

CHAPTER V

A CHILD RESTRAINED IN BECOMING ADULT IN HIS PROBLEMATIC EDUCATIVE SITUATION

1. INTRODUCTION

It has seemed that a child must be educated adequately in order to appropriately actualize his psychic life and, thus, his becoming adult. For the most part, this amounts to the fact that while the fundamental pedagogical structures are being realized he must be accompanied [educated] emotionally, intellectually and normatively.

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

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

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

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

For Langeveld² association is a pre-formed field for educating, and he says that an educator and child must trust each other since trust is a condition for an *encounter*. Thus, if a child does not lived-experience and experience a stable trust in his association with his educator, an encounter is not possible. In the association a child will trust the adult and will be trusted by the educator.

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

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

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

Hence, when the educative sequence does not flourish to *engagement*, a child does not acquire the opportunity to experience

that his educator trusts and accepts him and that he trusts and accepts the educator as well as his authority. If there is not trust, engagement is not possible and the educator cannot agree or interfere [i.e., intervene educatively].

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

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

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

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

An educator who is attuned to weighing the pros and cons of a child in a cold, penetrating and merely intellectual way instead of a loving surrendering, self-sacrificing, patient, tactful and persevering understanding way does not arrive at a true understanding of the child.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Irrespective of his personal potentialities, a child himself can do nothing about it if he is lovingly accepted or perhaps *rejected*. From the start he turns himself in all of his love and trust to and

* [een verwarde en verwarrende belevenis]

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

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

this association and encounter are also gnostically illuminative to the child. Thus, the child *feels* that he is not *accepted, is rejected* and *unwelcome* and he experiences insecurity. A rejected child does not experience or lived-experience an invitation to venture in trust with his educators. There is a sense of *awareness* that he is not accepted. This sense of mistrust leads to the exclusion and blocking of an educative encounter. Because he then also will not identify himself with the educator, he also loses its formative value.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The good achievements of other children too often these days are held up to the child as all that is worth the effort. Whenever the educators unfavorably compare a child's attempts at self-maintenance with an other child's, they emphasize to the child that he is a *lesser being* instead of allowing him feel that he also is a full-fledged person rather by noticing and valuing his successful attempts.

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

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

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

2.1 A child in a problematic situation of educating explores inadequately

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

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

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

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

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

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

A child in a problematic situation of educating responds to it with anxiety.³² Anxiety must not merely be viewed as an emotional feeling but indeed as an abiding attunement and, as such, objectless. Differing from fear, which is coupled to an object, a child does not know why he is anxious. According to Noordham³³ the presence of anxiety holds back each event of becoming and restrains the development of a nuanced human image.

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

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

A defensive attitude leads back to a child not being able to assimilate his "disturbed" meanings; he cannot assume a new position [toward them]. The unassimilated becomes an oppressive

burden and life becomes a constant threat; then he only accepts what is thoroughly familiar.³⁷

He considers himself as being not free and unable to change. Also he excludes himself from these unacceptable meanings because he fends them off.

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

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

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

He becomes inadequately acquainted with the educative contents and much of it remains entirely unfamiliar to him. Lubbers³⁹ says the inability to communicate with particular areas of the world "because I have not assimilated my experiences from those areas leads to an essential lack of freedom by which 'I' eventually, without offending myself or the life of another, succeed in trying to maintaining myself in 'imitation'. That is, by doing what others want me to eventually participate in, but not intrinsically. To the extent that 'I' attribute my experiences to someone, 'I' gain access to the closed areas."*

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

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

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

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

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

An unwillingness to explore also testifies to the neglect of educating willing because an unwillingness to participate in the tasks of becoming adult practically never arises with a child who is directed in an affectively stable way. An inadequately actualized willing

leads to a qualitatively *apathetic* as well as a *weakly* directed experiencing.⁴⁶

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

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

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

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

When a child loses trust in his parents there also is a disturbed communication between them. This lack of trust really leaves the

child alone in his anxiety because he “dare” not share it with them and, for the child they themselves represent insecurity and anxiety. Lubbers⁵⁰ emphasizes that any relation with his parents that includes for the child an experience of insecurity has a threatening character for him and is going to be paired with a conflict in trust.

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

Consequently, inadequate exploring means the child does not communicate sufficiently with the educative contents because he does not dialogue with them via all of his personal potentialities as ways of actualizing his psychic life. On the basis of educational neglect there thus is mention of *unfavorable feelings* about educative contents; *he becomes* anxious, insecure and threats are *seen*; he does not arrive at ordered perceiving, thinking, imagining and fantasizing, remembering and observing the contents; and the gaps in his world of meaning gradually increase because he does not give meaning to life contents as he can be expected of him.

2.2 A child in a problematic situation of educating emancipates inadequately

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

If the relationship structures are inadequately realized to any extent, then a child will fail to realize his emancipation adequately; rather in his emancipation he proceeds in emotional ways to labilize

his self-becoming and on a gnostic-cognitive level to inadequately arrive at a systematizing, ordering and understanding via experiencing and lived-experiencing. If in pedagogical association and encounter a child in the relationship of himself and the adult remains stuck on a diffuse, global-gnostic level he really degenerates pedagogically and his actual and potential personal-being do not correspond. Also, when the pedagogical sequence inadequately flourishes to an engagement, a child does not have enough opportunity to show that he is aware that he is a co-worker in his becoming adult.

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

In terms of emancipating as experiencing-, willing-, lived-experiencing-, knowing- and behaving-becoming, a child then also does not sufficiently *signify* that he trust and know his educator such that he approvingly accepts his intervention. Then the child is not *touched* sufficiently, does not know that he really is wrong and there is no desire to accept the adult's decisions as proper. Where inadequate pedagogical trust prevails, a child does not discover (via experiencing, willing, ect.) the objectionable and he does not feel or know that he is wrong; in addition, he does not feel that he must or will trust his educator because then he doesn't trust that the adult knows better.

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

In particular there must be reference to the inadequate realization of pedagogical intervention. This really deprives a child of the advantage of experiencing that his educator trusts him and knows

and approves his comportment and agrees with it and thus knows he also is right.

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

Also, when an educator wants to constantly educate he can hinder a child's adequately emancipating. It also is necessary that a child periodically withdraw from his parents, e.g., by himself being involved in his homework, by playing with his friends, etc. When a child is not granted the freedom to also "be out of his parents' sight", he will not acquire sufficient opportunity to "exercise" his discovered state of becoming. A child who envies this periodic breaking away has the right to object and, as education situated, to be someone himself outside of that educative situation where he can find evidence of his educator's trust in him and where he can, by actualizing his psychic life, think about the educative contents that have been unlocked for him during the course/sequence of educating.

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

Ter Horst⁵² emphasizes that "curtailment" arises if a child is granted too little freedom, given too little opportunity to use his unfolding independence, or to be someone himself with his own desires, interests and initiative. An educator who forgets that in a child decreasingly has a right to guidance and increasingly a right to freedom impedes his *emancipation* as experiencing-, willing-, lived-experiencing-, knowing- and behaving-becoming. When a child is

denied these rights, a child can submit to a curtailment and to no development of independence, says Ter Horst.⁵³

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

The educative dialogue between the educators and child also often is impeded because the child's state of becoming is not recognized sufficiently and taken into consideration. Here it is not the case that the child's increasing independence is ignored but that his being-someone-himself is not acknowledged or recognized enough. Consequently, it is these educators who inadequately understand the child by which loving interest is absent. Then the child experiences bewilderment and confusion⁵⁴ as well as aggression, feelings of guilt, anxiety and distress.⁵⁵

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A parent neglects his educative task if he does not purposefully support his child in his emancipating (in particular via willing-as-becoming) and thus in wanting to be what he can and ought to become in accordance with his given potentialities.

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

It is necessary that a child will continually hear the demands, questions, expectations that an educator presents, as such. If a child inadequately receives this “appeal” he cannot adequately answer it. According to Ter Horst⁶⁰ giving personal meaning does not occur and world meanings are not the child’s. He says that there is a lack in intentionality and “identity” because then there is a lack of

accessibility to reality. “Without identity there is no person, dialogue, world, perspective”*, according to Ter Horst.⁶¹ He points out that identity is not always identical with the I-self that is the way in which a person experiences and handles himself in dialogue, “and it is possible, through incongruity, that the I-self does not have at its disposal the entire structure of identity.”**⁶²

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

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

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

2.3 A child in a problematic situation of educating distances inadequately

Furthermore, the quality of realizing the fundamental pedagogical structures also determines the degree of a child’s adequate distancing-as-experiencing-, willing-, lived-experiencing-, knowing- and behaving-becoming. A experienced labile trust can impede a child in his actual distancing from the pathic to the affective, as a more controlled and stabilized distancing, on the one hand, and on

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

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

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

the other hand, from the gnostic to the cognitive as a more ordered, systematized, conceptual and synthesized distancing.

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

The degree of emotional lability is furthermore determinant of the amount of restraint in ordering in the gnostic-cognitive signifying of the educative contents. An insecure child only ventures in leaping from sensing to perceiving, and from perceiving to thinking, etc. with anxiety and with little peace of mind. A labile sensing finishes lingering with a landscape during the gnostic experiencing and lived-experiencing of it.⁶⁵

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

2.4 A child in a problematic situation of educating differentiates inadequately

If the fundamental pedagogical structures are inadequately realized, a child's readiness to risk himself with reality also is not adequately prepared for, and his readiness to want to optimally actualize his personal potentialities is slight on which basis a child then shows inertia in differentiating among his various potentialities when actualizing his psychic life. Then, indeed, he actualizes a number of the modes of actualizing his psychic life on a level lower than he ought to be able to do. With a lack of sufficient trust in his educators there is an un-willing-ness by a child to allow his dialogue with the educative contents to prosper because the unwillingness to distance his sensing to the gnostic-cognitive modes of actualizing his psychic life, because he differentiates inadequately among these various potentialities at his disposal as well as among the finer nuances within each. When cognitive educating is neglected, e.g., by educators inadequately answering a child's questions, there is a readiness by a child to differentiate, but the it remains only a *readiness* because the *unlocking* by the parents does not provide sufficient opportunity for the child to realize and practice his potentialities for actualizing his psychic life because the (educators') guidance and "teaching" simply are missing. Inadequate cognitive and normative educating implies that a child is denied the opportunities necessary to differentiate and actualize his personal potentialities for signifying life contents. In addition, this implies that a child becomes "differentiation-inert" and gradually is no longer attuned to optimally realizing his potentialities on which basis an under-actualization of his psychic life-in-education necessarily must follow.

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

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

2.5 A child in a problematic situation of educating objectifies inadequately

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

Especially this is the case with rejection, overprotection and overloading. If a child does not experience sufficient freedom to distance himself from himself, fellow persons and things in order to consider himself, his parents and the life contents from a "distance", he cannot adequately discover things as what indeed they are.

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

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

Thus, where in any sense there is emotional flooding on the basis of experiencing anxiety, tension and insecurity, a child does not succeed in breaking through the labile pathic-affective and

adequately proceed to a gnostic-cognitive level with life contents on the basis of which adequate objectifying is not possible.

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. SYNTHESIS

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

Where something occurs that a child cannot assimilate, that he could not integrate into his life from then until now, “then this history is going to weigh on him as a burden; it can reach an impass. Traumatization can be such an experience when this dare not be looked at, when there is a shrinking away from what announces itself as content in his life. A child will not be confronted with the meaning of the unacceptable experience, he wards it off—and thinks he will see it again in everything unknown and unfamiliar. It is continually lived in fear and tension in order to hold back what is anxiety provoking. The trauma deprives him of the freedom to be himself”,** says Kwakkel-Scheffer.⁶⁷

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

On the basis of his being in a problematic educative situation, a child’s lived-experiencing is not only harmed but so also is his experiencing-, willing-, lived-experiencing-, knowing- and behaving. Vliegthart⁶⁹ says, then a deviant psychic structure develops. Such a child signifies his situation of educating as always unsafe, and

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

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

Kwakkel-Scheffer⁷⁰ says if the parents do not guarantee security for their child, he is delivered to danger and he does not live in a being bonded with the adults that is directed to his adulthood.

According to Ter Horst⁷¹ this leads a child to lose a future perspective that, according to him⁷², “the whole custom of a child’s sleeping over six nights for his birthday, a new coat for mother as a present from the child”[???].* He⁷³ also says that “the temporal dimension is co-constitutive for human living. The present, the now is only livable if there is a past from which and a future to which it can be lived . . . The point where one stands colors the way in which one looks back and how one sees the future.”**

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

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

According to Vedder⁷⁷ *emotional poverty* leads to an inability to form deeper bonds with the educators and pees, and also to inadequate conscience forming, and activities such as telling lies and stealing. Ter Horst⁷⁸ says the child really isolates himself because he is not in a position to enter reality adequately and for him to design a world dialogically.

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

** [de tydsdimensie is medeconstituerend voor het menselijk leven. Het heden, het nu is alleen leefbaar al ser een verleden is van waaruit, en een toekomst waar naar toe, kan worden geleefd . . . Het punt waar men staat kleurt de manier waarop men terugkijkt en de toekomst ziet]

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

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

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

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

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

A child who is not free from the force of urges cannot adequately actualize his psychic life-in-education and he also does not

continually act in ways that can be expected for his age because the expected ordering of his own lifeworld is missing.

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

If at the same time, he is inundated with too much life contents this really leads to a chaotic world of meaning and in this connection Ter Horst⁸³ says “Large and small, near and far, now and presently, desirous and horrible, impulse and decision, beautiful and ugly, like and dislike, good and bad, past and present, mine and yours lie behind each other and come to each other or merge into an unpredictable, inextricable mixture.”[??]* Then there is a lack of adequate ordering and there is not sufficient consistency in the forms of educative dialogue offered by the educators.

However, when a child is allowed to do anything he wants to and also is not kept in check on the basis of a so-called anti-authoritarian or permissive educating, he does not succeed in constituting his own adequately differentiated lifeworld.

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

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

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

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

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

When a child does not progressively discover the norm-image of adulthood, he is hindered in thriving from a state of guided dependence intertwined with guided independence to a state of self-guided independence.⁸⁸ Then he really remains uncertain and insecure and his experiencing, lived-experiencing, willing, knowing and behaving are unfavorable for his becoming; he cannot adequately actualize his psychic life because he does not live closely bonded with adults directed to adulthood,⁸⁹ and thus he cannot adequately discover the sense of human dignity.

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

REFERENCES

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

9. Ibid.
10. Also see Perquin, N., op cit., pp. 35, 178-183.
11. Vedder, R.: *Inleiding tot de Psychiatrie*, Wolters, Groningen, 1965.
12. Beets, N.: *De Grote Jongen*, op cit., p. 21.
13. See Langeveld, M. J.: *Ontwikkelingspsychologie*, op cit., pp. 41-42.
14. Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., op cit., p. 71.
15. Cited by Rienstra, Y., op cit., pp. 115-116.
16. See Lubbers, R., op cit., p. 55.
17. See Ter Horst, W.: *Proeve van een Orthopedagogisch Theorieconcept*, op cit., p. 29
18. Ibid, p. 38.
19. Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op cit., p. 21.
20. Lubbers, R., op cit., p.6.
21. Perquin, N., op cit., pp. 31 and 81.
22. See Pretorius, J. W. M.: *Kinderlike Beleving*, op cit., p. 51.
23. Lersch, P., op cit., pp. 331-357.
24. Langeveld, M. J.: *Ontwikkelingspsychologie*, op cit., pp. 41-42.
25. Ter Horst, W.: *Proeve van een Orthopedagogisch Theorieconcept*, op cit., p. 79.
26. See Lubbers, R., op cit, pp. 6 and 58.
27. Nieuwenhuis, H., in Bordewijk, W., Daqaamen, H. E., Fokkema, D. and Nieuwenhuis, H.: *Kinderpsychologie en Opvoedkunde Psychologie*, Wolters, Groningen, 1964, p. 2.
28. Langeveld, M. J.: *Ontwikkelingspsychologie*, op cit., p. 83.
29. See Carp, E. A. D. E.: *Angst en vrees*, Aula, Utrecht, 1966, pp. 8-9.
30. See Faure, J. S. M., op cit., p. 53.
31. Nieuwenhuis, H., op cit., p. 2.
32. See Kwakkel-Scheffer, J. J. C., op cit., p. 67.
33. Noordam, N. F.: *Het mensbeeld in de Opvoeding*, 2, in: Van Gelder, L. (Ed.): *Informatie over opvoeding en onderwijs*, No. 8, Wolters-Noordhoff, Groningen, 1970, p. 18.
34. Landman, W. A.: *Leesboek vir die Christenopvoeder*, op cit., p. 14.
35. Lubbers, R., op cit., p. 58.
36. Muller-Eckhard, H., op cit., p. 86.
37. See Pretorius, J. W. M.: *Kinderlike Beleving*, op cit., p. 90.
38. Standeer, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op cit., p.22.
39. Lubbers, R., op cit., p. 10.
40. Ter Horst, W., op cit., ref. 25, p. 65.
41. Ibid, p. 75.
42. Van der Stoep, F.: *Didaktiese Grondvorme*, op cit., p. 26.
43. See Sonnekus, M. C. H.: *Onderwyser Les en Kind*, op cit., pp. 8-9.
44. Ter Horst, W., op cit., ref 25, p. 80.
45. Ibid.
46. Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psigopedagogiek: 'n Inleidende Oriëntering*, op cit., p. 156.
47. Pretorius, J. W. M., op cit., ref. 37, p. 51.
48. Ibid, pp. 50-51.
49. Sonnekus, M. C. H.: *A Pedagogical Study of the handicapped child with special reference to his sensory, motor, perceptual and conceptual orientation*, op cit.
50. Lubbers, R., op cit., p. 6.
51. Ter Horst, W., op cit., ref. 25, p. 92.
52. Ibid, p. 86.

53. Ibid.
54. Muller-Eckhard, H. op cit., p. 52.
55. Ibid.
56. Lubber, R., op cit., p. 10.
57. Ter Horst, W.: *Proeve van een Orthopedagogisch Theorieconcept*, op cit., p. 38.
58. See Noordam, N. F.: *Het Mensbeeld in de Opvoeding 1*, in: Van Gelder, R. (Ed.): *Informatie over opvoeding en onderwijs*, No. 7, Wolters-Noordhoff, Groningen, 1971, pp. 33-35.
59. Sonnekus, M. C. H., op cit., Ref. 49.
60. Ter Horst, W., op cit., Ref. 57, p. 91.
61. Ibid, p. 98.
62. Ibid.
63. Ibid, p. 99.
64. Gouws, S. J. L.: *Pedagogiese Diagnostisering van Kinders met Leemoeilikhede*, op cit., p. 26.
65. See Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psigopedagogiek: 'n Inleidende Oriëntering*, op cit., Chapter 4.
66. Lubbers, R., op cit., p. 55.
67. Kwakkel-Scheffer, J. J. C., op cit., p. 82.
68. Pretorius, J. W. M.: *Kinderlike Beleving*, op cit., p. 50.
69. Vliegthart, W. E.: *Algemene Orthopedagogiek*, op cit., p. 33.
70. Kwakkel-Scheffer, J. J. C., op cit., p. 71
71. Ter Horst, W.: *Een orthopedagogiek gezichtspunt*, in: Van Berckelaer-Onnes, et al.: *Verduisterd perspektief*, op cit., p. 3.
72. Ter Horst, W.: *Proeve van een Orthopedagogisch Theorieconcept*, op cit., p. 49.
73. Ibid, p. 48.
74. Ibid, p. 97.
75. Ibid.
76. Ibid.
77. Vedder, R.: *Kinderen met leer- en gedragmoeilikheden*, 4th ed., J. B. Wolters, Groningen, 1964, pp. 173-174.
78. Ter Horst, W.: *Proeve van een Orthopedagogisch Theorieconcept*, op cit., pp. 78-79.
79. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op cit., p. 31.
80. Ter Horst, W., op cit., Ref. 78, p. 85.
81. See Lubbers, R., op cit., p. 7.
82. Ter Horst, W., op cit., Ref 78, p. 97.
83. Ibid, p. 82.
84. Vedder, R.: *Inleiding tot de Psychiatrie*, op cit., p. 153.
85. See Langeveld, M. J.: *Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek*, op cit., p. 49.
86. De Klerk, L.: *De Grondsituasie der Puberteitsopvoeding*, J. B. Wolters, Groningen, 2nd ed., 1956, p. 46.
87. Ter Horst, W., op cit, Ref. 78, p. 83.
88. Oberholzer, C. K.: *Die Pedagogiese*, op cit.
89. Nel, B. F.: *Pedagogiese verwaarlosing*, op cit, p. 34.