Željka Pintar, mag. praesc. educ.
Kindergarten Kustošija, Zagreb
zeljka.pint@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/ 0000-0003-1178-9222

ADULTIZED CHILD OF EARLY AND PRESCHOOL AGE IN THE MODERN CONCEPT OF UPBRINGING AND EDUCATION

Abstract: The paper deals with an image of a modern child of early and preschool age in the context of current pedagogical paradigm. Modern society, interested in improving its economic system through knowledge, has a specific interest in the upbringing and education of individuals. The modern pedagogical concept of knowledge society is based on the theory of learning – constructivism. Accordingly, a child is predominantly understood as the one who learns while establishing partnerships with adults. A child is given a specific responsibility for his own developmental well-being, he is adultized. The modern approach to the child, which is based on the sociological concept of his rights, neglects the views of psychological discourse which considers his developmental needs, which consequently reflects on the character of the modern educational relationship and leads to a crisis of upbringing. This paper discusses the specific impact of modern pedagogical starting points, such as the one on equal partnership between child and educator, child as an autonomous subject or space as the third educator, on certain aspects of development of adultized early and preschool children. The paper points out the importance of conceptual redefining, instead of rejecting, the concept of upbringing as a central subject of pedagogical science.

Keywords: adultized child, modern pedagogical paradigm, early and preschool upbringing and education.

INTRODUCTION

The Convention on the Rights of the Child (2001) has in an important way directed the attitude of adults towards children, and thus, indirectly, towards their family and institutional upbringing. It is stated that in the institutional context, the concept of children's rights is a signpost to creation of a pedagogical relationship, established to help and support children in optimal development of their abilities (Bašić, 1999, as cited in Širanović, 2011). Children's rights are most often categorized as provision, protection and participation rights. Provision and protection rights protectively advocate for protection of a child from various undesirable influences, while participation rights promote a thinking, questioning child, capable of autonomous action. Although this document is unique and individual statements about children's rights are not considered hierarchically, but are to be understood comprehensively, there are polemics about what children need more- care and protection of adults or their own freedom of thought and action (Dillen, 2006, as cited in Širanović, 2011). Considering that regulations on children's rights significantly guide their relationships with adults, these discussions need to be considered in more detail.

Some authors (Kopić & Korajac, 2010) emphasize the possibility of multiple interpretations of the statements of documents related to children's rights and point to their contradiction. An analysis of international and Croatian documents on children's rights shows that, on one hand, children are interpreted as vulnerable, and childhood is explained as a period in which the role of adults is most important for the welfare of children, while on the other, emphasize children's autonomy and active participation in society.

1

It is concluded that, by directing society towards a protective approach to children and promoting competent children – full-fledged social subjects, the requirements of the document become contradictory.

Two different approaches to children can be observed – psychological, focused on child's needs and sociological, focused on his rights (Polić, 2015). The psychological approach advocates seeing a child as a person who has not developed autonomy, rationality, and responsibility; an emotionally dependent and vulnerable individual, who has a need for certain experiences and opportunities. In contrast, sociological discourse interprets that childhood is not determined by biological immaturity and is not a universal phenomenon, but a special kind of social reality (Prout & James, 1997, as cited in Polić, 2015). From a sociological perspective, children are presented as participants in shaping the experience of their childhood and active participants in its change; they are creative social workers who create their own culture and participate in shaping the lives of adults. Although some authors (such as Polić, 2015) point to the importance of harmonizing the two proposed approaches in the concept characteristic to pedagogy, it is still missing. The modern pedagogical paradigm dominantly deviates from the psychological and advocates the sociological perception of child and childhood. Thus, pedagogical literature and educational documents talk about a child as a social subject, an active citizen of the community (Slunjski, 2012) who participates, constructs and largely determines his own life and development (National Curriculum for Early and Preschool Education, 2014).

As noted, the modernly accepted concept of children's rights is a guideline for building a pedagogical relationship. It is established, starting from the level of early and preschool education, with the primary purpose of encouraging child's cognitive learning, which, in the knowledge society, is the focus of the modern pedagogical template. At the same time, pedagogy takes over psychological theory of learning – constructivism, accepting it as a pedagogical theory of didactics. The constructivist approach to learning promotes an individual's autonomous construction of reality, without direct mediation of knowledge (Palekčić, 2002). Self-regulated learning of a child of early and preschool age, encouraged by his self-initiated and self-organized activities, requires the adult to participate in this process indirectly. The role of a preschool educator in the child's learning activities is based on preparation of materially stimulating learning environment and partner support in the learning process, during which the adult affirms equality with the child through a sociologically understood concept of his rights.

Modern pedagogical concept often comprehensively expands the role of an adult in stimulating cognitive learning of the child to the way of his participation in the child's upbringing. However, the concepts of upbringing as cognitive learning and relationship as an equal partnership, significantly reduce the perception of necessary pedagogical engagement of adults and cannot be considered educationally sufficient for a child.

By taking a sociological approach to children's rights and adopting a psychological theory of learning without additional pedagogical elaboration, the modern pedagogical model significantly distances itself from its authentic subject, making a departure from the authentic child. In that context, this paper indicates a contemporary understanding of traditional pedagogical concepts such as upbringing or pedagogical authority. The modern-pedagogically advocated need of a child's (learning) self-determination considers characteristics of pedagogical relationship. The paper touches on the concept of space as the third educator in a period marked by the crisis of upbringing. A distortive approach to contemporary upbringing is represented by reference to tautologies such as upbringing and education for values. The paper points out the consequence of the modern educational model, which gives the child not only rights, but also new responsibilities and specific developmental requirements, to his overall development. In this sense, it advocates questioning and possibly redefining the established assumptions of the modern educational template, especially those related to upbringing and education of children of early and preschool age.

CHARACTERISTICS OF AN ADULT CHILD IN THE CHARACTERISTICS OF HIS UPBRINGING AND EDUCATION

A modern child, starting from early and preschool age, is presented by the pedagogical concept primarily as one who learns cognitively, in accordance with the constructivist features of that process – learning is a self-regulated, situational, collaborative construction of knowledge based on own prior knowledge, activities, experiences, emotions (Mara set al., 2018). Learning is actualization of self-organizing possibilities of the human cognitive system (Barth, 2004, as cited in Slunjski, 2011a). Constructivist learning implies active adaptation, situational and contextual learning that results in self-created and personal knowledge (Maras et al., 2018). For these reasons, it is necessary to take into account the child's ability to self-encourage action, self-organize and self-manage activities in the educational process (National Curriculum for Preschool Education and General Compulsory and Secondary Education, 2010).

Own construction of knowledge of an early and preschool child in his self-regulated learning process, through self-initiated games in which he participates self-motivated, directs the adult to respect the child as an autonomous subject. But approaching a child as an autonomous subject is not only related to the cognitive-learning process. At the general educational level, it is pointed out that it is not appropriate to understand a child as an unfinished or incomplete adult or even just as a family member because his views and attitudes may differ from those in his primary community (Slunjski, 2012). It is proposed to terminologically reject the term upbringing, explaining that concepts such as upbringing or socialization tacitly start from inequality and asymmetry of educational relationship in which the adult is understood as a subject, teacher, manager, and the child is given a role of object, product and results of adult activities. 2010, according to Slunjski, 2012). It is noted that a modern child needs upbringing for maturity, which is the opposite of everything that tends to keep people on a leash, which is contrary to subordinating the child to what is considered good, which contradicts keeping the child away from what is considered bad – it is upbringing for success and judgment, for self-discipline and self-criticism, voluntary sobriety and use of own abilities (Hentig, 2006; Slunjski, 2012). It is explained that it is inappropriate to expect obedience from a modern child because it is contrary to his self-initiative, which some authors explain by rhetorically asking educators of early and preschool children "Do I want children to develop obedience or initiative?" (Slunjski, 2011b).

In addition to upbringing, modern pedagogical template taboos the concept of pedagogical authority and discipline. Although in original sense discipline is related to teaching and learning (Siegel & Bryson, 2017), these authors emphasize that it should be understood as one of the primary characteristics of man, necessary for an individual to create a bridge between desires and achievements (Hercigonja, 2018), and despite the fact that authority implies reputation and reputation-based value, dignity and influential power (Kolarek, 1941, as cited in Begić and Golek, 2017), in the modern pedagogical concept they become avoided concepts and ignored constructs. It is noticeable that the modern pedagogical template does not distance the understanding of authority in the socio-political context from the concept of pedagogical authority, which in the modern pedagogical paradigm is rejected, without first being elaborated. By taking over social understanding of authority, the modern pedagogical model affirms its anarchist understanding according to which every authority is based on violence and needs to be opposed by "democratic means" (Miliša, 2009). Anarchism strives for a society without power and coercion, a welfare society in which hierarchy is replaced by self-organization and equality (Martinović, 2017). In anarchist understanding, the state, government, politics, and family represent tyranny, a kind of precursors of freedom and equality. In pedagogical context, accordingly, it is noted that it is necessary to encourage development of children's civic competencies from an early age, emphasizing that the condition of their adoption is certainly not expectation of the child's obedience or unconditional acceptance of ideas and suggestions of others

(Slunjski, 2012). It is not mentioned that a child's perception of adult authority as reasonable, with control of behavior and consideration for others, is necessary in reaching a child's moral maturity (Szentartoni, 1978).

Truncated understanding of an adult as an educational authority was presupposed by the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Although it affirms adults as the most responsible for upbringing and development of the child, it envisages that due to participatory rights of the child, the role of adults could only be understood to a limited extent. Therefore, this document specifically emphasizes how adults are the ones who assess the best interests of the child. Nevertheless, some states (USA) have not ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child because they have recognized a threat to the rights of parents, i.e. parental authority, in the child's rights to participate (Wall, 2008, as cited in Širanović, 2011).

The modern adult child, in a pedagogical concept which advocates his liberation from pedagogical authority and discipline, is addressed with a specific demand for self-determination. The child's self-determination is not understood as the goal of the pedagogical process, but as the only valid organizational criterion (Gojkov, 2009). But although the modern pedagogical model calls the individual to self-determination, promoting its importance and his own commitment to his realization in the educational process, self-determination is actually a man's indisputable feature, his destiny. As a non-specialized and indeterminate being, free from instinctive self-guidance, man is free to self-determine meaningfully and productively. Due to characteristics of his nature, he completes and determines himself from himself and in himself, and by the power of his own efforts solves the task that is actually himself (Senković, 2007). The very fact that he is not anatomically adapted to the environment, nor is its existence instinctively predetermined, points to human self-determination (Gehlen, 2005). In the process of self-determination, the task of an individual is to find his own meaning in the world. However, man is directed to a community whose members mediate his cultural nature, upbringing him and directing him to free and responsible self-determination (Senković, 2007). In the self-determination of man, he needs the support of upbringing. Advocating that the modern child self-determines himself, with no authority and autonomously, in an environment that primarily cares about his cognitive learning, with the rejected concept of upbringing, potentially leads to human deception of a child. Therefore, such an approach needs to be redefined.

The modern pedagogical concept explains characteristics of its approach to a child by claiming that it is the most natural for a person. It is emphasized how it is designed in accordance with the nature of the child and talks about achieving educational practice of kindergartens in harmony with the nature of the child and adult (Slunjski, 2009). It discusses the responsibility of adults for creation of early and preschool education institutions harmonized with human nature (Vujičić, 2011).

In kindergarten, which is occasionally called by its economically appropriated term – learning organization (Slunjski, 2006), project work stands out as an optimal method of preschool child's learning. The role of an adult in project work of children is primarily indirectly advisory, predominantly material-supplying, aimed at supporting children's independent development of the project. It is noted that during project work one child negotiates with children and adults about different understandings of the problem, he discusses and makes his own judgments (Slunjski, 2012). At the same time, he is the manager of his own learning – in understanding a new idea, he starts from his own knowledge and concepts (Gojkov, 2009). However, it is important not to simplify the complexity of the described process in a banal way. Knowledge, which the child adopts constructivistically, is not automatically built on the previously known, but most often a radical transformation of the child's conceptual framework is needed. This assumes that he must be able to see beyond its existing knowledge, which is not easy for a child, because activated conceptions are his only tool for deciphering his own reality (Gojkov, 2009).

In addition to organizing a material learning environment, the modern educator is suggested to be involved in the child's learning process by asking stimulating (generative) questions aimed at establishing

a child's knowledge, deepening his understanding, analyzing, synthesizing and evaluation (Slunjski, 2012). This systematization of stimulus questions derives from Bloom's taxonomy of knowledge, devised in 1956.

Information and communication technology is also mentioned as a potential learning resource for preschool children, which should support their activities of planning, implementation and evaluation of the educational process (National Curriculum for Early and Preschool Education, 2014).

A specific proposal for desirable action of an adult in learning activities of kindergarten children is described by Slunjski (2012). She tells how an educator shows the child photos of his tower building activities on the computer. She asks her "Do you remember what you built ... how you built." The child replies that she built the tower first, then the hotel. The educator further asks, "Do you remember how you built '", to which the child responds with hand movements. As she is showing the picture, the educator asks the question "What did you come up with here, after it crashed on you? How did you come up with the idea to build like this so that it wouldn't collapse?", Then the educator asks other children "What is different here than in the building you built? ". This illustrates how the educator encourages the child's metacognitive knowledge, the most complex type of knowledge crucial for self-regulation of learning. The child is instructed to report their thinking strategies in problem solving. However, considering that a child learns by doing, participating and researching through activities organized or encouraged by educator offering materials (Malnar et al., 2012), i.e. he learns contextually during his play, which has an important feature of spontaneity and self-purpose (Rubin et al. 1983, as cited in Klarin, 2017), it is questionable to what extent the proposed professionalization of play of an adultized preschool child, based on subsequent analysis of self-purpose activity, is consistent with the child's nature which the modern pedagogical concept is all about.

The previously described approach of encouraging child's competence to learn how to learn, by suggesting the above questions aimed at developing children's metacognition, shows a limited understanding of the complexity of self-regulated learning and the appropriateness of its encouragement in working with preschool children. In self-regulation of learning, in addition to metacognitive, children also activate motivational resources – they direct their thoughts and feelings by striving to achieve learning goals (Zimmerman, 2001, as cited in Lončarić, 2014). At the same time, the child's experience of his own efficiency and his perception of his own competence, influence perseverance in activities (Lončarić, 2014). Self-regulation of learning includes self-observation, self-assessment, self-reaction (Bandura, 1986, as cited in Lončarić, 2014). In order for children to self-regulate their learning activities well, they need to adopt attitudes about their abilities and evaluate their efforts, while developing a positive self-perception. A child builds such self-image through relationships with adults. In order for a child to persevere in self-selected activities on his own initiative and self-organized, persistently and engaged, a positive self-image that arises from the relationships built with educators should be developed. In addition to propagated support for learning by offering materials, indirect observation or intentionally asking stimulating questions, what a child primarily needs is an open, focused, fluent relationship with the educator who is situationally congruent with the non-adult perceived child and his actions.

EDUCATIONAL RELATIONSHIP AND SPACE AS AN EDUCATOR

Advice, instructions, pressure from the consumer society make modern parenting an extremely complex life task (Jurčević Lozančić & Kunert, 2015). Competitive spirit of the social atmosphere and uncontrolled influence of the media condition parents' mistakes by encouraging upbringing that will allow children to quickly and easily fit into an industrial and commercial society, where dominant values are often power, success, high intelligence and beauty (Ehrensaft, 2002). At the same time, modern possibility of parental control over the upbringing of own children is diminishing for various reasons – increasing obligations of parents outside the family, their unwillingness to change parenting style, transgenerational transfer of authoritarian or permissive parenting styles, disagreement of partners in attitudes and parenting

styles, which are only some of the causes of dysfunction of the modern family (Sunko, 2008). In striving to create balance between career, raising a child, and meeting one's own needs, parents often encounter inability to fulfill all life segments, resulting in feelings of guilt (Ehrensaft, 2002). Parents try to make up for the time they do not spend with their children by meeting their wishes, taking on responsibilities and obligations of children which they are able to fulfill on their own and allowing them unacceptable behavior (Ehrensaft, 2002). In addition, in the digital age of fast information, there is an impression that children have outgrown adults, so they often leave the responsibility of decision-making to children who do not live up to it (Vican, 2006).

Modern parents of democratic societies are required to establish authority on different values than a few decades ago (Zrilić, 2005). Diversity of instructions, advice and expectations often confuses parents and leads them to resort to an educational pattern that neutralizes authorities, pointing to moral relativism because the judgment of what is good or not depends on the individual, regardless of his age (Miliša et al., 2015).

Noticing the crisis of establishing a desirable parent-child relationship, constructive for the child's overall development, authors point to an epidemic of permissive upbringing. Poor developmental consequences that such an educational approach of adults leave on children are considered (Shaw & Wood, 2009). Therefore, it is noted that parental duty, in order to develop desirable parenting, is to invest time and energy in their own pedagogical education and activities, and the task of society is to provide support in coping with parental role through various forms of pedagogical education for parents (Jurčević Lozančić & Kunert, 2015). The proposition is to organize "school for parents" – especially future parents, parents of children in prepuberty, parents in the process of divorce, and establishment of permanent counseling for parents of school children, adolescents and parents with children leaving home (Čudina Obradović & Obradović, 2003). For youngest children up to four years of age, the „Growing Up Together" program is organized in Croatia. The goal of the program is to create an environment in which parents discuss their own parenting with each other and with program leaders consider the ways in which they treat their children (Pećnik & Starc, 2010).

Since 2000, in Germany, due to the realization that adult permissiveness makes children egocentric and unhappy, courses for parents have been held under the motto "Responsible parents – responsible children". It is pointed out that without clear parental goals, children are disoriented. In the same country, an „Alliance for Education" was launched with the aim of strengthening parental competencies. It is noted that the intention of such training is to reach a consensus on the fundamental values with which children will learn to live (Miliša, 2009).

In 2008, the European network „Diversity in Early Childhood Education" joined the University of Parenting movement with the aim of encouraging dialogue with parents and with the intention of helping to develop their parenting competencies (Cadart et al., 2011). Parents state that the difficulty in adequately responding to demands of their educational role is posed by the multitude of conflicting instructions they encounter (Cadart et al., 2011). The conflict of demands and the role of adults in upbringing of a child, as previously mentioned, was assumed in the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and in the parents' views of their practical role it has evidently been confirmed.

It is important to consider specifics of a modern pedagogical relationship in the institutional context of educational institutions of early and preschool education. The modern pedagogical concept states that the entire repertoire of educators' roles in the child's learning process can be reduced to creating conditions for children's learning (environment) and indirect support for various activities in the learning process (Slunjski, 2011a). It is emphasized that a child's learning and development is supported by the environment with a rich offer of materials that enable a child to obtain information, construct knowledge and solve problems (Sindik, 2008). It is noted that materials should encourage preschool children to set, check, revise their own assumptions and personal ideas about a particular problem. The environment should be structured

to promote self-regulation, independence, cooperation, respect for different opinions, asking questions, research, conversation, problem solving, reflection and self-evaluation of children and educators (Slunjski, 2001, according to Sindik, 2008). The importance of educator's observation, getting to know and trying to better understand the child is pointed out, so that in accordance with what was observed, he could influence the material environment (Budisavljević, 2015).

In the context of a preschool institution, a spatial-material environment acquires the status of a third educator. Modern pedagogical model affirms the idea of space as a type of aquarium that reflects ideas, values, abilities, and culture of those who live in it (Malaguzzi, 1998, as cited in Budisavljević, 2015). By describing the specific space of an educational institution, some authors point out how it is regulated, organized, and used as a consequence of educator's attitudes, beliefs, expectations and values (Petrović-Sočo, 2009) and it is their clear reflection. Looking at it the other way, it is assumed that the process of changing an educator's values or culture of the institution could begin precisely with restructuring physical space. Authors state that during action research in preschool institutions, by gradually making changes in physical and organizational environment of kindergartens and reflection on their activities, they tried to lead to changes in the educational process, the way children and adults are treated and thus sought to gradually change the culture of the institution (Vujicic, 2011).

While pedagogy quite confidently declares space to be an educator, a related problem, from a sociological perspective, is approached much more systematically. In the sociological context, it is carefully considered whether socio-structural or socio-cultural factors are predominantly important in the process of democratization of society (Maldini, 2008). Proponents of the structuralist approach note that democracy can only emerge in societies that achieve a minimum level of economic development that generates appropriate structural changes which favor development of social democracy (Maldini, 2008). Technological innovations and their socio-economic consequences are considered the basis of human progress with ubiquitous implications for culture and political institutions. At the same time, value orientations and moral standards are only an ideological superstructure that maintains the economic base of society, and ideology changes in parallel with the economic concept. Proponents of the sociocultural approach, in turn, emphasize the stubbornness of traditional values that are relatively independent of economic conditions (DiMaggio, 1994, as cited in Inglehart and Welzel, 2007). It is noted that, although socio-economic development in principle produces predictable systematic changes in what people think and want from life, the influence of traditions does not disappear. It is emphasized that belief systems are remarkably durable and resilient. Values, even when they change, still reflect the cultural heritage of society. Although, for example, the influence of religious institutions in modern society is modest, the fact that a society has historically shaped Protestant, Confucian, or Islamic cultural heritage leaves lasting consequences, placing society on a path that continues to influence further development (Inglehart & Welzel, 2007).

Considering development of a community at the level of capital – physical, financial, human, and social, some authors determine that the social one is primarily important for its progress. Social capital is defined as a set of cultural characteristics of a community which is characterized by creation and maintenance of mutual trust and cooperation among its members. Achieving social capital is related to level of trust among community members, mutual association in achieving goals, and self-discipline in adhering to norms (Štulhofer, 2003). It is established that the culture of a society, that is, specific norms and habits that prevail in it, often play a more important role in transformation of a country than technology and political stability.

In accordance with the above, in the context of a preschool institution, it is necessary to consider in more detail the extent to which construction of space is a factor that affects the level and quality of established (democratic) relations. Is it possible, by observing the physical environment of an educational institution, to simply conclude about the character of the relations established in it? Should the quality of

an educator's pedagogical activity be judged on the basis of the spatial-material context of the kindergarten institution? Does the space of a certain educational group, which is materially adequate for learning, necessarily structure desirable educational relationships? Should the role of a modern educator be reduced to an easily measurable preparation of material-learning context, and should the modern educator give way to space being the educator?

Current vision of the modern pedagogical relationship at the level of educational institutions is based on a perpetuating error of humanity to make certain resources a measure of life, so ultimately man loves resources for their own sake (Nietzsche, 1988, as cited in Novalić, 2003). In the pedagogical paradigm, space, instead of being considered a resource, becomes an educator's goal. However, according to modern pedagogical interpretation, immediate involvement of an educator in the relationship with the adult child is not crucial for the child's (self) development, focus on the learning-stimulating space can even be considered expected.

CRISIS OF UPBRINGING AND UPBRINGING FOR VALUES

A modern man is in the consumer society of democratic, capitalist communities presented as a self-made man- he shapes every segment of his life by his own will through his own life choices (Saleci, 2012). The psychology of self-worship emphasizes man's ability to self-change (Vitz, 2011). But instead of pleasure, the time of ideology of choice is accompanied by frequent occurrence of depressed individuals (Saleci, 2012). Self-preoccupation and realization of one's own identity are reduced to an individual's choice of needed products. While the earlier, more traditional human self, was rooted in relationships with others and anchored in the family, in the new human self, a vacuum of its interior was created which, obviously in vain, is tried to be filled with the idea of individualism and consumerism.

Although capitalism originated from protestant values of labor that combine perseverance, diligence, thrift, and material independence, systematic and perennial research conducted in the 1980s showed that these values were increasingly being replaced by consumeristic ones and that young people were quitting to believe in the value of protestant ethics of capitalism (Berg, 1986, as cited in Miliša, 2009). It is noticed that the 20th century was a period of only apparent development in which incomparably more was invested in the production of technology than in the quality of human relations. Today, human resources are approached as capital usable in the labor market (Keeley, 2009). It is considered that reduction of man to a biological and technical-labor product is a possible cause of a moral crisis affecting the world (Jukić, 2013).

A crisis of upbringing is observed in this context. It is considered that it occurs because of a change in social values, not accompanied by a corresponding change in the social environment. It is explained that its cause is the rift between proclaimed values and life itself (Miliša et al., 2015).

The crisis of upbringing is also interpreted as a consequence of insufficient generational transfer of values in the process of upbringing and education. Research indicates that in families where there is no generational transmission of prosocial values, children develop behavioral difficulties (Miliša et al., 2015). It is noticed that the family, as an important socializing factor, is increasingly losing its educational role, and parental authority, as the one that affects the individual and his conscience, degrades its value (Begić & Golek, 2017). Current state of the family is marked by an excessive emphasis on individualism and the notion of an individual as a person who builds himself according to his own desires, understood as absoluteness (Begić & Golek, 2017).

Considered in the institutional context, the contemporary pedagogical model detects the need to focus on upbringing and education for values. Values denote concepts related to desirable states or behaviors (Shwartz & Bardi, 1997, as cited in Miliša et al., 2015), i.e., the belief that a specific way of behaving or the goal of existence is socially or personally more desirable than the opposite one (Rokeach,

1973, as cited in Miliša et al., 2015). If we understand upbringing as the process of intentional development of voluntary (character) traits of man, and education as systematic development of cognitive abilities and learning of the individual (Mijatović, 2000), it is clear that values are the driving and regulatory factor of upbringing (Mougniotte, 1995, as cited in Miliša et al., 2015). In this sense, every upbringing and education is valuable, that is, for values, because otherwise is not possible. The term upbringing and education for values thus refers to a truncated understanding and a vague, unclear approach to the concept of upbringing.

Nevertheless, authors actively discuss education for values, separating the prescriptive and descriptive approach to teaching values (Jukić, 2013). Prescriptive, direct approach refers to open and direct teaching of children the basic moral imperatives and virtues that are considered common to all people, while in the indirect, descriptive approach the emphasis is on the child's critical and creative thinking, problem solving and reasoning which should provide independent insight into what is moral and correct (Jukić, 2013). In the context of indirect approach, the emphasis is on thinking and comparing different values and analyzing one's own behavior and the behavior of other people, with consideration of consequences that arise from them (Rakić & Vukušić, 2010). From the perspective of a descriptive approach, direct teaching of values is undesirable because it prevents children from taking an active role in creating truth, thinking about life, and making decisions. Critics of this approach note the overemphasis on children's cognitive aspect in value choices, while neglecting their emotional and behavioral dimension (Rakić and Vukušić, 2010).

In the United States, the process of clarifying values as an influential model of moral upbringing and education was developed in the 1960s. The concept expanded particularly in the 1970s, and given its popularity, aspects of this process predominated in value-based teaching throughout the 1990s as well (Vitz, 2011).

In the context of this theory, authors suggest that it is necessary for children to independently build their own value system, i.e., choose their own beliefs and behaviors, and then affirm them in public and act in accordance with them consistently and often. The concept is based on the assumption of natural goodness of man. It is instructed that each individual has innate desires, interests and motivations that need to be satisfied in the individual's natural and social environment. Proponents of this approach oppose traditional teaching of certain values to children, believing that adults force and impose their own preferences on children. It is clarified that, in a pluralistic society, it would be illegal for a teacher to refer children to certain values or to insist on them (Vitz, 2011). Critics of the approach say that it suggests the child's choice of values corresponding to the choice of product, which in turn leads to moral relativism, which is the path to social anarchy.

Focus on educational values is also evident in the design of philosophy programs for children. The program uses a pattern of philosophical discussion aimed at the ethical development of children, by encouraging critical and creative thinking. The basis of the program is children's philosophical research through their dealing with specific topics such as friendship, courage, or wisdom (Ćurko & Kragić, 2008). The founders of the program believe that philosophical discussion enables students to explore beliefs and values of others in order to develop their own views and attitudes, while learning clarity of thought and thoughtful reasoning, responsibility of behavior and reasonableness of decision-making and action. The role of the teacher is to organize and establish general conditions for discussion and dedication to listening to children, who themselves determine its course. However, the teacher's active role in asking questions to guide students' discussion and warn of various possibilities of approaching the problem is also emphasized. It is concluded that, with appropriate encouragement, students will come up with acceptable answers by themselves (Šimenc, 2008). This indicates that the teacher, by supporting independent student discussion, actually directs students to very specific values. This template would thus represent a kind of synthesis of a descriptive and prescriptive approach to teaching values.

Philosophy for children is actually a reflection of the need of a modern pedagogical model for, albeit apparent, affirmation of an anonymous adult who discreetly approaches children. It is noted that a child has a lot of intuitive knowledge which is different from knowledge of adults, but not inferior to it (MacNaughton & Smith, as cited in Slunjski, 2012). For this reason, in preschool children's cognitive learning, adults should be indirect. Accordingly, in the value referral of children they should also be neutral. The educator's (teacher's) authority should be suppressed in every sense. He cannot be an obstacle to the child's self-determination in any segment of the child's own self-development.

This is consistent with postmodern thinking characterized by a critique of belief in one correct perspective, absolute truth (Gojkov, 2009). Science does not have raw data because each subject of scientific research is already classified in a certain way, which implies that scientific discourse can represent objects only as they are constructed by specific categories of a particular narrative (Feyerabend, 2006). Bu,t can we apply the same standards of cognition in the value referral of a child as if it were a research of the subject world? Can a child construct his own attitudes, norms, and values with a value-discrete adult? Is the value orientation of an adult a constraint on a child's authorship in creating his or her own moral truths?

A child needs an adult as a role model, cultural and ethical pattern, which stands in relation to the world, others, and oneself (Bašić, 2011a). He needs a relationship with an individual of developed integrity, so that he first accepts certain values, reacts to them, and adopts them, and then organizes and evaluates them, creating his own value set. The modern pedagogical model needs clear consideration of the possibility of applying the principle of an educator as a partner stimulator of child's learning, which does not transfer ready-made knowledge, at the general educational level, independent of the aspect of child's development.

CONCLUSION

The modern pedagogical paradigm invokes the sociological concept of children's rights, promoting children as active participants in their own development. It is interpreted that the modern concept positions the child in the center of his attention and responsibility, while redefining duties, obligations and responsibilities of educators and policy makers in relation to the child (Lončarić, 2014). A child is presented as an agent of self-regulated learning which assumes that he independently improves his own ability to learn through selective use of metacognitive and motivational learning strategies; proactively selects, structures, and even creates a stimulating learning environment; has a significant role in deciding on the amount and manner of teaching he needs (Zimmerman, 2001, as cited in Lončarić, 2014). Significant responsibility for one's own development and upbringing is transferred from adult to child. By recognizing his rights, but also by associating him with significant responsibilities, a modern child is largely identified with the adult, and he becomes adultized, losing childhood as an age of his protected development, free from responsibility for his own developmental well-being.

A lack of a specific, pedagogical commitment that would consider both the psychological discourse based on consideration of a child's needs and the sociological concept based on the child's rights is evident in both family and institutional approach to the child. Confusion of the requirements related to the educational role of adults is evidenced by a growing need to organize programs aimed at developing parenting skills. Institutional educators, on the other hand, knowing the needs of the knowledge society, predominantly focus their work on child's cognitive learning, with the physical context of the institution for early and preschool education gaining the importance of a third educator. Such a contemporary approach needs to be considered more closely. To view space as a precondition for development of democratic relations is insufficient. To consider that material context is the main precondition of a child's self-regulated learning is incomplete. Self-regulation of a child's learning depends on the child's level of cognitive development, on the perception of one's own self-efficacy, motivational beliefs, and strategies (Lončarić, 2014). In the development of such dispositions, a child needs adults to be involved, so the consideration of

educator as an organizer of a material environment and an indirect promoter of a child's self-organized learning process is rather reduced.

It is believed that in the modern educational environment, great attention is paid to development of a child's intellectual skills, while less value is given to the emotional sphere, which causes a discrepancy between his intellectual and emotional processes. Emphasizing development of intellectual abilities at the expense of the emotional realm is considered one of the factors in the decline of moral activity in contemporary society (Guidelines for Art Education – World Conference on Creating Creative Opportunities for the 21st Century, 2006).

The modern pedagogical model recognizes the need to thematize upbringing and education for values. Consideration of education, which is valuable in itself, in the sphere of values indicates the absence of defining the basic pedagogical subject of study – upbringing. The modern pedagogical template connotes the concept of upbringing negatively, stating that it refers to subordinate position of a child in relation to the adult, so some authors suggest that instead of upbringing and education, we should talk about socialization and learning (Gudjons, 1994, as cited in Milat, 2007). The consequence of such an approach is seen in the recorded crisis of upbringing. In order to more adequately contribute to overall development of the child, the modern pedagogical concept needs to be continuously re-examined, encouraging its orientation to an authentic child and the pedagogical subject in an authentic way.

REFERENCES

Bašić, S. (2011). Nova slika djeteta u pedagogiji djetinjstva. In D. Maleš (ed.), *Nove paradigme ranog odgoja* (pp. 19–37). Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zavod za pedagogiju.

Begić, M., & Golek, M. (2017). Savjest i autoritet, međuovisnost u moralnom odgoju pojedinca. *Služba Božja: liturgijsko-pastoralna revija, 57*(1), 41–64.

Budisavljević, T. (2015). Kako oblikovanjem okruženja razvijati suvremeni kurikulum. *Dijete,vrtić, obitelj: Časopis za odgoj i naobrazbu predškolske djece namijenjen stručnjacima i roditeljima, 21*(79), 26–28.

Cadart, M. L., Clausier, M., & Murcier, E. (2011). Od okrivljavanja roditelja do roditelja istraživača. *Djeca u Europi: Zajednička publikacija mreže europskih časopisa, 3*(6), 24–25.

Čudina-Obradović, M., & Obradović, J. (2003). Potpora roditeljstvu: izazovi i mogućnosti. *Revija za socijalnu politiku, 10*(1), 45–68.

Ćurko, B., & Kragić, I. (2008). Filozofija za djecu – primjer „Male filozofije". *Život i škola: časopis za teoriju i praksu odgoja i obrazovanja, 54*(20), 61–68.

Dević, J., Miliša, Z., & Perić, I. (2015). Kriza vrijednosti kao kriza odgoja. *Mostariensia : časopis za društvene i humanističke znanosti, 19*(2), 7–20.

Ehrensaft, D. (2002). *(Raz)maženo dijete*. Mozaik knjiga.

Feyerabend, P. (2006). *Protiv metode.* DAF.

Gehlen, A. (2005). *Čovjek, njegova narav i njegov položaj u svijetu.* Naklada Breza.

Gojkov, G. (2009). *Didaktika i metakognicija.* Visoka škola strukovnih studija za obrazovanje vaspitača Mihailo Palov.

Hercigonja, Z. (2018). Važnost stvaranja discipline i unutarnje kontrole u procesu razvoja čovjeka. *Acta Iadertina, 15*(1), 59-78.

Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2007). *Modernizacija, kulturna promjena, demokracija: slijed ljudskog razvitka.* Politička kultura.

Jukić, R. (2013). Moralne vrijednosti kao osnova odgoja. *Nova prisutnost: časopis za intelektualna i duhovna pitanja, 11*(3), 401–416.

Jurčević Lozančić, A., & Kunert, A. (2015). Obrazovanje roditelja i roditeljska pedagoška kompetencija, teorijski i praktični izazovi. *Metodički obzori, 10*(2), 39–48.

Keeley, B. (2009). *Ljudski kapital: od predškolskog odgoja do cjeloživotnog učenja.* Educa.

Klarin, M. (2017). *Psihologija dječje igre.* Sveučilište u Zadru.

Kopić, Ž., & Korajac, V. (2010). Djeca i djetinjstvo u dokumentima o pravima djece. *Život i škola: časopis za teoriju i praksu odgoja i obrazovanja, 56*(24), 45–54.

Lončarić, D. (2014). *Motivacija i strategije samoregulacije učenja: teorija, mjerenje i primjena.* Učiteljski fakultet Sveučilišta u Rijeci.

Maldini, P. (2008). Uzročni procesi demokratskih promjena: socioekonomski razvoj ili sociokulturni činitelji. *Društvena istraživanja: časopis za opća društvena pitanja, 17*(3), 327–349.

Malnar, A., Punčikar, S., & Štefanec, A. (2012). Poticajno okruženje: izazov za suradnju i istraživanje djece i odraslih. *Dijete, vrtić, obitelj: časopis za odgoj i naobrazbu predškolske djece namijenjen stručnjacima i roditeljima, 18*(70), 4–7.

Maras, N., Matijević, M., & Topolovčan, T. (2018). Konstruktivistička didaktika i neurodidaktika u diskursu reformne pedagogije – teorijska polazišta, dileme i komparacija. *Nova prisutnost: časopis za intelektualna i duhovna pitanja, 16*(3), 561–576.

Martinović, R. (2017). *Društveni inženjering – vodič za razotkrivanje manipulacije društvom na globalnoj razini*. TELEdisk.

Mijatović, A. (2000). *Leksikon temeljnih pedagogijskih pojmova*. EDIP.

Milat, J. (2007). Epistemologija pedagogije – dileme, pitanja, moguća rješenja. *Pedagogijska istraživanja, 4*(2), 189-201.

Miliša, Z. (2009). Anarhističke implikacije oslobađanja od rada. *Riječki teološki časopis, 34*(2), 483–502.

Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja (2014). *Nacionalni kurikulum za rani i predškolski odgoj i obrazovanje.* Republika Hrvatska, Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja. https://mzo.gov.hr/UserDocsImages/dokumenti/Obrazovanje/Predskolski/Nacionalni%20kurikulum%20za%20rani%20i%20predskolski%20odgoj%20i%20obrazovanje%20NN%2005-2015.pdf

Novalić, F. (2003). *Rasipanje budućnosti: kritika mita napretka i cinizma rasipanja.* Alinea.

Organizacija Ujedinjenih naroda za obrazovanje, znanost i kulturu (2006). *Smjernice za umjetnički odgoj, Svjetska konferencija o umjetničkom odgoju: Oblikovanje stvaralačkih mogućnosti za 21. stoljeće.* http://www.hcdo.hr/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/Smjernice_UNESCO_o_umjetnickom_odgoju_06.pdf

Palekčić, M. (2002). Konstruktivizam – nova paradigma u pedagogiji. *Napredak: časopis za interdisciplinarna istraživanja u odgoju i obrazovanju, 143*(4), 403–413.

Pećnik, N.. & Starc, B. (2010). *Roditeljstvo u najboljem interesu djetetu i podrška roditeljima najmlađe djece*. Ured UNICEF-a za Hrvatsku.

Petrović-Sočo, B. (2009). *Mijenjanje konteksta i odgojne prakse dječjih vrtića: akcijsko istraživanje s elementima etnografskog pristupa.* Mali profesor.

Polić, P. (2015). Što za pedagogiju znači pitanje o odnosu potreba i prava djeteta. *Pedagogijska istraživanja, 12*(1-2), 149–160.

Rakić, V., & Vukušić, S. (2010). Odgoj i obrazovanje za vrijednosti. *Društvena istraživanja: časopis za opća društvena pitanja, 9*(4-5), 771–795.

Saleci, R. (2012). *Tiranija izbora.* Fraktura.

Senković, Ž. (2007). Antropološki temelji odgoja. *Život i škola: časopis za teoriju i praksu odgoja i obrazovanja, 53*(17), 62–69.

Siegel, D., & Bryson, T. (2017). *Disciplina bez drame: integrirani pristup za smirivanje kaosa i poticanje razvoja dječjeg uma.* Planetopija.

Sindik, J. (2008). Poticajno okruženje i osobni prostor djece u dječjem vrtiću. *Metodički obzori, 1*(5), 143–154.

Shaw, R., & Wood, S. (2009). *Epidemija popustljivog odgoja: zašto su djeca nevesela, nezadovoljna, sebična te kako im pomoći.* V.B.Z.

Slunjski, E. (2006). *Stvaranje predškolskog kurikuluma u vrtiću – organizaciji koja uči.* Mali profesor.

Slunjski, E. (2009). Postizanje odgojno-obrazovne prakse usklađene s prirodom djeteta i odraslog. *Život i škola: časopis za teoriju i praksu odgoja i obrazovanja, 22*(2), 104–115.

Slunjski, E. (2011a). Kriteriji kvalitete u situacijama učenja. *Dijete, vrtić, obitelj: časopis za odgoj i naobrazbu predškolske djece namijenjen stručnjacima i roditeljima, 17*(64), 4–7.

Slunjski, E. (2011b). Razvoj autonomije djeteta u procesu odgoja i obrazovanja u vrtiću. *Pedagogijska istraživanja, 8*(2), 217–228.

Slunjski, E. (2011c). *Kurikulum ranog odgoja, istraživanje i konstrukcija.* Školska knjiga.

Slunjski, E. (2012). *Tragovima dječjih stopa*. Profil.

Sunko, E. (2008). Utjecaj provedbe programa za roditelje na njihove stavove o odgoju. *Odgojne znanosti, 10*(2), 303–401.

Szentartoni, M. (1978). Moralna zrelost. *Obnovljeni život: časopis za filozofiju i religijske znanosti, 33*(1), 40–54.

Šimenc, M. (2008). Znanje kao bitni popratni proizvod istraživačke zajednice. *Metodički ogledi: časopis za filozofiju odgoja, 15*(1), 47–59.

Širanović, A. (2011). Prava djeteta između zaštite odraslih i djetetovog vlastitog mišljenja i djelovanja. *Pedagogijska istraživanja, 8*(2), 311–319.

Štulhofer, A. (2003). Društveni kapital i njegova važnost. In D. Ajduković (ed.), *Socijalna rekonstrukcija zajednice* (pp. 79–98). Društvo za psihološku pomoć.

UNICEF Hrvatska (2001). *Konvencija o pravima djeteta.* Državni zavod za zaštitu obitelji, materinstva i mladeži.

Vican, D. (2006). Odgoj i obrazovanje u Hrvatskoj u kontekstu europskih vrijednosti. *Pedagogijska istraživanja, 3*(1), 9–19.

Vitz, P. C. (2011). *Psihologija kao religija: kult samoobožavanja.* Verbum.

Vujičić, L. (2011). *Istraživanje kulture odgojno-obrazovne ustanove.* Mali profesor.

Zrilić, S. (2005). Autoritarni odgojni stil roditelja kao prediktor školskog neuspjeha. *Pedagogijska istraživanja, 2*(1), 125-137.