

CHAPTER THREE

A CHILD AS A PERSON: HIS NEED FOR SUPPORT

S. G. Roos

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter a further analysis is made of the educative phenomenon with particular reference to the child as a person. This is necessary because a child is a particular person who, on his 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 that is given to a child in his becoming [adult]. Thus, it is pedagogical help that qualifies as providing this support. The word pedagogical means accompanying a child, and whoever guides a child in his 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 pedagogical 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 that he designs? Answer: His educative activities are constituted by the fact that he allows the fundamental pedagogical structures to appear so that they can be realized in a pedagogical situation. Childlike need for support summons pedagogical 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 so that he can know which structures that are available for realization must be implemented in pedagogical situations, i.e., situations in which support is given to a

child so that he can gradually and progressively overcome this need. Thus, a pedagogue must know that his pedagogical activities are constituted by the fact that he designs pedagogical 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 pedagogical interference possible and this interference results in decreasing the child's need for support. In other words, he allows pedagogical relationships and the pedagogical sequence to occur (happen) so that pedagogical 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 will not understand the necessity for pedagogical events; thus it is really essential that a child is allowed, in his 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 pedagogical activities to occur, and the call for the pedagogical structures would not only be unnecessary but also impossible. In other words, a pedagogue realizes pedagogical structures as his response to an educand's appeal to notice and support him in his striving to overcome his 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 that 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 pedagogical situation cannot appear as it really is. In other words they are essentials or essential characteristics that are necessary preconditions for realizing pedagogical situations. Viewed in this light the pedagogical structures must also be seen as fundamental structures from which the *structural character* (Oberholzer) of a pedagogical event is constituted. Landman describes these fundamental pedagogical structures as general rules, constitutive unities or preconditions or carriers of meaning or evidences or what

can be experienced and that necessarily belong to a pedagogical situation.

In this chapter there is an attempt to understand the pedagogical structures by penetrating them from a particular perspective, i.e., from a child's need for support. The appearance of the pedagogical 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 in light of a child's need for support.

Because of his inability to become what he ought to be without support he directs an appeal to an adult. A support-giving adult responds to a child's distressful call by entering with him into *relationships of trust, knowing and authority* so that a space can be created within which the pedagogical 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 already indicated 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 pedagogical support to be able to give meaning to his 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 himself in fulfilling his task and calling as an adult. By appealing to the educative-giving nature of an educator, a child also supports the adult in bringing forth his 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 humanness.

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

support to adulthood can only flourish where sympathetic, authoritative guidance is possible. As a result of his incompleteness a child relies on what an adult shows and says to him but he does this only if he, as educator, has the trust and acceptance as someone who has trustworthy and thus also authentic authority to lead him on his 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, the fact is that each is part of one pedagogical situation. Consequently, there must be an indissoluble mutual relationship among these real pedagogical essences. Through a closer analysis it will be seen that the child's need for support is one of the ligaments that 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 relationship of encounter with an educator in an educative situation must be one of trust. Providing pedagogical support cannot occur without mutual trust between adult and child. However, it is not only trust between educator and child that is a necessary precondition for pedagogical support. On deeper examination, or by reaching further back, it is seen that a pedagogical situation also presumes a mutual trust between educators. 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 trust in his educators can be diminished to a degree that his educating is also

damaged. This aspect of trust as a precondition for giving pedagogical support will not be 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 *the foundation of all of them is in [a child's] need for support* and 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 pedagogical 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 will now be 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 so that he can become what he ought to become, i.e., an adult. It is an active acceptance that 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 that the other *accepts* it. On the other hand, the one in need of support will only *accept* the support offered to him if he accepts the educator as a trustworthy giver of support. However, a child can refuse the support offered. It cannot be forced upon him. Forced

support, and thus a forced acceptance of it, leaves no room for a pedagogical event. It is only through a mutually accepted trust that an educator accepts a child in need of support and puts the latter in a position to be accepted. Thus giving pedagogical 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.

Pedagogical support can only be given if the adult *accepts* the child and if the child *accepts* the adult, thus, also as his educator. This active acceptance must be unconditional. The adult must be prepared to accept the child as he is so that he can support him to become what he ought to be. To accept a child as he is also means that he must be unconditionally accepted in his full presence. The educator must keep the one in need of support near him because it is only here that the educator can recognize, feel and listen to the child's needs and then support him if necessary. Also, it is only with and by the educator that the child feels safe and opens himself for support. The 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 the educator must really make *room for* (Binswanger) the child in need of support in his life space so that he can support him on his 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 that 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 the pedagogic event, it is no guarantee that a pedagogical encounter will be reached. 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 the educator *accepts* the child with the intention *to support* and *be supported* to overcome the need for support that 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 the two different individuals can shrink or even

disappear so that providing support in a pedagogical sense becomes possible.

As appears from the above, active acceptance at the same time is also an active giving. The adult *accepts* the child in order to *give* support while the child *gives* himself to be accepted so that he can accept the support offered. The educator who accepts the child, and thus accepts him as he is, i.e., as in need of support, also gives himself to the child as an example to emulate and in doing so gives support in gradually overcoming the need for support. On the other hand, the child who accepts support also thereby acknowledges that he has trust in the adult as a giver of support. With this he also unconditionally gives himself to the 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 the child's need for support as the precondition for a pedagogically meaningful acceptance. Indeed, if the child were not in need of support then the mutual trust and acceptance between adult and child are not necessary preconditions for their being together as being involved with each other. Thus, it is correct to state that it is the child's need for support that calls the educator to let this pedagogic structure appear.

ii) Intention

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

a readiness to enter a relationship, as an essence of acceptance, is called into being and realized.

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

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

iii) Bonding

In the previous section it is indicated that a genuine educator accepts the child in order to address him as “my child”. This way of addressing refers to a bonding. With this the educator declares himself to be ready to forge a pedagogical bond between him and the child in need of support, a bond that indicates a close and intimate familial relationship, i.e., that between parent and child. It is a bonding appeal to the child with a deeper significance than to only have him bodily present. The educator’s trust and acceptance are expressed by his bonding with the child to a degree and it also brings about the obligation to accept him. This readiness to enter a bonding relationship obliges the educator to support the child in need of support at all times on his path of becoming [adult] even if this is sometimes unpleasant or even requires great sacrifice. The question that now arises is why the educator declares himself to be ready for such a bonding. The answer is obvious: it is the child’s need for support that speaks to him—even calls him—directs an appeal to him to give support. As an adult, the 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 the child's need for support that 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 the educator. The child's need for support allows him to appeal for help and the adult answers by realizing the pedagogical structures. He must not only answer but he also will answer because he is an adult. Whoever refuses to answer the appeal of the child in need of support at most can be considered an inhumane person. In order to give a positive response, the educator must and will carry a personal responsibility and thus also accept a co-responsibility for the child's becoming adult. As a person, the educator must be accountable not only to himself or others but ultimately also to a Higher Authority for the response he gives to the appeal of the child in need of support.

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

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

v) Caring

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

him. On the other hand, the educator sees the child's "deficiency" but he also knows that the child is potentiality and thus also is future. However, he is aware that the child cannot realize his potentiality without support and therefore he is prepared to establish an educative relationship with him. He will care for the child entrusted to him to gradually overcome his need for support. This willingness of the educator to provide educative care is evoked by the 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 it can be seen clearly that the real essence "caring" is not isolated but that there is a profound relationship among all of the pedagogical structures and their essences. It is the child's need for support that leads to the educator caring for him. By caring and in doing so making provision for the child's becoming, the educator allows the pedagogical structures to appear. Thus, the child's need for support is a precondition for pedagogical care and by caring the educator allows the reality of educating to be. Seen in this light, caring must be viewed as a precondition for the pedagogical event.

vi) Co-existence (fellow-humanness)

Out of the readiness to care pedagogically, the 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., the child is used only as a means for reaching an aim and not as an end in himself. In such a case, the child, e.g., can be trained with the aim of increasing the educator's prestige as a teacher. But if the child's dignity is violated in this way, it is no pedagogical relationship. It is a precondition for the pedagogical 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 the child is not supported to overcome his need for support and consequently he stagnates in his becoming such that in this case he is deprived of his dignity and there is no co-existential relationship in the true sense of the word. It is the *humanness* of the *child* in need of support that addresses the educator, that stirs him to establish a relationship in

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

vii) Address-listen

Only human beings are able to express reality in words and also it is only a person who is in a position to meaningfully interpret verbalized reality. However, there is something much more essential that a person can make meaningful with his words. He can give voice to the deepest grounds of his being human; for example, to his yearnings, his joys, his gratitude and his 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 also, because of his openness to the world, he is able to listen and also to be obedient when he is addressed. Because he wants to be someone himself (Langeveld) he will increasingly be made aware of the demands of adult humanness and he will progressively give expression to them. The child is not born with a hierarchy of preferred values and therefore he must and also will be addressed by an adult as a representative of the normative so that he can be supported to be able to gradually become morally independent.

Also the adult is ready to accept the child with his flaws (Binswanger), his influence-ability to positively affect him so that he can become as he ought to. He does this by addressing the child, or as Binswanger says, by taking him by the ear. This willingness on the part of the adult must be attributed to his understanding of the

child's need for support because otherwise he would not have had the need to pedagogically address the child.

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

viii) Futurity

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

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

ix) Regard

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

supported to responsible adulthood. The educator will than also consider it to be his obligation to provide this support.

Thus it is nothing other than the child's need for support that 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 of the child is not independent he cannot yet stand alone without the supportive power of the adult. He is thus in need of support. This fact compels the adult to regard and accept him as a fellow person in need who is in search of a safe foothold so he then proceeds to make room for the child to stand next to him. Thus, the child is elevated to a standing together, to a participant in a common world that must continually be affirmed in the future and that has being-with-each-other, as encounter, as its real ground.

From the above it is clear that the adult elevates the child to a standing together because he accepts him as in need of support. Thus, it is childlike need of support that compels the adult to also give form to this real pedagogical essence.

xi) Traveling together

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

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

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

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

Now that all of the essences of the essence "willingness to constitute a relationship" are penetrated closely, the following statement can rightly be made: The 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 the child's need for support that allows that 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 also is described and analyzed in order to see to what extent its realization depends on the fact that a child is 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 again be penetrated in light of the fact that a child is in need of support.

(i) Caring space

As already mentioned 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 the adult does not have the intention to care for the child and through caring the educator's acceptance of him is in evidence. Consequently, Landman also describes acceptance as an intention to care and adds to this: "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 already been indicated that it is the child's need for support that appeals to an educator to care. Now it is the case that educative caring embraces much more than only filling and providing for the child's life necessities. To clarify, only a brief distinction between pedagogical caring and purely physical caring is presented.

Pedagogical caring also includes physical caring for the 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 can "live his own life" as well as experience sufficient material security—but he must become an adult. A pedagogical space must be created for his becoming adult where the child can experience security so that he can venture into the future. In such a pedagogical space a child will feel secure

because he knows he is accepted by someone who knows him and under whose authority he can venture into it in order to explore it without harming his own dignity and can reach his destination, i.e., morally independent adulthood.

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

(ii) *Situations of acceptance*

In the previous section it was indicated that a caring space is a space where an educator accepts a child and where a child also feels welcome because he knows and experiences that he is accepted. Acceptance is thus a precondition for creating a pedagogical space as a caring space. The question that must now be answered is: What makes the educator ready to accept the child as he is and what makes the child commit himself to the care of the educator? To this Langeveld has already answered in part: "Out of the love that 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 the child does not yet know how to act to fulfill the demands of propriety, nevertheless he is not viewed by the educator with disrespect or treated as an improper person but is accepted in love as someone who has a need for support. Because of his need for support, in each situation the educator accepts the child as a becoming person and, therefore, he 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 the child's need for support one can arrive at no other

conclusion than that it is the child's need for support that calls them into being.

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

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

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

In as much as this caring-out-of-love is called into being by the 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 the adult for the becoming of the child cannot be genuine care if he 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* that is directed to giving support to the child who is in need of support in his 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 the educator is not prepared, in love, to arrange a place for the child to be by him. What is remarkable about arranging this place for the child beside him is that in reality the educator makes room in his own space for such an activity. However, it is not for this reason that he makes room for the child to be by him. If this were his reason he would become disillusioned because to use the child as a means to enrich or to expand his own

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

This making a place for the child discussed here must be such that he can experience it as a space where he is continually at home and where he ought to feel at home. By being able to act in love the educator must thus proceed to make a space in which the child feels at home. To do this he must also be prepared to *admit* the 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 the educator to *turn-in-trust* to the child. This is not only a trust in the child but also the trust of the educator in knowing that he has sufficient trust to also respect the child's trust in him so that the child also will be ready to take the educator at his word and also be accepted through the word of the educator. Consequently, this also points to a *presence-in-trust* where the adult represents the future for the child in need of support such that, in this respect, he is also has access to the child's destination.

The question that continually arises in the above discussion is what is it that moves the educator to act in love with the non-adult? The answer must be seen in the fact that the child is seeking and calling for support and that the educator sees and hears this with understanding and responds by acting in love with the child in need of support. The distress call from the non-adult to the 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 the child's need for support that calls into being this relationship structure

since not one of the essences of this structure can be thought of without taking into account the fact that the child is in need of support.

3.2.2 *Relationship of authority*

1. *Introduction*

In addition to the relationship of trust, the educative situation is further constituted by a relationship of authority. Without authority, the pedagogical event is just not possible and Perquin indicates directly that the child, even though he strives for adulthood, cannot achieve it without the authority of the educator. Oberholzer underlines the fact that the child has a need for authority, a need that he views as a precondition for educating. Langeveld also states very clearly the necessity of authority for the 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 the educative event that already has been observed by each of these educationists of note. Now a further look will be taken of a few real essences of the relationship of authority so that their realization can be evaluated in light of the child's need for support.

2. *Trust*

The relationship of authority assumes a relationship of trust. Both educator and educand must *accept* authority as the means by which educating is. Further, they must accept each other as well as the norms under whose authority they both stand. The educator must trust the child in order to be able to more responsibly give of himself and support the child. On the other hand, the child must also place his trust in the educator in order to be able to venture with him in responsible ways to give answers to what he cannot yet judge independently.

If mutual trust is missing, there cannot be mention of authority but at most of control. In this connection, Perquin talks of authoritarian authority in which case the child does not have a chance to be and to become someone himself. If the child, instead of being appealed to become different, has a “must-become-different” forced upon him, there can be no mention of educating to becoming independent.

Each real essence of the relationship of trust has been closely examined and it is seen that the child’s need for support is the 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, the relationship of authority cannot appear without the relationship of trust.

3. Responsibility

In the previous section, the necessity of a mutual trust between educator and educand was indicated so that the latter, through educative authority, could be supported to carry increasing responsibility. Viewed in this light, the aim the educator has in view with his authority is to help the child himself to increasingly answer the questions that life poses to him and not merely to prompt him with answers. However, it is the case that the 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 carry his responsibility until he can do so independently. For Langeveld, *authority* also means taking moral responsibility and answerability *in behalf of* another. Thus, the educator also is ready through his authority to assume the child’s responsibility and answerability because he is fully aware of the child’s inability to do this without his support. If the child were already free from birth to exercise his own authority in responsible ways then he would not allow himself to be addressed. Then the educator also would not see any sense in addressing him and thus would not be ready to extend his authority to the child in order to assume responsibility in his behalf. However, experience teaches something else: the child is in need of support because he cannot yet independently follow the authority of life norms and he has a need for someone who can do this for him or in his behalf—

someone who can assume responsibility in his place. In other words, the child has need for an authority figure who supports him so that one day he can be in a position to independently carry all responsibility.

From the above discussion, one can come to no other conclusion than that it is the child's need for support that also calls responsibility into being (as a real essence of authority) and, therefore, it must also be viewed as a necessary precondition for authority.

4. Obedience

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

If there is trust in the adult and thus also in the validity of what he "tells" him, then the becoming-adult will be obedient to his 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 the adult's *authority* while the adult is prepared to place them under his authority. The question that arises here is: What makes the educator extend his authority to the children and what makes the children acknowledge his authority by being obedient to it?

This question can be answered by indicating again that the child has an intense need for authority and authoritative guidance (Oberholzer) and the 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 uncertainty and ignorance so that he can experience the security for which he has a bad need for his personal becoming (Perquin). Thus, it is nothing other than the child's need for support that makes him be obedient to the adult. Viewed in this way, the 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 clearly evident that without the child's need for support authority loses its primary pedagogical significance, i.e., supporting the child to adulthood. Indeed, it is exclusively with the intention of supporting the child to adulthood that the adult is prepared to place the child under his authority. Here it is concluded without doubt that the child's need for support is as precondition for the 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 cannot yet independently give expression to the idea of adult humanness. Therefore, he is in need of support and because he is aware of this, in his course of becoming, he wants to be supported by someone he *knows* and who also has *knowledge* of him.

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

Giving pedagogical support not only requires a *thorough* knowledge but also as *complete* knowledge of the child as possible. If the child is supported merely on the basis of superficial or even misleading

incidentals his 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 the child. Providing support on the basis of such incomplete and inauthentic knowledge can only be giving support to a degenerative sub-personal level.

Giving pedagogical support also requires knowledge about the child’s *destination*. If the educator succeeds in acquiring a thorough and comprehensive knowledge of the child as such without knowing where he wants to go with the child, he cannot support him to adulthood and at most his providing support can fall into a pedocentrism.

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

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

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

Second, the answer regarding the precondition for providing pedagogical support within the pedagogical relationship of understanding must be sought in the child’s need for support. It has been indicated that the child’s need for support is a precondition for the relationship of trust. In this regard, the child’s need for support must also be viewed as a condition for the relationship of understanding. If, however, one thinks about why the adult wants to establish a relationship of understanding with the

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

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

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

It is because the educator knows the child as a child that he accepts him as he is and he is prepared to establish a relationship of trust with him. If the educator does not have fundamental knowledge of the essences of the child he cannot accept him as he 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 the child's becoming adult. Further, the educator must also know what degree of trust is appropriate and without sufficient knowledge of the child he can't know this.

On the other hand, the child only entrusts himself to the care of the adult who knows him and his way to adulthood. Thus, behind the relationship of trust, a relationship of understanding must always be seen as a precondition for it, but the child's need for support must be seen as even more fundamental because without it there is no necessity for the pedagogic relationship of knowing to exist. Hence, in this respect, the child's need for support must also be viewed as a precondition for the 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 the child in need of it, cannot appear without the relationship of understanding. To be in a position to provide sympathetic, authoritative guidance, the supporter must have a thorough knowledge of the child's need for support as well as knowledge of the way in which he must apply his authority in order to be able to meet the child half way in his need for support in order to be able to give him support. Without knowledge of the childness of the child the educator's authority might merely degenerate and, instead of persuading the child to follow his authority, he compels him to do so such that the child's possibilities to become someone himself are pushed aside and, in which case there can be no provision of pedagogical support.

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

5. Summary

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

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

3.3 THE PEDAGOGICAL SEQUENCE STRUCTURES

1. Introduction

From the above reflection the child's need for support appears to be a necessary condition for realizing the pedagogical relationship structures that in turn are themselves preconditions for the 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 the child's need for support in order to determine if it is also a precondition for realizing the pedagogical sequence structures.

2. The pedagogical association

Before the educative event can take a course, thus before the sequence structures can be realized, there must be a situation of association between the adult and the child. In other words, the 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 pre-formed 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 pedagogical 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 the pedagogical association to be qualified as educative. Langeveld sees two particular characteristics in the association: (i) there must be influence; and (ii) the influence must be purposefully directed to the non-adult. However, to purposefully influence a child is not yet educative activity. Only if this occurs with the aim of helping him to overcome his need for support can this qualify as an act of educating. Thus, it is the child's need for support that enables the association between the educator and the non-adult to acquire educative significance. In other words, it is only when the educator purposefully and willingly meets the non-adult to help him become the person he ought to be that pedagogical interference or intervention can begin. Hence, the need for support of the child must also be seen as a precondition for establishing a situation of pedagogical association.

3. The pedagogical encounter

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

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

4. The educative moment(s)

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

need for support, he cannot help himself, and he will not even know when the educative moment arises for him. On the other hand, the educative moments are observable to the adult who is aware that he cannot, must not and ought not turn away because the child is in need of support and this need directs a wakeup call to him. His answer, being the realization of the pedagogical structures, is evidence that he sees and understands the childlike need for support.

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

5. Engagement

The realization of the pedagogical relationship structures that already began with the association between adult and child, became clearer and more intense with the encounter and when educative moments had become observable. When the educator decides to take action to influence the child positively to gradually overcome his need for support, he has taken *responsibility* for the child's becoming. With this, the 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 that also 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, the child's need for support must be seen as a precondition. It is the child's need for support that the educator so clearly and urgently addresses that it impels him to an obligatory commitment by which he attempts to meet the child in his need for support. Here he takes responsibility for him because he knows that the child cannot become what he ought to be without his help. On the other hand, it is also the child's own need for support that impels him to an unconditional commitment to the educator because he knows he can expect support from him.

6. *Pedagogical interference*

i) Pedagogical intervention (disapproval)

If a genuine encounter emerges from the association between educator and child and then evolves into an engagement, the educator will feel obligated to intervene when educative moments become visible. If this is a genuine engagement then the educator will not try to accelerate the educative event by a forced intervention because he knows that this can repulse the educand or even evoke him to protest, in which case the relationship of trust will become problematic. Once again, this indicates that the nature and essence of the child's need for support must be *known* in order to give just enough support so that the pedagogical 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.

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

ii) Pedagogical assent (approval)

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

When the child does what is approvable the educator can keep quiet, but then no pedagogical event occurs (Oberholzer). Thus, he is compelled approve so that in this way he can support the child on his way to becoming adult. Through the assent or approval of the educator, the child is helped to purposefully strive for the

approvable such that he can arrive at living in terms of an accountable hierarchy of preferred values.

The activity of pedagogical 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 the child knows his positive actions are noticed so that he will also accept this with great satisfaction when the educator correctly points to his approvable actions. In this way, a better *relationship of authority* will also be brought about. Pedagogical assent also more easily brings about a *relationship of understanding*. By knowing each time whether his actions win the educator's approval, the child will also better understand what is expected of him. By his approval the educator gives notice that he better understands the child as a recognized question.

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

7. Summary

After penetrating all of the pedagogical sequence structures within which the pedagogical relationship structures have their beginning and are realized, it has clearly come to light that the child's need for support is a necessary condition before the pedagogical 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. The child is not yet an adult but he ought to become one. This tension between *is* and *ought* to be is what makes educating possible and necessary. The child *is* in need of support but he *ought* to gradually overcome this and therefore the educator can and must support him pedagogically until it is no longer necessary. The educator becomes unnecessary or

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

2. Meaningful existence

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

3. Self-judgment and self-understanding

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

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

4. Human dignity

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

5. Morally independent choosing and acting

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

6. Responsibility

The child is in need of support because he is not born with the awareness that responsibility is a fundamental principle of his being human. Also, as far as the content of this responsibility is concerned, it can only be acquired through the help of the adult; therefore, his 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 the adult. Without someone as the bearer of an image of the norms of adult living who is able to give expression in a morally independent, acceptable and meaningful way to the idea of adulthood, the child would not be able to identify himself with such a way of living. Thus it would never figure forth in his life. Hence, it is his need of support that calls for realizing this aim structure so that 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, the adult, as one who represents the normative, must intervene in his life in order to give a particular course to it. The child would not be able to independently arrive at his own philosophy of life, a philosophy of life that ought to be able to indicate a firm obedience to particular demands of propriety.

9. Summary

After a close examination of each of the pedagogical aim structures, it is clear that not one of them can be attained by the child on his

own. Beyond a doubt, this points to his need for support that must be seen as a precondition for the pedagogical. Indeed, the same can be said with respect to realizing all of 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 that are actualized within the framework of these structures. Now it will be much easier to make these distinctions because clarity has already 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 later 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 the teacher conveys positive knowledge to the child, thus unlocks reality for him (Van der Stoep) and in doing so supports him on his 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 pedagogical support and rather can lead to a depersonalization of the 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 talk of specific knowledge because the teaching does not necessarily involve the person in his 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 subject.

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 in a position to teach adults. There can also be mention of learning from experience and learning from one's own mistakes. Thus, teaching is not merely limited to the years of childhood and can continue to occur into old age.

3. Forming

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

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

4. Educating

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

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

1. There must be at least two persons: an adult and a child;
2. Pedagogical support must be provided to the child. In other words, in all respects the child must be accepted, known,

- cared for and guided sympathetically so that eventually he can live the norm-image of adulthood;
3. The support given must be guided by particular aims, thus 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 the educator ends with the child's becoming adult;
 7. It is giving support that is directed to the child as a person and his 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 in order to practice their science or something similar, but this is not what is meant!

The student who is serious about studying the subject of education must make sure that he uses his concepts correctly so that his reflecting can be purer and so he can give his best not only as an *educationist* but also as an *educator*.

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