

## CHAPTER 2

### UNDERSTANDING THE CHILD AS A PERSON

#### 1. CLARIFICATION OF CONCEPTS

From the previous chapter, the orthopedagogue should adequately know and understand the child restrained in becoming adult in his/her problematic educative situation before help can be provided. Thus, he/she has the task of searching for such knowledge.

This search has generally been known as **diagnostication**<sup>\*</sup>. The concept **diagnose** is linked to the activity of identifying illnesses in the medical profession, and currently **diagnosis** means "to identify, differentiate an illness according to its characteristic symptoms" (224, 113), or the "determination of the nature of an abnormality, disorder or disease" (53, 66), or "the art or act of discriminating between diseases and distinguishing them by their characteristic symptoms", or the "summary of symptoms and the conclusion arrived at" (69, 366).

The word **diagnose** is composed of **dia**, which means **through**, **between**, and **gnosis** (Greek: gnosko), which means **know** or **knowledge** (see 69, 366). The verb form, **diagnoskein**, means to **differentiate**, and this implies that there are distinctions among various similar and relevant phenomena or matters.

In diagnosis, the medical profession enjoys significant success in determining the nature and cause of different diseases and, analogously, there is a search for easily attributable causes regarding children with "problems".

Irrespective of medical diagnosis, nowadays, there also are a variety of different sorts of diagnoses, e.g., psychiatric, psychological, and

---

<sup>\*</sup> Since the word "diagnostication" has an awkward ring to the ears of speakers of American English, for the most part, I have translated "diagnostication" and related terms in the text as "evaluation".

pedagogical. In these scientific diagnoses, use is made, e.g., of conversation, observation, projective techniques, and a variety of so-called tests, or media. Currently, psychodiagnosis is described as, "The attempt to assess personal characteristics through the observation of external features, as in **physiognomy**, **craniology**, **graphology**, study of voice, gait, etc." (53, 230).

It is generally known that the success of the methods of the natural sciences, also with respect to their use to study persons, have given rise to a natural science or naturalistic philosophical anthropology (see 170), by which a person is viewed as a psychophysical organism or, at best, a higher animal.

The following considers how this view attempts to arrive at an understanding of a person.

## 2. AN ATTEMPT TO UNDERSTAND A PERSON FROM A NATURALISTIC POINT OF VIEW

The naturalistic view of a person has led to an equally naturalistic "diagnosis". The symptoms which are related to educative problems have existed for a very long time, as is illustrated by Cain slaying his brother. Adam and Eve had certainly asked, what now can be done to get over the problem.

An attempt to answer such a question on scientific grounds links its search to the methods of the natural sciences. With reference to the success of the method of analysis-synthesis regarding the physical world, especially during the more than one hundred years since the establishment in 1875 of the first psychology laboratory, there has been an attempt to clarify the entwined relationships of the psychic life of a person according to laws of behavior.

There is an attempt to isolate "developmental deficiencies" under the hypothesis that a person is but a compilation of abilities, aptitudes, functions, capacities, drives, impulses, habits, and behavioral patterns. There is a search for significant deviations in the process of adaptation which eventually automatically play themselves out in a person.

With the help of tests, the causes of malfunctioning factors are sought (see 299, 18 et seq.). There is a search for, and measurement of basic stimulus-response factors, which are

correlated with certain deviations. Knowledge regarding the unique individual is acquired by measuring the elementary factors, and it is assumed that persons only differ from each other in the degree to which the relative strengths of these quantitative factors differ. Since the profile of the elementary functions is determined only once, everything one must know about the individual is read from this profile.

Especially in American, there is an attempt to perfect the measurement method without first asking penetrating questions about whether a person can be known in this way and, although, in connection with different schools of thought (see 299, 22-24), gradual renovations come about with regard to a so-called individual "personality diagnosis", the **role** of the person him/herself in his/her development and change is still partly or entirely neglected, and the point of departure does not consider **what** and **who** a person is as a **person**.

In psychological diagnosis, psychological tests are developed as special tests to acquire, as far as possible, data about the person (see 302, 106). The word "test" means a **test sample** (174, 108). By means of a test, as in a natural science experiment, there is an attempt to let the person "react" to selected problems with behaviors, or written answers.

Since the basic assumption is that the person is impeded in his/her (automatic) "development", there are attempts to "measure" the progression of development with the help of generally known developmental tests. The aim is to "test" as many aspects of "development" as possible and on that basis to determine a developmental quotient, **isolate** the **factors** impeding the **development**, and then **doctor** them.

There is also an attempt to test as many **factors** as possible regarding the person's psychic state and then describe it in terms of a summary of quantitative test results.

Specific "factors" are concentrated on, which should lead to behavioral **deviations**, e.g., sensory defects, negative environmental influences, etc. Regarding sensory defects, many tests have been designed, which are based on the laws of classical Gestalt psychology.

Especially the person's **being a person** is misunderstood because only a naturalistic anthropology is in place. Tournier says [in English], "Science knows nothing of the person" (266, 41), meaning that, by measuring and testing, one does not come close to the core of a person, and remains only on the periphery. Tournier concludes with, "Through information, I **can** understand a case; only through communication shall I be able to understand a person" (266, 25).

### 3. AN ATTEMPT TO UNDERSTAND A PERSON FROM A PERSONOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW

To arrive at essential knowledge about a human being, it is necessary that he/she first be known as a **person** based on an accountable anthropology. Phenomenology provides a way to such an accountable view of being a person because it is **situation-directed and** aims at disclosing a person's being-in-the-world (see 84; 299, 24-26).

The anthropology accepted by the orthopedagogue gives a particular color to his/her evaluation (siagnosis) and is mostly reflected in his/her approach and methods ((see 243, 84). The orthopedagogic evaluator also is faced with the question: "What is a child as a **person**? Who is he/she as a **particular** person? Who **should** he/she be as a person? How far from the **norm** is this child? How does a child develop into a complete person? About these, Nel (174, 83) says the orthopedagogic evaluator must understand what a complete person means, which is a philosophical anthropological question (see 12, 10 and 19).

In gauging a child restrained in becoming adult, as a **person-in-education**, he/she must be considered as a **person** by continually proceeding from an accountable philosophical anthropology.

### 4. PERSON-EXPLORATORY CONVERSATION

Phenomenologically, it is shown that the best approach to another person's experiential world is a **conversation**, and not a test. In this regard, Van Strien says [in Dutch], "As far as one has a 'theory' of another, it must preserve the 'theme' of a conversation. One can show many motives central to the way one projects oneself. However, one should not attribute these to thing-like complexes and powers because one's own life is guided out of free personal decisions" (302, 163).

In an authentic conversation, "our" world is created and gradually structured further. According to Strasser (248, 140), there is a going from two isolated, subjective worlds which develop into a shared intersubjective world.

Van den Berg (269, 136-154) indicates that a conversation is determined by the nature of **being with** the conversational partner. In being with, a common world is created, and the conversational partner is **there with** things. **Being-with** means being-there-together, there with the matter or event ... thus, being together in a landscape, or also creating a joint world. According to Van den Berg (269, 146), jointly being-there with things with a conversational partner assumes a give-and-take, which preserves the fidelity of the world image as this has unfolded through communicating with all persons who in our life have directed a word to us. In fact, being-with means that we are understood because it refers to a going together into one world, to creating a common world. Thus, conversing is **communicating** (participating) in a mostly common world, even though the conversational partners continue to remain aware that the other is there next to him/her.

Conversing, moreover, is not only participating in a commonly designed world, but also is participating in each other's interiority and, thus, a communicating of being-with. Each communication includes an appeal for mutual understanding, an understanding which the communicated word itself cannot guarantee. Thus, conversing is much more than reporting, and it communicates the latent, that which is communicated without words.

Van den Berg (269) shows that what is unknown about the conversational partner, the differences between the two persons speaking, the asymmetry of the conversational partners, is a precondition for a conversation.

Ordinarily, a successful conversation includes a relationship of **encounter**, and a variety of writers unambiguously indicate that an **encounter** is the only way to authentically know another person.

Strasser says [in Dutch], "Psychological research has to do with an **encounter** between persons who are animated by differing intentionalities" (248, 138). According to Van Lennep, a person lets him/herself be known only in an "existential encounter of two

subjects, and that ... "a personality portrait without an encounter remains a summary of external appearances" (293 [in Dutch]). With reference to Buytendijk, he stresses that another is respected as a subject only in an "encounter" and then is no longer viewed as "an object in a chain of material for a useful aim, but as a subject who wants to gain clarity about his own existence, and answers to concrete questions of life contained in it" (293).

Essentially, a conversation has to do with the fact that it is one **person** who wants to learn to know another **person**, and what is primary is that it is an **interpersonal** matter. There is a subjective **merging into** the world of the other. In his/her conversation, he evaluator also tries to eliminate the distance between him/herself and his/her conversational partner and allow an intersubjective "our" world to arise. Strasser (248, 149) indicates that this "intersubjective" relationship of understanding, on an intuitive foundation, is a precondition for any psychological investigation. Nel (170, 3) notes that whoever wants to understand a person must merge him/herself into the other's lived experience and co-experience, and that such co-experiencing is a precondition for understanding. The one who "merges" must be able to see, experience, and lived experience the world as the other does. This involves understanding the other's personal meanings within a subject-subject relationship.

With respect to one person gauging the meanings which another person gives to life contents, Lubbers (150, 33), in reference to Buytendijk (31), indicates that much meaning is **implicit** in the situation within which it functions, and is not the person's property. Thus, a person can behave meaningfully in different situations without being able to explain to another what he/she is doing or even know this him/herself. This implicit meaning functions alongside his/her attributing **open**, and **personal meanings**. In this regard, Lubbers (150, 33) refers to Langeveld (127) and says that, by attributing **open meaning**, a person participates in and with reality as it holds true for other persons. By attributing **personal meaning**, he/she makes the uniqueness of his/her world into his/her own spiritual possession.

Attributing open meaning makes an objective world possible, and in it, the word functions as a concept. It is the world of truth and reality. Attributing personal meaning makes a subjective world possible, in which **the word is loaded**. It is the word by which my

truth, and my reality are known to me, and by which it is possible for me to classify flowers, understand disappointments, fears, joys, and, in other ways, have unique feelings about a matter (150, 34).

Attributing personal meaning is related to the implicit and yet is clearly different from the implicit because the personal experiences find their embodiment in images, within which the world-for-me is my own possession, and by which another can participate in that personal world of mine.

The results of giving personal meaning in evaluation are generally understood symbolically which are bound in various ways to a meaning which is conceptually anchored (150, 34).

Langeveld says [in Dutch], whoever encounters another "proceeds to link together and overcome a foreign perception and expressive understanding in a dual interiority of 'I-am-with-you' and 'you are with me'" (128, 243).

According to Binswanger (see 302, 97), this encounter is only possible in a high point of loving surrender in which an I opens him/herself to a **you**, and Van den Berg (269, 149) says there is a participation in each other's interiority. Buytendijk rightly thinks that, "whatever one says, one must first have a matter to talk about with someone before one can know him. Then, it can be said that one first shows his interiority, first unmask himself in his deeds, choices in extreme, surprising incidents, but especially in the quiet ordinariness of life itself, with its countless simple everyday tasks" (29, 23 [in Dutch]).

## 5. THE ORTHOPEDAGOGIC EVALUATIVE CONVERSATION

### 5.1 Subjective merging

Since a successful educative event assumes a **relationship of encounter**, actualizing an educative event is the proper way to learn to know the child (as a person) restrained in becoming adult.

The orthopedagogue is in search of the meanings the child attributes to life contents, i.e., in gauging his/her dialogue with reality. Van der Haan (275) indicates that the evaluator is confronted with "... a child-in-distress, not only a thing with characteristics or a bundle of functions. He must acquire as

complete an image as possible of the meaning of his dialogue with the world, the modes of existence he enters in his associations. but how he is met during child development" (275 [in Dutch]).

There is a personal encounter between the orthopedagogue and the child, during which the orthopedagogic evaluator, as educator, comes to an understanding of the child's human existence as an educand, thus, an understanding which is entirely embedded in the reality of educating itself (see 170, 70).

"There is a subjective merging into the child's world during which two I-worlds (my-world-as-adult and your-world-as-child-restrained-in-becoming-adult) are changed into an intersubjective our-world, from which I-as-adult no longer stand aloof but try to eliminate this aloofness.

This is an **entry** into another's humanity, which is related to our own understanding, and with which ... we are already primordially acquainted ..." According to Nel (174, 77 [in Afrikaans]), entry means "... being **present** in the child's world".

Thus, the two I-worlds are changed into an intersubjective our-world, where the orthopedagogic evaluator, as adult, no longer stands at a distance, but now penetrates, and co-experiences the experiential world of the child restrained in becoming adult.

According to Gouws (76, 8), the exploring pedagogue must primarily be an understanding person who listens to fellow persons as co-subjects to respond to their appeal.

Kwakkel-Scheffer asserts that, "In his living-with and feeling-with, he is at one with the child while, as an adult and an educator, he also differs from the child, he lived experiences things differently, by which a new possibility is passed on to the child and a new perspective is able to arise" (114, 83 [in Dutch]).

The orthopedagogue must lead the child to "narrate", to "represent", to "reveal" what he/she cannot assimilate (150, 9). He/she must look "through the eyes of the child" but, at the same time remain **adult** and continue to educate as an **educator** (see 114, 84).



This subjective merging is a precondition for the orthopedagogic evaluator to arrive at a meaningful interpretation. In this interpretation, he/she also is involved in his/her totality, which includes his/her emotionality and affectivity, according to Gouws (76, 31). However, as Strasser notes, this does not involve a "feeling-with" but a "feeling-toward", i.e., it involves "the emotional, or also the affective grasp of values and purposes which are defined in encountering **another**. It is true that this act of encountering is personal but not arbitrary. It allows us to understand the behaviors of our fellow persons" (248, 140 [in Dutch]). According to Gouws (76, 31), the child's affects, disturbances, anxieties, passions, etc. must be understood with feeling. The orthopedagogic evaluator must make the child's actual experiences his/her own (see 154, 132; 286, 57).

In an orthopedagogic evaluative (i.e., diagnostic) **conversation**, its quality is extremely important in gauging the child's communication with things and others. However, where there is a merging of the worlds of the orthopedagogue and the child restrained in becoming adult, this does not mean they are **identical** as conversational partners because their being together is not only a **communicating**, but a **participating** (see 269, 147; 174, 91) in each other's interiority, which is made possible by mutual acceptance.

This **merging** into the child's world, however, is not as straightforward as some adults assume, because they can readily forget that the restrained child lives in an entirely different world from the adult for whom life has assumed fixed forms, and it is assumed that the child adopts those forms as they exist for the adult. It is too easy to assume that everything which has fixed meanings for the adult also has the same meanings for the child. The adult's recollections are vague, and besides, they are colored with interpretations from an adulthood to which a child is still on the way.

For this conversation to thrive, first, the orthopedagogue must establish an affective relationship with the restrained child. Thus, the appropriate emotional climate must be created before an authentic encounter can be reached.

## 5.2 Implementing the fundamental pedagogical structures

According to Redl and Wineman, there is one foolproof method for learning to know children who are somewhat difficult to know, and that is "to live with them in an 'action' rather than a mere relationship of 'discussion'" (206, 30 [in English]). In this way, the educator can be effectively **present** in the child's world.

Nel (174, 77), following Langeveld (128), indicates "...to be present, one also must be welcome ... the child must also allow the adult to be present" [in Afrikaans].

The successful development of this conversation, above all, is also dependent on the quality with which the fundamental pedagogical relationship, sequence, activity, and aim structures are implemented. Thus, e.g., there should be mutual trust, and especially the restrained child should have trust in the orthopedagogue, as an adult. Sonnekus (235, 34) indicates that an encounter between the child and the orthopedagogic evaluator occurs on a pathic-affective level, as well as on an ethical-normative foundation. Thus, the evaluator must continually ensure that the pedagogical relationship of authority is implemented in the orthopedagogic evaluative (diagnostic) situation. Authority is actualized in a sympathetic way with respect to the not-yet-responsible, helpless, restrained child. Because this child also looks up to the orthopedagogue, who represents the normative to him/her, he/she gladly submits him/herself to his/her authority. Moreover, the orthopedagogue must continually be accountable for the pedagogical **admissibility** of the events in the educative situation, and a "free expression, where everything might and usually does occur, is no longer educating, because then the adult encourages inappropriate development", says Lubbers (150, 12 [in Dutch]). Therefore, the orthopedagogic evaluator continually gives pedagogical guidance, according to the pedagogical criteria of responsibility, sympathetic authoritative guidance, the normative, security, acceptance, etc.

In the first place, the orthopedagogue then understands the restrained child him/herself and as a child in **distress** from his/her problematic educative situation. Secondly, he/she searches for a more complete understanding of this/her **problematic** educative situation.

In this search, it is precisely the adequate actualization of the pedagogical event, in terms of the relationship, sequence, activity,

and aim structures (see 118) which permit the orthopedagogic evaluative (diagnostic) conversation to flourish and it sustains the orthopedagogic evaluative situation.

### 5.3 Means of conversing

The most important conversational medium is the spoken word, but because of a child's inability to verbalize his/her "problem", this conversation must be readily implemented by other means, such as by play, images, and more.

Langeveld states that, "With restrained children, there is something wrong with communication" (125, 90 [in Dutch]), and to help such children involves reestablishing personal communication, also through personal communication in the situation of orthopedagogic evaluation (diagnosis).

For the restrained child, usually there is an emotional as well as a cognitive conflict, which require that means other than language be used to properly gauge this/her "conflict" because, according to Lubbers, the fact that something is amiss with communication also means "that because a child communicates too little about himself, his lived experiences, etc., or his interior is concealed, rather than manifested, this also means that his behavior and expressive life are unreadable to everyday educators" (150, 90 [in Dutch]).

In addition, a child is not directly questioned about his/her "problem". In this regard, Perquin (189) emphasizes that a child's intimacy should not be damaged in the conversation, and he/she should never experience it as an invasion of his/her privacy. Hence, it is important that a child who explores his/her problematic educative situation with the orthopedagogue know, because of his/her **trust** in him/her, that his/her deepest secrets will not be "fished for" in this conversation. According to Van den Berg (269, 154), the other's secrets are a precondition for a conversation, and he states clearly that if another no longer has a secret for us, he/she also has nothing more to offer us. Also, Van Strien stresses this when he says, "... he no longer lives for us if he no longer is a secret to us. Indeed, we know him through and through. Then, trust becomes 'encased', as Jaspers expresses it" (302, 254 [in Dutch]).

For these reasons, particular aspects of the problematic educative situation must be kept **anonymous** and communicated in only

indirect ways. If the child feels secure, also in the sense that he/she knows his/her deepest secrets are not going to be "fished for", he/she also feels ready to disclose much about him/herself during his/her being with the evaluator (diagnoser).

Moreover, he/she has the right that the orthopedagogue pay attention to his/her **potentialities** and limitations. Here, the correct attitude is **respect** for each other's potentialities. Rumke speaks of "a maximum approach, while maintaining a distance" (216, 364 [in Dutch]), and Rogers (210, 187) refers to an **empathetic understanding**, which includes the evaluator being welcome in the child's world. "It is a moment-to-moment sensitivity ... a sensing of the (child's) inner world of private, personal meanings, as if it were your own, while never forgetting that it is not yours" (210, 187 [in English]).

Unlike **sympathy**, where the necessary distance is missing, where there is an emotional identification with the circumstances and feelings of another, and where the purpose is not to try to understand the other better, with **empathy**, the necessary distance is properly kept (see 226, 160).

Without denying the empathetic distance, the orthopedagogue must purposely distance him/herself, after which there must be a subjective merging so he/she can place his/her findings "in a meaningful relationship with genuine life situations and occurrences in diverse situations which he has co-experienced, and still distances himself from", according to Van der Haan (275).

In the "second phase", the orthopedagogic evaluator takes him/herself out of the intersubjective world and comes to an **objective** view, to objectivity-in-subjectivity. In the practical orthopedagogic evaluative situation, this distancing occurs in various ways, a matter to which greater attention is given.

## 5.4 Disclosing meaning

Orthopedagogic evaluation entails exploring the child's experiential world. There is a search for the meanings he/she has given to educative contents, as life contents. Ter Horst says, "Orthopedagogic diagnostics is that orthopedagogic activity directed to finding the changeable, modifiable, controllable factors in a problematic educative situation" (258, 102 [in Dutch]).

Thus, orthopedagogic evaluation must be directed to the total situation of the child restrained in becoming adult. Furthermore, this situation must be entered without any preconceptions. All aspects which can relate to accelerating a child's becoming must also be considered. A penetrating understanding of the restrained child, as a person, must be attained.

The restrained child's total educative situation is the only place where these meanings, and what has led to them, are to be found (also in terms of under actualizing his/her psychic life-in-education) (see 299, chapter 5). It is within this situation that the child's dialogue with his/her educators and life contents must be gauged. In his/her educative situation, the restrained child also "exists in his totality, and the whole of his personal world is implicated. A situation is the totality of the personal world, put in perspective by an intentional structure," says Linschoten (269, 429 [in Dutch]). Thus, the orthopedagogic evaluator searches for an essential view of the child's relationships (see 171, 11) he/she has constituted in his/her dialogue with the world.

Such an analysis of essentials must indicate how the child actualizes his/her own becoming adult as well as the meanings he/she gives to his/her becoming. From this, his/her lived experienced problems of becoming appear, and how he/she does or doesn't assimilate them, an essential viewing of the actualized fundamental pedagogical structures might indicate that, because of their inadequate actualization, the child's educative situation is a problematic one.

To understand a child restrained in becoming adult in his/her situation requires that the evaluator understands his/her **relationships** to life contents. Such an understanding requires knowledge about the events of educating and becoming adult. Only with this knowledge can the distressful situation, and his/her being enmeshed in it be gauged and be confidently shown what this child's achievable level of becoming is.

Necessarily, the orthopedagogue must gauge, in their essentials, the pedagogically achieved and achievable, so one can determine with confidence what the **gap** in becoming adult includes, since this is the basis [or result?] of his/her problematic becoming adult.

Thus, the orthopedagogue is searching for an image of this child's meanings, as an image of his/her experiencing, willing, lived experiencing, knowing, and behaving, a "totality image" of the world relationships he/she has already established. Thus, there must be a reflection on all the situations in which the "problem appears; the persons and matters regarding its appearance, and what the undesired behaviors themselves are" (see 56, 54-55 [in Dutch]).

Vermeer (306, 164) says the orthopedagogic evaluator seeks an overview of the child's personal world of meanings and of his/her educative reality. He/she tries to arrive at a cross-sectional view of the longitudinal coherence of meanings which characterize the child's life history (306, 154).

The **inadequate** response of the restrained child to the appeal which is directed to him/her must be explicated. His/her disturbed dialogue must be uncovered there **where** his/her giving meaning, with the adult's help, has failed in daily life (see 45, 88).

Such explication, moreover, is about his/her **different** actualization of his/her psychic life-in-education. More explicitly, this is a penetrating analysis of the essentials of the restrained child's actualization of his/her psychic life-in-education. Thus, there is a search for his/her **different** experiencing, willing, lived experiencing, etc. It is determined how the structure of his/her psychic life appears and what its relationship is to the origin of the significant gap between what is pedagogically achieved and the achievable. Thus, the orthopedagogic evaluator must determine the relationship between the way a child actualizes his/her becoming adult and the structure of his/her affective foundation; what dynamic workings have a role in these interactions among the different modes of his/her psychic life; what changes have occurred in his/her educative situation which can directly or indirectly influence the manifested restraints; what influences does the restrained becoming itself have on the structure of his/her psychic life and how does this structure influence his/her dialogue with educative contents; and the extent to which the manifested stagnation is appropriate for the particular structure (see 287, 96-97).

This requires an analysis of the actual structure of the restrained child's psychic life-in-education, and of the structure of the

educating which has contributed to unfolding such a personality structure.

Strasser says, "We must ferret out what exists for him and how" (247, 115 [in Dutch]). Thus, this involves determining **what** he/she **knows**, what he/she has already discovered; **how** he/she feels, and how he/she arrived at these feelings; what **meanings** he/she has attributed to life contents, **how** he/she has arrived at such meanings. Thus, on the one hand, the question is **what** constitutes his/her **experiential world** and how has he/she gradually constituted these meanings; and, on the other hand, how does he/she now act and how does he/she now allow him/herself to be known as a child who is inadequately becoming adult.

Thus, the essentials of the functioning structure of his/her psychic life must be determined, what distinguishable modes of actualization figure prominently regarding demands of becoming adult, what modes of actualization are not actualized adequately, and what their relationships are to his/her psychic life as a functional totality. Also to be determined is the state of his/her fundamental emotional structure, and how this influences the adults' guiding him/her to actualize his/her potentialities for becoming adult, as well as the extent to which problems in this becoming lead to further under actualization.

Disclosing the essentials of the restrained child's experiential world includes gauging the actualization of his/her psychic life in his/her dialogue with life tasks in the world, and particularly the disturbed actualization of his/her psychic life-in-education. This involves gauging the degree of blunted directedness, disturbed experiencing, willing, lived experiencing, knowing, and behaving, and the positive and negative valences life tasks have for him/her. Thus, a qualitative analysis of his/her **responses** to life's appeals is required (see 243, 87).

Thus, there must be a search for the **essentials** of the restrained child's disturbed experiencing, willing, lived experiencing, knowing, and behaving in education. Because the **quality** of his/her response to life's appeals is co-determined by the educating he/she has been given, the quality of this response also is an indication of the level of becoming adult he/she has already attained. However, this quality must be continually judged in the light of the highest

attainable level of experiencing, willing, lived experiencing, knowing, and behaving deemed possible for a particular child.

### 5.5 Determining the pedagogically attained and attainable

The pedagogically attained and attainable can only be evaluated in terms of pedagogical criteria. Establishing the pedagogically achieved level, simultaneously, answers the question of what the educative deficiency is, and what is at the basis of the problematic educative situation.

The question remains, how has the child's becoming adult already been furthered because of educating, and always **in relation to what is attainable**. Thus, this is not merely explicating and illuminating the restraints and deficiencies of becoming adult in terms of specific "symptoms", but is an optimistic pedagogically accountable exploration of his/her "total" educative situation, where any aspects of becoming adult are preserved, and the degree to which he/she is ready for and able to venture with the tasks of becoming adult are explicated with the aim of linking up with them, while assisting him/her to "accelerate his/her becoming adult".

Hence, the **nature** and **intensity** of his/her failure to communicate with the world must be determined. Because such a child's expressive life has become "unreadable" to his/her everyday educators (see 125), the orthopedagogic evaluator (diagnoser) has the task of **reading** it.

The child's potentialities for becoming adult must be determined without any doubt and so does whether he/she has at his/her disposal sufficient abilities to acquire a pedagogically adequate grasp of life contents and integrate them with his/her possessed experience. Kwakkel-Scheffer (114, 112) says the state of his/her educability must be gauged; whether he/she really is still educable, whether he/she is already capable of attributing particular meaning, or perhaps not yet. Thus, the orthopedagogic evaluator has the task of searching for the level of becoming adult which the child has attained, and to compare this with the level he/she ought **now** to have attained, and to search for the **nature** of the discrepancy, and the underlying reasons for it.

This is why Van Gelder (287, 49) says that pedagogical evaluation (diagnosis) establishes what has been pedagogically achieved in



terms of the level achievable. The orthopedagogue, thus, knows **what** is restraining a child's becoming adult, as well as **why** it is restrained and with the aim of providing help.

Orthopedagogic evaluation has a normative character, since the child's current situation is continually viewed and explored with respect to what it **can** and **ought** to be. This exploration requires a blending of the evaluator's perspective with the child's total situation.

The starting point for all this is the phenomenological method, which amounts to the "researcher taking a human activity or situation as his point of departure for the investigation, i.e., a phenomenon itself, viewing and analyzing it naturally and without prejudice", according to Nel and Sonnekus (181, 23).

Here, the concern is with the child restrained in becoming adult in his/her problematic educative situation, i.e., especially with his/her **inadequate actualization** of becoming adult. The phenomenological method leads to learning to know the restrained child in his/her world relationships but, at the same time, recognizing that he/she also has his/her mysteries and secrets, which we can only partly reach (see 174, 77).