

This is an electronic reprint of the original article. This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Non-affirmative Education Theory as a Language for Global Education Discourse in the Twenty-First Century

Uljens, Michael

Published in:
Non-affirmative Theory of Education and Bildung

DOI:
[10.1007/978-3-031-30551-1_17](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30551-1_17)
[10.1007/978-3-031-30551-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30551-1)

Published: 07/08/2023

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript

[Link to publication](#)

Please cite the original version:
Uljens, M. (2023). Non-affirmative Education Theory as a Language for Global Education Discourse in the Twenty-First Century. In M. Uljens (Ed.), *Non-affirmative Theory of Education and Bildung* (pp. 357-371). (Educational Governance Research). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30551-1_17, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30551-1>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Part VI. Concluding reflections and openings

17. Non-affirmative education theory as a language for global education discourse

Abstract Given the crisis of neoliberal education policy in operation since 1990's, non-affirmative theory of general education, didactics and subject matter didactics provides a productive language for global education discourse in the 21st century. This school of thought has the capacity to operate as a global meta-language of education due to how it defines the teaching-studying-learning process, and to how it perceives the dynamic relation between different forms of societal practices. Given that education praxis at different levels, non-affirmatively mediate between the learner and society, and educates for a nonhierarchically organized societal praxis, teaching needs to recognize but not to pedagogically affirm neither societal interests nor the learner's life-world. In doing so, this theory helps us to identify and to empirically study at different levels, how education by directing the Other's attention co-create pedagogical spaces for discerning thought and practice around experiences, knowledge and values. The approach is an alternative to contemporary educational policies such as academic factualism, performativism, educational activism and technologism.

Key-words global education discourse, education for 21st century, academic factualism, performativism, educational activism, technologism

Michael Uljens

In several ways, this volume scrutinised how the research programme on non-affirmative education may provide us with conceptual language to analytically and empirically deal with present-day local, national and global developments and needs in teaching, curriculum work and educational governance. Throughout the volume, we asked, and tried to answer, what strengths the non-affirmative approach offers in conceptualising the relationship between Bildung and education as it pertains to a non-teleological view of the future. However, as the non-affirmative way of understanding education and Bildung has taken various shapes throughout history, we are forced not only to reread but also to partly rewrite the historical

heritage of the theory of education. While the contributions, in different ways, took their point of departure from the longstanding tradition of non-affirmative education theory, the contributions represented unique and creative voices that deepened some of the assumptions and broadened the applicability of this approach to general education. In this respect, the volume has avoided reflecting on non-affirmative theory in affirmative and non-critical ways.

By communicating and clarifying the fundamental features of the position, readers were offered the opportunity to learn about the features of the approach. By pointing at what questions this theory aims to answer, the reader may evaluate whether the questions posed are the right ones and if how they were answered are reasonable. In this treatment of non-affirmative education theory, the volume itself aims to follow the principles of educative teaching and summon the reader to engage self-reflectively with the presented ideas, which is a feature of academic reasoning. Undoubtedly, it would be logical to follow *affirmative* education ideals when reflecting on non-affirmative education theory.

The volume started with the assumption that when profound changes in societies occur education becomes a central topic of societal debate. Thus, theories of education strongly interweave with societal development at large. Theorising education, therefore, represents a sort of cultural self-reflection on a collective level. Not only educational policies and practices, but also educational theories tell us something about who we are and what we want to be, for ourselves, and others. In this sense, education theory at some level always demonstrates anthropological reasoning. In addition, accepting the historicity of conceptual reasoning in education and *Bildung* means accepting that any education theory is valid only relative to its cultural and historical conditions. While universal theories are not possible, general theories are. Taking this condition seriously, the volume argues, we need to articulate in what kind of world we theorise about education and what we expect to achieve with such conceptualisations. So, what do we see and what do we need?

After the Berlin Wall came down in 1989, and after the collapse of the Soviet Union, for many years, the air was full of hope. However, less hopeful have strengthened over the past 15 years in many places in Europe, the US, Russia and China. In the aftermath of the 'market state' that came to dominate after 1989 (Reis, 2012), we saw an increasing number of problematic consequences such as the deregulation of laws, decentralisation of administration, increased focus on cost-benefit reasoning and efficiency and the increased privatisation of education and technological standardisation. While technology made the world smaller, we also witnessed increasing cultural plurality and tensions within nation-states, reflecting neo-conservative nationalist movements all

over the world. In addition to these developments, the ecological challenges have risen to new, previously unanticipated levels.

We have witnessed an orientation towards performative and competency-based curricula and an idea of increased individual choice in school matters. We have witnessed a reduced focus on egalitarianism and a reduced interest in minimising disparities. The concentration of economic wealth is widely discussed. Over the past 30 years, we have seen the movement from an idea of education serving democratic ideals, citizenship education and promotion of humanistic ideals to increasingly viewing education and cultural expression as tools serving economic ends.

It is widely acknowledged that the shift towards neoliberal education policies that promote competition as a vehicle to improve educational outcomes, as well as corresponding technologies of governance (Pettersen, Popkewitz & Lindblad, 2017), have had profound consequences for professional activity, identity and development of the education sector (Normand, 2016). These ongoing changes are far from being simply functional or organisational; they are also ideological. There is a risk of transforming education research to serve either as a tool for instrumental efficiency or as some form of ideologically driven activism. The interventionist, action theoretical and school developmental paradigm in empirical education research has grown strong after three decades of the use of various qualitative methodology approaches, but has been tamed in many places to serve policy-directed school improvement. How education *theory* responds to normative interests of this sort is then central to deal with.

Both expected and unintended consequences have resulted in increasing mistrust regarding whether global neoliberal policy provides sustainable solutions for guiding reform in the public sector, including education. Nationalist tendencies have been strengthened all over the world. These counterproductive consequences make it central to see connections between economic neoliberal globalisation, national and transnational governance policies, educational ideals, curriculum, teaching and leadership practices. While the tradition of didactics, most often framed by a nation-state perspective, which still today is relevant given the crucial character of the nation state as an organising body, a transnational or 'globopolitan' (Uljens & Ylimaki, 2017, p. 107f) perspective needs to complement the nation-state perspective because of increasing interdependency on all societal sectors.

These developments clearly point towards a need for a more general and all-encompassing approach to education theory that operates with complementary perspectives instead of exclusionary ones. This volume accepted the challenge of responding to an existing and urgent need to find new ways of conceptualising education, ways that take us beyond the

instrumentalist policy paradigm dominated by economism. This book was authored and edited with the conviction that non-affirmative theory of education offers itself as a more comprehensive language of education especially in comparison with given education policy developments worldwide, over the past three decades. However, we do not wish to end up repeating a battle between, for example, conservative or transformative ideals of education. Such approaches tend to, in the end, make education a tool for external interests in ways that may endanger the political ideals of democratic societies and limit the space for knowledge-informed public rational reasoning. In this light, non-affirmative education theory offers itself as an alternative for the 21st century. How does the non-affirmative approach to the *theory* of education differ from existing schools of thought?

In dealing with these contemporary challenges in educational policymaking and theorising, one idea often recurs. According to this answer, the solution lies in radically reforming and redirecting present-day education practices, as they appear inappropriate concerning existing and future challenges. The argument is that continuing such practices would only prolong an unfavourable situation, as new generations would continuously be socialised into practices that do not contain the required solutions. Instead, research should contribute to renewed policies and develop new curriculum ideals and practices, as well as new leadership policies that can turn things right for the future. This is precisely the argumentation structure that Rousseau (1762) applied in his famous preface to *Émile* in advocating for a new, transformative or reformatory education practice. Here, education was the instrument for creating a new, preferred social order. From 20th-century history, we can find many examples of how normative education ideals and policies, put in practice by affirmative education, have not been hindered developments opposite to the intended ones. The fall of the Berlin Wall is a paradigmatic example. East-German normative education did not stop people from tearing down the Berlin Wall.

Instead of continuing to turn to normative education after WWI, many Western countries put their hope into a democratic education ideal combined with a high educational level. This is the solution we have applied in solving solve many global developments. Also today, many voices require a strengthened focus on policies promoting critical, constructive and responsible individuals and citizens, with reflected personal identity, cultural belonging and political awareness. Such subjects, the argument goes, would be capable of recognising others and being socially responsible, extending the responsibility to future generations. A long tradition of broad self-formation or *Bildung*-centred education shares these ideals and values

(Klafki, 1995; Benner, 2015). In other words, Western education policies have, for decades, approved of, defended and practised such ideals as leading principles. Education for personal and cultural identity, political and economic citizenship and education for global humanity and international solidarity have been strongly guiding principles. Despite education along these ideals for the past 50 years, we have witnessed the previously mentioned increase in global competition, new ecological challenges, curricular developments oriented towards more performative competencies and accountability-based leadership and evaluation practices. In such a scenario, we may ask whether non-affirmative education theory is a solution or part of the problem. Perhaps stronger ideological and normative positions in education theory that support rather than question education policies, are the right way to go. This idea takes us to the core of the tasks of academic education and scientific research. Non-affirmative education theory defends the preservation of spaces for critical reflection, spaces that are not limited to serving pragmatic or ideological interests of various kinds. The ideal of the critically reflecting and acting citizen in cultural, ecological, political and knowledgeable questions is still worth pursuing, especially if we appreciate a citizenship that is capable of thinking beyond what is and acting in the interest of all. To conclude, although overlapping, educational theorising is not the same as educational policymaking. If they are not the same, how should we move beyond theories that subordinate educational practice to politics in unproblematic ways, either in a socialisation- or transformation-oriented sense? If we value developing citizenship featuring a democratic mindset, then moving beyond such positions is necessary.

Non-affirmative theory as a critical theory

Despite all societally organised education being political and despite all educational theory featuring values, this volume assumed it would be a mistake to equate pedagogical practice with political practice. Similarly, it would be a mistake to equate educational theory with curriculum policy, political ideology or political utopia. Education and politics are related, yet we cannot deduce either from the other without violating the idea and character of each. In a non-democratic polity, education is by definition strictly subordinate to politics. In any version of politically democratic societies—liberal, conservative, republican or some other—the task of education is to prepare for political reflection and readiness to act and participate in self-directed ways. Such education is, of course, also value-bound in that it recognises and respects political freedom of thought and the right to political convictions. However, such

education is not about deciding what direction political interests should take. Such pedagogical practice does not take any ideology for granted, but problematises them all for pedagogical reasons, thereby creating opportunities for learners to make up their minds. In this light, non-affirmative education is anarchistic in a limited pedagogical sense of the word. It does not reject the state as a liberal mode of social organisation.

There is a moral imperative inherent in non-affirmative education theory. For example, while teaching in schools needs to make established knowledge accessible to students, teachers' responsibility is not limited to affirm culture, existing societal practices or future political or educational ideals without making them an object of critical reflection by students. Such behaviour would imply reducing education to an art, aiming at fulfilling given, specified aims that overlook the students' contribution to establishing the meaning of these contents and aims. Education would then result in technical instrumentalism. Still, by law, leaders and teachers in public school systems are expected to follow the spirit of a curriculum and must recognise such interests.

Non-affirmative theory in understanding school teaching

While the first part of the volume clarified the fundamental features of non-affirmative education theory, Part II of the volume dwelt into these assumptions, especially from the perspective of educative teaching in schools. In his chapter, Thomas Rucker convincingly demonstrates how a non-affirmative approach to Didaktik/didactics implies a view of school teaching that is educative. He clarified how both school teaching and school development appear in light of non-affirmative education. His contribution identifies various dimensions of non-affirmativity, which are important in the context of educative teaching, namely objective insight, value judgements and many-sidedness. His point was that when school development is focused on developing teaching in schools, these dimensions of educative teaching operate as guiding criteria.

In her chapter, Ling Lin continued arguing for the benefits of turning back to Herbart's ideas of educative teaching. Her point was to demonstrate how big data-based measurement and assessment in education, which are expanding worldwide, conceptually obscure the relationship between teaching and learning. In short, these assessment programmes systematically overlook that 'studying' mediates between teaching and learning outcomes. Therefore, learning outcomes are not valid indicators of the quality of teaching. Numerical

symbols are incapable of opening up the relational dynamics between teaching and students' studying activity.

Part II ended with Michael Uljens' chapter on a Bildung-based non-affirmative interpretation of school didactics. Given that learning occurs everywhere, there is reason to identify the specific nature of school learning. Viewing education as a multilevel phenomenon, the chapter demonstrated not only how the constitutive but also the regulative principles developed by Dietrich Benner were highly relevant from a school didactic perspective. The idea of didactics as a science, not of the teaching-learning process, but the teaching-studying-learning process, as argued 25 years ago, was conceptually clarified by making use of the notions of summoning to self-activity and *Bildsamkeit*. The chapter also pointed out that this education theory emphasizes that understanding teaching in classrooms require relating it to pedagogical dimensions of educational leadership at different levels. If the regulative principle, called the 'transformation of societal interests into legitimate pedagogical practice', is expected not to violate the realisation of non-affirmative educative teaching, then the pedagogical dimensions of school leadership, governance and school development also need to follow the same principles. A non-affirmative curriculum and governance policy is easier to apply in democratic societies with a multi-partisan electoral system, while governments in two-party systems, or bipartisan politics, more often and more strongly make use of the education system to push their own political agendas. This demonstrates how dilemmas of education systems may point to a need to reform the political culture, not least regarding bipartisan electoral systems. Given the globally influential role of the US, the ongoing development of its bipartisan political life is worrying.

Non-affirmative education and related theoretical positions

Following the ideal of non-affirmative treatment of non-affirmative education theory, Part III of the volume broadened the topics towards related theoretical positions.

Andrea English demonstrated how the non-affirmative approach relates to the Deweyan understanding of education. She reminded readers of the primacy of listening in teachers' work. Listening as a mode of pedagogical activity reflects recognising the student's voice. Listening also creates space for students to voice their own interpretations, thus making them an object for shared reflection. Such a pedagogy requires tactfulness. Learning to *listen* to the content of others' argumentation is also an important aspect of public discourse that carefully engages with the difference between opinion and knowledge.

For more than half a century, the ideals of social justice have been guiding principles in organising education all over the world. Today, the concept covers many more aspects than how families' socioeconomic status influences students' school performance. In contemporary school systems, positive discrimination is a widely applied policy. Despite the crucial role of the distributive view on justice, Juan José Sosa Alonso argues for the need to develop a complementary perspective on justice in education. By drawing on Gadamer's and Foucault's interpretations of Plato, the chapter identifies the possibility for non-affirmative theory to deal with justice as a virtue, evolving in and through the pedagogical process. Only in this way can we ensure a just society.

While teaching includes making the world accessible from various perspectives, teaching itself also features unique forms of interpretative activity and understanding present in the pedagogical relation. The chapter by Michael Uljens and Mari Mielityinen argues for two ways of dealing with hermeneutics in education. In the first step, they argue for the need to utilise different notions of subjectivity and intersubjectivity when talking about the pedagogical process. While the learner already shares the world with the teacher in some sense, education aims to establish new ways of sharing the world, thereby aiming at a different kind of intersubjectivity than the one from which education started. The same holds true for subjectivity. This chapter then views summoning and *Bildsamkeit* as notions that speak about the transformation between various ideas of subjectivity and intersubjectivity. This process involves different interpretative activities that hermeneutics helps us talk about.

In the final chapter in this section of the volume, Johannes Türistig and Malte Brinkmann turn to Egon Schütz's phenomenology and Pierre Bourdieu's sociology to expand Dietrich Benner's interpretation of non-affirmative education. The critique started by questioning the dualism between socialisation and *Bildung*-oriented transformation. To overcome this dualism, the chapter argues that by accepting the primacy of the life world, habits and opinions form the foundation of judgement. Given this, *habitus* cannot only be seen as an object to be affirmed or transformed. The phenomenological and sociological approach then allows us to talk about the lived dimensions of pedagogical practice as they relate to power dimensions in society.

Taken together these four chapters are successful both in expanding the interpretations of non-affirmative theory and in problematising some of the basic assumptions of non-affirmative education theory.

Non-affirmative education and empirical research

Two developments feature more recent empirical education research. The first is an interest in asking how educational research may support school development. The second is an awareness of understanding education from a multilevel perspective. These are not the only characteristics, but they are obvious and they are global. The three chapters of Part IV of the volume deal with these two developments from the perspective of non-affirmative education theory.

The first chapter, by Hanno Su and Johannes Bellmann, continues a sort of non-affirmative treatment of non-affirmative education theory. In their chapter, they point out some aspects they found inconsistent regarding non-affirmativity. The main point of the chapter was, however, to reflect on whether a non-affirmative theory of education necessarily requires a non-affirmative concept of educational research and how such an approach would differ from empirical-analytic, historical-hermeneutic and ideology-critical approaches. While these positions are primarily epistemological, they remain silent regarding the research object—pedagogical processes. Su and Bellman then argued that empirical research based on these approaches is affirmative. Partly drawing on research by Jacques Rancière, the chapter concluded by pointing out the possibilities for developing non-affirmative action research.

The second chapter in this section is a comparative study of how non-affirmative education theory relates to the fourth generation of cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT), which was developed by Yrjö Engeström. While the approaches obviously differ, they also share many of the same root assumptions. Both theories highlight the cultural-historical context of education and recognise the importance of education as aiming to support an individual's achievement of autonomy and emancipation through self-activity. The chapter perceived non-affirmative education theory primarily as an initiative within systematic education to ontologically conceptualise education by identifying foundational features as cultural and historical phenomena. In turn, CHAT was perceived as a general systems-theoretical approach to be used as a point of departure for action research aiming to achieve a change in praxis, yet not by directing praxis from an outside interest. The chapter argued that CHAT, in its different steps for the research-supported development of praxis, makes use of constitutive principles from NAT. However, CHAT does not contain much from the normative character of the pedagogical interventions it promotes.

Taken together these two chapters contributed new perspectives regarding how research-supported school development might be designed. Non-affirmative theory offers a theory of

educational praxis and does not treat any societal praxis with the same universal apparatus that CHAT does. In turn, CHAT represents an internationally widespread approach to action research regarding its design.

With the growing awareness of the role of educational governance in school development initiatives, it is clear that we need to pay more attention to educational leadership as a topic for educational research. All too often, the perspective is limited to either the classroom or the individual school. Especially if empirical research focuses on the regulative principle of how societal interest transforms into legitimate pedagogical practice, then educational leadership cannot be grounded in organisational theory. In her chapter, Ann-Sofie Smeds-Nylund highlights the dilemmas related to municipal leadership. Like some other chapters in the volume, Smeds-Nylund was able to point to how empirical research on educational leadership, starting from non-affirmative theory, can utilise ideas developed by Vivien Schmidt regarding discursive institutionalism.

Non-affirmative education and contemporary curriculum policies

The last section of the volume, Part V, consists of a critical discussion of contemporary educational governance policies. This section started with a chapter by Leif Moos in which he introduces the main tensions developed in Part V of the book. He discerned and identified features of, on the one hand, a democratic Bildung discourse that developed during the ideal of the social-democratic welfare state and, on the other, an outcomes-based discourse that developed over the past 30 years in the so-called neoliberal competition state. Utilising Foucault's view of discourse, he then reflected on a kind of contract government in Denmark.

As the next step in this section, Andreas Nordin addressed transnationally occurring and very influential principles in data-driven curriculum policymaking. Following the distinction made by Leif Moos, Nordin reminded us that this global discourse also follows certain educational ideals (i.e. competitiveness, objectivity and distance). In the reconstructive part of his chapter, he supports non-affirmative education theory as an alternative and more reflexive language for policymaking.

If non-affirmative education theory is to be perceived more broadly as a fruitful idea, then there is a need for a comparative dialogue between the Bildung paradigm and, for example, 21st-century competencies. In his chapter, Armend Tahirslay delves into the similarities and differences between these two schools of thought.

Finally, while policy borrowing is indeed an old-age phenomenon, in a globalised world, this phenomenon has not diminished. Policy borrowing has been studied in several ways.

Using non-affirmative education theory, this chapter describes the reception of foreign education theories in China. Bangpin Din argued that while China applied an affirmative mode of policy borrowing for most of the previous 100 years, the modus of reception has developed into a sort of reflected non-affirmative engagement with perspectives developed in other cultures. He exemplified this with how German Didaktik was introduced at the beginning of the 20th century and how Kairov's pedagogy was imported from the Soviet Union. The more recent engagement with contemporary curriculum theory and European Didaktik (didactics) features a more reflected attitude.

Non-affirmative education theory as a language for the 21st century

Throughout the volume, we have argued that the non-affirmative education theory is not a value-neutral position. It affirms certain educational ideals, which are essential for democratic polity and a view of the future as non-teleological (i.e. laying in the hands of humanity itself). There is still reason to remind us of the difference between emphasising autonomy as an educational ideal and emphasising what ideals this autonomy should strive for. In this sense, the distinction between affirmativity and non-affirmativity in some respects may be seen as two positions on a continuum rather than two excluding positions. Due to its relative openness and by avoiding narrow normative prescriptive recommendations, the approach may operate as an analytical vehicle in empirical settings to ask how and to what extent educational policies or practices promote legitimate educational ideals. Thus, it is reasonable not only to compare this theory of education with other *theories* of education but also to reflect on this position in relation to other curricular policy positions. Read in this way, the non-affirmative approach offers an alternative to the following contemporary educational ideologies or policy positions. They all feature specific views on educational aims, contents and methods.¹

Academic factualism. Many initiatives in curriculum and didactics, as well as in education policy, argue in favour of solving dilemmas of today's world with a stronger focus on increasing disciplinary knowledge rather than viewing our challenges as moral dilemmas. Non-affirmative education considers the value of generally accepted and tested knowledge not as value neutral but as, the best possible language by which the subject may transcend his or her unique individual experience and culture. Yet, to be meaningful from an educative perspective, the learner herself must reflect on such knowledge to establish its meaning and

¹ Compare with chapter by Armend Tahirsly in this volume.

value. In this respect, Klafki's reminder to ask what meaning selected contents may have for the learner now and in the future is central.

Furthermore, so-called factual knowledge by itself does not provide any advice for action. We know, that there is no direct path from knowledge to action. By knowing what something is, we cannot conclude what it should be in the future. In addition, although rational reason may be helpful in moral issues, analytical thinking does not offer conclusive solutions. Such educational or *academic factualism* promoting the learning of knowledge without discernment of its morals or personal meaning represents a limited idea of the individual as a self-determined subject. Such an approach to Bildung also reminds us of the traditional 'material' approach to Didaktik, often prevalent in subject matter didactics. Finally, the ongoing psychologisation of education as an academic discipline supports this rationalist ideal of learning. After all, much educational psychology limits its focus to the attainment of (learning) conceptual knowledge, but it lacks theoretical tools to discuss how selected content would be educative in nature.

While Bildung-centred non-affirmative education theory is aware of the value dimensions of knowledge, it also reminds us of the importance of maintaining a difference between opinions and knowledge, doxa and episteme. In a world of opinions on social media, learning to reason rationally by following established ideas of truthful knowledge is crucial. However, this is not a good argument for keeping academic factualism a curricular principle.

A second contemporary orientation in curriculum policymaking is content with performative competencies. This position, *educational performativism*, argues that it is sufficient it will suffice if individuals can *perform* the tasks needed in, for example, working life. With such arguments, authorities in many places expect, for example, higher education institutions to validate competencies achieved in 'real life'. Such policies clearly downplay the worth of conceptual or theoretical knowledge and reasoning, which offer nuanced and foundational insights beyond the practical matters at hand. In addition to its normative foundations, educational performativism, driven by technical, instrumental and social efficiency, typically aims to increase economic effectiveness. As an educational ideal, this orientation diminishes the subjects' ability to reach self-determination in a broader sense. A different version of practice-oriented curriculum policy corresponds with research on situated cognition and legitimate peripheral participation in communities of practice. This direction might deserve the title of educational contextualism.

A third developmental line in curriculum work is the familiar idea of subordinating education to political interests and ideologies. We call this position *educational activism*, in which the values promoted by education are unquestioned and self-evident—for the proponents. The pedagogical challenge is limited to the transformation or reconstruction of society by a) transferring predetermined experiences or b) implementing ideals for the future. An example of the first is a contemporary neo-conservative ‘cultural canon’ movement. In an increasingly multicultural world, curriculum policy based on a ‘cultural canon’ defines the core features of what it is to be an ‘educated’ or qualified member of a society or nation. An example of the second position is limiting education to allow the growing generation to dream of a given dream. In both cases, education operates instrumentally to promote external interests. The utopian version of educational moralism emphasises social, cultural and political agency but strives to encourage to promote predetermined values by future activists. Activist pedagogy often operates in the interests of politicised education policy, which differs from non-affirmative political citizenship education (*Politische Bildung*). While democratic polities defend their obvious right to establish curricular norms *politically* to guide education, these polities, especially multiparty-oriented governments, typically understand that sufficient room must be reserved for *pedagogical* critique and debate of the interests promoted. If the space needed for the subject’s own will formation is sacrificed, education in such systems may become counterproductive, not only for democratic life but also for an otherwise dynamic culture and economy.

Finally, recent developments in artificial intelligence and robotics, combined with the global pandemic, have once again turned attention to the constantly recurrent focus on *teaching methods* or technology as a solution for guiding future developments. However, since Comenius, we have been familiar with the ideal of ‘teaching all things to all men’ by a universal *method*. We call this position *educational technologism*. Recent technological developments require serious rethinking of, for example, the social character of human teaching and learning, as well as a rethinking of the extent to which advanced intelligent systems may support pedagogical processes. However, this *method* is only a single dimension. In a fragmented educational research culture, there is a risk that this research direction will come to live a life of its own. A related reductionist position consists of initiatives to consider communication theory as the foundation of didactics.

A non-affirmative approach to education and *Bildung*, views the previous four policy tendencies as one-eyed. First, each perspective typically perceives itself as superordinate to

the others. Second, not acknowledging the dynamics between the topics raised, by balancing and questioning each against the ambitions of another, dramatically reduces the subject's possibilities to develop towards self-determination and a reach reflected will. These educational aims correspond with understanding societal practices as non-hierarchical and the future as non-teleological.

The non-affirmative theory provides us with a reflected language not only for understanding the task of education, being human and becoming human but also for empirical research regarding the extent to which education (e.g. for self-determination and co-determination) is possible to practice within a given policy system. In extension, non-affirmative education theory offers an analytical lens for working with curriculum development and policy. Operating with this lens recommend us to view the notions of *recognition* and *affirmation* distinct from each other. Schools need to *recognise* curricular aims and content, but to what extent are they allowed not to affirm these aims and contents with pedagogical motives? To *affirm* them would mean not to problematise these aims and contents *with* students, thereby risking reducing education to transmitting given values and contents, leading to pedagogy in conflict with predominant citizenship ideals. Not affirming these aims and contents does not mean denying their truth or relevance but working with them to create *pedagogical space* for the student or pupil. These pedagogical spaces allow critical reflection on the meaning and value of phenomena. These constructed spaces are invitations for discerning thought and experimental practice, asking how knowledge relates to value and how given knowledge may solve urgent problems in society, but also reflecting on whose interest knowledge is developed. Non-affirmative educative teaching is a way to promote and reflect on such reflective and experimental pedagogical spaces. Due to embracing a non-teleological view where the shape of the future depends of how we, and future generations, act ourselves, it is an education of hope, but also and education that emphasizes ethical awareness and responsibility in many different ways.