

CHAPTER ONE

AN ESSENCE ANALYSIS OF THE SITUATION OF EDUCATING

W. A. Landman

1.1 INTRODUCTION: *The fundamental pedagogical structures*

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

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

In an educative situation (pedagogic situation) educator(s) and educand(s) enter a special relationship. They become involved in *educative relationships*, namely:

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

These three relationships are also known as pedagogic *relationship structures* because if they are not realized, an educative situation does not exist, and educating is not possible. Realizing these real pedagogical essences is a precondition for an educative situation to progress meaningfully. This event progression occurs as follows:

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

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

In an educative situation, because of his/her need for support, a child is a child-in-need [of being educated, i.e., an educand]. He/she needs the support of an adult who can enter an educative relationship with him/her as a child-in-educating, and to carry out educative activities. In other words, an educator is someone who can realize the pedagogic relationship and sequence structures with a child. This occurs with an eye to realizing the *aim* which an educator has with a child. Thus, the educative activities are directed to realizing an *educative aim* and, thus, these activities are aim-directed. Being aim-directed presumes knowledge of the aim which must be realized. *Aim-knowledge* is a precondition for effectively educating. Hence, the educative aim is also a fundamental pedagogical structure, thus, a real pedagogical essence.

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

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

1. Meaningful existence,
2. Self-judgment and self-understanding,
3. Human dignity,

4. Morally independent choosing and acting,
5. Responsibility,
6. Norm identification,
7. Philosophy of life.

The educative activities of an educator are:

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

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

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

8. *Designing-possibilities-for-adulthood,*
9. *Gradual-attainment-of-destination (adulthood),*
10. *Increasing-respect-for-human-dignity,*
11. *Becoming-adult-through-increasing-self-understanding,*
12. *Conquering-responsible-freedom.*

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

In summary: The fundamental pedagogical structures, i.e., real pedagogical essences are:

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

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

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

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

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

1.2 THE PEDAGOGICAL RELATIONSHIP STRUCTURES:

1.2.1 *The pedagogical relationship of trust*

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

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

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

• This will be discussed with the pedagogical aim structure *and* with the pedagogical categories.

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

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

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

world with its demands of propriety. (The *italicized* words can be viewed as real essences of the pedagogical essence “willingness to constitute a relationship”).

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

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

ready and willing to establish a relationship with a child and wants to realize his/her intention to care for him/her.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.2.3 The pedagogical relationship of authority

A child yearns for authority and sympathetic, authoritative guidance (Oberholzer). When two persons are with each other and one is seeking support and the other possesses the means to support him/her, a relationship of authority appears. In a pedagogical situation, it is a relationship of pedagogical authority which, for a child, is of fundamental significance because he/she is not yet adult:

the obligation to be obedient has a central place in his/her moral life.

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

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

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

Oberholzer explains this as follows: "There are those who want there to be no authority in educating; there are others who award it such a prominent place that educating really is synonymous with the exercise of authority. Whoever says educating means authority, and whoever will have no authority present may not speak of educating. There are prominent thinkers in the field of pedagogics who view the element of authority as precisely the characteristic of educative action. This does not mean that only a child is placed under authority; rather and especially an educator puts him/herself under it. As one who obeys authority, via acknowledging it, he can do nothing other than also lead and support an educand to increasing obedience. The authority is there to 'protect' the freedom, which a

person is, in such a way that the freedom which he must master will never impair his dignity.”

1.3 THE MUTUAL CONNECTIONS AMONG THE PEDAGOGICAL RELATIONSHIP STRUCTURES

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

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

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

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

In an educative situation, educator and child come close to each other and they have an opportunity to learn to know each other. Because of the relationship of trust, which is already there, this knowing is a knowing-in-appreciation (Viljoen). Thus, a relationship of trust is a precondition for understanding, especially an appreciative understanding of each other.

1.4 REAL ESSENCES OF THE PEDAGOGICAL SEQUENCE STRUCTURES

1.4.1 *Introduction*

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

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

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

1.4.2 *Pedagogical association*

In a pedagogic association an educator and an educand are *by* each other at the *same time* and in the *same place*, and they are *aware of* the *presence* of each other. Langeveld calls this association a

pedagogically preformed field because it is a precondition [or opportunity] for the eventual purposeful pedagogical interfering by an educator. It is a necessary step in the direction of interfering pedagogically.

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

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

1.4.3 *Pedagogical encounter*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.5 *Pedagogical interference*

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

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

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

1.4.6 *Return to pedagogical association*

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

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

1.4.7 Periodic breaking away

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

1. Separating as periodic breaking away

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

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

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

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

Because his/her being-someone-him/herself thrives in terms of norms, here there also is the flourishing of his/her being-a-person. Periodic breaking away, then, is an opportunity for him/her to appropriate and actualize independently and on his/her own accountability his/her connectedness with reality and to do so in a stylish and normative way. Although this event cannot be limited to

periodic breaking away, it can come to expression more fully during it, and this emphasizes its necessity.

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

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

It is precisely under the influence of the unfamiliar, among which are mass-communication media, that a child intensely experiences his/her becoming morally independent when he/she is cast back on him/herself and is dependent on his/her own powers to pass moral judgments. Now there is not only an appeal made to his/her

knowledge of the demands of propriety but also and especially to the degree he/she can apply these demands as criteria (norms).

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

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

2. Leaving and saying farewell

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

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

Unanimity with respect to demands of propriety is reached at a certain stage in an educative situation, and this means a similar

striving for what is deemed to be worth pursuing. Reciprocity in this sense is also a test of whether it is advisable to allow the leaving to occur. In other words, i.e., to determine whether the breaking away indeed will be a leaving and not a fleeing. Unanimity with respect to the demands of propriety does not mean a unanimity regarding all of the demands of propriety an educator represents but rather as much unanimity as is possible with what the educator has had in mind. Absolute unanimity is impossible because educator and child are both human beings and because the child is on the way to adulthood.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

this situation that creates an opportunity for him/her to flee from his/her task of becoming a proper adult.

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

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

4. Leaving as periodic breaking away from the educative situation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

b) Leaving out of necessity. Leaving out of necessity arises from unforeseen circumstances or those out of the control of the educator. The normal course of a pedagogic event is then interrupted by an outsider or an unrelated event, and breaking away is necessary. Authentic leaving in the sense of a mutual attunement regarding norms or of satiation is not done justice. Indeed, the pedagogical remains unfulfilled and the child experiences his/her need for support more intensely. A continual interruption of the pedagogic event to such a degree that its course is not actualized, eventually gives rise to pedagogical neglect. Then there is neglect, not because of unwillingness but because of impotence. Contemporary hurried life often encourages this situation. A pedagogical crisis arises when periodic breaking away no longer functions as a necessary complement to the pedagogical but betrays the not-yet adult because of faulty educative situations.

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

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

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

the prospect of an affectionate-being-together and has the immediate aim of eliminating distance.

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

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

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

6. Returning to an educative situation

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

The success of the educative event with the return of the educand is going to depend on the degree of mutuality which has been attained. The mere fact that during periodic braking away a child has new experiences, that the “new” continually appears in his/her stream of thought, that new experiences acquire additional permanent meaning in the light of supporting experience, all bring about change. All of this prevents a mere repetition of something which remains the same. What is repeated is no longer the same, and can no longer be restored in the present as it was. Perspectives have changed, what was merely on the horizon has moved to the center of attention. Previous opportunities are actualized or appear to be impossible. Briefly, a child who re-enters the educative situation does so as a changed person, and the educator who ignores this meaning of periodic breaking away cannot fully educate.

1.5 THE MUTUAL CONNECTIONS AMONG THE PEDAGOGICAL RELATIONSHIP AND SEQUENCE STRUCTURES

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

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

In a *pedagogic encounter* a further development of the pedagogical relationship structures is possible. An educator’s responsibility for

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

At this stage in the course [sequence] of the educative event, an even more intense appearance and actualization of the pedagogical relationship structures is noticed, and the educator experiences and accepts the pedagogical *engagement* which leads him/her to *interfere pedagogically*. The appearance of educative moments and the acceptance of the obligation to interfere pedagogically in a still more intense way brings forth the pedagogical relationship structures even more intensely for actualization. The pedagogic interference then is realized in the light of pedagogical relationship structures which have been maximally actualized.

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

1.6 THE STRUCTURE OF THE PEDAGOGICAL

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

reflectively searches for the preconditions for the possibility of that reality he/she wants to study.

**AN ESSENCE ANALYSIS OF THE EDUCATIVE SITUATION TO SHOW
ONE POSSIBLE WAY ITS COURSE IS (SEQUENCE) MANIFESTED**

First possible educative activity:

PEDGOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Pedagogical relationship structures appear
Intensification of the actualization of these structures

Second possible educative activity:

PEDAGOGICAL ENCOUNTER

Further thriving of the pedagogical relationship structures

EDUCATIVE MOMENTS BECOME VISIBLE

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

Third possible educative activity:

ENGAGEMENT

Further intensification of the actualization of the pedagogical relationship structures

Fourth possible educative activity:

PEDAGOGICAL INTERFERENCE

Pedagogical interference in the context of the pedagogical relationship structures

Either PEDAGOGICAL INTERVENTION or ASSENT

Purposefulness of pedagogical interference decreases

Fifth possible educative activity:

RETURN TO PEDAGOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Sixth possible educative activity:

PERIODIC BREAKING AWAY FROM THE PEDAGOGICAL SITUATION

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

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

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

Now it is possible and necessary that a pedagogician, with his/her pedagogical perspective, converse scientifically with practitioners of some of the other perspectives [e.g., psychology, on the educative

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

From a pedagogical situation, thus from a pedagogical perspective, a scientific conversation can be carried out with practitioners of a psychology which is acceptable to a pedagogician. Such a conversation can result in a thinking viewing of the lifeworld of a child from a psychopedagogical perspective. This thinking is a directed search for real essences of the psychic life in a pedagogic situation and is the task of *psychopedagogics*. *Didactic pedagogics* will bring to light didactic (teaching) essences in a pedagogic situation; *sociopedagogics* will disclose and understand the essences of social life in a pedagogic situation; *historical pedagogics* will describe and interpret the real essences of child-images and educative aims through the centuries and evaluate contemporary child-being against this background, while *orthopedagogics* involves itself with the real essences of a child-in-educating who is dealing with particular distress. *Vocational orientation pedagogics* will uncover and implement the real essences of the child-in-educating in his/her increasing self-determination of the vocational future which is approaching.

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

Each of the pedagogical perspectives on the educative aspect of the lifeworld are a particular, independent perspective of an

autonomous pedagogical perspective. This means that each of these pedagogical areas of science necessarily is a constitutive aspect of pedagogics.

Pedagogics is a science with possibilities of application, thus with the possibility of being employed post-scientifically in the lifeworld with its concrete situations of educating. That is, pedagogical thinking (reflection), which has its origin in the lifeworld, returns to it. Then, a post-scientific refinement occurs which is a consequence of scientific practice. The science of pedagogics directs an appeal to a practicing educator (pedagogue/teacher) that, if he/she decides to apply its findings, he/she does so in a pedagogically permissible, accountable way. Pedagogics has brought to light what is appropriate for *all* pedagogical situations. However, an educator is a particular person in a particular educative situation and, thus, in the presence of particular children. Thus, an educator who is Calvinist-Protestant is in the presence of such a child. This means that such an educator listens to *an additional* appeal, i.e., the appeal to properly implement his/her philosophy of life. This implementation is the philosophy of life contents which are given to the fundamental pedagogical structures and to the actualization of them in particular educative situations. There also must be consideration given to this particular furnishing of contents by which life is awakened in the fundamental pedagogical structures. This is a task for a pedagogue's post-scientific thinking and is known as *educative doctrine*.•

• See chapters five and six.