

CHAPTER VI

EVALUATING THE PROBLEMATIC EDUCATIVE EVENT AND THE CHILD'S UNDER ACTUALIZATION OF HIS/HER PSYCHIC LIFE WITHIN IT

1. INTRODUCTION

The possibility of a child under actualizing his/her becoming an adult in a problematic educative situation is considered in the previous chapter. When, because of certain symptoms, a child “gives notice” that he/she is not adequately becoming an adult, in scientifically accountable ways, it must be determined what the essences are of such an inadequate becoming, as well as what their fundamental origins are.

An image must be acquired of **how** he/she, as a **person**, actualizes his/her psychic life in his/her pedagogical situation. Actualizing his/her becoming an adult must be evaluated in terms of its adequacy or inadequacy. Thus, the investigator must have criteria for evaluating the child's actual actualization of his/her psychic life, as well as of the educative activities he/she receives.¹ These criteria are **pedagogical criteria**.

The word *criterion* comes originally from the Greek word *krinein*, which means *separating* or *judging*²; at present, it refers more to a yardstick, or basis for judging a matter. Garbers³ says that each criterion question is a “value judgment”, and implies a testing against criteria which hold as a minimum, or even a maximum condition for what we judge.

According to Landman,⁴ a pedagogical criterion is a pedagogical category whose evaluative significance is involved in a pedagogical judgment. He says the evaluative significance is even clearer when the pedagogical categories are formulated in the form of questions. Pedagogical categories let the pedagogical structures and their coherences appear as they essentially are; i.e., they let the fundamental structures appear to the pedagogue for their actualization in the educative situation.⁵

Through the pedagogical criteria, pedagogical activities are placed in an evaluative light, and the accountability of these activities can be evaluated⁶, also regarding actual educative situations.⁷

When an orthopedagogue wants to gauge and evaluate the essences of the problematic educative situatedness of a child, he/she directs his/her evaluative perspective to its categorical structures.⁸

Because the way and quality of actualizing the stated categorical structures must be evaluated in terms of criteria, an orthopedagogue actualizes and implements these structures with their coherences when he/she answers the appeal of a child restrained in becoming in his/her problematic educative situation, with the aim of giving him/her re-educative support.⁹

Qualifying a pedagogical situation as *problematic* and/or a child as *restrained in becoming adult* can only occur from a *pedagogical* approach following *pedagogical criteria*. To be able to gauge if a child is restrained in or is inadequately becoming in his/her pedagogical situation, it first must be determined what the level of his/her current psychic life actualization is as such. Then, it must be determined what this level of actualization is, specifically, in terms of the pedagogically achieved. After that, it must be determined what the level of becoming is which the child already *must* have achieved in accordance with his/her potentialities of becoming. Briefly, his *pedagogically attained* and *attainable* levels must be determined.

If the pedagogically attained is not congruent with the pedagogically attainable, this is an indication that a child under actualizes his/her becoming adult, and he/she must be qualified as restrained in becoming.

Where there is mention of restrained becoming, the immediate task is to determine what the *nature* of the *gap* is between what a child *is* and what he/she *ought to be*, and also what the nature is of the *problematic educative event* which has given rise to the *gap*.

2. EVALUATING THE PEDAGOGICALLY ACHIEVED LEVEL

It has appeared that a child is always on a particular level of becoming, but that he/she also *ought* to be on a specific level. The

event which leads from *is* to *ought* implies an *elevation* in level of dialogue, choice, values, and *meaning*.

To gauge a child's achieved pedagogical level, his/her self-actualized becoming must be gauged in terms of psychopedagogical, as well as fundamental pedagogical criteria. Thus, an investigator explores the child's lifeworld. With various exploratory media, which he/she inserts between him/herself and the child, and by which the child is enabled to establish relationships with others, the investigator acquires an image of *how* the child actualizes his/her person-being-in-educating. Such an investigation is qualified as *pedagogical* diagnostics. Hence, the *educative effect* on a child is explored.

The educative effect is manifested in a child's behaviors, by which, in no sense is meant only external, perceivable behaving, since a child always behaves as a totality-in-function in communication with reality. As such, this includes a determination of the level of actualization of all his/her modes of actualizing his/her psychic life, as an evaluating of his/her total dialoguing with reality.

Thus, such evaluating occurs in terms of *psychopedagogical* criteria which are psychopedagogical categories in the form of questions. These criteria cannot merely be qualified as criteria on a *psychic level*, or as *psychological* criteria as is done by Nel¹⁰ and Faure,¹¹ respectively, when they refer to the following: The biological moment; the principle of helplessness; the principle of safety or security; the principle of exploration; the state of the affective, together with temperament; the state of the cognitive; interests; learning difficulties at school; disturbed social relationships; attentive concentrating; perceiving; and intentionality.

This has to do with evaluating a child's self-becoming, and psychopedagogics gives pronouncements about this, and the various psychopedagogical categories, as considered in the previous chapter, are applied as criteria.

All the moments of a child's psychic life-in-educating must be investigated. In terms of the criteria, it is determined what his/her level of becoming is and, indeed, in terms of *how* he/she now is a *person*.

For example, the following must be investigated:
How does he/she carry on a dialogue?

How does his/her *experiencing* appear there?
How does his/her *live experiencing* appear there?
How does his/her *actualizing knowing* appear there?
How does his/her *behaving* appear there?

The question is on what levels and ways does he/she explore, emancipate, distance, differentiate, and objectify?

In the following, there is a brief consideration of each evaluative moment regarding a child's current actualization of becoming.

2.1 Evaluating exploring as a psychic life actualization of becoming

Here it is asked: *How* does a child explore the educative contents? With what attunement does he/she direct him/herself to his/her world? To what degree does he/she unlock new landscapes for his/her various cognitive ways of being? How is it with his/her habitual sensing? How does he/she attend? How does he/she perceive? How does he/she think? How does he/she imagine? How does he/she fantasize? How does he/she remember? How does he/she observe? Is he/she *ready* to become involved and remain concerned with the educative contents? What educative content does he/she avoid? How does he/she play? Does he/she gladly read? What does he/she read? What does he/she talk about with his/her parents, and with his/her friends? What activities does he/she prefer? Does he/she initiate self-activity? Must he/she always be told to begin something?

2.2 Evaluating emancipating as a psychic life actualization of becoming

It also must be determined how a child now embodies his/her being a *person*. In this connection, question such as the following must be answered:

How does this child emancipate? Does he/she want to be someone? How will he/she be someone? How does he/she explain him/herself during his/her dialogue with fellow persons at home, in school and among his/her friends? How does his/her current image appear in terms of personal dignity, especially in the experienced and lived experienced look of others? Is there mention of emotional lability

because of his/her experiencing and lived experiencing “animosity” in the other’s look?

The question of a child’s personal intention regarding life appeal is closely related to his/her future perspective and as such, it is an indication of his/her intention to want to become adult. An inadequately anticipated image of adulthood contains a decrease in the quality of his/her intention to become, and this leads to muddying his/her future perspective, which holds for all levels of the actualization of his/her becoming. Therefore, his/her future perspective must continually be investigated. A child’s level of intentionality in becoming must be continually gauged.

The adequate emancipation of a child is indicated by the fact that he/she increasingly wants to experience the world him/herself.¹² It is questioned how he/she *him/herself* is experientially involved in his/her world because experiencing predisposes not only his/her emancipation, but also has an effect on its nature and duration, according to Ferreira.¹³ The someone the child is, and now will be, continually reflects the level on which he/she actualizes his/her becoming. Therefore, attention is given to whether there is a loosening of his/her being bound to the authority-carrying educator in favor of the norm itself. Are there signs that he/she is becoming free, and is responsibly free?

It must be determined if a child’s emancipating also refers to pathic-affective stability, as his/her readiness, as a *person*, to want to disclose reality in its coherent sense and meaning. How is it with his/her striving for independence, and how, as a person, does he/she manifest independence? Will he/she do things *alone*? How does he/she participate in a conversation? Is he/she self-assured? Does he/she take part in discussions? Does he/she take the lead or prefer to follow where others lead? Is he/she snobbish? Does he/she try to draw attention? How does he/she compare with younger ones? Is he/she neat? Does he/she slavishly follow the fashions?

2.3 Evaluating distancing as a psychic life actualization of becoming

It is important to know the extent to which a child already can distance him/herself from matters, or if perhaps he/she is too caught up in them.

With respect to evaluating distancing, it must be asked: How does he/she distance him/herself from him/herself? Is he/she emotionally flooded, and can he/she not distance him/herself from him/herself? How does he/she distance him/herself from others, such as his/her parents, teachers, peers? How does he/she distance him/herself from the matter or content? The quality of the child's actualization of his/her cognitive ways of actualizing his/her psychic life, such as perceiving, thinking, remembering, etc., are indications of the quality of his/her distancing.

With a younger child there also is an accounting of his/her obstinate actions, questions, thinking, reasoning, and his/her reflecting about experience. It is asked: How does the older child ask about and evaluate matters, relationships, behavioral codes, values, norms, etc.? How does he/she approach his/her assignments? How does he/she approach his/her homework? How does he/she approach his/her peers, his/her teachers, and other persons? How does he/she approach success?

2.4 Evaluating differentiating as a psychic life actualization of becoming

Because this does not have to do with the mere *ripening (maturing) of functions*, but with an *intentional acting*, the first question is: *How does he/she direct him/herself to a matter? How does he/she sense? How does he/she attend? How does he/she perceive?* On what level does he/she think, remember, etc.? By investigating the level of actualizing all his/her intentionalities, an indication is found of the quality of the child's differentiating: Does he/she proceed on a concrete or abstract level with the educative contents? How attentive is he/she? Does he/she readily see slight differences, or is it only the conspicuous which addresses him/her? How flexible is his/her thinking? How differentiated is his/her cognitive life? How does he/she differentiate regarding distinguishable matters? How does he/she communicate with reality? Does he/she want to understand? Does he/she want to think? Does he/she know his/her limits? Does he/she recognize his/her potentialities? Does he/she work with abandon? Is he/she quick? Is he/she nonchalant? Is he/she careless with his/her work? Does he/she try to complete his/her tasks thoroughly? Does he/she always do his/her best?

2.5 Evaluating objectifying as a psychic life actualization of becoming

It also is important to know how objective a child already is regarding matters, or if he/she is not too subjectively involved.

An indication of the quality of his/her objectifying, especially is acquired by investigating his/her knowledge of landscapes of reality. His/her taking a standpoint regarding life contents is investigate, and there is a verification of how this stands regarding his/her own philosophy of life. What standpoint does he/she hold regarding specific matters? Does he/she understand assignments, values, demands of propriety? Does he/she want to understand? Does he/she allow him/herself to be led only by his/her feelings? Does he/she respect the opinions of others? Does he/she try to investigate a matter? Does he/she act impulsively? Is he/she ready to think a matter through? How is it with his/her judgments in terms of sound understanding?

2.6 Evaluating how exploring, emancipating, distancing, differentiating, and objectifying meaningfully related as various ways of becoming

Because the psychic life is actualized in his/her educative situatedness by exploring, emancipating, distancing, differentiating, and objectifying, the various modes of actualizing the psychic life, also must be investigated.

2.6.1 Evaluating experiencing, willing, lived experiencing, knowing, and behaving in their coherence, as ways of actualizing becoming

Since the sense and meaning which the child continually has given to the educative contents, and by means of experiencing, to his/her lifeworld, in terms of added possessed experience, the quality of his/her *experiencing* must be gauged.

There must be attention given to the child's *habitually formed behaving*, since this gives an indication of his/her experiencing.¹⁴ The nature and quality of habits, also testify to the "knowing" and "experiencing" which he/she has acquired. "Weak" habits indicate problems with his/her experiencing.

The “repeated answer” of a child in regularly recurring situations, if he/she answers in terms of *his/her* meaning of the matter, gives an indication of the quality of his/her experiencing. Thus, attention is paid to the *skillfulness* or *awkwardness* which the child’s habitually formed behaving has acquired.

Because experiencing implies that one’s *own* lifeworld is continually expanded, attention also is paid to the “furnishings” of the child’s own lifeworld, and if and where there are possible deficiencies. It is determined what image a child has of a matter, or what understanding he/she shows in this connection. The *quality* of the knowledge at his/her disposal is gauged, and attention is given to the judgments he/she makes regarding matters. Thus, there also is an enquiry into the child’s insightful knowing, and if his/her “understanding” perhaps rests mostly on an intuitive knowing which can lead to misconceptions. Hence, it must be determined how the *child* understands the matter. He/she must always be perceived carefully because his/her anticipating tendency—as the pre-understanding of what becomes available itself in perceiving, in the sense that certain aspects of the perceived, which are not given in the direct observing, are presumed—must be evaluated. There is attention to moments of imagining, fantasizing, thinking, and even remembering. Attention is given to the child’s activity and his/her passivity. How does he/she act, view, design, choose, and what is their quality?

In addition, it is determined how he/she *wills*. “Impulsive”, expressive behaviors, e.g., are an indication of a weak-will since the immediate lived experiences then are brought to expression because the moment of willing is not present prominently enough.

An indication of the quality of actualizing willing is evident from the degree of control of expressive behavior. There is an investigation of how a child behaves and how he/she knows the factual. Therefore, the three modes by which behaving¹⁶ appears must be investigated, i.e., *voluntary* behaving—where the child’s direction to an aim is gauged since this is the result of a willful decision; *expressive* behaving—where there especially is notice of the child’s bodily control, and his/her anticipation of possibilities of movement before he/she proceeds to the deed; and *habitually formed* behaving.

In addition, there must be an enquiry about the child's habitual taking a position toward his/her world. Thus, the "sort" of emotional lived experiencing is determined, e.g., the quality of willing. A poor emotional life results in a child who cannot want to arrive at taking an adequate gnostic-cognitive position.¹⁷

The coherence among *willing, emotional, gnostic-cognitive, and normative lived experiencing* must be investigated because these will have a direction-giving, and initiating function.¹⁸

The quality of willing can be determined by looking at *how* a child begins with a given task; in other words, How does his/her willing *initiate* his/her knowing lived experiencing? Also looked at is the nature of his/her intellectual lived experiencing, as well as how responsibly or irresponsibly his/her abilities are actualized.

An indication that the child takes a position on a predominantly sensory-gnostic level is evidence that he/she communicates mainly sensorially, and especially relies on an intuitive or felt knowing. When there are signs of *distancing*, this also is an indication of gnostic lived experiencing, and when there is mention of taking a clearly distanced position toward a slice of reality, and the matter is known as *what* it is, this is an indication of taking a position on a cognitive level. Therefore, it must be asked if the child *knows* or *understands*—if he/she knows that he/she doesn't know, and understands that he/she doesn't understand? Moreover, this can be deduced from the degree of systematic-ness, abstractness, and order which accompany his/her explanations. There is enquiry into the ordering, logic, and planning in his/her actions, and if his/her "understanding" does or does not testify to systematic-ness and insight. In this connection, there also is an investigation into whether there is adequate attentive concentration, if the child perceives adequately, etc. Briefly: it not only is determined how he/she actualizes his/her gnostic-cognitive potentialities, but also his/her "ableness", as the totality of his/her personal potentialities.

With respect to emotional lived experiencing, there must be an enquiry into how far a child has advanced from an insecure, helpless state at birth, to a feeling of security and affective safety.

Thus, there is an investigation of the structure of emotional lived experiencing, and especially if there is increasing stability at the expense of lability. It is asked if there are signs of increasing

appropriation of the esthetic, artistic valuing, hope, fairness, honesty, and if there are signs of an adequate distancing from the pathic to the affective. It is asked how the child actualizes his/her pathic-affective potentialities of lived experiencing.¹⁹ In addition, there is an investigation of possible unfavorable bodily lived experiences; if experiences and lived experiences of affective relations are stable; what his/her interests are, how he/she establishes social relationships, if he/she is ready to actualize *optimally* his/her personal potentialities.

With respect to gauging the state of emotional lived experiencing, it is important to investigate the level of behaving; especially, what holds regarding the mobility of voluntary and expressive behavior,²⁰ to indicate the affectivity, which pre-forms and initiates the behavior. Thus, e.g., a smile indicates accessibility, affection, sympathetic, and peaceful satisfaction.

Moreover, the state of the child's current normative-meaning giving lived experiences must be investigated. Because the results of all lived experiencing are lived experiencing meaning, the meaning the unique child attributes to his/her momentary situatedness must be investigated. There must be an investigation of the meaning the child him/herself gives to the educative contents. and especially in terms of their meaningfulness, or meaninglessness for him/her. Questions which can be asked in this respect are the following: Does he/she lived experience striving to become adult as meaningful? Does he/she lived experience a striving for moral independence, as meaningful? Does he/she flourish towards moral independence? How does he/she lived experience particular norms and values? How is it with his/her knowing lived experiencing?²¹

Because spontaneous "expressive behavior" is the perceivable manifestation of lived experiencing, the level (e.g., senso-pathic, pathic, affective) as well as the structure (stable or labile) of lived experiencing manifest itself in the child's behaving: Thus, expressive behavior, e.g., gives an indication of the child's interpersonal relationships, when his/her face expresses his/her lived experiencing of what he/she perceives.²² However, because the control-nature of the expressive behavior can elevate the level of behaving, as such, so that the nature of the lived experiences becomes difficult to interpret, there also must be an investigation of whether the expressive behaviors perhaps are not effectively used and, thus, there is a proceeding to voluntary behaving, in which

case the “smile” is not expressive of the lived experiencing, but is used effectively to obtain approval.

However, this has to do with continually determining the *pedagogically* attained and, in this connection, use is made of *fundamental pedagogical criteria*. It has appeared that a child gradually must show the norm-image of adulthood; in other words, gradually, he/she must realize the educative *aim*. Thus, when one wants to determine the pedagogically attained, it also must be verified to what degree the educative aim is already realized.

2.7 Evaluating the realization of the educative aim

A clear image also must be obtained of how a child, as a psychic life actualizing *person*, already *lives* the norm-image of adulthood. Therefore, questions such as the following must be answered:

What meanings does a child give to life contents?
What values has he/she already made his/her own?
What decisions does he/she already make independently?
What norms does he/she respect?
How does he/she act? How does he/she appear?

For the aim of this evaluation, we proceed from the seven value-possibilities which Landman²³ also calls essences of adulthood.

2.7.1 Evaluating the child’s interpreting his/her own existence as meaningful or meaningless²⁴

It is important that it be determined with confidence how a child interprets his/her own existence, and if it is sufficiently meaningful to him/her.

It is asked: *How* does the child, as a person, carry on a dialogue with life? How is the meaningfulness of his/her own existence now interpreted by him/her? Since this mainly is a *being aware*, a *knowing*, a *questioning*, an *answer* regarding his/her own existence is implied; thus, there also is a specific investigation of the child’s taking a gnostic-cognitive position towards his/her own existence. Are there signs of a break-through of the awareness that he/she is accountable? Is he/she aware that he/she is called on to realize values? Does he/she ask about the sense of life? To what degree is he/she aware that he/she must carry on a responsible life? Is there

an increase in the manifestation of his/her own responsibility? To what extent are his/her actions guided by responsible choices? To what extent does he/she account for his/her actions, conduct and choices? What degree of insight is there into his/her life-task and – calling? How does he/she answer the appeal to meaningfully actualize his/her potentialities? What is his/her attitude towards work? To what extent does he/she perform tasks and assignments voluntarily? How does he/she interpret possible disabilities, illnesses, poor educating, rudeness, etc.? Does he/she realize his/her potentialities with an eye to a *meaningful* existence—with an eye to fulfilling his/her tasks to also reach his/her destination (adulthood)? Is he/she aware that he/she also has responsibilities? Does the child’s life show that his/her direction to the future is *thriving*?

2.7.2 Evaluating the child’s self-judgment and self-understanding²⁵

Nel²⁶ says the sense of each personal individuality is exclusively in the significance of individuality for the greater whole, and that the meaning of an individual him/herself transcends in the direction of the community. He²⁷ is of the opinion that “More than the emotional givenness, it seems that belonging-to-a-community is a task for a person. The sense of the individual only becomes fulfilled in the community. By fulfilling the task which the community into which he is born has given him, a person becomes more valuable, and he acquires a sense of responsibility”. Therefore, there also continually must be an investigation of the child’s feeling of being included in the community. Does he/she feel that he/she is excluded?^{28?}

To be able to judge and understand him/herself requires taking an active, critical position and, therefore, the state of his/her cognitive lived experiencing must be accurately investigated because a child continually must judge him/herself in terms of norms and, thus, he/she also must acquire an adequate gnostic-cognitive grasp of the norms and values.

Questions which must be answered are:

How does the child judge and understand him/herself?

Are there signs of a personal taking a position towards him/herself?

Are there signs of an active, critical judging of him/herself?

Can he/she express moral judgments about him/herself? Can

he/she make moral judgments about his/her choices? Does he/she

act in accordance with a plan of life? Does he/she have insight into his/her own problems? Does he/she accept possible deficiencies?

Because conscience refers to self-judging,²⁹ the functioning of conscience also must be put in the spotlight. Does his/her self-understanding testify to his/her responsibility? Is he/she aware that he/she also has responsibilities? Does he/she accept assignments? Must he/she have a say in everything? Is there a pride in what he/she has accomplished him/herself? Is he/she perhaps too infantile?

2.7.3 Evaluating the child's interpreting human dignity³⁰

In the first place, clarity must be acquired regarding the child's view of his/her own human dignity. This especially has to do with a *valuing* of him/herself, and in this *emotional meanings* have a prominent place. Thus, the state of pathic-affective lived experiencing must be investigated thoroughly. This involves an evaluation of the child's self-evaluation in terms of contents. To be able to gauge how he/she understands and knows these contents, the state of his/her gnostic-cognitive lived experiencing must be examined.

Here, the overarching question is: How does the child treat his/her own human dignity? How does he/she treat the dignity of persons in general? How does he/she treat the dignity of specific fellow persons—his/her parents, teachers, peers?

To what extent does he/she have respect for him/herself? Does he/she act as can be expected of a person at his/her level of becoming? What person's dignity does he/she perhaps undervalue? Are there signs of the voluntary obedience to what dignified behavior requires? Does he/she respect the opinions of others? Does he/she respect the property of others? Is there regard for another's human dignity because they realize values? Does he/she feel free to act him/herself? Does he/she show the necessary respect for his/her elders? Does he/she make fun of another's defects or distress?

2.7.4 Evaluating the child's morally independent choosing and acting³¹

It also must be determined to what extent a child can make independent, moral decisions and act accordingly. Here the state of the gnostic-cognitive strongly arises, since he/she must know *what* he/she decides. To act according to a decision, demands *remaining true* to a decision, and it also is necessary that the state of the pathic-affective be investigated.

Here then the overarching question is the degree to which a child makes independent, moral decisions and acts accordingly. Does he/she remain true to his/her decisions? What values does he/she view as of most worth for him/herself personally? Can he/she choose independently? Does he/she accept responsibility for his/her choices and actions? Does he/she make the effort to carry out his/her decisions? Do his/her choices indicate moral responsibility? Does he/she actualize his/her potentialities in accordance with the demands life places on him/her? Is there mention of consistency in his/her activities? Does he/she understand the proper? Does he/she identify him/herself with the proper? Are his/her actions evidence that they are the result of his/her increasing knowledge of good and bad? Does he/she stay with his/her decisions? Does he/she change his/her decisions when he/she discovers they are “wrong”? Does he/she listen to arguments (pleas)?

2.7.5 Evaluating the child’s exercise of responsibility³²

Following Nel,³³ responsibility is the basic criterion since being-responsible is nothing more than recognizing values and norms and living according to them. Because here the demand placed on a child is that he/she will take a responsible stand with respect to *something*, the state of taking a gnostic-cognitive position must be examined. Does the child understand *why* this is so? To take a responsible stand, however, also includes an *attunement* and, therefore, the state of the pathic-affective also must be examined.

Here the overarching questions are: To what degree does the child take responsibility for him/herself? Is he/she aware of his/her responsibility?

Does he/she realize his/her responsibility with respect to related matters? How responsible is his/her execution of tasks? What is his/her stance towards life obligations? What is his/her stance towards authority? To what degree does he/she understand the

demands of propriety? Is he/she conscientious in carrying out assignments? because Frankl³⁴ implies that responsibility always is responsibility with respect to an obligation. Does he/she exert him/herself to act responsibly? Does he/she show a sustained readiness to do what is proper? How is his/her initiative to behave responsibly? Does he/she freely show responsible behavior? Does he/she understand why the “improper” is improper? Is he/she ready to freely exert him/herself? Does he/she recognize his/her obligations? Does he/she accept authority? Is he/she obedient? Is he/she ready to accept punishment? Does he/she persist with a task?

2.7.6 Evaluating the child’s identification with norms³⁶

Identification with others and with the norm emanates from the child him/herself. Thus, the willing readiness for such identification is of importance. Therefore, the child’s pathic-affective meanings must be examined. However, this also involves an *understanding* of the norm by the child, and this requires a gauging of his/her gnostic-cognitive meanings.

Here the overarching question is: To what extent does the child identify him/herself with the norms? Is there mention of an independent, adequate awareness of propriety? Is his/her identification with authority increasingly directed away from the adult and to the norm itself? Does he/she do what is proper for the sake of the proper itself? Must he/she still be prompted to do what is proper? Are there signs of mere docility? To what degree does he/she recognize the demands of propriety? Does he/she subject him/herself to the person with authority? Does he/she subject him/herself to the norm? Who does he/she identify him/herself with? Is he/she obedient? With whom is he/she possibly disobedient? What norms does he/she ignore? Can he/she differentiate among moral values? How is his/her awareness of good and bad? Does he/she avoid the objectionable? How is his/her future perspective in terms of a striving for propriety? With whom does he/she usually agree? With whom does he/she usually differ? Is he/she usually obedient or disobedient? Does he/she enjoy being disobedient? Does he/she feel bad when he/she has disappointed his/her parents, teachers, and others?

2.7.7 Evaluating the child’s philosophy of life³⁶

In the first place, this has to do with decisions of what is particular and subjective. A gauging of the child's taking a pathic-affective position, thus, is necessary. However, because this also has to do with a *belief* in a matter, the gnostic-cognitive also must be examined.

The overarching question here is whether a child acts in accordance with his/her own particular principles of life. Does he/she show that he/she has particular principles? What values has he/she already added to his/her own hierarchy of values? Is there an unconditional commitment to these life-obligatory values? To what extent does he/she consistently show faithful obedience to his/her philosophy of life and its demands of propriety? Does he/she remain true to his/her principles? How do these principles appear to him/her? How does he/she identify him/herself with the demands of propriety? How is it with his/her faith? Can he/she be relied upon?

2.7.8 Synthesis

To determine a child's pedagogically achieved level, there must be an accounting of his/her *actual actualization of his/her psychic life* in his/her current pedagogical situatedness, and the *meanings* he/she attributes to life as such. Thus, there is not only an investigation of *how* the child's psychic life actualization (more specifically his/her sensing) *appears* there but, indeed, an investigation of how his/her psychic life is actualized—i.e., also the actualization of his/her becoming—*as educatively situated*.

Thus, this has to do with an evaluation of becoming in terms of a *normative* evaluation by means of *pedagogical criteria* to evaluate the *degree of adulthood* already reached.

However, to be able to make judgments regarding the *adequacy* of a child's current level of having *become adult*, this must be compared with the level he/she *ought* to have reached. Thus, it also must be determined how this *can* be and how it *ought* to be.

On the other hand, it must be determined what *now can* be expected of *this* child in terms of his/her potentialities for actualizing his/her psychic life in accordance with the *expected* level of actualization of a child who has adequate personal potentialities. This *expected* level is determined by studying the longitudinal becoming of

children in general. Determining how a specific child's becoming *can be*, occurs in terms of criteria of the "psychology of becoming" which are particularized by disclosing the essences of childlike psychic life actualization on different levels of becoming corresponding to the child's age.

For example, such studies have indicated what can be expected from a baby, a suckling, a toddler, a school beginner, a junior primary school child, a pupil or senior primary school child, a puber, and a pre-adult who possess adequate potentialities for becoming, and also adequately actualizes them.

Thus, it also must be determined if a child possesses adequate potentialities for becoming and, along with this, whether he/she actualizes them in a pedagogically adequate way.

3. EVALUATING THE CHILD'S PEDAGOGICALLY ATTAINABLE LEVEL

It is evident that an indication must be found of the child's potentialities for becoming adult. It must be determined what his/her potentialities are for exploring, emancipating, distancing, differentiating, and objectifying. His/her potentialities for sensing also must be investigated in terms of emotional lability or stability; how is his/her potential for attending, perceiving, imagining and fantasizing, thinking, actualizing intelligence, remembering, and observing, especially in terms of how ordered, systematic, and abstract they are. The functioning of all his/her sense organs must be gauged because it is via them that he/she, as *corporality*, enters a dialogue with the world, and communicates with it.

It is, e.g., determined whether he/she has adequate intellectual potentialities at his/her disposal. These potentialities are gauged by implementing various media for exploring them, a matter which cannot be treated here in detail.*

An image of the child's potentialities for becoming also continually give an indication of his/her optimal becoming at the period in his/her progress to adulthood by evaluating this in terms of hi/hers

* In this regard, the interested reader is referred to the following: P. A. van Niekerk (1999) *Orthopedagogic Evaluation* (translation of *Orthopedagogiese Diagnostiek*, University Publishers and Booksellers, Stellenbosch, 1978.) G.D.Y.

life task to which he/she, as a unique child with his/her potentialities, *now* is called.

The level of becoming that the unique child *ought* to attain can only be determined if his/her potentialities are gauged on the basis of which the striven for *independence-for-him/her*, and, indeed, as optimal independence at this period, is determined by comparing this with what can be expected of a child who is at this level of becoming.

The form that this “momentary” optimal becoming contains, is acquired by studying the adequate course of becoming of children who possess adequate potentialities of becoming who are at various levels of becoming. By such a longitudinal study, norms or yardsticks are particularized, which are relevant to the child who is on this level of elevating his/her progress to adulthood.

In addition to knowledge of the child’s destination, knowledge of the various periods of life of the child (in general), thus, is necessary. It is just this which can be expected of a child on a certain level of becoming, and which is indicative of *what must* be expected of *this* unique child, according to his/her level of becoming. However, here one must be warned about a possible absolutizing in this regard.

For example, if a child of two months does not yet put his/her hand in his/her mouth, this might indicate that he/she has not yet “learned to know” his/her hand and possibly is under actualizing his senso-gnostic modes of being.

Where, e.g., it is viewed as “acceptable” for a puber to push his girlfriend if he wants to charm her, with a pre-adult, it is expected that he will behave differently, and respond to her rather with a loving smile.

The adequacy of a child’s becoming continually also is evaluated in terms of fundamental pedagogical criteria, as they are relevant for the various times of life of the child; accordingly, e.g., it remains clear that the puber might no longer behave as a baby and that a pre-adult can no longer act as a school beginner. This allows that the child’s becoming adult requires that he/she increasingly lives “more properly”.

When it seems that a child is not living as he/she ought to, there is mention of a gap in becoming because his/her pedagogical attainment does not correspond to what is pedagogically attainable and, thus, there is mention of a *restrained becoming*.

With the aim of eliminating such a gap in becoming, it is necessary that its nature be gauged more specifically.

4. DETERMINING THE NATURE OF THE GAP IN BECOMING

If it seems that a child's becoming adult is inadequately actualized, immediately there also is mention of a disturbed sense of values. Thus, his/her hierarchy of values must be gauged in terms of his/her "different" meanings. In this connection, *psycho-(ortho)-pedagogical* criteria are implemented for evaluating the *under actualization* of the child's psychic-life-in-educating. However, because he/she also signifies "differently" the life contents and does not comply with accepted norms, use is made of *fundamental-(ortho)-pedagogical* criteria. In terms of these criteria, the child's "different" attribution of meaning, via his/her "different" actualization of his/her psychic life is evaluated. Also, all circumstances again are considered, such as, e.g., his/her age, possible deficiencies, his/her socio-economic milieu, his/her total pedagogical situatedness.

4.1 Evaluating the child's under actualization of his/her psychic life-in-education

To gauge the "different" attribution of meanings by the child restrained in becoming, an evaluation must be done of the moments of under actualizing his/her psychic life-in-educating. Thus, particularly there is a search for the essences of the child's inadequate actualization of his/her becoming.

4.2 Psycho-(ortho-)pedagogical criteria

In terms of the psycho-(ortho-)pedagogical criteria, the quality of his/her realization of the various modes of actualizing his/her psychic life now are investigated with respect to their possible under actualization. Following this, if an indication is found of the possible impairment and its degree of, among others³⁷, the biological moment, the principle of helplessness, the principle of safety and security, the affective, cognitive, concentration of

attending, interest, social relations, actualizing intentionality are evaluated. The possible *deficiencies in actualizing* with respect to inadequate exploring, emancipating, distancing, differentiating, and objectifying, thus, are illuminated by determining the quality of their actualization.

In terms of the already mentioned psychopedagogical criteria (see section 2 of this chapter), now implemented as psycho-(ortho-)pedagogical criteria, there is a penetration into the nature of the distress of a unique child.

Thus, e.g., it is determined what is at the basis of the child's anxiety, by evaluating his/her experience, because his/her distress has arisen from the experiences he/she has had. The otherness of his/her own unique experiencing is illuminated to understand his/her current lived experiencing of being unsafe, insecure, frustrated, and anxious. On the one hand, his/her *different* lived experiencing is evaluated, and, on the other hand, the nature of this difference is determined with the help of the mentioned psychopedagogical criteria. This never has to do with a mere diagnosis of behavior but with the illumination of moments of attributing meaning.

To what degree does a child *explore* the world inadequately? Is there perhaps mention of affective lability, being unsystematic gnostic-cognitively, normative meaninglessness? How is it with his/her anxiety, his/her imagining and fantasizing, his/her thinking, his/her actualizing his/her intelligence, his/her remembering, and his/her observing? Is there mention of a lived experience of helplessness? Are there signs of unassimilated helplessness, insecurity, and anxiety? Is the condition of the child's psychic life favorable for his/her becoming adult? Is there a defect in self-assurance, confidence, and self-possession? Does the child show signs of confusion, uncertainty, perplexity, despair, helplessness? Is he/she over-aggressive? Does he/she have control of his/her emotions? Answers to these questions are obtained by implementing the mentioned criteria. These answers also indicate how that child's emancipating, distancing, etc. are actualized "differently".

Because a child restrained in becoming, e.g., necessarily does not emancipate his/her personal dignity, and readily devaluates him/herself, this determines to what extent he/she devaluates

him/herself. Nel³⁸ says this especially has to do with determining to what extent there already is an acceptance of the self with his/her deficiencies.

In terms of fundamental-(ortho-)pedagogical criteria, it is determined *where* the *failure* of the realization of the educative aim occurs.

4.3 Fundamental-(ortho-)pedagogical criteria

In the pedagogical literature there is reference to the criterion of adulthood³⁹ and the criterion of normativity, or norm-centricity, or ought-to-be, or validity of the demands of propriety.⁴⁰

For our purpose, the criteria mentioned in section 2.7 of this chapter now are applied as fundamental-(ortho-)pedagogical criteria in terms of which the nature of the following is determined:

4.3.1 Inadequate attribution of meaning to one's own existence⁴¹

Indications can be found of a possible *misconception* of the sense of life, a defective insight into the task of life, and calling, a deficient future perspective, etc. The nature of the *inadequateness* of giving meaning to one's own existence will appear when there are positive answers to questions such as:

Is his/her future perspective obscure? Does the child withdraw him/herself, and are there signs of isolation? Is there an unwillingness to explore? Does the child feel him/herself excluded? Does he/she ridicule the defects and illnesses of others? Is he/she rude? Does he/she persevere with the same "transgressions"? Does he/she enjoy being disappointed? Is he/she content to under achieve? Is he/she satisfied with nothing? Does he/she give insufficient concern to what he/she is going to make of him/herself?

4.3.2 Inadequate self-judging and -understanding

When there can be positive answers to questions such as the following, this is an indication that a child inadequately judges and understands him/herself:

Does he/she feel that he/she is inferior? Is he/she dissatisfied with him/herself? Does he/she undertake tasks beyond his/her ability?

Is he/she very ashamed in the company of peers and other fellow persons? Does he/she swagger and boast? Is he/she unwilling to help others? Does he/she feel that he/she is unwelcome by his/her peers? Does he/she not care if he/she appears to be unreasonable? Does he/she allow him/herself to be led only by his/her feelings? Does he/she over-estimate his/her own ability? Does he/she act infantile?

4.3.3 Inadequate understanding of human dignity⁴²

That the child's own dignity or that of others is not correctly understood will appear when questions such as the following can be answered positively:

Is he/she dissatisfied with him/herself? Will he/she not accept him/herself? Does he/she ridicule the behavior of older persons? Does he/she ridicule the defects and limitations of others? Does he/she ignore the mandates of his/her superiors? Does he/she show a lack of respect for his/her parents, teachers, and other adults? Does he/she purposefully ignore the proper? Does he/she enjoy the improper? Is he/she overjoyed by the sorrows of others? Does he/she only do what is pleasant for him/her? Is he/she dissatisfied with his/her parents, his/her school, his/her circumstances? Does he/she interfere with opinions of others?

4.3.4 Inadequate forming of moral choices and corresponding actions⁴³ by the child him/herself

That the child can inadequately make independent choices or inadequately acts in accordance with the choices he/she makes, appear when questions such as the following can be answered positively:

Does he/she not keep his/her promises? Does he/she prefer the unacceptable? Does he/she have a poor insight into the demands of propriety? Is he/she willful? Does he/she make promises and not carry out his resolves? Does he/she easily make many promises? Does he/she have insufficient regret for possible misdeeds? Is he/she inclined to lie and deceive? Is he/she dishonest? Does he/she have respect for another's property? Does he/she readily neglect his/her obligations? Does he/she easily lay the guilt on others? Does he/she refuse to try? Is he/she lazy? Is he/she

inconsistent in his/her actions? Does he/she let him/herself be led by the nose by anyone?

4.3.5 Inadequate taking responsibility⁴⁴

That a child inadequately takes responsibility appears when questions such as the following can be answered positively:

Does the child not accept the authority of his/her parents? Does he/she rebel against his/her parents and teachers? Are there signs of a poorly functioning conscience? Does he/she have a poor insight into the life demands of propriety? Does he/she often neglect to do his/her homework? Is he/she satisfied with careless work? Does he/she bully smaller children? Must everything first be said to him/her before he/she acts? Is he/she willful? Does he/she not allow for the consequences of his/her actions? Is he/she not attuned to order? Is he/she unwilling to exert him/herself?

4.3.6 Inadequate identification with norms⁴⁵

That a child inadequately identifies him/herself with norms, and the demands of propriety appear when positive answers can be given to questions such as:

Does he/she refuse to accept authority? Is he/she disobedient? Is he/she rebellious? Is he/she stubborn? Does he/she reject authority? Is he/she guilty of various transgressions? Does he/she reject religion? Does he/she ridicule conservatives? Does he/she easily tell lies? Does he/she take other's possessions for him/herself? Does he/she try to deceive and mislead his/her peers? Does he/she not care if he/she hurts others? Does he/she enjoy being "different"? Is he/she very quarrelsome? Is he/she not very alarmed by setbacks? Does he/she allow him/herself to throw tantrums? Does he/she call his/her peers names? Does he/she eagerly berate others? Does he/she have no regrets about his/her own misdeeds? Does he/she pick his/her friends from "weaker" groups? Does he/she seek the company of those who try to be conspicuously different? Does he/she enjoy being disobedient? Does he/she allow him/herself to be easily persuaded?

4.3.7 Inadequate appropriation of a philosophy of life

That a child has inadequately appropriated his/her own philosophy of life for him/herself will appear when there are indications that there are uneven actions regarding specific views. In addition, this will appear when questions such as the following can be answered positively:

Does he/she easily deviate from his/her decisions? Is he/she inconsistent in his/her actions? Can he/she not be relied upon? Is he/she changeable?

4.4 Synthesis

In terms of *(ortho-)*pedagogical criteria, more particularly *psycho-(ortho-)*pedagogical, and *fundamental-(ortho-)*pedagogical criteria, it is determined in what respect a child's psychic life is *under actualized*, and how his/her attribution of meaning to life contents is *different* than what it ought to be. Thus, with the help of (ortho-)pedagogical criteria, the nature of the child's restrained becoming is evaluated.

If the nature of the gap in becoming or the nature of the under-actualization of the psychic life are gauged, then it is obvious that a search must be directed to possible causes which have given rise to them. This means that the educative event with which the child is involved must be evaluated with the aim of gauging those educative structures which are not adequately actualized. The moments which give rise to the problematic educative event must be determined.

5. GAUGING THE ORIGINS UNDERLYING THE UNDER ACTUALIZATION OF THE PSYCHIC LIFE-IN-EDUCATING OF A CHILD RESTRAINED IN BECOMING

5.1 Evaluating aspects of the restraints in self-becoming

A child restrained in becoming does not adequately actualize his/her potentialities to become, and he/she manifests him/herself as "different", in the sense that he/she is not adequately becoming adult. Consequently, it must be determined what this **different becoming** in his/her problematic educative situation entails. The **meaning** of a child's being **different** must be evaluated. In his/her educative situation, how does he/she implement values **differently**,

how does he/she exert him/herself **differently**, in the sense of **inadequately**?

There must be a search for the fundamental reasons for his/her currently experienced helplessness, insecurity, anxiety, unwillingness to explore, affective lability, gnostic-cognitive disorder, etc. There must be a search for the real deficiencies in experiencing, willing, lived experiencing, knowing, and behaving in his/her pedagogical situation.

Essentially, this amounts to a penetrating evaluation of the inadequate **actualization** of becoming adult, as a **different** actualization because it is **inadequate**. This requires an evaluation of a unique child's current actualization of his/her becoming adult in terms of his/her self-actualization, and his/her guidance by adults to such self-actualization.

Such an evaluation occurs in terms of **(ortho-)pedagogical** criteria since psychopedagogical and fundamental pedagogical criteria are now specifically applied to evaluate the **inadequate** actualization of the psychic life of a child-in-educating, on the one hand, and of the **inadequate** actualization of the educative event, on the other hand.

With the help of **(ortho-)pedagogical** criteria, a careful phenomenological description is given of the uniquely **different** life world of a child, and the problematic aspects of his/her educative situation. Thus, there is a gauging of meanings which he/she, as a child restrained in becoming, attributes to his/her world in dialogue, or conversation, or communication, or relationship with it-as a fathoming of a child in his/her situatedness, of his/her constituted experiential world, as a world image, and world relationship.⁴⁶

Attention must be paid to the quality of the emotional atmosphere created in a child's pedagogical situation. Is there sufficient opportunity for him/her to feel safe, self-confident, and to experience and lived experience security, or is he/she exposed to uncertainty, lack of safety, insecurity, and anxiety? In addition to affective guidance, cognitive and normative guidance must be evaluated.

Rienstra⁴⁷ indicates how emotional ambivalence between parents and children impose a burden on a child and, among other things,

leads to feelings of insecurity, and anxiety. Thus, a child's experiencing and lived experiencing of security is a clear yardstick for evaluating the educator's pedagogical intervention. Emotionally poor educating leaves a child more helpless than what is desired, says Faure.⁴⁸

The degree of disorder and defective systematization which gnostic-cognitive guidance promotes must be gauged.

As far as normative, meaning-giving guidance is concerned, among other things, there must be a search for the significance to a child of the educative norms presented by the educator and emulated by the child. Is it of such a nature that the child's egocentricity, pathic stubbornness, and unrestrained emotionality can develop into level-headedness, a controlled emotional life, and norm-directed actions, or is it of such a nature that the child's emotional life can thrive only with difficulty, and not serve as a favorable precondition for his/her cognitive and normative directedness?

If a child lived experiences a situation as meaningful, it is expected that he/she can direct him/herself in appropriate ways within the limits of his/her abilities and can also acquire a grasp of this situation. Where the situation is meaningless to him/her, it is doubtful that he/she will adequately direct him/herself to it. For example, when he/she is asked to think, but it is itself meaningless for him/her to do so, he/she very easily might follow a playful or fantasizing way of directing him/herself, and this means an under actualization of his/her psychic life-in-educating.

Thus, the educative event must be evaluated in terms of the inadequate educating of experiencing, willing, lived experiencing, knowing, and behaving. Particularly, there must be a search for the emotional level which he/she habitually assumes in his/her pedagogical situation, and an enquiry about the educative failings which are promoting emotional lability, and a weak inner directedness.

Among others, questions which must be asked in this connection are: does the educative relationship lead a child to feel insecure, secluded? Does he/she develop faulty trust? Does he/she feel unaccepted, rejected? In brief, can this affectively secure space be qualified as successful or not?

A child inhabits the world through his/her body, and we find him/her bodily in a pedagogical situation, hence, we also must enquire about possible chronic illnesses, and defects, not because such deficiencies, in themselves, include an under actualization of his/her psychic life, but to determine if he/she has meaningfully assimilated such biological defects, or deviations as meaningful to him/herself and, thus, has accepted them.⁴⁹ When a child has not accepted and assimilated his/her defects or lacks, he/she feels that he/she is **different** and inadequate, that is, uncertain, and insecure.

5.2 Evaluating a problematic educative event

Particularly, the inadequate guidance to actualizing becoming oneself must be evaluated. This requires that the quality of actualizing the fundamental pedagogical structures be evaluated with the aim of determining what the **problematic** aspects are.

The nature of **forming** a child's spirituality, his/her norms, regulating and routinizing him/her must be investigated.⁵⁰ The unlocking (presenting) of educative contents by the adult must be placed in an evaluative light. The **educative shortcomings** must be disclosed.

5.2.1 Evaluating the quality of actualizing the pedagogical relationship structures

The moments of the pedagogical relationship must be placed in an evaluative light. An orthopedagogue specifically must determine what is implied by the inadequate dialogue or failed communication of a child restrained in becoming regarding, regarding the three main moments of the pedagogical relationship. The possibly "*distorted*" relationships between him/her and his/her educators must be disclosed.

5.2.1.1 Under actualized becoming during the inadequate actualization of pedagogical trust

Giving and accepting trust by the educators and the child must be evaluated.⁵¹ Nieuwenhuis⁵² says there is a very close connection between the **feeling** of **security** and **trust**, and he distinguishes between them as follows, "A primary difference between **security** and **trust**, it seems to me, is that security is an expressed state within which one finds himself, while trusting contains within itself

a certain degree of activity" and trust, moreover, is a "further developed state of consciousness" than is security.⁵³

Here, it is asked: in what respects do the educators inadequately establish relationships of trust? Does a child experience and lived experience that he/she is not trusted, that he/she is not unconditionally accepted? Does he/she experience and lived experience the presence of the educators as a disturbing lingering with him/her? Is he/she truly not accepted? Is a child not treated as a valued companion? Is there no intention by the educator to care for him/her? Is there mention of a lack of love regarding his/her care by the educators?

Is there mention of an absence of a secure space? Is he/she appealed to inadequately to elevate his/her dialogue? Is his/her dignity undervalued? Do the educators begrudge him/her his/her privilege of an active part in life activities? Is the educator's care evidence of other matters, such as love? Is inadequate room made for the child at home? Are the educators too inaccessible for him/her? Are the educators absent too often? Are the educators too often not available for him/her? Is there an absence of feeling committed to be available for him/her? Is there too seldom agreement with the child? Does he/she perhaps feel unwelcome? Do the educators and child seldom do things together? Do the educators perhaps put little trust in his/her abilities?

5.2.1.2 Under actualized becoming during the inadequate actualization of pedagogical understanding⁵⁴

Also, the actualization of the relationship of understanding must be evaluated as a possibly inadequately actualized educative relationship. The important question here is whether there is inadequate participation in the relationship of understanding by the educator, and/or the child. Do the educators establish a relationship of understanding in unaccountable ways? Is the child seldom confronted with tasks of self-understanding? Do the educators have inadequate knowledge of the child? Do the educators have inadequate knowledge about his/her destination (adulthood)? Is there mention of misunderstanding by the adults and/or child? Oberholzer⁵⁵ postulates the criteria of understanding and responding to the needs of a needy child; what this involves is evaluating the adults' understanding of the child, and the question also is whether the educator opens him/herself too little to

conversing with and understanding the child. Other possible considerations are whether the educator incorrectly understands the child's potentialities. Does the child know that his/her educators do not, or are not willing to understand him/her? Does the educator possibly over-estimate the child's potentialities? Does the child know that his/her educators do not accept him/her? Does he/she know that he/she is unwelcome? Is the child given too little opportunity to gradually understand things better? Is he/she given too little opportunity to judge him/herself critically? Is he/she forced to understand him/herself as inadequate? Is he/she given too little opportunity to practice and make sense of his/her abilities? Is he/she given too few opportunities to lived experience being appreciated, and to experience that the actualization of his/her potentialities are valued? Does he/she know his/her educators hold out a "distorted" future for him/her? Does he/she know that his/her parents don't expect him/her to exert effort? Does he/she know that his/her parents allow him/her to be disobedient? Does he/she know that his/her parents thwart him/her? Is there a lack of familiarity with good and evil? Do his/her parents easily refrain from making sure he/she correctly understands the norms? Do his/her educators avoid readily answering his/her questions? Do his/her educators seldom invite him/her to ask questions? Is he/she given too few opportunities to state his/her views?

5.2.1.3 Under actualizing becoming during the inadequate exercise of pedagogical authority⁵⁶

Nel⁵⁷⁾ postulates the criterion "poor insight into the demands of propriety of life", and Oberholzer⁵⁸ the criteria of "sympathetic authoritative guidance" as well as "validity of the demands of propriety." Among others, questions which can be asked in this connection are:

How is authority exercised? Is it absent? Is there too much? Is a child given too little responsibility? Is he/she given too many responsibilities too soon? Is discipline too lax or severe? Is there possibly too much or too little punishment? Are there inconsistencies in exercising authority? Has the relationship of authority been established in irresponsible ways? Is there too little obedience to the authority demanded? Does the exercise of authority indicate a lack of trust? Are too few demands and norms presented to the child? Nel⁵⁹ also postulates the criteria of

"inadequate acceptance of authority", and the "inadequate exercise of authority." Do the parents' examples possibly contradict what they demand? Is he/she not brought up to live what is proper? Is he/she given too few opportunities to experience and lived experience that he/she has acceptable dignity? Does the educator pay too little attention to whether assignments are completely carried out?

In addition to evaluating the pedagogical relationships, as such, the actualization of the sequence of educating must be evaluated.

5.3 Evaluating the quality of actualizing the pedagogical sequence

It also is necessary that the orthopedagogue evaluate the course or sequence of the educative event in which the restrained child is involved, to determine if there are any deficiencies.

5.3.1 Under actualizing becoming during inadequate pedagogical association⁶⁰

An important evaluative question which must be asked is whether there is sufficient opportunity in the child's pedagogical situation for pedagogical association. Are the parents and the child too often absent from each other? Does the father have a work schedule which keeps him/her away from the family too much? Is the mother too involved in out of house activities? Does the child participate in too many activities outside the family? Are there too few opportunities for the educators and the child to relax together?

5.3.2 Under actualizing becoming during inadequate pedagogical encounter⁶¹

It also must be determined if the educators arrive at a sufficient encounter with the child. Do the educators carry on a monologue in conversing with the child because of inadequate mutual trust, understanding, and authority? Does the child experience and lived experience that his/her educators are not accessible to him/her? Are there possibly no signs of intimacy between the child and the educators? Does the child feel that he/she is not understood, or that the educators don't really care about him/her?

5.3.3 Under actualizing becoming during inadequate pedagogical engagement⁶²

Also, to be determined is if the educators and child accept responsibility for the educative event, and if they arrive sufficiently at a pedagogical engagement. Is there a deficiency in feeling responsible for establishing educative relationships by the educators, by the child, or by both? Do the educators not provide an educative aim for the child to strive for? Is the child unwilling to make him/herself available to pedagogical influencing?

Is there an absence in the child of a desire to become someone with personal dignity? Does the child prefer to try to avoid his/her educators? Does the child not listen to reason, and do the parents resign themselves to accepting this? Is the child guided too little to responsibility? Does the child discover too readily that he/she does not have many prospects? Do the educators and child talk too little about his/her future? Does the child feel too often that it is only the educators who must appear proper, without discovering his/her own being addressed by norms and values? Do the educator and child understand that their obligations regarding the child's becoming are too deficient? Is the child infantilized too much?

5.3.4 Under actualizing becoming during inadequate pedagogical intervention

In terms of pedagogical intervention, as a criterion, evaluated is where this fails in habitual educative interventions. In the first place, the question is if there is adequate intervention if the child acts incorrectly and, in the second, if there is sufficient concurrence with the child's pedagogically meaningful and commendable behaviors.

Is the child opposed too much, or too little? Does the child experience and lived experience too little that he/she also can do what is proper? Is the child punished too often? Are too many directions given without seeing that the child also carries them out?

5.3.5 Under actualizing becoming during inadequate return to pedagogical association

It also is necessary to determine if the child is given sufficient opportunity to return to the more relaxed relationship of

pedagogical association after the more "tense" relationship during intervention and/or concurrence? Does the child experience and lived experience that he/she is "constantly" being educated? Is the child perhaps burdened with an overdose of directions?

5.3.6 Under actualizing becoming during inadequate periodic breaking away from educative situations

The question, moreover, is if the child has too little opportunity to be him/herself pedagogically outside authentic pedagogical situations? Does he/she have too little opportunity to pursue his/her responsibilities apart from his/her educators? Is an eye kept too much on him/her? Is he/she clung to too much? Is he/she granted too little freedom-to-responsibility? When periodic breaking away from the educative situation eventually proceeds in pre-adulthood to periodically establishing educative situations, this is a clear indication that the child is adequately emancipating him/herself from his/her educators.

Also, the pedagogical activities must be evaluated.

5.4 Under actualizing becoming during inadequate pedagogical activities

5.4.1 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate giving meaning

Here the question is in what regard does the educator's helping the child give meaning to life contents occur inadequately. In this regard, Nel⁶³ postulates the pedagogical criterion "forming responsibility" or "making aware of responsibility". The questions are: How does the child live the demands of propriety **differently**? Is the child too seldom given the opportunity to design a world him/herself, or to firmly attribute proper meaning to life contents, or to test out meanings for him/herself, or to become familiar with meaning, or to experience and lived experience his/her deeds as meaningful, or to take responsibility for identifying with what ought to be, or to adequately discover what is incorrect?

5.4.2 Under actualizing becoming during inadequate pedagogical exertion

The question here is whether the child too seldom the opportunity has to recognize his/her obligations, and to know what responsibilities are demanded of him/her. Does the educator too seldom let the child discover what is demanded of him/her? Is he/she given too little opportunity to discover what he should put his/her effort into? Is he/she too seldom given the opportunity to learn to know his/her own potentialities? Is he/she grudgingly given the opportunity to discover that he/she must actualize his/her potentialities optimally? Is he/she given too little opportunity for self-reflection? Is he/she hindered in actively exerting him/herself? Is he/she given too few opportunities to properly think through his/her decisions? Also, to what degree is the child helped to take a truly "effortless" stance toward the world? Is he/she not too readily permitted to leave all that he/she deals with half done; that he/she doesn't have a real need to exert him/herself? Does the child "forget" to work? Are there too many who do everything for him/her? Are there perhaps too few assignments and tasks for him/her to carry out? Is there perhaps a persistent deficiency in willingness to perform tasks? Is there a deficiency in persistence? Are opportunities not granted for the child to act on his/her own initiative? In everything, must he/she first ask for the educator's permission?

5.4.3 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate norming

Here the question is in what respect the educator's exemplification of norms falls short and the child is inadequately supported to increasingly follow them. Here the entire spectrum of the adult's presenting and exemplifying norms is questioned. Is the educator too unaware of the child's deficient insight regarding what is proper? Does he help the child too seldom to disclose the essences of what is proper and improper, e.g., on account of defective cognitive and normative educating? Does he/she not indicate to the child enough the dangers of life? Does the child refuse to identify himself with the norms of his educators? Does the child have too much difficulty recognizing his educator's philosophy of life? Do the educators demonstrate too little what their standpoint is regarding objectionable matters? Are the educators themselves disobedient to their philosophy of life? Do the educators themselves show a disobedience to and disregard for what is proper?

5.4.4 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate venturing with each other

Here the question especially is in what respect there is mention of a deficiency in venturing together with respect to the educative contents. Is there no opportunity for the child also to **independently** venture with his/her educators? Is the child's venturing attunement too deficient because of affective neglect? Does the pedagogical association too seldom proceed to a pedagogical encounter? Is the educative conversation too often replaced with general guesswork and chit-chat? Is there a lack of mutual trust to such a degree that the child feels too afraid to venture with his/her educators? Does the child feel he/she cannot entrust him/herself to his/her educators? Does the child know that he/she is accepted as someone who cannot carry responsibility?

5.4.5 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate gratitude for pedagogical security

Oberholzer⁶⁴ postulates the criterion of **gratitude**. Here the question is whether the child is grateful for the educative security provided by the educators. Do the educators provide a secure space? Is showing gratitude by a child overemphasized by the educators? Does the child experience and lived experience too much blame? Is the child too seldom given the opportunity to discover that he/she is accepted unconditionally? Is the child accepted only conditionally? Can the child, indeed rightly, seldom agree with the educators' actions? Is the caring by the educators of such a nature that it justifies no gratitude? Does the presence of the educators make a **calm** being together impossible? Do the educators themselves too seldom show their gratitude for good gifts? Does the child learn to confuse rights and privileges because of his/her educators' actions?

5.4.6 Under actualizing becoming during inadequate acceptance of pedagogical accountability

In the first place, there must be a consideration of the degree of responsibility which can be expected of the child. Further, the question then is if he/she is given enough opportunity to accept responsibility. Does he/she experience and lived experience that he/she does not have an obligation to let the educative event succeed? Does he/she feel that the educators look at him/her as a less valued person who is not able to do much him/herself? Is there

mention of an absence of “our space” in which he/she can feel and know that he/she also can and must contribute?

5.4.7 Under actualizing becoming during inadequate hope for future adulthood

Here the question is whether the parents present a “senseless” future to the child. Further, it can be asked if the child is given too little opportunity to experience and lived experience that he/she also increasingly becomes “more adult”, and eventually must become a proper adult. Is there a deficient future created for the child? Do the educators demonstrate an unfavorable image of adulthood as an image of the future for the child?

Is the child afraid to venture into such a future? Are future risks and failings overemphasized? Does the child have a distorted self-image and a related distorted or obscure future image? Do the educators too readily ignore the child’s historicity when they confront him/her with his/her future achievements? Is the child too neglected regarding the assimilation of unassimilated past experiences and traumas which make him/her anxious with respect to the future? Has the child been taught too little regarding the demanding nature of a beckoning future? Has the child not yet been taught that he/she must now optimally actualize his/her potentialities with an eye to the future? Is the child allowed to try to avoid present problems by fantasizing in an “idealized future”? Regarding school achievement at the end of the term, are unattainable expectations presented to the child? Is the child given too little help to now make the “right” choices for the future? Is the child readily provided help to think about the future? Are the present activities of the child too often separated from his/her future? Is there too little talk about the child’s future or perhaps too much? Does the child too seldom experience and lived experience that there is confidence in him/her and his/her future success?

5.4.8 Under actualizing becoming during the inadequate design of possibilities toward adulthood

The first question is how this child inadequately designs his/her possibilities. Does the child have too little opportunity to independently actualize his/her possibilities in his/her life design? Is he/she excessively overprotected? Are the parents excessively

concerned that he/she must not be “hurt”? Is he/she given too little opportunity to do things him/herself?

In this connection, Oberhofer⁶⁵ postulates the criteria *must do things him/herself, ought to be* and also *be someone him/herself who must do something him/herself*.

Questions asked here are: Is the child given too little opportunity to strengthen his/her trust in his/her educators? Is there an absence of security from which a conflict in trust develops? Are the child's personal attempts too often misunderstood and underestimated? Are the child's achievements not seen as means to another aim, as his/her increasingly becoming adult? Is the child too readily restrained from doing things him/herself? Is there too much for the child to do? Is too little or too much expected of the child?

5.4.9 Under actualizing becoming during the inadequate gradual fulfillment of pedagogical destination (adulthood)

Does the child have too little opportunity to have more responsibility placed on him? Is there too little consideration for the child's actual elevation of meaning? Does he have an inadequate opportunity to exercise conscience?⁶⁶ For Dienelt⁶⁷ educating is “educating to responsibility ... to having a conscience”, and it also must be asked if the child is not held accountable enough when he has acted incorrectly?

5.4.10 Under actualizing becoming during inadequate increasing respect for human dignity

Here, in the first place, it must be asked how the child respects his/her own human dignity and that of others. Does the child have too little opportunity to gradually act independently with dignity because he/she is a person? In this connection, Oberholzer⁶⁸ postulates the pedagogical criterion *being human as being a person*. The question is if the educator too seldom calls the child to develop dignity. Is the child's individuality too easily misunderstood? Is his/her “otherness” coupled with “being of lesser dignity”? Does he/she discover a lack of respecting the dignity of other persons by his/her educators?

5.4.11 Under actualizing becoming during an inadequate increase regarding self-understanding by the child

Here the question is to what degree there is mention of inadequate understanding of him/herself by the child. Is the **sympathetic** criticism from the adult absent? Is the child criticized too much? Does he/she too seldom can critically judge him/herself in terms of the person image emulated by his/her educators? Does he/she discover too little his/her accountability because of defective demonstration by his/her educators?

5.4.12 Under actualizing becoming during inadequate pedagogical becoming free to responsibility

Oberholzer⁶⁹ postulates the criterion *conquering freedom*. The most important questions in this connection are: Where is the unaccountability of the restrained child's exercise of freedom? Where does this go amiss regarding his/her morally independent acting? Is there a deficiency on the part of the educators regarding the creation of opportunities for the child to responsibly exercise his/her freedom? Is too little freedom granted to him/her? Is he/she allowed too much freedom and too little responsibility demanded of him/her? Do the educators demonstrate an unwillingness to themselves voluntarily recognize the authority of what is proper? Are the educators themselves disobedient to the demands of authority? Do the educators invite the child to a life of unrestrained freedom?

6. SYNTHESIS

On the one hand, the orthopedagogic diagnostician determines, in terms of **pedagogical** criteria, the level of becoming of the child and, on the other hand, his/her achievable level. From the disclosed gaps in becoming, he/she implements (ortho-) pedagogical criteria to evaluate the nature of the child's restraints in becoming in terms of the nature of his/her under actualized psychic-life-in-educating, on the one hand, and the inadequately actualized pedagogical event, on the other hand.

Thus, an orthopedagogue not only recognizes the problems of becoming adult, but he/she illuminates their underlying origins. In addition, it is only an orthopedagogue who can make accountable pronouncements with respect to the child's inadequate becoming adult, and its underlying sources. Now, he/she also can plan accountably how this child must be further handled with the aim of his/her optimal becoming adult.

REFERENCES

1. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., p. 4.
2. See Garbers, J. G.: *Intree in die maatskaplike taak*, J. B. Wolters, Groningen, 1958, p. 129.
3. Ibid, pp. 129-130.
4. Landman, W. A.: *Aanwending van die Pedagogiese Kategoriee in die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, *Pedagogiekstudies* No. 68, University of Pretoria, p. 42.
5. Ibid, p. 41.
6. See ibid, p. 42.
7. See Landman, W. A., Kilian, C. J. G. and Roos, S. G., op. cit., p. 17.
8. See Landman, W. A., op. cit., p. 41.
9. See ibid, p. 42.
10. Nel, B. F.: *Die grondbeginsels van 'n pedagogies-verantwoorde pedoterapie*, in: *Jubileum-Lesings*, University of Pretoria, Faculty of Education 1937-1962, HAUM, Pretoria, 1963, pp. 64, 65.
11. Faure, J. S. W., op. cit., pp. 61-62.
12. See Ferreira, G. V., op. cit., p. 60.
13. Ibid.
14. See Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psigopedagogiek: 'n Inleidende orienteering*, op. cit., p 183.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid, p. 166.
17. Ibid, p. 154.
18. Ibid.
19. See Pretorius, J. W. M.: *Kinderlike Belewing*, op. cit., pp. 52, 70; Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 66.
20. See Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.), p. 170.
21. See Pretorius, J. W. M.: *Kinderlike Belewing*, op. cit., p. 50.
22. See Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.), p. 170.
23. Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., pp. 71-73.
24. Also see: Landman, W. A and Gous, S. J., op. cit., p. 72; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 56; Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 61; Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op. cit., p. 85.
25. See Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., op. cit., p72; Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit, p.

- 35; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., pp. 54, 57; Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 60; Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op. cit., p. 85.
26. Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 62.
 27. Ibid, p. 58.
 28. See Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 58.
 29. See Frankl, V. E.: *De onbewuste God*, Dutch translation by Melotte-Athmer, 3rd ed., Helmond, p. 57; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 54.
 30. See Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., op. cit., p. 72; Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., p. 36; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 56; Nel, B. F., op. cit., pp. 61, 65; Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op. cit., p. 85.
 31. See Landman, W. A., and Gous, S. J., op. cit., p. 72; Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., pp. 36, 37; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 73, et seq.: Oberholzer, C. K.: *Die Pedagogiese*, op. cit.; Oberholzer, C. K.: *Inleiding tot die Prinsipiele Opvoedkunde*, J. J. Moreau, Pretoria, 1954, pp. 5, 271, 286.
 32. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., p. 37; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 53; Nel, B. F., op. cit., pp. 60 et seq.; Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op. cit., p. 85; Ungersma, A. J.: *The search for Meaning*, Rusking House, George Allen and Unwin, London, p. 21.
 33. Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 65; See also Langeveld, M. J.: *Beknopte Theoretische Paedagogiek*, op. cit., p. 43.
 34. Frankl, V. E.: *Medische Zielzorg*, Dutch translation by Toon Bartels, Vonk and Co's publisher, pp. 24 et seq.
 35. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., p. 37; Nel, B. F., op. cit., pp. 60-63; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., pp. 54-60; Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op. cit., p. 85.
 36. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., p. 37; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 60; Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 63; Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op. cit., p. 85.
 37. See Langeveld, M. J.: *Ontwikkelingspsychologie*, op. cit.; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., pp. 61-72; Nel, B. F., op. cit., pp. 64-66.
 38. Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 65.
 39. Landman, W. A., op. cit., p. 72.
 40. See Oberholzer, C. K.: *Prolegomena van 'n Prinsipiele Pedagogiek*, HAUM, Cape Town, 1968, p. 317; Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., op. cit., p. 70.
 41. See Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., pp. 56-57; Nel, B. F., op. cit., pp. 61-62.
 42. Nel, B. F., op. cit., pp. 61-62.

43. See Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 55.
44. See Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., pp. 53, 54; Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 60.
45. See Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 54; Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 60.
46. See Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op. cit., p. 21.
47. Rienstra, Y., op. cit., pp. 73-76.
48. Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 63.
49. See Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 61.
50. Pretorius, J. W. M.,: *Kinderlike Belewing*, op. cit., p. 61.
51. See Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., op. cit., p. 48;
Landman, W. A.,: *Leesboek vir die Christen Opvoeder*, op. cit., p. 30.
52. Nieuwenhuis, H., op. cit., p. 1.
53. Ibid.
54. See Landman, W. A.: *Pedagogiese kriteria by die gesprekstherapie*, in Sonnekus, M. C. H., (Head Editor): *Psychologia Pedagogica Sersum!*, op. cit., p.47; Landman, W. A., op. cit., p. 47; Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., p. 8.
55. Oberholzer, C. K., op. cit., pp. 321, 323.
56. See Landman, W. A., op. cit., p. 30; Landman, W. A., op. cit., p.47; Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., pp. 16 et seq.
57. Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 60.
58. Oberholzer, C. K., op. cit., pp. 321-323.
59. Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 60.
60. See Landman, W. A., op. cit., p. 30; Landman, W. A., op. cit., pp. 46-53.
61. See Landman, W.A., op. cit., p. 30.
62. See Landman, W. A., op. cit., pp. 27-30; Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., p. 10; Landman, W. A.,: *Op soek na pedagogiese kriteria*, *Publication of the University of Pretoria*, No. 48, 1969; Landman, W. A., Kilian, C. J. G. and Roos, S. G., op. cit., pp. 120-121.
63. Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 65.
64. Oberholzer, C. K., op. cit., p. 319.
65. Ibid, pp. 321, 322; also see Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., op. cit., pp. 11, 71.
66. See Bigot, L. C. T.: *Het Kind*, Wolters, Groningen, 1967, pp. 12-13.
67. Dienelt, K.: *Opvoeding tot verantwoordelijkheid*, PAX, s'Gravenhage, 1962.
p. 45.

- 68. Oberholzer, C. K., op. cit., p. 317.
- 69. Ibid.