his/her obligation to provide this support.

Thus, it is nothing other than a child's need for support which converts the possible impersonal involvement between adult and child into a mutual regard so that there can be educating, and the pedagogical structures can figure forth.

x) Standing-together

Because a child is not independent, he/she cannot yet stand alone without the supportive power of an adult. He/she is thus in need of support. This fact compels an adult to regard and accept him/her as a fellow person in need, who is in search of a safe foothold, so he/she then proceeds to make room for a child to stand next to him/her. Thus, a child is elevated to a standing together, to a participant in a common world which must continually be affirmed in the future, and that has/her being-with-each-other, as encounter, as its real ground.

Hence, an adult elevates a child to a standing together because he/she accepts him/her as in need of support. Thus, it is childlike need of support which compels an adult to also give form to this real pedagogical essence.

xi) Traveling together

An educator not only allows a child to stand beside him/her but is also prepared to go into the future with him/her. He/she will indicate the correct path by exemplifying the demands of propriety of adult life in accountable ways, thus, give help to a child in his/her need for support on his/her course of becoming adult. He/she does this because he/she knows a child has a need for support to be able to become the person he/she wants to and ought to be. A child cannot become this someone without the sympathetic travelling partnership of an adult who is already there where he/she wants to be (Oberholzer). The “*together*” as well as the “*traveling*” clearly indicate that the essentials of all pedagogic events are included here. Therefore, an educator invites a child to come and stand beside him/her on the path so that the two of them can go

together as co-travelers, and a child can safely reach his/her destination as a moral adult.

If a child were not in need of support, he/she also would have no need for an adult co-traveler as a leader on his/her path of life, and he/she also would not be ready to walk together with someone who has already done this. On the other hand, an adult would not have had a direct invitation if a child had not had a need for support.

The only conclusion which can be drawn is that it is a child's need for support which is a precondition for calling into being this real essence of the pedagogical relationship of trust.

xii) Participating together

By elevating a child to one who stands and travels together, an adult also invites him/her to increasingly participate jointly in the adult world. He/she does this because he/she knows the child has adult life as a destination, but that he/she cannot attain this without being supported. Therefore, he/she supports a child to an increasing participation in the adult world by allowing him/her gradually to progressively accept responsibility for his/her own task fulfillment so that he/she can become a full-fledged participant in a mutual world. Also, a child is aware of his/her own need for support, and because he/she wants to be someone him/herself, he/she is thankful to be allowed on his/her own part to contribute to designing his/her own life so that he/she also can become a full-fledged participant in the community. An educator accepts a child's share because he/she accepts him/her as a child in need of support, and even invites him/her to greater participation even if sometimes his/her participation is contrary to what he/she is expected to do. With patience, devotion and love, an educator helps a child in need of support to continually participate on a higher level in a mutual world until he/she is a full-fledged participant. He/she is prepared to guide a child time and again because he/she knows a child in need of support has a need for his/her help.

Also, in this case, it is a child's need for support which compels an adult to establish a pedagogic relationship with him/her and, in doing so, to realize the pedagogical structures.

Now that the essences of the essence “willingness to constitute a relationship” are penetrated closely, the following statement can rightly be made. A child’s need for support is an indispensable necessity for realizing willingness to constitute a relationship as a real essence of pedagogical acceptance. In other words, it is a child’s need for support which allows real essence of acceptance known as willingness to constitute a relationship to appear.

In the following, the second real essence of acceptance, i.e., intention to care for is described and analyzed to see to what extent its realization depends on a child being in need of support.

b) Intention to care for

Also, this real essence of pedagogical acceptance is constituted by additional real essences, each of which will now be penetrated since a child needs support.

(i) Caring space

An educative situation cannot appear if an educative space is not created through the mutual acceptance of adult and child. An educative space cannot appear if an adult does not have the intention to care for a child and, through caring, an educator’s acceptance of him/her is in evidence. Consequently, Landman describes acceptance as an intention to care, and adds: “More fundamental than observing a child and knowledge about him is the establishment of a caring space in which situations of acceptance can be created.”

It has been indicated that it is a child’s need for support which appeals to an educator to care. Now it is the case that educative caring embraces much more than filling and providing for a child’s life necessities. To clarify, a brief distinction between pedagogic caring and purely physical caring is presented.

Pedagogic caring includes physical caring for a child but the former is primarily a matter of propriety. A child must not only grow up to be an adult—for which there should be a balanced diet and a safe place where he/she can “live his/her own life” as well as experience sufficient material security—but he/she must become an adult. A pedagogical space must be created for his/her becoming adult

within which he/she can experience security so that he/she can venture into the future. In such a pedagogical space, a child will feel secure because he/she knows he/she is accepted by someone who knows him/her and under whose authority he/she can venture into and explore it without harming his/her dignity and can reach his/her destination, i.e., morally independent adulthood.

An educator's intention to create such a caring space where he/she can support a child to adulthood is called into being by a child's need for support. Indeed, if a child were not in need of support, he/she would not abandon him/herself to a space of pedagogic care, and an adult would see no necessity to create a space where he/she can care for a child pedagogically. In this light, a child's need for support must be seen as a precondition for a caring space as a real essence of an educator's intention to care for him/her.

(ii) *Situations of acceptance*

In the previous section it is indicated that a caring space where an educator accepts a child and a child feels welcome because he/she knows and experiences that he/she is accepted. Acceptance is thus a precondition for creating a pedagogic space as a caring space. The question which must now be answered is: What makes an educator ready to accept a child as he/she is, and what makes a child commit him/herself to the care of an educator? To this, Langeveld has answered in part: "Out of the love which unites them. In this love the child, in his natural helplessness, elevates the educator in his pure absoluteness and inspires him to his task, and grants him self-confidence [Uit die liefde die hen verbindt. In deze liefde schenkt het kind in zijn natuurlijke *hulpeloosheid* zijn vertrouwen dat in zijn smetteloze absoluutheid de opvoeder opheft, bezieling tot zijn taak en zelfvertrouwen schenkt]."

Even though a child does not yet know how to act to fulfill the demands of propriety, nevertheless, he/she is not viewed by an educator with disrespect or treated as an improper person but is accepted in love as someone who has a need for support. Because of this need, in each situation an educator accepts a child as a becoming person and, therefore, he/she is supported with patience, love and dedication so that the pedagogical structures can be realized. Because the realization of these pedagogical structures is

made possible by a child's need for support, one can arrive at no other conclusion than that it is a child's need for support which calls them into being.

(iii) *caring-out-of- love*

Because of his/her inability to reach his/her destination as a moral adult without support, a child is radically and implacably dependent on the adults who accept him/her in his/her being-a-child and lovingly care for him/her in his/her becoming.

Since an educating adult is aware of and understands a child's complete dependence, he/she cares for and accepts him/her in an unconditional love so he/she can give him/her the necessary support on his/her way to becoming [adult]. In other words, it is just in the knowledge that a child is completely and entirely dependent on him/her that an adult acquires love for a child entrusted to his/her care and is concerned about his/her becoming. Therefore, it is a caring because of love which motivates an educator to create a secure space within which he/she can provide a child with pedagogic support.

In as much as this caring-out-of-love is called into being by a child's need for support, this must also be viewed as a precondition for this pedagogical structure [intention to care for] to appear.

(iv) *acting-in-love*

The caring of an adult for the becoming of a child cannot be genuine care if he/she does not also accordingly *act-in-love*. Indeed, caring without acting cannot be authentic. Caring because of love also requires an actual *acting-in-love* which is directed to giving support to a child who needs support in his/her being-on-the-way-to-adulthood.

Acting-in-love, a real essence of the intention-to-care-for, is constituted by additional real essences. Thus, an educative activity cannot be realized if an educator is not prepared, in love, to arrange a place for a child to be by him/her. What is remarkable about arranging this place for a child beside him/her is that in reality an educator makes room in his/her own space for such an activity. However, it is not for this reason that he/she makes room for a child

to be by him/her. If this were his/her reason, he/she would become disillusioned because to use a child to enrich or to expand his/her own life would accomplish the opposite. Indeed, then love for a child and acting in accordance with it cannot appear because his/her own love remains in the foreground, and this will bring about an inner impoverishment or a narrowing of his/her own life space. There must be something much more deep-seated which compels an adult in *love to make room for a child in which he/she feels at home*. The essence of this activity by an adult must be sought in a child's need for room by him/her which only an adult can bring about, and he/she does so because he/she is aware of and understands a child's need.

This making a place for a child must be such that he/she can experience it as a space where he/she is continually at home and where he/she ought to feel at home. By being able to act in love, an educator must thus proceed to make a space in which a child feels at home. To do this he/she must also be prepared to *admit* a child into *our-space*. This implies establishing a space for nearness and this means something radically deeper than a mere geometric space. This activity will confirm a willingness of an educator to *turn-in-trust* to a child. This is not only a trust in a child but also the trust of an educator in knowing that he/she has sufficient trust to also respect a child's trust in him/her so that a child also will be ready to take an educator at his/her word and also be accepted through the word of an educator. Consequently, this also points to a *presence-in-trust* where an adult represents the future for a child in need of support such that, in this respect, he/she also has access to a child's destination.

The question which continually arises in the above discussion is what is it that moves an educator to act in love with a non-adult? The answer must be seen in the fact that a child is seeking and calling for support, and that an educator sees and hears this with understanding and responds by acting in love with a child in need of support. The distress call from a non-adult to an adult for support, in this case, must also be seen as a precondition for the pedagogic event to begin and take its course.

3. Summary

From the above analysis of the pedagogical *relationship of trust*, one unavoidable fact has come to light, and this is that it is a child's need for support which calls into being this relationship structure since not one of the essences of this structure can be thought of without considering the fact that a child is in need of support.

3.2.2 *Relationship of authority*

1. *Introduction*

In addition to the relationship of trust, an educative situation is further constituted by a relationship of authority. Without authority, a pedagogic event is just not possible, and Perquin indicates directly that a child, even though he/she strives for adulthood, cannot achieve it without the authority of an educator. Oberholzer underlines the fact that a child has a need for authority, a need which he views as a precondition for educating. Langeveld also states very clearly the necessity of authority for an educative event when he comes to the following conclusion: *"Authority is thus the immediately necessary precondition for educating: its sine qua non condition [Gezag is dus de onvermijdelijk noodzakelijke voorwaarde der opvoeding: de condition sine qua non]."*

The above are just a few general comments regarding the necessity of authority for an educative event, which has been observed by each of these educationists of note. Now a further look is taken of a few real essences of a relationship of authority so that their realization can be evaluated considering a child's need for support.

2. *Trust*

The relationship of authority assumes a relationship of trust. Both educator and educand must *accept* authority as educatively necessary. Further, they must accept each other, as well as the norms under whose authority they both stand. An educator must trust a child to be able to responsibly give more of him/herself and, on the other hand, a child must also place his trust in the educator to be able to venture with him/her in responsible ways to give answers to what he/she cannot yet judge independently.

If mutual trust is missing, there cannot be authority but at most control. In this connection, Perquin talks of authoritarian authority,

in which case a child does not have a chance to be and to become someone him/herself. If a child, instead of being appealed to become different, has a “must-become-different” forced upon him/her, there can be no educating to becoming independent.

Each real essence of the relationship of trust has been closely examined and it is seen that a child’s need for support is a precondition for each one. Viewed from this perspective, this need is also seen as the fundamental precondition for the relationship of authority because, as is apparent from the above argument, a relationship of authority cannot appear without a relationship of trust.

3. Responsibility

In the previous section, the necessity of a mutual trust between educator and educand is indicated so that the latter, through educative authority, could be supported to carry increasing responsibility. Viewed in this light, the aim an educator has in view with his/her authority is to help a child him/herself to increasingly answer the questions which life poses to him/her and not merely to prompt him/her with answers. However, it is the case that a child, being not-yet-responsible, not-yet-independent, someone who cannot yet answer life questions in a responsible way, asks for and seeks someone who can help him/her carry his/her responsibility until he/she can do so independently. For Langeveld, *authority* also means taking moral responsibility and answerability *on behalf of* another. Thus, an educator also is ready, through his/her authority, to assume a child’s responsibility and answerability because he/she is fully aware of a child’s inability to do this without his/her support. If a child were already free to exercise his/her own authority in responsible ways, then he/she would not allow him/herself to be addressed. Then an educator would not see any sense in addressing him/her and, thus, would not be ready to extend his/her authority to a child by assuming responsibility on his/her behalf. However, experience shows that a child is in need of support because he/she cannot yet independently follow the authority of life norms, and he/she has a need for someone who can do this for him/her on in his/her behalf—someone who can assume responsibility in his/her place. In other words, a child has need for

an authority figure who supports him/her so that one day he/she can be able to independently carry all responsibility.

From the above discussion, one can conclude that it is a child's need for support which also calls responsibility into being (as a real essence of authority) and, therefore, it must also be viewed as a precondition for authority.

4. *Obedience*

Authority not only implies that there is something said but that it must be listened to. Thus, an educator demands that a child be obedient to him/her. However, it is the case that a child will not listen if an adult does not also subject him/herself to the same life norm demands and gives evidence of this. By him/herself being obedient in responsible ways to the authority of life norms, an educator creates the necessary trust between him/herself and a child which is needed for a meaningful progression of a pedagogic event. To be able to give pedagogic support, an educator must accept a two-fold responsibility: a responsibility for life norms as well as a responsibility for a child's becoming. In other words, the becoming of a child demands a responsibility for life norms so that the needed trust can be awakened for realizing educative situations.

If there is trust in an adult and, thus, also in the validity of what he/she "tells" him/her, then a becoming-adult will be obedient to his/her authority. It also is the case that wherever adults and children interact in a *relationship of trust*, these are children who will be *obedient* to an adult's *authority* while an adult is prepared to place them under his/her authority. The question which arises here is: What makes an educator extend his/her authority to the children, and what makes the children acknowledge his/her authority by being obedient to it?

This question can be answered by indicating again that a child has an intense need for authority and authoritative guidance (Oberholzer), and an adult is fully aware of this. Now the following question pushes itself into the foreground: From what does this need exist? The answer is obvious: It is a need for authority to complement his/her uncertainty and ignorance so that he/she can experience the security for which he/she has a need for his/her

personal becoming (Perquin). Thus, it is nothing other than a child's need for support which makes him/her be obedient to an adult. Viewed in this way, a child's need for support is a precondition for obedience as a real essence of educative authority.

5. Summary

From the above discussion it is evident that without a child's need for support, authority loses its primary pedagogical significance, i.e., supporting a child to adulthood. Indeed, it is exclusively with the intention of supporting a child to adulthood that an adult is prepared to place a child under his/her authority. Here it is concluded without doubt that a child's need for support is as precondition for a relationship of authority without which the phenomenon of educating could not appear.

3.2.3. Relationship of understanding

1. Introduction

Because a child is not born an adult person, he/she cannot yet independently give expression to the idea of adult humanness. Therefore, he/she is in need of support, and because he/she is aware of this, in his/her course of becoming, he/she wants to be supported by someone he/she *knows* and who also has *knowledge* of him/her.

Providing pedagogic support is only possible if an educator has a thorough knowledge of the essences of a child in need of support. He/she must have accurate knowledge of the particular state of his/her becoming so he/she can support him/her sufficiently. In addition, he/she must also *understand* the essences of a child so that he/she can penetrate (empathize with) his/her need. Providing pedagogic support also requires that an educator have knowledge of the ways a child can be supported to overcome his/her need for support.

Giving pedagogic support not only requires a *thorough* knowledge but also as *complete* knowledge of a child as possible. If a child is supported merely based on superficial or even misleading incidentals, his/her call for help will be incorrectly understood and the help given on this basis will not be educative. Here one thinks

of one-sided laboratory experiments with animals where the acquired knowledge is merely applied to “illuminate” the essences of a child. Providing support based on such incomplete and inauthentic knowledge can only be giving support to a degenerative sub-personal level.

Giving pedagogic support also requires knowledge about a child’s *destination*. If an educator succeeds in acquiring a thorough and comprehensive knowledge of a child as such without knowing where he/she wants to go with a child, he/she cannot support him/her to adulthood and, at most, his/her providing support can fall into a pedo-centrism.

The following is an examination of the extent to which a child’s need for support is a precondition for the pedagogic relationship of understanding.

2. The relationship of understanding as a precondition for giving support

The question which must be reflected on here is: What makes the pedagogic relationship of understanding possible and necessary? First, it is answered that the relationship of trust is a precondition for it. By trusting and accepting a child as he/she is and by receiving him/her with the aim of supporting him/her to adulthood, a child is considered as he/she is so that he/she can be known in his/her childness. Through mutual trust a child also makes him/herself knowable as he/she is, and by taking a trusting child into his/her trust, he/she can be known by an educator so that he/she can be appropriately supported during his/her becoming adult.

Second, the answer regarding the precondition for providing pedagogic support within the pedagogic relationship of understanding must be sought in a child’s need for support. It has been indicated that a child’s need for support is a precondition for a relationship of trust. In this regard, a child’s need for support must also be viewed as a condition for the relationship of understanding. If, however, one thinks about why an adult wants to establish a relationship of understanding with a child, it is answered that this is because he/she wants to support him/her. An additional

question is why does an adult want to support a child and the answer is because a child needs it. If a child had no need to become what he/she ought to be, then an adult would have no need to want to understand him/her. Indeed, if an educator saw no necessity in giving support to a child, he/she would also have no difficulty in not establishing a pedagogic relationship of understanding with him/her. It is precisely a child's need for support which directs an appeal to an adult to learn to know him/her so he/she can support him/her in overcoming this very need.

Viewed in this light, a child's need for support must be seen as a fundamental structure of a relationship of understanding without which a pedagogic event simply cannot appear. A pedagogical relationship of understanding is also a precondition for providing meaningful pedagogic support.

3. The relationship of understanding as a precondition for the relationship of trust

It is because an educator knows a child as a child he/she accepts as he/she is and he/she is prepared to establish a relationship of trust with him/her. If an educator does not have fundamental knowledge of the essences of a child, he/she cannot accept him/her as he/she is because a blind acceptance cannot be genuine acceptance.

Providing support without knowledge (understanding) and, thus, also without genuine acceptance can be extremely precarious for a child's becoming adult. Further, an educator must also know what degree of trust is appropriate, and without sufficient knowledge of a child he can't know this.

On the other hand, a child only entrusts him/herself to the care of an adult who knows him/her and his/her way to adulthood. Thus, behind a relationship of trust, a relationship of understanding must always be seen as a precondition for it, but a child's need for support must be seen as even more fundamental because without it, there is no necessity for a pedagogic relationship of knowing to exist. Hence, in this respect, a child's need for support must also be viewed as a precondition for a relationship of trust.

4. The relationship of understanding as a precondition for the relationship of authority

Also, the relationship of authority, a condition for giving support to a child in need of it, cannot appear without a relationship of understanding. To be able to provide sympathetic, authoritative guidance, a supporter must have a thorough knowledge of a child's need for support as well as knowledge of the way in which he/she must exercise his/her authority to be able to meet a child in his/her need for support to be able to give him/her support. Without knowledge of the childness of a child, an educator's authority might merely degenerate and, instead of persuading a child to follow his/her authority, he/she compels him/her to do so such that a child's possibilities to become someone him/herself are pushed aside and, in which case there can be no provision of pedagogic support.

From the above, a relationship of understanding must also be viewed as a precondition for a relationship of authority. Because a child's need for support is a precondition for the existence of a relationship of understanding, a child's need for support, in this respect, is viewed as a precondition for a relationship of authority.

5. Summary

A relationship of understanding is a precondition for the other pedagogic relationship structures, but also a child's need for support is at the foundation of these relationships. Thus, viewed from a relationship of knowing, a child's need for support, in both respects, is a necessity for the appearance of the relationship structures and, therefore, also for the pedagogic as such.

Now, after the pedagogical relationship structures have been closely examined and it has come to light that a child's need for support is a general precondition for their realization, now the pedagogical sequence structures are closely examined to see if a child's need for support also holds as a precondition for realizing them.

3.3 THE PEDAGOGICAL SEQUENCE STRUCTURES

1. Introduction

From the above reflections, a child's need for support appears to be a necessary condition for realizing the pedagogic relationship structures which, in turn, are themselves preconditions for an

educative situation. The sense of the sequence structures must be seen in the fact that the relationship structures within them must come forth so that the pedagogical aim structures can also be realized. The following is a further description and explication of a child's need for support to determine if it is also a precondition for realizing the pedagogical sequence structures.

2. The pedagogic association

Before an educative event can take a course, that is, before the sequence structures can be realized, there must be a situation of association between an adult and a child. In other words, a being-by each other of educator and child must be seen as a first condition for the beginning of the pedagogical sequence structures. Perquin sees the association between adult and child as an important facet of educating, while Langeveld sees it as a pedagogically preformed field. Nel indicates that it is called a pre-formed field of educating because, in the mere association between adult and child, there is not yet pedagogic interference but only the beginning of the possibility for it.

Because associating between adult and child does not always occur in an educative situation, it can be asked what is it that allows a pedagogical association to be qualified as educative. Langeveld sees two characteristics in the association: (i) there must be influence; and (ii) the influence must be purposefully directed to a non-adult. However, to purposefully influence a child is not yet educative activity. Only if this occurs with the aim of helping him/her to overcome his/her need for support can this qualify as an act of educating. Thus, it is a child's need for support which enables an association between an educator and a non-adult to acquire educative significance. In other words, it is only when an educator purposefully and willingly meets a non-adult to help him/her become the person he/she ought to be that pedagogic interference or intervention can begin. Hence, the need for support of a child must also be seen as a precondition for establishing a situation of pedagogic association.

3. The pedagogical encounter

Before a situation of association can take its course in the direction of pedagogic interference, it must first evolve into a real encounter

initiated by an adult with the aim of helping a child pedagogically. Landman also indicates that providing help and support requires an encounter. In other words, an encounter which has pedagogic consequences also implies providing help and support. It also is a fact that a child can only be supported pedagogically when an adult encounters him/her in his/her situation. An educator's willingness to encounter a child in his/her situation is his/her response to a child's existential need. In his/her responding, the original situation of association becomes one of intimacy. The being-by-each-other evolves into a being-with-each-other where a child is encountered face-to-face and is regarded as a fellow person so that he/she can be supported in the course of his/her becoming adult. As a result, the pedagogic relationship structures have also increased in intensity.

From the above discussion, an educator goes to meet a child to listen to his/her appeal in need so he/she can answer by realizing the pedagogical structures. If no appeal is directed to him/her to provide support, perhaps because a child doesn't need any, then a pedagogic encounter would make no sense to an adult as well as to a child. But a child *is* now in *need of support* and the fundamental condition for a pedagogic encounter must be seen in this fact.

4. The educative moment(s)

Educative moments are only genuinely observable to an educator within a real encounter. Without a pedagogic encounter which springs from an association, an educator would not have known when the appropriate and necessary moment(s) arise for him/her to support a child pedagogically. This giving of pedagogic support is a particular influencing of a child which includes a moral and/or value judgment. To so influence a child, an educator must act; something has happened which is unacceptable to him/her, but he/she is still free to close his/her eyes to it, and can still decide to turn away—to not proceed to intervene pedagogically. The question which now arises is what compels an educator to proceed with his/her giving pedagogic support? Once again, the answer is obvious. Because of a child's need for support, he/she cannot help him/herself, and he/she will not even know when an educative moment arises for him/her. On the other hand, educative moments are observable to an adult who is aware that he/she cannot, must

not and ought not turn away, because a child needs support and this need directs a wakeup call to him/her. His/her answer is to realize the pedagogical structures, and this is evidence that he/she sees and understands the childlike need for support.

Once again it is clear that a child's need for support makes this sequence structure (educative moment(s) becoming visible) possible.

5. Engagement

The realization of the pedagogical relationship structures which already began with an association between adult and child, became clearer and more intense with an encounter and when educative moments had become observable. When an educator decides to take action to influence a child positively to gradually overcome his/her need for support, he/she has taken *responsibility* for a child's becoming. With this, an encounter proceeds to an engagement where both participants take responsibility for what emanates from the encounter (Landman). For Oberholzer, engagement refers to the unconditional acceptance of the other for the future and under all circumstances, while Klafki sees this as an obligatory personal readiness which includes a congruent form of communal life. For Viljoen, engagement embraces an obligatory entwining together of persons as a promise of security by which support can be guaranteed for the one in need of help.

Also, with engagement, a child's need for support must be seen as a precondition. It is a child's need for support which an educator so clearly and urgently addresses that it impels him/her to an obligatory commitment by which he/she attempts to meet a child in his/her need for support. Here he/she takes responsibility for him/her because he/she knows that a child cannot become what he/she ought to be without his/her help. On the other hand, it is also a child's own need for support which impels him/her to an unconditional commitment to an educator because he/she knows he/she can expect support from him/her.

6. Pedagogic interference

i) Pedagogic intervention (disapproval)

If a genuine encounter emerges from an association between educator and child and then evolves into an engagement, an educator will feel obligated to intervene when educative moments become visible. If this is a genuine engagement, then an educator will not try to accelerate the educative event by a forced intervention because he/she knows that this can repulse the educand or even evoke him/her to protest, in which case the relationship of trust will become problematic. Once again, this indicates that the nature and essence of a child's need for support must be *known* to give just enough support so that pedagogic intervention can occur at the right moment and the educative event can return to the ordinary situation of association at the right time until the following educative moment appears, and action must again be taken.

Pedagogic intervention is only needed if something occurs which runs counter to an educator's hierarchy of value-preferences. Because a child is not born an adult and, thus, cannot yet give independent expression to the demands of propriety, this compels an educator, as representative of the normative, to intervene in a pedagogic event and give it a particular course so that a child can be helped to realize his/her becoming adult. Once again, it is a child's need for support which directs an appeal to an adult to intervene in his/her life and, consequently, this must also be seen as a precondition for this sequence structure.

ii) Pedagogic assent (approval)

A child also needs to know when his/her actions win an educator's approval. He/she has a need for this since he/she is still in need of support because he/she is not born with norms by which he/she can fulfill his/her own becoming adult.

When a child does what is approvable, an educator can keep quiet, but then no pedagogic event occurs (Oberholzer). Thus, he/she is compelled to approve so that in this way he/she can support a child on his/her way to becoming adult. Through the assent or approval of an educator, a child is helped to purposefully strive for the approvable such that he/she can arrive at living in terms of an accountable hierarchy of preferred values.

The activity of pedagogic approval also brings educator and child closer to each other so that a *relationship of trust* can more easily be brought about. A relationship in which a child knows his/her positive actions are noticed so that he/she will also accept this with great satisfaction when an educator correctly points to his/her approvable actions. In this way, a better *relationship of authority* will also be brought about. Pedagogic assent also more easily brings about a *relationship of understanding*. By knowing each time whether his/her actions win an educator's approval, a child will also better understand what is expected of him/her. By his/her approval, an educator gives notice that he/she better understands a child as a recognized question.

From the above, pedagogic approval can be seen as an intensifier of the pedagogic relationship structures (Landman). It also seems that a child's need for support is what makes approval necessary. In this light, a child's need for support is not only a precondition for pedagogic approval but also for a better realization of the relationship structures, thus for the entire pedagogic event.

7. Summary

After penetrating the pedagogical sequence structures within which the pedagogic relationship structures have their beginning and are realized, it has clearly come to light that a child's need for support is a necessary condition before a pedagogic event can take its course.

3.4 THE AIM STRUCTURES

1. Introduction

The realization of the sequence structures leads to actualizing the pedagogical aim structures. A child is not yet an adult but he/she ought to become one. This tension between *is* and *ought* to be is what makes educating possible and necessary. A child *is* in need of support, but he/she *ought* to gradually overcome this and, therefore, an educator can and must support him/her pedagogically until it is no longer necessary. An educator becomes unnecessary or superfluous when a child has reached adulthood as a morally independent person, i.e., when the pedagogical aim structures are

realized. So viewed, the aim structures can also serve as criteria *or* yardsticks for adulthood.

The following a close examination is made of the aim structures as explicated by Landman from the perspective of a child's need for support.

2. Meaningful existence

A person is not born with the understanding which he/she is called upon by life and he/she must answer by living responsibly. He/she has a need for help and guidance so that he/she can become aware of the sense of his/her life (as task acceptance and fulfillment) and from which his/her life can acquire meaning. The pedagogic action which must lead to an awareness of the meaningfulness of his/her existence, thus, is called into being by a child's need for support so that, in this case, it also must be viewed as a precondition for a pedagogic event.

3. Self-judgment and self-understanding

It is only with the help of an adult that a child is able to become self-enlightened such that he/she can be critical of him/herself and can also judge him/herself morally. Without an adult who can continually show him/her the right way and correctly help him/her, he/she will not become aware that he/she him/herself is also subjected to moral judgments, and his/her self-judging would be an impossibility.

The fact that this aim structure is not realized by a child from the beginning points to his/her need for support such that, in this respect, it is also seen as a condition for a pedagogic activity to be able to be accomplished.

4. Human dignity

A child is born as a human being but his/her human dignity must be acquired. However, to arrive at such an acquisition and realization he/she is committed to an adult. Without help, he/she would not have become aware of his/her own dignity as a human being. Then he/she also would not have known that he/she must remain involved in his/her becoming a person through continual self-forming in morally independent ways.

5. Morally independent choosing and acting

For morally independent choosing and acting, initially a child is committed to an adult so that he/she can be taught to remain true to his/her choices and can carry them out so he/she can also become the person he/she ought to be. Because, in this respect, he/she is also in need of support, it is this need which directs a wakeup call to an adult to support him/her. Consequently, providing help to realize this aim structure is possible because a child needs support.

6. Responsibility

A child is in need of support because he/she is not born with an awareness that responsibility is a fundamental principle of his/her being human. Also, as far as the content of this responsibility is concerned, it can only be acquired through the help of an adult; therefore, his/her need for support also must be seen here as a precondition.

7. Norm identification

For the realization of norm identification as a pedagogical aim structure, a child is committed to the support of an adult. Without someone who is the bearer of an image of the norms of adult living who can give expression in a morally independent, acceptable and meaningful way to the idea of adulthood, a child would not be able to identify him/herself with such a way of living. Thus, it would never figure forth in his/her life. Hence, it is his/her need of support which calls for realizing this aim structure, so it also must be posited as a precondition.

8. Philosophy of life

Because a child is not born as an independent practitioner of the norm-image of adulthood, an adult, as one who represents the normative, must intervene in his/her life to give it a particular course. A child would not be able to independently arrive at his/her own philosophy of life, a philosophy of life which ought to be able to indicate a firm obedience to specific demands of propriety.

9. Summary

After a close examination of each of the pedagogical aim structures, not one of them can be attained by a child on his own. Beyond a doubt, this points to his/her need for support which must be seen as a precondition for the pedagogic. Indeed, the same can be said with respect to realizing the pedagogical structures discussed previously.

3.5 TEACHING, FORMING AND EDUCATING

1. Introduction

After penetrating the fundamental pedagogical structures, it is necessary to take a closer look at the concepts educating, teaching and forming because they are activities which are actualized within the framework of these structures. Now, it is much easier to make these distinctions because clarity has been acquired about the real essences of the educative situation.

First brief attention is given to the concepts teaching and forming against which the concept educating will be delimited. This is necessary because the first two concepts show points of agreement with the concept educating, but must be distinguished from it for the sake of clearer scientific thinking.

2. Teaching

In general, teaching means that situation in a classroom where a teacher conveys positive knowledge to a child, thus unlocks reality for him/her (Van der Stoep) and, in doing so, supports him/her on his/her way to adulthood. In this case, it is more correct to speak of a didactic-pedagogic or an educative-teaching situation. However, this is not always the case because some teaching situations are sometimes (fortunately a minority) the opposite of providing pedagogic support and, rather, can lead to a depersonalization of a child. Thus, e.g., a child can receive instruction in tricks of dishonesty such as disallowed coaching for exams, in stealing, or in doing what is morally unacceptable.

In its narrow sense, teaching means presenting or introducing specific knowledge or skills. Here, there is specific knowledge because the teaching does not necessarily involve a person in his/her totality. In this case, teaching is also synonymous with

instructing. Thus, there can be mention, e.g., of history-instruction, science-instruction or of instruction in any other subjects.

Teaching can occur between adults and children or between mutual adults and between mutual children. That is, one child can teach another child, or one adult can teach another. Children are also able to teach adults. There can also be learning from experience and learning from one's own mistakes. Thus, teaching is not merely limited to the years of childhood and continues to occur into old age.

3. Forming

As a becoming being, a person is never completed. From birth, he/she is influenced and this lasts until the day he/she dies. The totality of influences or interactions between an individual and his/her total world (people, things, animals, nature and culture) act upon him/her and the resulting changes in him/her can be labeled as forming. Forming mainly occurs unconsciously, unintentionally, indirectly and unsystematically (Oberholzer).

Forming can be positive, but an adult can never allow his/her children to be formed haphazardly. Indeed, so-called natural educating, where children depend on themselves for positive, natural forming, does not seem to hold true. Human life is too short and, therefore, a child has a need for *purposeful* influencing on his/her way to meaningful adulthood.

4. Educating

Before there can be educating, the pedagogical structures must be realized. In other words, a trusting, knowing and authoritative relationship must be established which is directed by a particular aim structure. In addition, there must be a personal association between adult and child which becomes a pedagogic encounter out of which purposeful pedagogic activities can emerge.

The primary demands which a situation must meet to qualify as an educative situation, and out of which its differences from teaching and forming appear, are summarized as follows:

1. There must be at least two persons: an adult and a child;

2. Pedagogic support must be provided to a child. In other words, in all respects, a child must be accepted, known, cared for and guided sympathetically so that eventually he/she can live the norm-image of adulthood;
3. The support given must be guided by particular aims, thus, there must be purposeful intervention;
4. The support given must be systematic, purposeful or deliberate;
5. The support given must occur during the right time period and need not be continuous;
6. The support given by an educator ends with a child's becoming adult;
7. It is giving support which is directed to a child as a person and his/her total being-in-the-world.

The critical reader will quickly note that sometimes these concepts are used very unscientifically such that a confusion of tongues reigns. For example, one often hears of educational excursions, educational films, educational books, etc. Perhaps there can be educational tours where pedagogues guide the travel to practice their science, or something similar, but this is not what is meant!

A student who is serious about studying the subject of educating must make sure that he/she uses his/her concepts correctly so that his/her reflecting can be purer and so he/she can give his/her best, not only as an education*ist*, but also as an educa*tor*.

In the following chapter there is additional discussion of other concepts or categories which are typical of a pedagogic situation and which also can be used as criteria or yardsticks to evaluate the quality of a situation known as educating.