

CHAPTER VI

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

1. INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

According to Landman⁴ a pedagogical criterion is a pedagogical category whose evaluative significance is involved in a pedagogical judgment. He says the evaluative significance is even clearer when the pedagogical categories are formulated in the form of questions. Pedagogical categories let the pedagogical structures and their coherencies appear as they essentially are; i.e., they let the fundamental structures appear to the pedagogue for their actualization in the educative situation.⁵

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. EVALUATING THE PEDAGOGICALLY ACHIEVED LEVEL

It has appeared that a child always *is* on a particular level of becoming, but that he also *ought* to be on a specific level. The event that leads from *is* to *ought* implies an *elevation* in level of dialogue, choice, value and *meaning*.

To gauge a child's achieved pedagogical level, his self-actualized becoming must be gauged in terms of psychopedagogical as well as fundamental pedagogical criteria. Thus, an investigator explores

the child's lifeworld. In terms of various exploratory media that he inserts between himself and the child and by which the child is placed in a position to establish relationships with others, the investigator acquires an image of *how* the child actualizes his person-being-in-education. Such an investigation is qualified as *pedagogical diagnostics*. Hence, the *educative effect* on a particular child is explored.

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

Thus, such evaluating occurs in terms of *psychopedagogical* criteria that are psychopedagogical categories in the form of questions. These criteria Also cannot merely be qualified as criteria on a *psychic level* or as *psychological* criteria as is done by Nel¹⁰ and Faure¹¹, respectively, when they refer to the following: The biological moment; the principle of helplessness; the principle of safety or security; the principle of exploration; the state of the affective together with temperament; the state of the cognitive; interests; learning difficulties at school; disturbed social relationships; attentive concentrating; perceiving; and intentionality.

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

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

For example, the following must be investigated:
How does he carry on a dialogue?
How does his *experiencing* appear there?
How does his *live- experiencing* appear there?
How does his *actualizing knowing* appear there?
How does his *behaving* appear there?

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

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

2.1 Evaluating exploring as a psychic life actualization of becoming

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

2.2 Evaluating emancipating as a psychic life actualization of becoming

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

How does this child emancipate? Does he want to be someone? How will he be someone? How does he explain himself during his dialogue with fellow persons at home, in school and among his friends? How does his current image appear in terms of personal dignity, especially in the experienced and lived-experienced look of others? Is there mention of emotional lability because of his experiencing and lived-experiencing "animosity" in the other's look?

The question of a child's personal intention regarding life appeal is closely related to his particular future perspective and, as such, it is an indication of his intention to want to become-adult. An inadequately anticipated image of adulthood contains a decrease in the quality of his intention to become and this leads to muddying his future perspective, which holds for all levels of the actualization

of his becoming. Therefore, his future perspective continually must be investigated. A child's level of intentionality in becoming must be continually gauged.

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

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

2.3 Evaluating distancing as a psychic life actualization of becoming

It is important to know the extent to which a child already can distance himself from particular matters or if perhaps he is too caught up in them.

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

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

2.4 Evaluating differentiating as a psychic life actualization of becoming

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

2.5 Evaluating objectifying as a psychic life actualization of becoming

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

An indication of the quality of his objectifying especially is acquired by investigating his knowledge of landscapes of reality. His taking a standpoint regarding particular life contents is investigated and there is a verification of how this stands regarding his own philosophy of life. What standpoint does he hold regarding specific matters? Does he understand particular assignments, values, demands of propriety? Does he want to understand? Does he allow himself to be led only by his feelings? Does he respect the opinions

of others? Does he try to look into a matter? Does he act impulsively? Is he ready to think a matter through? How is it with his judgments in terms of sound understanding?

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

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

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

Since the sense and meaning that the child continually has given to the educative contents and, by means of experiencing, to his lifeworld, in terms of added possessed experiences, it is obvious that the quality of his *experiencing* must be gauged.

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

The "repeated answer" of a child in more or less regularly recurring situations, if he answers in terms of *his* particular meaning of the matter, gives an indication of the quality of his experiencing. Thus, attention is paid to the *skillfulness* or *awkwardness* that the child's habitually formed behaving has acquired.

Because experiencing implies that one's *own* lifeworld is continually expanded, attention also is paid to the "furnishings" of the child's own lifeworld and if and where there are possible deficiencies. It is determined what particular image a child has of a particular matter or what understanding he shows in this connection. The *quality* of the knowledge at his disposal is gauged and attention is given to the judgments he makes regarding particular matters. Thus there also is an inquiry into the child's insightful knowing and if his "understanding" perhaps rests mostly on an intuitive knowing that

can lead to misconceptions. Hence, it must be determined how the *child* understands the matter. He must always be perceived carefully because his anticipating tendency—as the pre-understanding of what becomes available itself in perceiving in the sense that certain aspects of the perceived that are not given in the direct observing are presumed—must be evaluated. There is attention to moments of imagining, fantasizing, thinking and even remembering. Attention is given to the child’s activity and his passivity. How does he act, view, design, choose and what is their quality?

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

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

In addition, in particular there must be an inquiry about the child’s habitual taking a position toward his world. Thus the “sort” of emotional lived-experiencing is determined, e.g., the quality of willing. A poor emotional life results in a child who cannot will to arrive at taking an adequate gnostic-cognitive position.¹⁷

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

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

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

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

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

With respect to gauging the state of emotional lived-experiencing it is important to investigate the level of behaving; in particular, what holds regarding the mobility of voluntary and expressive behavior,²⁰ to indicate the affectivity that pre-forms and initiates the behavior.

Thus, e.g., a smile indicates accessibility, affection, sympathetic and peaceful satisfaction.

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

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

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

2.7 Evaluating the realization of the educative aim

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

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

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

2.7.1 Evaluating the child's interpreting his own existence as meaningful or meaningless²⁴

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

It is asked: *How* does the child as a person carry on a dialogue with life? How is the meaningfulness of his own existence now interpreted by him? Since this mainly is a *being aware*, a *knowing*, a *questioning* an *answer* regarding his own existence is implied; thus there also is a specific investigation of the child's taking a gnostic-cognitive position towards his own existence. Are there signs of a break-through of the awareness that he is accountable? Is he aware that he is called on to realize values? Does he ask about the sense of life? To what degree is he aware that he must carry on a responsible life? Is there an increase in the manifestation of his own responsibility? To what extent are his actions guided by responsible choices? To what extent does he account for his actions, conduct and choices? What degree of insight is there into his life-task and -calling? How does he answer the appeal to meaningfully actualize his potentialities? What is his attitude towards work? To what extent does he perform tasks and assignments voluntarily? How does he interpret possible disabilities, illnesses, poor educating, rudeness, etc.? Does he realize his potentialities with an eye to a *meaningful* existence—with an eye to fulfilling his tasks to also reach his destination (adulthood)? Is he aware that he also has responsibilities? Does the child's life show that his direction to the future is *thriving*?

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

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

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

Questions that must be answered are:

How does the child judge and understand himself?

Are there signs of a personal taking a position towards himself?

Are there signs of an active, critical judging of himself?

Can he express moral judgments about himself? Can he make moral judgments about his choices? Does he act in accordance with a plan of life? Does he have insight into his own problems? Does he accept possible deficiencies?

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

2.7.3 Evaluating the child's interpreting human dignity³⁰

In the first place, clarity must be acquired regarding the child's view of his own human dignity. This especially has to do with a *valuing*

of himself and in this *emotional meanings* have a prominent place. Thus the state of pathic-affective lived-experiencing must be investigated thoroughly. This involves an evaluation of the child's self-evaluation in terms of particular contents. To be able to gauge how he understands and knows these contents, the state of his gnostic-cognitive lived-experiencing must be examined.

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

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

2.7.4 Evaluating the child's morally independent choosing and acting³¹

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

Here then the overarching question is the degree to which a child makes independent, moral decisions and acts accordingly. Does he remain true to his decisions? What values does he view as of most worth for himself personally? Can he choose independently? Does he accept responsibility for his choices and actions? Does he make the effort to carry out his decisions? Do his choices indicate moral responsibility? Does he actualize his potentialities in accordance with the demands life places on him? Is there mention of consistency in his activities in particular situations? Does he understand the proper? Does he identify himself with the proper? Are his actions evidence that they are the

result of his increasing knowledge of good and bad? Does he stay with his decisions? Does he change his decisions when he discovers they are “wrong”? Does he listen to arguments (pleas)?

2.7.5 Evaluating the child’s exercise of responsibility³²

Following Nel³³ responsibility is the basic criterion since being-responsible is nothing more than recognizing values and norms and living according to them. Because here the demand placed on a child is that he will take a responsible stand with respect to *something*, the state of taking a gnostic-cognitive position must be examined. Does the child understand *why* this is so? To take a responsible stand, however, also includes an *attunement* and therefore the state of the pathic-affective also must be examined.

Here the overarching questions are: To what degree does the child take responsibility for himself? Is he aware of his responsibility?

Does he realize his responsibility with respect to related matters? How responsible is his execution of tasks? What is his stance towards life obligations? What is his stance towards authority? To what degree does he understand the demands of propriety? Is he conscientious in carrying out assignments? because Frankl³⁴ implies that responsibility always is responsibility with respect to an obligation. Does he exert himself to act responsibly? Does he show a sustained readiness to do what is proper? How is his initiative to behave responsibly? Does he freely show responsible behavior? Does he understand why the “improper” is improper? Is he ready to freely exert himself? Does he recognize his obligations? Does he accept authority? Is he obedient? Is he ready to accept punishment? Does he persist with a task?

2.7.6 Evaluating the child’s identification with norms³⁶

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

Here the overarching question is: To what extent does the child identify himself with the norm as such? Is there mention of an

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

2.7.7 Evaluating the child's philosophy of life³⁶

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

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

2.7.8 Synthesis

In determining a child's pedagogically achieved level, there must be an accounting of his *actual actualization of his psychic life* in his current pedagogical situatedness and the *meanings* he attributes to life as such. Thus, there is not only an investigation of *how* the child's psychic life actualization (more specifically his sensing) *appears* there but indeed an investigation of how his psychic life is

actualized—i.e., also the actualization of his becoming—as *educatively situated*.

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

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

On the other hand, it must be determined what *now can* be expected of *this* child in terms of his potentialities for actualizing his psychic life in accordance with the *expected* level of actualization of a child who has adequate personal potentialities. This *expected* level is determined by studying the longitudinal becoming of children in general. Determining how a particular child's becoming *can be* occurs in terms of criteria of the “psychology of becoming” that are particularized by disclosing the essences of childlike psychic life actualization on different levels of becoming corresponding to the child's age.

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

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

3. EVALUATING THE CHILD'S PEDAGOGICALLY ATTAINABLE LEVEL

It is evident that an indication must be found of the child's potentialities for becoming adult. It must be determined what his potentialities are for exploring, emancipating, distancing, differentiating and objectifying. His potentialities for sensing also must be investigated in terms of emotional lability or stability; how is his potential for attending, perceiving, imagining and fantasizing,

thinking, actualizing intelligence, remembering and observing especially in terms of how ordered, systematic and abstract they are. The functioning of all of his sense organs must be gauged because it is via them that he, as *corporality*, enters a dialogue with the world and communicates with it.

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

An image of the child's potentialities for becoming also continually give an indication of his optimal becoming at a particular period in his progress to adulthood by evaluating this in terms of his life task to which he, as a particular child with his particular potentialities, *now* is called.

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

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

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

For example, if a child of two months does not yet put his hand in his mouth this might indicate that he has not yet "learned to know"

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

his hand and, as such, possibly is under-actualizing his sensognostic modes of being.

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

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

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

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

4. DETERMINING THE NATURE OF THE GAP IN BECOMING

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

4.1 Evaluating the child’s under-actualization of his psychic life-in-education

In order to gauge the “different” attribution of meanings by the child restrained in becoming, an evaluation must be done of the moments of under-actualizing his psychic life-in-education. Thus, in particular, there is a search for the essences of the child’s inadequate actualization of his becoming.

4.2 Psycho-(ortho-)pedagogical criteria

In terms of the psycho-(ortho-)pedagogical criteria the quality of his realization of the various modes of actualizing his psychic life now are investigated with respect to their possible under-actualization. Following this, if an indication is found of the possible impairment and also its degree of, among others³⁷, the biological moment, the principle of helplessness, the principle of safety and security, the affective, cognitive, concentration of attending, interest, social relations, actualizing intentionality are evaluated. The possible *deficiencies in actualizing* as such with respect to inadequate exploring, emancipating, distantiating, differentiating and objectifying thus are illuminated by determining the quality of their actualization.

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

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

To what degree does a child *explore* the world inadequately? Is there perhaps mention of affective lability, gnostic-cognitive unsystematicness, normative meaninglessness? How is it with his anxiety, his imagining and fantasizing, his thinking, his actualizing his intelligence, his remembering and his observing? Is there mention of a lived-experience of helplessness? Are there signs of

unassimilated helplessness, insecurity and anxiety? Is the condition of the child's psychic life favorable for his becoming adult? Is there a defect in self-assurance, confidence and self-possession? Does the child show signs of confusion, uncertainty, perplexity, despair, helplessness? Is he over-aggressive? Does he have control of his affects? Answers to these questions are obtained by implementing the mentioned criteria. These answers also indicate how that child's emancipating, distantiating, etc. are actualized "differently".

Because a child restrained in becoming, e.g., necessarily does not emancipate his personal dignity, and readily devaluates himself, this determines to what extent he devaluates himself. Nel³⁸ says this especially has to do with determining to what extent there already is an acceptance of the self with his deficiencies.

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

4.3 Fundamental-(ortho-)pedagogical criteria

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

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

4.3.1 Inadequate attribution of meaning to one's own existence⁴¹

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

Is his future perspective obscure? Does the child withdraw himself and are there signs of isolation? Is there an unwillingness to explore? Does the child feel himself excluded? Does he ridicule the defects and illnesses of others? Is he rude? Does he persevere with the same "transgressions"? Does he enjoy being disappointed? Is he

content to under achieve? Is he satisfied with nothing? Does he give insufficient concern to what he is going to make of himself?

4.3.2 Inadequate self-judging and -understanding

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

Does he feel that he is inferior? Is he dissatisfied with himself? Does he undertake tasks beyond his ability? Is he very ashamed in the company of peers and other fellow persons? Does he swagger and boast? Is he unwilling to help others? Does he feel that he is unwelcome by his peers? Does he not care if he appears to be unreasonable? Does he allow himself to be led only by his feelings? Does he over-estimate his own ability? Does he act infantile?

4.3.3 Inadequate understanding of human dignity⁴²

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

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

4.3.4 Inadequate forming of moral choices and corresponding actions⁴³ by the child himself

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

Does he not keep his promises? Does he prefer the unacceptable? Does he have a poor insight into the demands of propriety? Is he willful? Does he make promises and not carry out his resolves?

Does he easily make many promises? Does he have insufficient regret for possible misdeeds? Is he inclined to lie and deceive? Is he dishonest? Does he have respect for another's property? Does he readily neglect his obligations? Does he easily lay the guilt on others? Does he refuse to make an effort? Is he lazy? Is he inconsistent in his actions? Does he let himself be led by the nose by anyone?

4.3.5 Inadequate taking responsibility⁴⁴

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

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

4.3.6 Inadequate identification with norms⁴⁵

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

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

4.3.7 Inadequate appropriation of a philosophy of life

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

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

4.4 Synthesis

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

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

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

5.1 Evaluating aspects of the restraints in self-becoming

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

does he implement values **differently**, how does he exert himself **differently**, in the sense of **inadequately**?

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

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

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

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

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

Rienstra⁴⁷ indicates how emotional ambivalence between parents and children imposes a burden on a child and, among other things, leads to feelings of insecurity and anxiety. Thus, a child's

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

The degree of disorder and defective systematization that gnostic-cognitive guidance promotes has to be gauged.

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

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

Thus the educative event has to be evaluated in terms of the inadequate educating of experiencing, willing, lived-experiencing, knowing and behaving. In particular, there has to be a search for the emotional level that he habitually assumes in his pedagogical situation and also an inquiry about the educative failings that are promoting emotional lability and a weak inner-directedness.

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

A child inhabits the world through his body and we find him bodily in a pedagogical situation, hence we also have to inquire about possible chronic illnesses and defects, not because such deficiencies,

in themselves, include an under-actualization of his psychic life but to determine if he has meaningfully assimilated such biological defects or deviations as meaningful to himself and thus has accepted them.⁴⁹ When a child has not accepted and assimilated his defects or lacks, he feels that he is **different** and inadequate, that is, uncertain and insecure.

5.2 Evaluating a problematic educative event

In particular, the inadequate guidance to actualizing becoming oneself has to be evaluated. This requires that the quality of actualizing the fundamental pedagogical structure be evaluated with the aim of determining what the **problematic** aspects are.

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

5.2.1 Evaluating the quality of actualizing the pedagogical relationship

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

5.2.1.1 Under-actualized becoming during the inadequate actualization of pedagogical trust

Giving and accepting trust by the educators and the child have to be evaluated.⁵¹ Nieuwenhuis⁵² says there is a very close connection between the **feeling** of **security** and **trust** and he distinguishes between them as follows, "A primary difference between **security** and **trust**, it seems to me, is that security is an expressed state within which one finds himself while trusting contains within itself a **certain degree of activity**" and trust moreover is a "further developed state of consciousness" than is security.⁵³

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

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

5.2.1.2 Under-actualized becoming during the inadequate actualization of pedagogical understanding⁵⁴

Also the actualization of the relationship of understanding has to be evaluated as a possibly inadequately actualized educative relationship. The important question here is whether there is inadequate participation in the relationship of understanding by the educator and/or the child. Do the educators establish a relationship of understanding in unaccountable ways? Is the child seldom confronted with tasks of self-understanding? Do the educators have inadequate knowledge of the child? Do the educators have inadequate knowledge about his destination (adulthood)? Is there mention of misunderstanding by the adults and/or child? Oberholzer⁵⁵ postulates the criteria of understanding and responding to the needs of a needy child; what this involves is evaluating the adults' understanding of the child and the question also is whether the educator opens himself too little to conversing with and understanding the child. Other possible considerations are whether the educator incorrectly understands the child's potentialities. Does the child know that his educators do not or are not willing to understand him? Does the educator possibly over-estimate the child's potentialities? Does the child know that his

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

5.2.1.3 Under-actualizing becoming during the inadequate exercise of pedagogical authority⁵⁶

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

How is authority exercised? Is it absent? Is there too much? Is a child given too little responsibility? Is he given too many responsibilities too soon? Is discipline too lax or severe? Is there possibly too much or too little punishment? Are there inconsistencies in exercising authority? Has the relationship of authority been established in irresponsible ways? Is there too little obedience to the authority demanded? Does the exercise of authority indicate a lack of trust? Are too few demands and norms presented to the child? Nel⁵⁹ also postulates the criteria of "inadequate acceptance of authority" and the "inadequate exercise of authority." Do the parents' examples possibly contradict what they demand? Is he not brought up to live what is proper? Is he given too few opportunities to experience and lived-experience that he has acceptable dignity? Does the educator pay too little attention to whether assignments are completely carried out?

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

5.3 Evaluating the quality of actualizing the pedagogical sequence

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

5.3.1 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate pedagogical association⁶⁰

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

5.3.2 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate pedagogical encounter⁶¹

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

5.3.3 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate pedagogical engagement⁶²

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

educative aim for the child to strive for? Is the child unwilling to make himself available to pedagogical influencing?

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

5.3.4 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate pedagogical intervention

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

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

5.3.5 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate return to pedagogical association

It also is necessary to determine if the child is given sufficient opportunity to return to the more relaxed relationship of pedagogical association after the more "tense" relationship during intervention and/or concurrence? Does the child experience and lived-experience that he is "constantly" being educated? Is the child perhaps burdened with an overdose of directions?

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

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

Also, in particular, the pedagogical activities have to be evaluated.

5.4 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate pedagogical activities

5.4.1 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate giving meaning

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

5.4.2 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate pedagogical exertion

The question here is whether the child too seldom has the opportunity to recognize his obligations and to know what responsibilities are demanded of him. Does the educator too seldom let the child discover what is demanded of him? Is he given too little opportunity to discover what he should put his effort into? Is he too seldom given the opportunity to learn to know his own potentialities? Is he grudgingly given the opportunity to discover that he has to actualize his potentialities optimally? Is he given too little opportunity for self-reflection? Is he hindered in actively exerting himself? Is he given too few opportunities to properly

think through his decisions? Also, to what degree is the child helped to take a truly "effortless" stance toward the world? Is he not too readily permitted to leave all that he deals with half done; that he doesn't have a real need to exert himself? Does the child "forget" to work? Are there too many who do everything for him? Are there perhaps too few assignments and tasks for him to carry out? Is there perhaps a persistent deficiency in willingness to perform tasks? Is there a deficiency in persistence? Are opportunities not granted for the child to act on his own initiative? In everything must he first ask for the educator's permission?

5.4.3 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate norming

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

5.4.4 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate venturing with each other

Here the question especially is in what respect there is mention of a deficiency in venturing together with respect to the educative contents. Is there no opportunity for the child also to **independently** venture with his educators? Is the child's venturing attunement too deficient because of affective neglect? Does the pedagogical association too seldom proceed to a pedagogical encounter? Is the educative conversation too often replaced with general guesswork and chit-chat? Is there a lack of mutual trust to such a degree that the child feels too afraid to

venture with his educators? Does the child feel he cannot entrust himself to his educators? Does the child know that he is accepted as someone who cannot carry responsibility?

5.4.5 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate gratitude for pedagogical security

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

5.4.6 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate acceptance of pedagogical accountability

In the first place there must be a consideration of the degree of responsibility that can be expected of the child. Further, the question then is if he is given enough opportunity to accept responsibility. Does he experience and lived-experience that he does not have an obligation to let the educative event succeed? Does he feel that the educators look at him as a less valued person who is not able to do much himself? Is there mention of an absence of "our space" in which he can feel and know that he also can and must make a contribution?

5.4.7 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate hope for future adulthood

Here the question is whether the parents present a "senseless" future to the child. Further, it can be asked if the child is given too little opportunity to experience and lived-experience that he also increasingly becomes "more adult" and eventually must become a proper adult. Is there a deficient future created for the child? Do

the educators demonstrate an unfavorable image of adulthood as an image of the future for the child?

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

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

The first question is how this child inadequately designs his possibilities. Does the child have too little opportunity to independently actualize his possibilities in his life design? Is he excessively overprotected? Are the parents excessively concerned that he must not be "hurt"? Is he given too little opportunity to do things himself?

In this connection Oberhozer⁶⁵ postulates the criteria *must do things himself, ought to be* and also *be someone himself who must do something himself*.

Questions asked here are: Is the child given too little opportunity to strengthen his trust in his educators? Is there an absence of security on the basis of which a conflict in trust develops? Are the child's personal attempts too often misunderstood and underestimated? Are the child's achievements not seen as means to another aim as

his increasingly becoming adult? Is the child too readily restrained from doing things himself? Is there too much for the child to do? Is too little or too much expected of the child?

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

Here the first question is in what respect does the child continually judge himself in his becomingness and does the inadequacy lie? Does the child have too little opportunity to have more responsibility placed on him? Is there too little consideration for the child's actual elevation of meaning? Does he have an inadequate opportunity to exercise conscience?⁶⁶ For Dienelt⁶⁷ educating is "educating to responsibility ... to having a conscience", and it also must be asked if the child is not held accountable enough when he has acted incorrectly?

5.4.10 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate increasing respect for human dignity

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

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

Here the question is to what degree there is mention of inadequate understanding of himself by the child. Is the **sympathetic** criticism from the adult absent? Is the child criticized too much? Does he too seldom have the opportunity to critically judge himself in terms of the person image emulated by his educators? Does he discover too little his accountability on the basis of defective demonstration by his educators?

5.4.12 Under-actualizing becoming during inadequate pedagogical becoming free to responsibility

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

6. SYNTHESIS

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

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

REFERENCES

1. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., p. 4.
2. See Garbers, J. G.: *Intree in die maatskaplike taak*, J. B. Wolters, Groningen, 1958, p. 129.
3. Ibid, pp. 129-130.
4. Landman, W. A.: *Aanwending van die Pedagogiese Kategoriee in die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, *Pedagogiekstudies* No. 68, University of Pretoria, p. 42.

5. Ibid, p. 41.
6. See ibid, p. 42.
7. See Landman, W. A., Kilian, C. J. G. and Roos, S. G., op. cit., p. 17.
8. See Landman, W. A., op. cit., p. 41.
9. See ibid, p. 42.
10. Nel, B. F.: *Die grondbeginsels van 'n pedagogies-verantwoorde pedoterapie*, in: *Jubileum-Lesings*, University of Pretoria, Faculty of Education 1937-1962, HAUM, Pretoria, 1963, pp. 64, 65.
11. Faure, J. S. W., op. cit., pp. 61-62.
12. See Ferreira, G. V., op. cit., p. 60.
13. Ibid.
14. See Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psigopedagogiek: 'n Inleidende orienteering*, op. cit., p 183.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid, p. 166.
17. Ibid, p. 154.
18. Ibid.
19. See Pretorius, J. W. M.: *Kinderlike Belewing*, op. cit., pp. 52, 70; Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 66.
20. See Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.), p. 170.
21. See Pretorius, J. W. M.: *Kinderlike Belewing*, op. cit., p. 50.
22. See Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.), p. 170.
23. Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., pp. 71-73.
24. Also see: Landman, W. A and Gous, S. J., op. cit., p. 72; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 56; Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 61; Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op. cit., p. 85.
25. See Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., op. cit., p.72; Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit, p. 35; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., pp. 54, 57; Nel, B. F., op. cit.,p. 60; Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op. cit., p 85.
26. Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 62.
27. Ibid, p. 58.
28. See Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 58.
29. See Frankl, V. E.: *De onbewuste God*, Dutch translation by Melotte-Athmer, 3rd ed., Helmond, p. 57; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 54.
30. See Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., op. cit., p. 72; Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., p. 36; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 56; Nel, B. F., op. cit., pp. 61, 65; Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op. cit., p. 85.
31. See Landman, W. A., and Gous, S. J., op. cit., p. 72; Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., pp. 36, 37; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 73, et seq.: Oberholzer, C. K.: *Die Pedagogiese*, op. cit.; Oberholzer, C. K.: *Inleiding tot die Prinsipiele Opvoedkunde*, J. J. Moreau, Pretoria, 1954, pp. 5, 271, 286.
32. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., p. 37; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 53; Nel, B. F., op. cit., pp. 60 et seq.; Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op. cit., p. 85; Ungersma, A. J.: *The search for Meaning*, Rusking House, George Allen and Unwin, London, p. 21.
33. Nel, B. F., op. cit., p.65; See also Langeveld, M. J.: *Beknopte Theoretische Paedagogiek*, op. cit., p. 43.
34. Frankl, V. E.: *Medische Zielzorg*, Dutch translation by Toon Bartels, Vonk and Co's publisher, pp. 24 et seq.

35. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C.R., op. cit., p. 37; Nel, B. F., op. cit., pp. 60-63; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., pp. 54-60; Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op. cit., 85.
36. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., p. 37; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 60; Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 63; Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op. cit., p. 85.
37. See Langeveld, M. J.: *Ontwikkelingspsychologie*, op. cit.; Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., pp. 61-72; Nel, B. F., op. cit., pp. 64-66.
38. Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 65.
39. Landman, W. A., op. cit., p. 72.
40. See Oberholzer, C. K.: *Prolegomena van 'n Prinsipiele Pedagogiek*, HAUM, Cape Town, 1968, p. 317; Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., op. cit., p. 70.
41. See Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., pp. 56-57; Nel, B. F., op. cit., pp. 61-62.
42. Nel, B. F., op. cit., pp. 61-62.
43. See Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 55.
44. See Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., pp. 53, 54; Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 60.
45. See Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 54; Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 60.
46. See Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H., op. cit., p. 21.
47. Rienstra, Y., op. cit., pp. 73-76.
48. Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 63.
49. See Faure, J. S. M., op. cit., p. 61.
50. Pretorius, J. W. M.: *Kinderlike Belewing*, op. cit., p. 61.
51. See Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., op. cit., p. 48; Landman, W. A.: *Leesboek vir die Christen Opvoeder*, op. cit., p. 30.
52. Nieuwenhuis, H., op. cit., p. 1.
53. Ibid.
54. See Landman, W. A.: *Pedagogiese kriteria by die gesprekstherapie*, in Sonnekus, M. C. H., (Head Editor): *Psychologia Pedagogica Sersum!*, op. cit., p.47; Landman, W. A., op. cit., p. 47; Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., p. 8.
55. Oberholzer, C. K., op. cit., pp. 321, 323.
56. See Landman, W. A., op. cit., p. 30; Landman, W. A., op. cit., p.47; Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., pp. 16 et seq.
57. Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 60.
58. Oberholzer, C. K., op. cit., pp. 321-323.
59. Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 60.
60. See Landman, W. A., op. cit., p. 30; Landman, W. A., op. cit., pp. 46-53.
61. See Landman, W. A., op. cit., p. 30.
62. See Landman, W. A., op. cit., pp. 27-30; Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R., op. cit., p. 10; Landman, W. A.: *Op soek na pedagogiese kriteria*, *Publication of the University of Pretoria*, No. 48, 1969; Landman, W. A., Kilian, C. J. G. and Roos, S. G., op. cit., pp. 120-121.
63. Nel, B. F., op. cit., p. 65.
64. Oberholzer, C. K., op. cit., p. 319.
65. Ibid, pp. 321, 322; also see Landman, W. A. and Gous, S. J., op. cit., pp. 11, 71.
66. See Bigot, L. C. T.: *Het Kind*, Wolters, Groningen, 1967, pp. 12-13.
67. Dienelt, K.: *Opvoeding tot verantwoordelikheid*, PAX, s'Gravenhage, 1962. p. 45.
68. Oberholzer, C. K., op. cit., p. 317.
69. Ibid.