

CHAPTER V

A CHILD RESTRAINED IN BECOMING ADULT IN HIS/HER PROBLEMATIC EDUCATIVE SITUATION

1. INTRODUCTION

A child must be educated adequately to appropriately actualize his/her psychic life and, thus, his/her becoming adult. For the most part, this amounts to the fact that, while the fundamental pedagogical structures are being realized, he/she must be accompanied [educated] emotionally, intellectually, and normatively.

In many respects, this emotional, intellectual, and normative educating can occur inadequately. Then, there is usually not sufficient opportunity for the sequence of an educative association, encounter, engagement, [intervening], return to association, and periodic breaking away to occur, and on this basis, educating progresses adequately.

It is especially important that problematic moments of educating which are controllable, on the one hand, or which can be eliminated or changed, on the other hand, are considered. Attention must also be given to *how* a child restrained in becoming adult under actualizes his/her psychic life and his/her becoming, how he/she under actualizes his/her exploring, emancipating, distancing, differentiating, and objectifying, and how he/she under actualizes his/her *experiencing, willing, lived experiencing, knowing, and behaving*.

When the pedagogical sequence occurs inadequately, this also implies that the pedagogical relationships are not realized as they should be, and then it can be that a child experiences and lived experiences that they are of little meaning. On this basis, he/she no longer *will* venture optimally to establish educative relationships with the educator; but stable educator-child relationships are indispensable.¹ Consequently, where mutual trust, understanding,

and authority are wanting in an educative event, a child is not only neglected emotionally, but also intellectually, and normatively.

When, for example, the pedagogic association is unfavorable, a child cuts him/herself off from the relationship structures, and inadequately explores them, and in his/her sensing, pre-cognitive exploration of them, a pedagogic encounter is not adequately prepared for. Then trust becomes labile. and this dampens his/her exploring. Because association is illuminative, and in it a child arrives at a fore-knowing of the educator, he/she knows the adult as one who unsympathetically intervenes with him/her.

For Langeveld,² association is a pre-formed field for educating, and he says that an educator and child must trust each other, since trust is a condition for an *encounter*. Thus, if a child does not lived experience, and experience a stable trust in his/her association with his/her educator, an encounter is not possible. In the association, a child will trust the adult, and will be trusted by the educator.

When the educative encounter rests on a labile foundation, it also continually runs the risk of not flourishing. Then, a child does not experience he/she is encountered by the adult, and then is not sufficiently disposed to accept authority, and norms.

Hence, when the course of educating does not flourish to an encounter, a child lacks the further willingness to trust his/her educator, and to be trusted by him/her, or to accept and exercise authority. Thus, he/she does not open him/herself adequately to educating because he/she experiences that he/she is not understood, and he/she will not listen to the explanation of things, and of norms. Because he/she feels him/herself as not accepted by his/her educator, he/she also is not prepared to accept his/her educator.

Thus, when, in his/her exploration of the *pedagogical sequence*, a child experiences that he/she does not trust and understand his/her educator, and that he/she is not trusted and understood, he/she is not willing to allow his/her educator to exercise authority over him/her. Indeed, then he/she will not open him/herself to be educated, and there is insufficient readiness by the child and the

educator to themselves take responsibility to be educated, and to educate, respectively.

Hence, when the educative sequence does not flourish to *engagement*, a child does not acquire an opportunity to experience that his/her educator trusts and accepts him/her, and that he/she trusts and accepts the educator as well as his/her authority. If there is not trust, engagement is not possible, and the educator cannot agree or interfere [i.e., intervene educatively].

When the educative sequence is not adequately realized, there is a strong conflict in trust, and then a child's actualization of his/her psychic life remains on a more infantile level than expected of him/her.

When a parent does not adequately trust his/her child, he/she him/herself is a deceiver for him/her, and his/her child's experiencing, willing, lived experiencing, knowing, and behaving become pre-formed inadequately. Lubbers³ says there is a conflict in trust because then, because of insecurity, a child does not learn the meaning of human dignity, he/she does not discover freedom, and because he/she does not know it, he/she does not venture in his/her educative situation.

With a child whose trust is impoverished, a labile and even impulsive affect strongly emerges, and he/she clings to a pathic disposition, and does not adequately distance him/herself to a gnostic-cognitive level in actualizing his/her psychic life. Then pedagogic distress also primarily means affective distress,⁴ and this always restrains becoming.⁵

Where a relationship of trust is impaired, and a child cannot trust his/her educators, the relationship of understanding also usually miscarries, because they [the educators] cannot then really know the child and what occurs with him/her, and especially not what his/her distress implies.

An educator who is attuned to weighing the pros and cons of a child in a cold, penetrating, and merely intellectual way, instead of a loving surrendering, self-sacrificing, patient, tactful, and

persevering understanding way, does not arrive at a true understanding of the child.

When inadequate situations of association and encounter are established between educators and children, this falls short of a fundamental relationship necessary for acquiring that deeper knowledge of the child and of his/her destination [adulthood].

If parents do not understand their child, because of his/her affective lability and the absence of an image of adulthood worth striving for, the child is not bonded with them in the direction of adulthood.⁷ Muller-Eckhard⁸ says where parental understanding and interest are lacking, “confused and confusing lived experiences”^{*} arises. He emphasizes that misunderstanding between parents and child can have serious consequences which restrain his/her becoming because, with this defect in understanding, a child is “disturbed in his/her entire psychic development ... because the child lives in a sphere which does not support his/her spirit.”^{9**}

Also, when a child does not “correctly” understand his/her parents, for him/her they become representatives of insecurity. Indeed, if there is not mutual trust and understanding between educator and child, the requirement for sympathetic, authoritative guidance also cannot be met.

Vedder¹⁰ carries educational neglect back to the neglect of authority in an educative situation, when he says “There is mention of educational neglect when too few demands of self-limitation are imposed on a child, when no norms are taught.”^{11***}

Thus, there must be a search in a child’s educative situation for those problematic educative moments which are present in educative activities which contribute to the educative relationships not thriving, the educative sequence being restrained, and the educative aim striven for and reached inadequately.

^{*} [een verwarde en verwarrende belevenis]

^{**} [zijn gehele psychische ontplooiing gestoord ... omdat het kind in een sfeer leeft die de ziel niet draagt]

^{***} [Van pedagogische verwaarloosing is sprake wanneer aan het kind te weinig eisen van zelfbeperking worden opgelegd, wanneer het geen normen wordt geleerd]

These moments of educative restraint can be present in a variety of forms and here only a few are referred to by way of illustration.

Irrespective of his/her personal potentialities, a child him/herself can do nothing about it, if he/she is lovingly accepted or, perhaps, *rejected*. From the start, he/she turns him/herself, in all his/her love and trust to his/her educator, and this association and encounter are also cognitively illuminative to the child. Thus, the child *feels* that he/she is not *accepted*, *is rejected* and *unwelcome*, and he/she experiences insecurity. A rejected child does not experience or lived experience an invitation to venture in trust with his/her educators. There is a sense of *awareness* that he/she is not accepted. This sense of mistrust leads to the exclusion and blocking of an educative encounter. Because he/she then also will not identify him/herself with his/her educator, he/she also loses his/her formative value.

Beets¹² says, “when a fellow person does not provide support, does not ‘*create*’ a *space within which development can find a place*, a child dies an early death.”*

Mere physical care does not address a child’s helplessness,¹³ he/she has need for an experienced security from a loving trustworthiness in terms of unconditional acceptance.

For example, if everything were done for an over-protected child, he/she would not have ample opportunity to do things for him/herself and, if need be, to struggle; “he who does everything for a child deprives him of his human potentialities”, says Landman.¹⁴ An over-protected child does not have enough opportunity to participate in activities which threaten his/her security, such as playing with other children, swimming with them, going to school alone, or venturing alone outside the security of the family.

* [Daar waar de medemens niet ter zijde, niet de *ruimte ‘schept’*, *waarbinnen de ontwikkeling plaats kan vinden*, steerft de zuigeling een vroege dood]

Levy¹⁵ sees over-protection as an error in educating, especially committed by a mother. In this regard, he emphasizes an unusually intensive being together of mother and child, where a child practically never is out of the mother's sight, where a child sleeps with his/her mother for too long, where the mother provides her child with too much help dressing and undressing, washing and bathing and sitting on his/her bed; accompanies him/her to and from school, protects him/her from teacher criticism, chooses for him/her, and exercises too much or too little control.

In addition, a child's educative situation becomes problematic if there is continually an unsympathetic, unloving, dictatorial exercise of authority, or when the exercise of authority is absent.

When a child is confronted with an overdose of instructions, expectations, and demands, of which he/she experiences the majority as meaningless, the multiplicity of impressions are the origin of the child's insecurity.¹⁶

Closely related to this is the phenomenon, which so many educators forget, that a child's human dignity does not lie in achievements in one or another area. Especially when parents, at any time, expect from their child a result he/she cannot achieve or perform well, they accentuate his/her "failing him/herself" not only in that area but also as a *person*.

For various reasons, a parent might have high expectations for his/her child, and this also is necessary, but when this involves any other aim, than a child's optimally becoming adult, then these expectations are bad. For example, if a child's achievement becomes the mother's social ambition,¹⁷ and the child does not fulfill it, the mother's anxiety, feelings of guilt, and excessive expectations are carried further until educating is restrained, according to Ter Horst.¹⁸

The good achievements of other children, too often these days, are held up to the child as all that is worth the effort. Whenever the educators unfavorably compare a child's attempts at self-maintenance with another child's, they emphasize to the child that he/she is a *lesser being*, instead of allowing him/her to feel that

he/she also is a full-fledged person rather by noticing and valuing his/her successful attempts.

A child's loss of security goes hand in hand with an attack on his/her existing security, and his/her status, as a person, comes under pressure, according to Stander and Sonnekus.¹⁹

In the following, there is a reflection on a child's under actualization of his/her becoming adult in his/her problematic situation of educating with reference to some errors in educating.

2. A CHILD'S UNDER ACTUALIZATION OF HIS/HER PSYCHIC LIFE IN A PROBLEMATIC SITUATION OF EDUCATING

2.1 A child in a problematic situation of educating explores inadequately

When an educator neglects to educate a child in trust, a child remains stuck on a pathic-labile level of trust, and in his/her exploring, as experiencing-, willing-, lived experiencing-, knowing- and behaving-becoming. Lubbers²⁰ says, "Only the communication between parents and children can lead to a child withdrawing into himself in fear and secret behavior."* Perquin²¹ points out that an affectively neglected child not only feels insecure and unsafe, with the consequence of not venturing to explore, but also is blunted, superficial, and emotionally cold, or demanding, violent, and disappointed.

Those positions of a child in his/her exploratory going out to the world which he/she cannot assimilate give rise to labile pathic-affective lived experiences and, if the non-assimilated experiences increase quantitatively, this gradually propels the child into a no-man's-land where he/she is going to be burdened by feelings of anxiety, insecurity, being unsafe, being threatened, helplessness, impotence, uncertainty, awkwardness, dependence, general basic life uncertainty, loneliness and being inferior.²² Lersch²³ also refers to feelings of pessimism, discontentment, lack of self-confidence, and inferiority.

* [Alleen de gemeenschap tussen ouders en kinderen kan voorkomen, dat het kind ertoe neigt zich in vrees en stiekem gedrag terug te trekken]

From feeling insecure, a child is too afraid to explore the strange and unfamiliar world because to him/her an active going out to the world of educating means additional exposure to insecurity. Thus, he/she is not affectively prepared to participate in a dialogue with the world. Hence, the pathic-affective is an inadequate “precondition” for exploring. Langeveld²⁴ emphasizes that an insecure child does not venture by exploring, and Ter Horst²⁵ says he/she withdraws him/herself into the false-security of his/her own world which is anxiety-intensifying.

Helplessness leads to anxiety for a child who is inadequately accompanied by his/her educators,²⁶ and anxiety leads to impotence; this makes a child powerless and cripples him/her, according to Nieuwenhuys.²⁷ Langeveld²⁸ indicates that oneness and security are present in love, but loneliness and insecurity are attributed to anxiety. Carp²⁹ speaks of a primordial anxiety which silently accompanies each person’s life. The ontological opposite of anxiety is love, and they are the most personal of what can be experienced.

An anxious child cannot carry responsibility for his/her choices,³⁰ and anxiety makes him/her feel powerless because he/she is not able to protect him/herself against it.³¹

A child in a problematic situation of educating responds to it with anxiety.³² Anxiety must not merely be viewed as an emotional feeling but, indeed, as an abiding attunement and, as such, objectless. Differing from fear, which is coupled to an object, a child does not know why he/she is anxious. According to Noordham,³³ the presence of anxiety holds back each event of becoming and restrains the development of a nuanced human image.

Any inadequate realization of an event of educating leads to anxiety, which restrains a child’s optimal actualization of his/her psychic life, especially in terms of an unwillingness to explore. This inadequate exploring, however, increasingly intensifies this anxiety, and because the child would rather withdraw him/herself from the new, the actualization of his/her psychic life is diminished with respect to educative contents.

Then there is mention of inadequate help with meanings.³⁴ Hence, the child develops an unfavorable attitude toward life which drives him/her into a defensive attitude.³⁵ Muller-Eckhard³⁶ calls the fundamental moments of a defensive attitude a fleeing forward (aggression), a fleeing into him/herself (isolation), and a fleeing backward (regression).

A defensive attitude leads back to a child not being able to assimilate his/her “disturbed” meanings; he/she cannot assume a new position [toward them]. The unassimilated becomes an oppressive burden, and life becomes a constant threat; then he/she only accepts what is thoroughly familiar.³⁷

He/she considers him/herself as being not free and unable to change. Also, he/she excludes him/herself from these unacceptable meanings because he/she wads them off.

The disposition to defend and flee intensifies the communication of anxiety regarding specific educative landscapes, particularly, but also life reality, in general. The fleeing from confident exploring leads to isolation, says Stander and Sonnekus.³⁸

From the nature of things, the child’s educative dialogue is defective, and because of its cumulative retardation, this leads to a further isolation from reality.

When in isolation, he/she has now escaped the threat he/she finds him/herself in a situation which is meaningless-for-him/her. This attempted escape from the threat by denying communicating with it only intensifies his/her anxiety because there is still knowledge that the denied situation is not denied by others, and he/she also wants to control him/herself as others would. This intensifies his/her anxiety as well as his/her self-designation as being inferior.

He/she becomes inadequately acquainted with the educative contents, and much of it remains entirely unfamiliar to him/her. Lubbers³⁹ says the inability to communicate with some areas of the world “because I have not assimilated my experiences from those areas, leads to an essential lack of freedom by which ‘I’ eventually,

without offending myself or the life of another, succeed in trying to maintaining myself in 'imitation'. That is, by doing what others want me to eventually participate in, but not intrinsically. To the extent that 'I' attribute my experiences to someone, 'I' gain access to the closed areas.”*

However, the world also must continually be explorable for a child, and it can only be so when an educator knows the child and takes into consideration his/her attained level of independence, and sees to it that reality continually has an appropriately challenging character for him/her.⁴⁰ Ter Horst says that the educative dialogue provides a perspective if the world is ordered adequately for a person, and is appropriately challenging.⁴¹

However, a child must not be “deluged” with challenges because then it becomes very difficult for him/her to take the “risk” to explore. Especially if these challenges are above his/her ability, he/she experiences too many insurmountable obstacles, partly because of possible related experiences of failure. An anxious child, thus, withdraws him/herself from anything which might refer to any sense of danger, whether experienced or imagined. He/she withdraws him/herself into his/her own insecure experiential world to hide him/herself from danger, and to shelter him/herself in passivity, by which his/her affective mobility is diminished further.

Then there is mention of an under actualization of experiencing because the child does not adequately take the *initiative* to “move” to the unfamiliar. There is a lack of *activity* and *action*, in the sense of a *self-willingness* to explore. Thus, the new is not *reached* and *understood*. He/she *orients* him/herself inadequately, or as Van der Stop⁴² says, he/she cannot determine his/her own place in terms of given beacons.⁴³

* [omdat ek zijn ervaringen uit de gebieden niet verwerkte lei tot een weselijke onvrijheid, waardeur 'ik' ten slotte buite zichzelf en buiten het leven van de ander geraakt, zich alleen nog maar handhaven in, 'imitatieve' gedoe. Deur te doen als anderen lukt het 'ik' uiterlijk mee te doen, maar innerlijk niet. Pas als 'ik' zijn ervaringen tot de zijne heft gemaakt, heft 'ik' toegang tot de gesloten gebieden]

Also, to a large extent, a child can be prevented from having specific experiences, or he/she can be confronted with an excess of only a few.⁴⁴ Then, the total essential reality of educating cannot enter the educative dialogue and, thus, cannot become a part of the child's world. Here one thinks of an overemphasis of material gains, power, status, and material possessions as the primary educative intentions of the educators.⁴⁵

An unwillingness to explore also testifies to the neglect of educating willingness, because an unwillingness to participate in the tasks of becoming adult practically never arises with a child who is directed in an affectively stable way. An inadequately actualized willing leads to a qualitatively *apathetic*, as well as a *weakly* directed experiencing.⁴⁶

Pretorius⁴⁷ says that, for a child-in-distress, pathic lived experiences mean *pathic unrest*, which usually is paired with lability, confusion, and disorientation regarding his/her gnostic lived experiences. In many respects, this thwarts a child's yearnings and initiative. As examples, he mentions the following:⁴⁸

A child wants to be someone him/herself, but he/she is kept small; he/she is an initiative of relationships, but he/she is limited to "wait and see"; he/she wants to be accepted, but he/she feels rejected; he/she wants to feel of worth, but he/she feels inferior; he/she seeks stability, but experiences lability; he/she wants to be understood, but he/she experiences him/herself as not understood; he/she seeks support in realizing his/her potentialities, but he/she is constrained; he/she wants to accept authority, but he/she experiences a lack of authority.

An unwillingness to explore is often present with a handicapped child whose becoming is restrained. In the first place, his/her handicapped body comes into play as a barrier⁴⁹ against purposeful exploring. In his/her exploring, in establishing his/her world, things appear differently, since he/she is handicapped in communicating with the world. He/she is continually thrown back on his/her body, and then experiences it as a barrier because so many "appeals" pass him/her by.

The self-confidence of a child who is rejected by his/her educators is impacted, and his/her being bonded with his/her parents is lacking; with this, the trustworthiness of the figure he/she ventures and explores the world with, can be put at risk. Especially when a small child's nurturance is accompanied by a lack of love, and impoverished, cold emotions, this is experienced as a threatening experience on a pathic-vital level. It is he/she, as body, who is being neglected, and on a vital-pathic level, as a person, he/she signifies this as unpleasant, and as long as he/she cannot assimilate this affective distress, he/she feels insecure, unsafe, uncertain, and he/she will not feel a readiness to want to discover his/her world on a gnostic/cognitive level.

When a child loses trust in his/her parents, there also is a disturbed communication between them. This lack of trust leaves the child alone in his/her anxiety because he/she "dare" not share it with them and, for the child, they themselves represent insecurity and anxiety. Lubbers⁵⁰ emphasizes that any relation with his/her parents, which includes for the child an experience of insecurity, has a threatening character for him/her, and is going to be paired with a conflict in trust.

Where any event in a child's educative situation implies that he/she is emotionally labilized, e.g., a loss of self-confidence, feelings of aggression, or rebelliousness, insecurity, etc. also mean for a child an unwillingness to explore because then he/she does not feel prepared to want to communicate with educative content via optimally actualizing his/her psychic life; also, on this basis, his/her giving meaning gnostic-cognitively and normatively *cannot* be adequately actualized, and the child cannot sufficiently arrive at such a position. He/she inadequately *discovers* the educative contents because he/she does not adequately perceive, think about, and remember what he/she does not investigate by exploring.

Consequently, inadequate exploring means the child does not communicate sufficiently with the educative contents because he/she does not dialogue with them via all his/her personal potentialities, as ways of actualizing his/her psychic life. Because of educative neglect, there is mention of *unfavorable feelings* about educative contents; *he/she becomes* anxious, insecure, and threats

are *seen*; he/she does not arrive at ordered perceiving, thinking, imagining and fantasizing, remembering, and observing the contents; and the gaps in his/her world of meaning gradually increase because he/she does not give meaning to life contents as can be expected of him/her.

2.2 A child in a problematic situation of educating emancipates inadequately

What is said in the previous section about inadequate exploration-as-psychic-life-actualized-becoming-in-education also has obvious implications for a child's emancipation-as-psychic-life-actualized-becoming.

If the relationship structures are inadequately realized to any extent, then a child will fail to realize his/her emancipation adequately; rather in his/her emancipation he/she proceeds in emotional ways to labilize his/her self-becoming and on a gnostic-cognitive level to inadequately arrive at a systematizing, ordering, and understanding via experiencing and lived experiencing. If in pedagogical association and encounter, a child in the relationship of him/herself and the adult remains stuck on a diffuse, global-gnostic level he/she really degenerates pedagogically, and his/her actual and potential personal-being do not correspond. Also, when the pedagogical sequence inadequately flourishes to an engagement, a child does not have enough opportunity to show that he/she is aware that he/she is a co-worker in his/her becoming adult.

When the relationships of trust, understanding. and authority are not realized adequately, the pedagogical sequence cannot thrive to an adequate pedagogical intervention (authentic pedagogical disapproval or approval).

In terms of emancipating, as experiencing-, willing-, lived experiencing-, knowing-, and behaving-becoming, a child then also does not sufficiently *signify* that he/she trusts and knows his/her educator such that he/she approvingly accepts his/her intervention. Then the child is not *touched* sufficiently, does not know that he/she really is wrong, and there is no desire to accept the adult's decisions as proper. Where inadequate pedagogical trust prevails, a

child does not discover (via experiencing, willing, ect.) the objectionable, and he/she does not feel or know that he/she is wrong; in addition, he/she does not feel that he/she must or will trust his/her educator because then he/she doesn't trust that the adult knows better.

Where there is seldom pedagogical intervention because the educator, because of inadequate trust, understanding, and authority, where there is seldom or ever appreciation shown for a child's approvable deeds, a child does not adequately experience that he/she is trusted, understood and allowed "to be someone him/herself", by which he/she also signifies him/herself as inadequately emancipated via experiencing, willing, etc.

Particularly, there must be reference to the inadequate realization of pedagogical intervention. This really deprives a child of the advantage of experiencing that his/her educator trusts him/her, and knows and approves his/her comportment, and agrees with it and, thus, knows he/she also is right.

Also, if [after intervention] a child is not sufficiently able to return to a pedagogical association to experience and lived experience that he/she is allowed to be someone him/herself, his/her emancipation is restrained because then he/she does not discover, by actualizing his/her psychic life, that he/she him/herself is someone of value and, thus, does not get sufficient opportunity for exercising his/her own norms and system of values. Actually, there is insufficient opportunity, via remembering, for the child to stabilize his/her just realized becoming.

Also, when an educator wants to constantly educate, he/she can hinder a child adequately emancipating. It also is necessary that a child periodically withdraw from his/her parents, e.g., by him/herself being involved in his/her homework, by playing with his/her friends, etc. When a child is not granted the freedom to also "be out of his/her parents' sight", he/she will not acquire sufficient opportunity to "exercise" his/her discovered state of becoming. A child who envies this periodic breaking away has the right to object and, as educatively situated, to be someone him/herself outside that educative situation, where he/she can find evidence of his/her

educator's trust in him/her, and where he/she can, by actualizing his/her psychic life, think about the educative contents which have been unlocked for him/her during the course/sequence of educating.

A child who, while still educatively situated, is not able to discover him/herself by him/herself outside an educative situation (also in terms of bodily experience, self-concept, conscience) does not have enough opportunity to build up an I-self.⁵¹

Ter Horst⁵² emphasizes that "curtailment" arises if a child is granted too little freedom, given too little opportunity to use his/her unfolding independence, or to be someone him/herself with his/her own desires, interests, and initiative. An educator who forgets that a child has a right to decreasing guidance, and a right to increasing freedom impedes his/her *emancipation*, as experiencing-, willing-, lived experiencing-, knowing-, and behaving-becoming. When a child is denied these rights, he/she can submit to a curtailment and no development of independence, says Ter Horst.⁵³

It is this child who is awkward as soon as he/she must step outside the trusted space with his/her educators because this world is not of *his/her* design. Here there can be reference to his/her parents' demand for achievement, over-protection, authoritarian educating, and a lack in adequate challenges for their child.

The educative dialogue between educators and child also is often impeded because the child's state of becoming is not recognized sufficiently and taken into consideration. Here it is not the case that the child's increasing independence is ignored, but that his/her being-someone-him/herself is not acknowledged or recognized enough. Consequently, it is these educators who inadequately understand the child, by which loving interest is absent. Then the child experiences bewilderment and confusion,⁵⁴ as well as aggression, feelings of guilt, anxiety, and distress.⁵⁵

When educators neglect the relationship of authority, they deprive themselves of the opportunity to allow the child to discover him/herself as someone of personal worth in his/her obedience to authority.

A child restrained in becoming learns too readily (from experience) that he/she acts incorrectly, fails, and can't succeed. In a relationship of authority, a child also can be confronted with feelings of guilt. Lubbers⁵⁶ says, e.g., that feelings of guilt can arise with a deed, by which he/she deeply shames him/herself, so deeply that he/she is unable to accept it. However, this need not be a deed; feelings and desires which are not acceptable to him/herself also can lead to such a sense of guilt. Ter Horst⁵⁷ says, "Tensions, feelings of guilt, irritations, death wishes, ambivalences can arise."* In addition, everything regarding him/herself which a child cannot integrate into his/her world of meaning leads to anxiety. Thus, a child who is not free from impulsive and vital forces is not able to adequately actualize his/her psychic life. Noordam⁵⁷ emphasizes that it is only the non-anxious, non-neurotic child who can become adequately.

Such a child does not have the *freedom* to emancipate. In addition, the someone he/she continually becomes, via actualizing his/her psychic life, corresponds to the anticipated self-image which he/she, as a person, wants to become.

If this self-image *seems* vague and unattainable to the child, he/she soon accepts that it is unattainable for him/her, and that he/she is "inferior".

Where emancipation essentially means the freeing or actualizing of a child's personal potentialities, there is the child who "underestimates" his/her personal potentialities, and who then will actualize only these supposedly "inferior" potentialities.

With respect to his/her given potentialities, there is then a labilized willing, especially regarding emancipating, as actualizing his/her psychic life, and this implies an *unwillingness* to want to become adult.

A parent neglects his/her educative task if he/she does not purposefully support his/her child in his/her emancipating

* [Er kunnen spanningen, ontstaan, schuldgevoelens, irritaties, doodsverlangens, ambivalenties]

(particularly via willing-as-becoming) and, thus, in wanting to be what he/she can and ought to become in accordance with his/her given potentialities.

With reference to a handicapped child impeded in becoming, the under actualization of his/her emancipating-as-experiencing, willing-, lived experiencing-, knowing-, and behaving-becoming remains a problem because his/her being handicapped is so conspicuous to him/herself and to others. He/she readily experiences his/her body unfavorably “under the look of fellow persons”. Through the look of another, and possible comments about it, he/she experiences it as a handicapped body and him/herself as “being a handicapped body”, or a “less worthy person”, i.e., as a handicapped I, according to Sonnekus.⁵⁹

It is necessary that a child continually hear the demands, questions, expectations which an educator presents. If a child inadequately receives this “appeal”, he/she cannot adequately answer it. According to Ter Horst,⁶⁰ giving personal meaning does not occur, and world meanings are not the child’s. He says that there is a lack in intentionality, and “identity”, because then there is a lack of accessibility to reality. “Without identity, there is no person, dialogue, world, perspective”*, according to Ter Horst.⁶¹ He points out that identity is not always identical with the I-self, which is the way in which a person experiences and handles him/herself in dialogue, “and it is possible, through incongruity, that the I-self does not have at its disposal the entire structure of identity.”**⁶²

He also points to the danger of the techniques regarding the loss of identity, and then refers to clothing, information, food, and patterns of behaving, and says, “If cities, houses, residential areas, streets have no identity, if millions of children laugh at the same moment because a television star makes a joke, the development of identity becomes seriously impeded.”***⁶³

* [Zonder de eigenheid geen persoon, geen dialoog, geen wereld, geen perspectief]

** [en het is mogelijk dat door discongruentie het ik-zelf hele structuur van het eigenheid niet ter beschikking heft]

*** [Als stede, huise, woonwyke, strate geen eigenheid hebben, als miljoenen kinderen op hetzelfde ogenblik lachen omdat een televisie-ster een grapje maakt, wordt het ontwikkelen van eigenheid sterk belemmerd]

Also, if a child is not confronted with all the essences of the educative aim, and only a few primary aims are confronted, a “one-sided” person unfolds.

Adequate emancipation always presumes the adequate realization of the fundamental pedagogical structures, particularly with an eye to the aim structures. When this fails, a child’s past also is not adequately ordered, and his/her future also is inaccessible, to the extent that his past is ordered inadequately simply because an accessible future presumes an ordered past.⁶⁴

2.3 A child in a problematic situation of educating distances inadequately

Furthermore, the quality of realizing the fundamental pedagogical structures also determines the degree of a child’s adequate distancing-as-experiencing-, willing-, lived experiencing-, knowing-, and behaving-becoming. An experienced labile trust can impede a child in his/her distancing from the pathic to the affective, as a more controlled and stabilized distancing, on the one hand, and from the gnostic to the cognitive, as a more ordered, systematized, conceptual, and synthesized distancing, on the other hand.

Because a child impeded in becoming remains in the grips of feelings of helplessness and insecurity, this implies the under actualization of his/her psychic life, such that he/she does not arrive at an adequate distancing. He/she attributes “skewed” meanings and, indeed, cannot sufficiently distance him/herself from him/herself and proceed to take a position more toward the world. This defect in adequate distanced, ordered, and controlled experiencing and lived experiencing in his/her perceiving, imagining, fantasizing, thinking, etc. leads to a further pathic-affective lability, and a diffuse emotional life, simply because he/she cannot sufficiently control them gnostic-cognitively.

The degree of emotional lability, furthermore, is a determinant of the amount of restraint in ordering in the gnostic-cognitive signifying of the educative contents. An insecure child only ventures in leaping from sensing to perceiving, and from perceiving

to thinking, etc. with anxiety, and with little peace of mind. A labile sensing ends lingering with a landscape during the gnostic experiencing and lived experiencing of it.⁶⁵

Inadequate distancing to the educative contents because of the under actualization of the various modes of actualizing the psychic life, thus, implies that a child cannot adequately participate in the educative event. During the presentation and discussion of life contents by an adult, a child *signifies*, via inadequate sensing, attending, perceiving, imagining and fantasizing, thinking, actualizing intelligence, remembering, and observing; i.e., inadequately relating to the educative contents via experiencing, willing, lived experiencing, knowing, and behaving because he/she does not adequately distance him/herself from him/herself to the contents, and also from the pathic to the affective, and from the gnostic to the cognitive, but also from the pathic-affective to the gnostic-cognitive.

2.4 A child in a problematic situation of educating differentiates inadequately

If the fundamental pedagogical structures are inadequately realized, a child's readiness to risk him/herself with reality, also is not adequately prepared for, and his/her readiness to want to optimally actualize his/her personal potentialities is slight, by which he/she then shows inertia in differentiating among his/her various potentialities when actualizing his/her psychic life. Then, indeed, he/she actualizes some of the modes of actualizing his/her psychic life on a level lower than he/she ought to be able to do. With a lack of sufficient trust in his/her educators, he/she is unwilling to allow his/her dialogue with the educative contents to prosper, because the unwillingness to distance from his/her sensing to the gnostic-cognitive modes of actualizing his/her psychic life, because he/she differentiates inadequately among these various potentialities at his/her disposal, as well as among the finer nuances within each. When cognitive educating is neglected, e.g., by educators inadequately answering a child's questions, there is a readiness by a child to differentiate, but it remains only a *readiness* because the *unlocking* by the parents does not provide sufficient opportunity for their child to realize and practice his/her potentialities for

actualizing his/her psychic life because the (educators') guidance and "teaching" simply are missing. Inadequate cognitive and normative educating implies that a child is denied the opportunities necessary to differentiate and actualize his/her personal potentialities for signifying life contents. In addition, this implies that a child becomes "differentiation-inert", and gradually is no longer attuned to optimally realizing his/her potentialities by which an under actualization of his/her psychic life-in-educating necessarily must follow.

As far as a child restrained in becoming is concerned, it is emphasized that he/she also is called, via the adequate actualization of his/her given potentialities, to proceed to an optimal discovery of reality. It can be accepted that he/she, indeed, is not as good at communicating with some terrains as a child not restrained in becoming, but often the educators accept that this holds true for his/her total communication with reality. Then the child is helped, in passivity, to fall on the ground, by which he/she also does not feel ready to differentiate adequately among his/her given potentialities.

Thus, when an event of educating thrives inadequately, a child's differentiation, as a qualitative refinement of his/her becoming adult is impeded.

2.5 A child in a problematic situation of educating objectifies inadequately

In a pedagogical event, a child also does not arrive at adequate objectifying-as-experiencing, willing-, lived experiencing-, knowing-, and behaving-becoming if the fundamental structures are not adequately realized.

Especially, this is the case with rejection, over-protection, and [content] overloading. If a child does not experience sufficient freedom to distance him/herself from him/herself, fellow persons, and things to consider him/herself, his/her parents, and the life contents from a "distance", he/she cannot adequately discover things as what, indeed, they are.

An educator who does not adequately teach, prompt, exemplify, etc. cannot sufficiently support a child to take an objective position. A child who is not helped in doing tasks him/herself, to say certain things him/herself, to think and judge for him/herself, and to discover the essences of a matter him/herself, remains too subjectively involved, and then matters are judged only from his/her own standpoint.

Thus, when an educator ignores or inadequately answers a child's cognitive questions, a psychic life actualizing child does not acquire an adequate grasp of the unknown knowledge of life contents, and is ignorant of them and, with this, cognitive questioning is more intense, and the child becomes more labilized emotionally just because, in actualizing his/her psychic life, he/she experiences that he/she cannot know and be aware. Then, he/she does not arrive at satisfactory structure in his/her knowing search, and does not adequately discover the life contents.

Thus, where, in any sense, there is emotional flooding from experiencing anxiety, tension, and insecurity, a child fails in breaking through the labile pathic-affective, and adequately proceed to a gnostic-cognitive level with life contents, by which adequate objectifying is not possible.

If with respect to cognitive educating, a child is not supported adequately, he/she is handicapped in his/her objectifying-as-experiencing-, willing-, lived experiencing-, knowing-, and behaving-becoming.

The contemporary Western world attributes value to an objective approach to life. Within this hides the danger that too early in his/her family situation, a child can be flooded with learning material without first talking about the multiplicity of landscapes which are brought to him/her through radio, television, movies, and writings. A child often has inadequate time to penetrate all these impressions to their essentials, and then an "objective inertia" readily unfolds in him/her, and he/she becomes less receptive for the many appeals which come to him/her in his/her educative situation.

A child who becomes inundated with lots of impressions which he/she cannot meaningfully assimilate and cannot meaningfully integrate these life contents into his/her own lifeworld. Then many life contents acquire a slippery character for him/her and as not grasped or not adequately grasped, they then become part of the meanings which already constitute his/her fragmentary field of experience. Then his/her uncertainty because of the knowledge which he/she inadequately knows is intensified further.

Inadequate objectifying-as-experiencing-, willing-, lived experiencing-, knowing-, and behaving –becoming, then is one of the most important labilizing moments of a child's emotional life.

Thus, when a child is accompanied inadequately in his/her educative situation, he/she is restrained in adequately objectifying. as well as the defective objectifying contributing to a further labilization of his/her emotional life.

In addition, this means that a child, because of a pedagogically inadequate objectifying constructs a skewed view of matters, and then an accountable view of life cannot develop.

3. SYNTHESIS

Lubbers⁶⁶ indicates that, if a person is not able to assimilate what life offers him/her—also as a task and an assignment—“and it cannot live long because it is of no concern, the unassimilated sinks in, and becomes a diffuse burden from which there is no escape; it is a burden taken up in such emotions as uneasiness, and whose content can hardly be determined.”*

Where something occurs which a child cannot assimilate, which he/she could not integrate into his/her life from then until now, “then this history is going to weigh on him as a burden; it can reach an impasse. Traumatization can be such an experience when this is not looked at, when there is a shrinking away from what announces itself as content in his life. A child will not be confronted with the

* [en eer toch niet langs kan leven, omdat hij er geen vrede mee heft, beklijft het onverwerkte en wordt het tot een diffuus last waar geen ontkomen is; een last die zich in gevoelens van onbehagen aandient, doch die zich inhoudelijk nauwelijk laat bepalen]

meaning of the unacceptable experience, he wards it off—and thinks he will see it again in everything unknown, and unfamiliar. It is continually lived in fear and tension to hold back what is anxiety provoking. The trauma deprives him of the freedom to be himself”,** says Kwakkel-Scheffer.⁶⁷

Pretorius⁶⁸ indicates that pedagogical neglect culminates in the non-actualization of the pathic, gnostic, and normative moments of lived experiencing, and the fact that a child's lived experiences are unfavorable for his/her becoming.

Because of his/her being in a problematic educative situation, a child's lived experiencing is not only harmed, but so is his/her experiencing-, willing-, lived experiencing-, knowing-, and behaving. Vliegthart⁶⁹ says, then a deviant psychic structure develops. Such a child signifies his/her situation of educating as always unsafe, and Kwakkel-Scheffer⁷⁰ says if the parents do not guarantee security for their child, he/she is delivered to danger, and he/she does not live in a being bonded with the adults who should direct him/her to his/her adulthood.

According to Ter Horst,⁷¹ this leads a child to lose a future perspective which, according to him⁷², “the whole custom of a child's sleeping over six nights for his birthday, a new coat for mother, as a present from the child”[???].* He⁷³ also says that “the temporal dimension is co-constitutive for human living. The present, the now, is only livable if there is a past from which and a future to which it can be lived . . . The point where one stands, colors the way in which one looks back, and how one sees the future.”**

** [kan deze gebeurtenis al seen last op hem gaan drukken; het kan in een impasse raken. Traumatiserend kan zo 'n ervaring worden aanneer het deze niet onder ogen durft te zien, wanneer het terugschrikt voor wat zich als inhoud in zijn leven aandient. Het kind wil niet geconfronteerd worden met de betekenis van die onacceptabele ervaring, weert hom af—en denkt toch stees hem in alles onbekend en onvertrouwd is terug te zien. Het left voortdurend in zorg en spanning om het angstwekkende van zich af te houden. Het rauma ontnemt hem de vrijheid om zichzelf te zijn]

* [heel gewoon de verjaardag van het kind over zes nachtjes slapen, de nieuwe mantel voor moeder als de kinderbijslag komt]

** [de tydsdimensie is medeconstituerend voor het menslijk leven. Het heden, het nu is alleen leefbaar al ser een verleden is van waaruit, en een toekomst waar naar toe, kan

A child's historicity, as the history of the actualization of his/her psychic life in the past, i.e., of his/her relationships in his/her educative situations in which he/she has had a part, continually are incorporated in his/her present actualization of his/her psychic life, with respect to present designs for the future. In this context, Ter Horst⁷⁴ notes that, for the time being, the educators are the past, present, and future for a child. If the educators ignore or shirk their educative task, the child has nothing which binds him/her to his/her past, no keepsakes, no stories, no photo albums, no persons, or things.⁷⁵

If a child's future is obscure, however little, there is no prospect, nothing attractive in the offing, no plan, no task to wait for in the future.⁷⁶

According to Vedder,⁷⁷ *emotional poverty* leads to an inability to form deeper bonds with the educators and peers, and also to inadequate conscience forming, and activities such as telling lies, and stealing. Ter Horst⁷⁸ says the child isolates him/herself because he/she is not able to enter reality adequately, and for him/her to design a world dialogically.

A child also experiences insecurity if he/she is given too little guidance, or demands posed in relation to his/her potentialities for independence and, as with a lack in experienced trust, the fruitful tension between what a child is and what he/she ought to be⁷⁹ is diminished. Then a variegated world does not arise because there is an inadequate dialogue between parents and child. Ter Horst⁸⁰ states that inadequate guiding means insecurity.

On the other hand, an educator must not merely set daily demands, and maintain an authoritarian educating, because these also mean insecurity for a child. If they do so, then they themselves are representatives of insecurity. This is especially the case if a child him/herself experiences the demands as meaningless, or perhaps is confronted with demands which he/she attempts to deny because of an experienced inability.⁸¹

worden geleefd . . . Het punt waar men staat kleurt de manier waarop men terugkijkt en de toekomst ziet]

If a child learns to know his/her parents and trusts them, only to have them pose demands and threaten him/her every day, without him/her understanding or accepting them, his/her parents soon become experienced by him/her as a constant threat. Then, to a decreasing degree, the child initiates a dialogue with his/her parents, as well as with the demands themselves, just to avert being “degraded”.

When the parents always demand absolute obedience, and forget that their child is just on his/her guard regarding their demands and expectations, they just intensify his/her readiness to close him/herself off, if he/she is confronted by them. In this way, a child tries to protect him/herself against the experienced lack of love and of insecurity, and then he/she readily responds with hate, aggression, distrust, and depressive behaviors.

Also, a child responds in suitable ways when he/she is burdened by intense, continuous straining future expectations of the parents, which he/she cannot meet, according to Ter Horst.⁸² Indeed, an improper hierarchy of preferred values develops, and the child does not discover how to appropriately distinguish among what is proper, and improper, good and bad, beautiful and ugly.

A child who is not free from the force of urges cannot adequately actualize his/her psychic life-in-educating, and he/she also does not continually act in ways which can be expected for his/her age, because the expected ordering of his/her own lifeworld is missing.

Moreover, when a child is only confronted with a few specific demands instead of a differentiated hierarchy of values, this easily leads to rigidity, narrow-minded ideas, and gradually the child signifies everything in their light.

If, at the same time, he/she is inundated with too much life contents, this leads to a chaotic world of meaning and, in this connection, Ter Horst⁸³ says “Large and small, near and far, now and presently, desirous and horrible, impulse and decision, beautiful and ugly, like and dislike, good and bad, past and present, mine and yours, lie behind each other, and come to each other, or merge into

an unpredictable, inextricable mixture.”[??]* Then there is a lack of adequate ordering, and there is not sufficient consistency in the forms of educative dialogue offered by the educators.

However, when a child is allowed to do anything he/she wants to, and is not kept in check by a so-called anti-authoritarian or permissive educating, he/she does not succeed in constituting his/her own adequately differentiated lifeworld.

Vedder⁸⁴ says, “There is *pedagogical neglect* when too few demands of self-limitation are placed on a child, and when no norms are taught.”**

Thus, a parent who allows his/her child to act “incorrectly”, and seldom corrects him/her deprives him/her of his/her own opportunity to discover what is good. A child who is only “left to his own devices” does not arrive at freedom because, according to Langeveld,⁸⁵ human freedom means limitations. De Klerk⁸⁶ clearly shows how the omission of limits implies an inadequate preparation for his/her more difficult educating in puberty.

Defying a child to broaden his/her horizon of meanings is inadequate, and a child can easily develop an attitude of sufficiency.⁸⁷

When a child does not progressively discover the norm-image of adulthood, he/she is hindered in thriving from a state of guided dependence intertwined with guided independence, to a state of self-guided independence.⁸⁸ Then he/she remains uncertain and insecure. and his/her experiencing, lived experiencing, willing, knowing, and behaving are unfavorable for his/her becoming; he/she cannot adequately actualize his/her psychic life because he/she does not live closely bonded with adults directed to

* [Groot en klein, digby en veraf, nu en straks, begerenswaardig en afschuwelijk, impuls en beslissing, mooi en lelik, lus en onlus, goed en slecht, verleden enheden, mijn en dijn liggen door elkaar heen en komen na elkaar of tegelijkertijd voor in een onvoorspelbare onontwarbare mengeling]

** [Van *pedagogische verwaarloosing* is sprake wanneer aan het kind te weinig eisen van zelfbeperking worden opgelegd, wanneer het geen normen wordt geleerd]

adulthood,⁸⁹ and, thus, he/she cannot adequately discover the sense of human dignity.

Hence, it is obvious that the inadequate realization of the event of educating makes it impossible for a child to adequately actualize his/her psychic life in such a problematic situation of educating; further, this under actualization in continually calls into being a problematic situation of educating.

REFERENCES

1. Valentine, C. W.: *The Psychology of Early Childhood*, Methuen, London, 1946.
2. Langeveld, M. J.: *Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek*, op cit., p. 21.
3. Lubber, R.: op cit., p. 7.
4. Pretorius, J. W. M.: *Kinderlike Beleving*, op cit., p. 51.
5. See (i) Van Krevelen, D. A.: *Nederlandsch Leerboek der Speciele Kinderpsychiatrie*, Leiden, 1952, p. 240. (ii) Van Gelder, L.: *Ontsporing en Correctie*, J. B. Wolters, Groningen, 1964, pp. 45, 54 and 56. (iii) Schonell, F. J.: *Backwardness in the Basic Subjects*, op cit., pp. 201-202. (iv) Berk, T. J. C., Van Weelden, J. and Wilmink, A. J.: *Kinderen met Leer- en Opvoedingsmoeilijkheden aan twee Amsterdamse L.O.M. scholen*, Bijleveld, Utrecht, 1963, pp. 175-176. (v) Sonnekus, M. C. H.: *'n Besinning oor die Pedagogiese ondersoek en behandeling van kinders met leermoeilikhede: 'n bydrae tot die psigologies-pedagogiese grondslae van die Ortopedagogiek*, in Nel, B. F. (Ed.): *Jubileum-Lesings 1937-1962*, Faculty of Education, University of Pretoria, H.A.U.M., Pretoria, 1963, pp. 150-151. (vi) Wilmink, A. J. and Van Houte, I. C.: *Opvallende Kinderen*, Bijleveld, Utrecht, 1958, p. 29.
6. See Perquin, N., op cit., p. 126.
7. Nel, B. F.: *Pedagogiese Verwaarlosing, Opvoedkunde Studies* No. 46, University of Pretoria, 1965, p. 83.
8. Muller-Eckhard, H.: *Kinderen vragen Begrip*, op cit., p. 48.
9. Ibid.
10. Also see Perquin, N., op cit., pp. 35, 178-183.
11. Vedder, R.: *Inleiding tot de Psychiatrie*, Wolters, Groningen, 1965.

12. Beets, N.: *De Grote Jongen*, op cit., p. 21.
13. See Langeveld, M. J.: *Ontwikkelingspsychologie*, op cit., pp. 41-42.
14. Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., op cit., p. 71.
15. Cited by Rienstra, Y., op cit., pp. 115-116.
16. See Lubbers, R., op cit., p. 55.
17. See Ter Horst, W.: *Proeve van een Orthopedagogisch Theorieconcept*, op cit., p. 29
18. Ibid, p. 38.
19. Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op cit., p. 21.
20. Lubbers, R., op cit., p.6.
21. Perquin, N., op cit., pp. 31 and 81.
22. See Pretorius, J. W. M.: *Kinderlike Beleving*, op cit., p. 51.
23. Lersch, P., op cit., pp. 331-357.
24. Langeveld, M. J.: *Ontwikkelingspsychologie*, op cit., pp. 41-42.
25. Ter Horst, W.: *Proeve van een Orthopedagogisch Theorieconcept*, op cit., p. 79.
26. See Lubbers, R., op cit., pp. 6 and 58.
27. Nieuwenhuis, H., in Bordewijk, W., Daqaamen, H. E., Fokkema, D. and Nieuwenhuis, H.: *Kinderpsychologie en Opvoedkunde Psychologie*, Wolters, Groningen, 1964, p. 2.
28. Langeveld, M. J.: *Ontwikkelingspsychologie*, op cit., p. 83.
29. See Carp, E. A. D. E.: *Angst en vrees*, Aula, Utrecht, 1966, pp. 8-9.
30. See Faure, J. S. M., op cit., p. 53.
31. Nieuwenhuis, H., op cit., p. 2.
32. See Kwakkel-Scheffer, J. J. C., op cit., p. 67.
33. Noordam, N. F.: *Het mensbeeld in de Opvoeding*, 2, in: Van Gelder, L. (Ed.): *Informatie over opvoeding en onderwijs*, No. 8, Wolters-Noordhoff, Groningen, 1970, p. 18.
34. Landman, W. A.: *Leesboek vir die Christenopvoeder*, op cit., p. 14.
35. Lubbers, R., op cit., p. 58.
36. Muller-Eckhard, H., op cit., p. 86.
37. See Pretorius, J. W. M.: *Kinderlike Beleving*, op cit., p. 90.
38. Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op cit., p.22.
39. Lubbers, R., op cit., p. 10.
40. Ter Horst, W., op cit., ref. 25, p. 65.
41. Ibid, p. 75.
42. Van der Stoep, F.: *Didaktiese Grondvorme*, op cit., p. 26.

43. See Sonnekus, M. C. H.: *Onderwyser Les en Kind*, op cit., pp. 8-9.
44. Ter Horst, W., op cit., ref 25, p. 80.
45. Ibid.
46. Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psigopedagogiek: 'n Inleidende Orientering*, op cit., p. 156.
47. Pretorius, J. W. M., op cit., ref. 37, p. 51.
48. Ibid, pp. 50-51.
49. Sonnekus, M. C. H.: *A Pedagogical Study of the handicapped child with special reference to his sensory, motor, perceptual and conceptual orientation*, op cit.
50. Lubbers, R., op cit., p. 6.
51. Ter Horst, W., op cit., ref. 25, p. 92.
52. Ibid, p. 86.
53. Ibid.
54. Muller-Eckhard, H. op cit., p. 52.
55. Ibid.
56. Lubber, R., op cit., p. 10.
57. Ter Horst, W.: *Proeve van een Orthopedagogisch Theorieconcept*, op cit., p. 38.
58. See Noordam, N. F.: *Het Mensbeeld in de Opvoeding* 1, in: Van Gelder, R. (Ed.): *Informatie over opvoeding en onderwijs*, No. 7, Wolters-Noordhoff, Groningen, 1971, p0p. 33-35.
59. Sonnekus, M. C. H., op cit., Ref. 49.
60. Ter Horst, W., op cit., Ref. 57, p. 91.
61. Ibid, p. 98.
62. Ibid.
63. Ibid, p. 99.
64. Gouws, S. J. L.: *Pedagogiese Diagnostiseering van Kinders met Leemoeilikhede*, op cit., p. 26.
65. See Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psigopedagogiek: 'n Inleidende Orientering*, op cit., Chapter 4.
66. Lubbers, R., op cit., p. 55.
67. Kwakkel-Scheffer, J. J. C., op cit., p. 82.
68. Pretorius, J. W. M.: *Kinderlike Beleving*, op cit., p. 50.
69. Vliegthart, W. E.: *Algemene Orthopedagogiek*, op cit., p. 33.
70. Kwakkel-Scheffer, J. J. C., op cit., p. 71
71. Ter Horst, W.: *Een orthopedagogiek gezichtspunt*, in: Van Berckelaer-Onnes, et al.: *Verduisterd pespectief*, op cit., p. 3.
72. Ter Horst, W.: *Proeve van een Orthopedagogisch Theorieconcept*, op cit., p. 49.

- 73. Ibid, p. 48.
- 74. Ibid, p. 97.
- 75. Ibid.
- 76. Ibid.
- 77. Vedder, R.: *Kinderen met leer- en gedragsmoeilijkheden*, 4th ed., J. B. Wolters, Groningen, 1964, pp. 173-174.
- 78. Ter Horst, W.: *Proeve van een Orthopedagogisch Theorie-concept*, op cit., pp. 78-79.
- 79. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op cit., p. 31.
- 80. Ter Horst, W., op cit., Ref. 78, p. 85.
- 81. See Lubbers, R., op cit., p. 7.
- 82. Ter Horst, W., op cit., Ref 78, p. 97.
- 83. Ibid, p. 82.
- 84. Vedder, R.: *Inleiding tot de Psychiatrie*, op cit., p. 153.
- 85. See Langeveld, M. J.: *Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek*, op cit., p. 49.
- 86. De Klerk, L.: *De Grondsituatie der Puberteitsopvoeding*, J. B. Wolters, Groningen, 2nd ed., 1956, p. 46.
- 87. Ter Horst, W., op cit, Ref. 78, p. 83.
- 88. Oberholzer, C. K.: *Die Pedagogiese*, op cit.
- 89. Nel, B. F.: *Pedagogiese verwaarlosing*, op cit, p. 34.