

CHAPTER I

THE “DISCOVERY” THAT A CHILD IMPEDED IN BECOMING IS IN A PROBLEMATIC EDUCATIVE EVENT

1. INTRODUCTORY ORIENTATION

1.1 Introduction

As a way of access to the facts of reality about being human, pedagogics attempts to understand and interpret educating in terms of particular truisms as well as various perspectives or ways of access as particular standpoints from which there is an attempt to understand educative facts. Each of these perspectives has its own categories that have reality status because essentially each is involved in a perspective on human life reality, according to Landman and Gous.¹

As part-areas of knowledge of pedagogics, one can distinguish among fundamental pedagogics, psychopedagogics, didactic pedagogics, physical pedagogics and sociopedagogics, to mention a few.

Ever since pedagogics has been practiced as an autonomous science with its own area of focus and categories (that are illuminative means of thinking),² and especially since the 1950's, orthopedagogics as a very recent sub-part of pedagogics arose and educationists began to distance themselves from a haphazard intervention with children in educative distress.

Educative problems are as old as educating itself and research into “educative problems” has a long history. However, until relatively recently this research was completely unconnected and even today there is a conspicuous lack of a common point of departure for such research or an accountable orthopedagogic perspective involving studying a *child in a problematic situation of educating who is impeded in his becoming*.

Because providing help to a child in a problematic educative situation (in particular, a child with one or another specific handicap) was initiated by scientific disciplines other than pedagogics, next there is a brief historical exploration of such interventions.

1.2 A historical exploration of intervening with the handicapped child

Since earliest times the child with specific handicaps has made himself conspicuous. In particular, the specific symptoms connected with particular handicaps compelled “special” intervention and there were attempts to help such children.

In this connection, the first such institution was the *Abbe de l’Epee* that was established in Paris in 1770 with the aim of helping deaf children.³ After Valentin Haüy witnessed how sighted bystanders ridiculed a number of blind children who gave a musical performance,⁴ he had pity for them and his campaign for them contributed to the establishment of an institute for the blind in 1784.⁵

An institute and school for severely mentally handicapped was established in 1928 in Switzerland under the leadership of Guggenbuhl,⁶ and in 1840, a similar institute was started by Seguin in Paris.⁷

During 1848 similar institutions were established in England and the U.S.A.⁸ Since then physically handicapped and mentally deficient children have also enjoyed attention,⁹ and “specialized” help for such handicapped children was gradually expanded and differentiated and was also carried into the ordinary school context, especially toward the end of the 20th century. Gradually, in connection with helping blind, deaf, epileptic and other handicapped children, interest in the affectively disturbed child also increased.

From the 1920’s, especially in the Netherlands, attention was given to scientific educative help to the handicapped child, and since the 1930’s attention was directed in a large scale to schools for

providing exceptional teaching/educating to children with learning and educative difficulties.¹⁰

In the U.S.A. intervention with the handicapped child gained momentum beginning with the establishment of a number of child guidance clinics at the beginning of the 20th century, and much attention was given to remedial teaching.¹¹

In South Africa, “specialized” help for the handicapped child more or less followed the same pattern as in Europe. Teaching the blind, and deaf came first and since the 1930’s the intellectually handicapped enjoyed more attention. Teaching children with cerebral palsy and those with learning difficulties have been strongly in the foreground since the 1950’s.¹²

A very recent development is the attention given to the *learning-impaired* child, as such, and especially in the Transvaal, orthodidactic help was given to children with specific learning difficulties.

1.3 An evaluation of the pedagogical accountability of the intervention with the handicapped child

With a closer penetration of the “specialized” help for the handicapped child in the institutes and schools for the deaf, blind, debilitated, epileptic and others, it is immediately obvious that this is done without first reflecting on the essence of these children or on their world.

Persons involved in providing such help were prepared in sciences other than pedagogics and had little or no knowledge of the child’s educative situated-ness. Usually these children were “treated” in institutions by physicians, psychiatrists and psychologists who moreover were assisted by clergymen, social workers and also less scientifically oriented functionaries.¹³

This help was especially practical in nature and often moralizing. Two viewpoints served as points of departure, i.e., those children who showed one or another sensory or intellectual defect and those who had manifested character defects.¹⁴

The conspicuousness of the symptoms had allowed for a search for means and methods for helping the child in his “development”. There was special concentration on the “state” of the child and the “treatment” of the symptom and attempts were made to help a handicapped child with one or another defect that he should “endure”. This also explains why the names of physicians such as Itard, Seguin, Montessori, Decroly, Strumpell, Lutz, Asperger, Zuithoff and Valk¹⁵ appeared so prominently in the list of the first providers of help to the handicapped child.

The priority of the medical intervention with the “deviant” child and the overlapping with other scientific disciplines such as psychology, psychiatry, sociology and social work had the consequence that there was no unitary approach, and with the different sciences as its basis of origin, there was no authentic orthopedagogics. Each science had studied the handicapped child from its own particular approach.¹⁶ This is indeed characterized by an eclectic character since it availed itself of a series of theories, methods and techniques developed by the different sciences irrespective of their underlying [philosophical] anthropology, usefulness and origin.

In addition, a unitary approach was hindered by the multi-sidedness of help for such a divergent number of symptoms. Instead of noticing the child’s educative distress, it is concealed to such an extent that in practice the provision of help shows little recognizable sign of *orthopedagogics*.

Also, the *learning difficulties* of the deviant child enjoyed attention but for an explanation of the “problem” and of learning difficulties a connection was sought with the contemporary teaching practice that, in its turn, also had no accountable foundation since it was not grounded in the pedagogical.

This ignoring of the handicapped child’s educative situation and the acceptance of sciences other than pedagogics as basic for providing help greatly kept in check the establishment of an accountable helping practice.

Seeing the child's pedagogical situatedness and the "discovery" of *educative distress* led to the establishment of the orthopedagogical that includes a study of the *problematic* event of educating and the child's under-actualization of his potentialities within it.

1.4 The "discovery" of educative distress

The first scientific approach to child problems was taken in 1890 by Ludwig Strumpell who in his "Die Paedagogische Pathologie" reflected on "deviant behavior" by "problem children" and their psychiatric "treatment".¹⁷

With the rise of psychoanalysis and especially after Freud in 1907 had "treated" a child for anxiety,¹⁸ the phenomenon of deviancy in children also had become a matter that was approached from this perspective. However, at first this was little more than an application of child psychopathology.

With the appearance of his "Einführung in die Heilpaedagogik" in 1924¹⁹ Hanselmann was really the first to present a comprehensive work on children with deviancies.. This work was very influential and contributed to the fact that after 1930 various forms of psychological and psychiatric approaches came into the foreground, but also the psychological-psychiatric viewpoints on child problems became dominant.

Hanselmann's work was followed by the more pedagogical works of Moor,²⁰ Bopp,²¹ Asperger,²² and Cruickshank and Johnson,²³ in which the educative situated-ness of the deviant child no longer was entirely ignored.

The absence of a founded orthopedagogical theory and the applied approach that was generally in vogue and according to which different sciences also found application in intervening with these children, the development was hindered from then on and this had the consequence that pedagogics was very late to intervene with the handicapped child, as *a child-in-educative-distress*.

The first pedagogical intervention came from the "didactic pedagogic" side by "scientists of teaching" who were asked to make

a contribution to the “treatment” of handicapped children in institutions²⁴ in the form of *special* or *exceptional teaching*.

Since the 1950’s orthopedagogic practice, even here in South Africa, gradually began to lose its haphazard character.²⁵ On the one hand, the educative distress of the child who came into the orthopedagogical field of vision gradually was noticed more, and on the other hand, the provision of help became strongly directed by the current pedagogical thinking.

Especially the works of Langeveld, Vliegenthart, Van Gelder, Lubbers, Dumont, Ter Horst and others in the Netherlands, and Nel, Sonnekus, Stander, Gouws and others in South Africa contributed to the development of a general orthopedagogical theory and an accountable practice. The Faculty of Education at the University of Pretoria played a leading role in constructing orthopedagogic practice in which connection, especially Nel had done pioneering work. The book “Psigiese beelde van kinders met leermoeilikhede”²⁶ {Psychic images of children with learning difficulties} that he co-authored with Sonnekus appeared in 1959 and must be seen as an important mile-stone.²⁷

Vliegenthart²⁸ indicates the place of orthopedagogics as a fixed structure of pedagogics as a “mother science” and Ter Horst emphasizes that the problematic situation of educating²⁹ is the object of study of orthopedagogics.

Providing help to a “deviant” child had a very long and tortuous course before the educative distress of such a child was accepted as its point of departure. Although there still are a number of “specialists” who involve themselves in helping children with “problems” and who still ignore the child’s educative situated-ness, each provider of help whose work rests on scientifically founded grounds takes his point of departure in the problematic educative situation of a particular child.

Where help is given to another person it is obvious that such a person must first be *known* and this also leads to showing the way one can arrive at such *knowledge*.

By means of a historical exploration of the development of acquiring knowledge of a person it is immediately clear that there were many stumbling blocks in this development and the initial stranglehold of naturalism on the human sciences is seen as one of the most central, a matter considered next.

2. VIEWING BEING HUMAN FROM A NATURAL SCIENCE PERSPECTIVE AND THE CONCEALMENT OF ITS ESSENCES

Mainly because of the success of the methods of the natural sciences during the previous two and a half centuries, the human sciences also made use of these methods and the rationale for doing so compellingly entered the foreground that it did not leave them unscathed.

There was an attempt to arrive at knowledge of a human being in the same way as learning to know about things in nature. By also studying a human being as an *object* there was a search for correspondences between human and non-human forms.

From this approach a view of being human and also a psychology gradually developed that could be qualified as “naturalistic”. With respect to the human being as a *person*, a psychic *life-as-totality-in-function*, the emphasis fell on the physical and psychic and it was attempted to isolate the psychic and then to understand and explain the isolated psychic functions causal-mechanistically in terms of cause and effect according to which particular and general causes would have constant, repeatable effects.

This naturalistic-oriented anthropology availed itself of concepts or categories that *characterize* the human being as another natural phenomenon, e.g., as a psychophysical organism or a higher animal.

Also in psychology the analysis-synthesis method was preferred. A human being was isolated from his world and he also was viewed as a compilation of abilities, aptitudes, functions, capacities, temperaments, urges, desires and behavioral patterns that could be isolated and measured, as such.

Human “behavior” is equated with animal behavior and viewed as resulting from various psychic processes that automatically play themselves out in a human being, such as, e.g., processes of perceiving, learning and thinking. When these processes do not proceed adequately this implies that the human being, as an organism, does not successfully *adapt* himself to his environment. He is considered to be the product of heredity and environment and the malfunctioning of the many processes also is the product of a weak reaction to stimuli or also the consequence of precisely defined laws regarding human urges and desires who, as does an animal, should live in a closed world. Faulty processes should be able to be corrected again by sufficient *motivation*. On the basis of *maturation* and *growth* a human being also should automatically develop to adulthood if the right conditions for growth are provided.

Since human “reactions” are considered to be the result of the activity of a limited number of simple functions there is an attempt to isolate them as elements,³⁰ for which reason this psychology can also be referred to as an “element-psychology” really as a continuation of the “psychology of consciousness” of which Descartes was the founder.

With the establishment of Wundt’s psychological laboratory in Leipzig in 1875 a number of psychologists accepted that finally a method was found by which it should be possible to measure by particular tests the complex coherencies of human psychic life and explain them according to particular laws of behavior.

The findings of general psychology had provided the necessary theories for what had come to be known as psychotechnics, a term introduced in 1903 by Stern,³² which included the application of psychology to practice. According to Munsterberg³³ psychotechnics is the science of the practical application of psychology in the service of cultural tasks.

In his differential psychology³⁴ Stern analyzed the extent to which general human differences are realized within particular individuals and that can be shown by a psychogram. [In this way] the specific individuality of each unique person is entirely misunderstood.³⁵

By measuring stimuli and reactions that are paired with particular changes in consciousness, there is an attempt to discover fundamental factors. For example, “extravagance” should be explainable in terms of the strength of relationship among a number of character tendencies and three temperamental basic factors—namely a strong emotionality, a weak activity and a weak secondary function. Knowledge of the individual is acquired by measuring the elementary factors. It is accepted that individuals differ from each other only in the extent to which the strength of the relationship among these factors differ. Thus, if one only has a profile of the elementary functions, one can read from it all there is to know of the individual in terms of a psychogram.

It was especially American psychologists who tried to perfect the methods of measurement. However, because the course of contents of consciousness are not measured directly, the emphasis is allowed to fall on measuring the intensity of the incoming stimuli while the outgoing motor reactions and accompanying bodily phenomena are noted.

Many of these psychologists were really nothing more than physiologists. Cattell, who had introduced the concept “test” in 1890, also then mentions physiological and psychological measurement in the same breath.³⁶

Statistical prediction and the control of behavioral achievements had become the main aim and the emphasis was placed on objectively recordable behavior. For example, Van Strien³⁷ notes in this regard, “What lays behind the behavior no longer interested the psychologist, it was the behavior itself.”*

Especially with behaviorism, the main aim became to develop methods for measuring behavior and although the attempt was to implicate different “aspects of personality” in these measures, there was a one-sided concentration on external stimuli.

*[Wat achter het gedrag lag interesseerde de psycholoog niet langer, het ging hem om het gedrag zelf]

This emphasis on the measurement of characteristics had led to *psychometrics* strongly entering the foreground and where, at first, it pointed to the measured aspects of psychological experiments, increasingly it became a collective noun referring to the statistical analysis of test results.

The natural science oriented psychologist in particular turned himself to statistics that had become an important tool of psychology, especially the technique of calculating correlations.

There was an industrious attempt to improve the reliability of measurements and to demonstrate statistically the validity of the results.

Van Strien³⁸ indicates that the task of the psychological investigator really implies that of “the ‘research-man’”. On the one hand he must have the resourcefulness to design tests and, on the other hand, have the mathematical ability for their validation.... Once a good test battery is compiled, judgment follows ... from the obtained scores with mathematical certainty”.*

Under the influence of behaviorism the view of a human being as merely a higher form of being an animal in the course of evolutionary development not only became more strongly oriented naturalistically but more specifically psychology became an animal psychology and, especially as a psychology of rats, was placed on an equal footing with child psychology.³⁹

Up to and including the First World War the entirety of psycho-diagnostics was based on the idea of human “behavior” as the product of a combination of a number of elementary functions. Starting with the assumption that the activation of particular psychic functions contributed to corresponding external achievements⁴⁰ resulted in moving psycho-diagnostics to a naturalistic-psychological level⁴¹ and this is described as “The attempt to assess personal characteristics through the observation

* [Hij moet enerzijds beschikken over vindingrijkheid in het ontwerpen van tests, anderzijds over een wiskundige knobbel bij het valideren ervan ... Wanneer eenmaal een goede testbatterij is opgesteld, volgt het oordeel ... met wiskundige zekerheid uit de behaalde scores]

of external features, as in *physiognomy, craniology, graphology, study of voice, gait, etc.*"⁴²

Psycho-diagnosis was little more than a mere medical or medical-psychiatric diagnosis.⁴³ The person is viewed as a *patient* or a *case*. The emphasis is on the *symptom* that should be the result of a "neuroticising process" that must be "diagnosed" with the aim of "treating" the patient in order to bring about a "healing process".

Frequency tables compiled on the basis of previous experiences also were often leaned on, e.g., "types" of misdeeds, etc. while the *why* of their connection to the subsequent judgment is mostly not taken into account.⁴⁴

With the rise of depth psychology, inaugurated by Freud and where there was particular emphasis on the *unconscious*, attention was diverted somewhat from externally perceivable stimuli and the origin of particular behaviors was sought in the *past*. Freud tried to trace traumas to the past and thus to find the origins of present disturbances or neuroses. *Making* these traumas *conscious* should make possible a release from and cure of them.⁴⁵ Since the Ego can no longer effectively hold the Id in check, it collapses and this results in a neurosis. Now there is a conflict between what a person *wants* to do and what he *may* do in terms of what the environment allows. Thus, there is a search for the *repressed desires* or causes of the collapse of the Ego. Such a psycho-diagnosis really goes hand in hand with "psychotherapy" as "psychoanalysis". In practice this amounts to the verbalization of repressed material mainly by means of the technique of *free association*.

A "Clinical history" of the "patient" is obtained by asking him to describe his own past and problems, to answer direct questions about them and also by means of free association without censure,⁴⁶ dream analysis or hypno-analysis.

In free association, e.g., a person is asked to say the first word that comes to mind after a "stimulus word" is provided. Usually use is made of the "train of thought" method where the person must elaborate on the subsequent thoughts that arise in connection with the word [first] given. Jung⁴⁷ had specifically made use of the word-

list type of association where a series of stimulus words is presented to the person and he then must say the first word that this calls forth.

After completing the free association test, a discussion is carried on with the “testee” to find out how the “associations” had occurred with the aim of discovering repressed contents in the unconscious.⁴⁸

Dream analysis is directed to a person’s dream content on the basis of latent in contrast to manifest contents since the dream also is seen as representing the fulfillment of unfulfilled desires.

In terms of hypno-analysis there is an attempt via “hypno-regression” to let the person once again experience the disturbing traumatic situation.

Thus, contemporary “behavior” is explained in terms of the forgotten or repressed contents. Making the repressed material conscious is very important because by doing so the anxiety it causes is eliminated.

With a child there is an attempt to snatch from the unconscious what has resulted in a fixation in the so-called oral, anal, genital or oedipal phase,⁴⁹ because Freud believed that all neuroses were the consequence of traumas during the periods of infantile sexuality.⁵⁰ Van den Berg⁵¹ points out that in reality the unconscious is an *anti-I*, and Freud’s striving to make the unconscious conscious implies that the unconscious, as a second person, must be disclosed. The loving “first” person (the ‘patient” in the present), e.g., must become conscious of the “hating” person (the person in the past), and the two clashing “persons” must reconcile with each other.

Consequently, a human being is still viewed as a being “reacting” to “stimuli” (from the unconscious), and the emphasis is placed strongly on the past that conditions the present behavior.⁵²

Although after World War I there was renovation in various directions noticed and especially “individual personality diagnostics” strongly entered the foreground since the 1930’s and

1940's,⁵³ the *personal* role of the *person* in establishing his relationships was still entirely neglected.

In the U. S. A. psychoanalytic thought had undergone change and there was a shift in emphasis from the earlier “developmental phases” to the contemporary “environment” and it was accepted that neurosis can be just as much a consequence of conflicts and tensions in the present, e.g., poor housing accommodations, employment circumstances, etc. as from an unassimilated oedipal problem, and psychoanalysis had really become a mere “method of treatment” where the present problems implicate “counseling” without reaching much of an *understanding* of the person's actions, as such.

The psychoanalytic approach with children did not differ at all from that with adults and although gradually situational adjustments were made with toys, the play room, drawings and other media being substituted for the sofa, association, hypno- and dream-analysis, essentially there was not much change especially when an objectivistic approach was maintained.⁵⁴

A “diagnostician” continued to be viewed as the person who, with the help of available *techniques* (e.g., toys and other media), deciphers and treats the “mechanisms” by which the “patient” is *controlled* and “reconditions his thoughts”.

The conscious and unconscious were seen as two *separated* areas and moreover the psychic was viewed in a *physical* and *physiological* light. The *significance* of the person *himself* in his relatedness was ignored, and his *own* role in this was neglected, while the emphasis was placed on the causal connections among the psychic phenomena.

Also, a child was seen as a plaything of his urges and all child neuroses were really explained in terms of handy hypotheses such as the Oedipus hypothesis. The child himself had no role since his psychic life is determined in a drive-causal-mechanistic way. For example, Ruttin⁵⁵ says: “The occurrence of neurotic ways of behaving and experiencing by anyone, as intuitively conceived by psychoanalysis in its classical form, also is a mechanistic doctrine.

Also, Freud said the origin of all human behavior is in the individual's past. In his view a person reacts on the basis of drives unknown to him and is the prisoner of his 'psychic mechanisms', not only in his dreams."*

From these few thoughts it seems evident that there cannot be a penetration to an understanding of a person from a naturalistic viewpoint, and even less so regarding an understanding of another *person*, and that another method than that of the natural sciences needs to be implemented to disclose a *person* in his *essence* learn to *know* a unique person in his *essentials*.

3. THE HUMAN BEING IS DISCLOSED AS A PERSON

On the basis of the clear lack of an accountable point of departure, underlying concepts and an accountable view of being human that made it impossible to *understand a human being as well as a person*, gradually there was an objection to the exaggerated confidence that was placed in the natural scientific methods for studying the human being. It was realized that one who wants to *understand* another person must allow himself to be guided by an entirely different fundamental experience than that from a psychometric starting point.

With respect to an answer to the question of *who* and *what* a human being is, *phenomenology* has shown in terms of grounded results that he is a *person*.

Since the phenomenological method, emanating from the thought of Brentano, Husserl, Heidegger, Jaspers, Binswanger, Sartre and others, aims to disclose a phenomenon in its primordial relatedness to reality, it goes to the lifeworld, there where the primordial experience of being human appears.

*[De naar aanleiding van neurotische gedragwijzen en belevenissen van iedereen, intuïtief geconcepioneerde psychoanalyse is in haar klassieke vorm eveneens een mechanistische leer. Ook Freud zag de oorzaak van alle menselijk gedrag in het individueel verleden. De mens reageert in zijn ogen op grond van aan homzelf onbekende drijfveren en is de gevangene van zijn 'psychisch apparaat', niet alleen in zijn dromen].

The human being is disclosed as *Dasein* (Heidegger) and by verbalizing the essences of this *being-in-the-world*, being human is described by an accountable [philosophical] anthropology in terms of justifiable *categories* from the human order of being.

In this way, it is shown that being human is *openness* or a *being open-for*. As *intentionality* he is continually open-for but also directed-to the world as a *meaning-giving* being-directed-to [something]. He need not be “reaction stimulated”. He is *never isolated* from the world but is in continual *dialogue* with it. Van den Berg⁵⁶ says, e.g., that a human being is not a thing but “he is a dialogue”. He continually, *actively* goes out to [the world] because he *will give sense and meaning* to it. He *answers* the *appeal* that the contents of reality direct to him by dialoging [with them], and indeed in terms of the *relationships* he *establishes* with things, fellow persons and with God. Consequently, he is always *involved-in-relating* and in particular relating to the world within which he *finds* himself because, in addition to *consciousness* as *consciousness of something* (Brentano) or *of meaning* (Husserl), he is also *self-conscious*. As an *existential* being, a human being dwells intentionally in the world by *intentionalizing* and *orienting* via various *ways of being* or *existentialia*. As *subject*, as *initiative of relationships*⁵⁷ a *person* continually signifies the world or *dwells* in it and in his dwelling he *transforms* it into an intentionalized world on the basis of what has meaning for him. Because the meaning-giving of no two persons is precisely the same, no two humans are in precisely the same *lifeworld*. The entirety of a person’s *experienced* meanings form his lifeworld as the *always growing, expanding, further shifting horizon of meanings, as the possessed experiences of the contents of reality for a unique person*.

Hence, a person always finds himself in a *situation* as the *whole of momentary relations with respect to which he must act*. According to Van den Berg⁵⁸ a situation is the “totality of the personal world, perspectively structured by a specific intentional structure.”*. He⁵⁹ says the situation “... [is] when I am “with” the things of this world

* [totaliteit van de personale wereld, perspectivisch gestructureerd door een specifieke intentionele structuur]

in a thinking, feeling, imagining or willing way”*. According to Ruarus et al.⁶⁰ a situation is “a perceivable *location* before us that is precisely researchable and in which we find ourselves at *any time* but at the same time is our experiencing of our being here-and-now (i.e., being-present) and the attribution of meaning that the here-and-now provides.”** Consequently, in each situation a person is present in his full communicative totality and this implies the entirety of his personal world, according to Gouws.⁶¹

By intentionalizing the situations in which he finds himself, he is continually involved in shifting the horizon of his own lifeworld on the basis of also integrating his possessed experiences. Thus, he is someone who continually becomes *different* and who *himself* also collaborates in this becoming by *self-actualizing* his *psychic life* for which reason he is *unpredictable*.

As a *person*, a human being is continually a *subject* and differs fundamentally from all objects in nature. Hence, in order to really be able to *know* a *person* he must be *understood* from the inside out; this is different from dead nature that only can be known from the outside because it is causally determined and is unlike the *living* person who is *goal-striving*.

Because a human being as a *person* is unique he withdraws himself from being measured in the sense that the rest of reality is amenable to measurement research,⁶² and in the following is a brief reflection on the possibility of *understanding another person*.

4. ACQUIRING ESSENTIAL KNOWLEDGE OF A PERSON

One who wants to push through to a true understanding of another person quickly discovers that external behavior is just a symptom that conceals the interiority behind it and that indeed it is this interiority that is really the focus of knowledge.

* [‘houdt ik mij op’, wanneer ik denkend, voelend, imaginerend of willend ‘bij’ de dingen van deze wereld ben, of, zoals de taal het overvalt vertolk, ‘er in op ga’]

** [een voor ons waarneembare *plaatsbepaling*, die exact onderzoekbaar is, en waarin wij ons *enige tijd* bevinden, maar ze is tevens onze beleving von on shier-en-nu-zijn (d.i. aanwezig-zijn) en de zingeving, die we aan de hier-en-nu verlenen]

Already in 1894 Windelband⁶³ showed the contrast between natural scientific and human science methods and in 1912 Dilthey⁶⁴ indicated that “we explain Nature and we understand the Inner life”*, and he distinguishes between *understanding* of the naturally given and its causal-mechanistic determination and *comprehending* as a way of *interpretation*.⁶⁵

For Spranger,⁶⁶ who had built on this concept, *understanding* means to *meaningfully* understand mental/spiritual coherencies or relations. *Meaningful* means an ordering or coherence within what forms a *valued whole*. The sense or meaning of someone’s behavior is only to be gauged in relation to a greater valued whole and not to be seen in the “form of behavior” itself.

Various streams in psychological thinking were directly or indirectly influenced by these *ideas about understanding* and various persons had directed attention to the human being as a *totality* although this idea was still very divergently explained. As psychology had become more anthropologically oriented,⁶⁷ greater clarity was attained with respect to a person as a *totality* and *understanding him*.

In 1938 Allport,⁶⁸ and also Murray⁶⁹ in the U.S.A. argued for a totality approach to the individual and then a new stream of understanding diagnostics arose. Allport,⁷⁰ however, thought that each “human life has its own lawfulness” and that I cannot explain or understand someone’s “behavior” from my knowledge of human beings in general. He says there is a fatal short-circuiting (non-sequitur)⁷¹ in understanding another person if he is explained in terms of general rules. I must first know the full *pattern* of his life. In this context Van Strien⁷² cites Allport⁷³ and says, “Human ability to know therefore does not proceed via an implicit statistical generalization of coded experiences but it has an ability to perceive relations and anticipate changes that a computer would miss.”**

* [De Natur erklären wir, das Seelenleben verstehen wir]

** [Het menselijke kenvermogen werkt daarom niet langs de weg van een impliciete statistische generalisatie van gecodeerde ervaringen, maar bezit een vermogen tot het waarnemen van veranderingen, dat de Hollerith-machine mist]

As far as understanding another person is concerned, it must be pointed out that much of the knowledge acquired in everyday association remains *implicit* and gradually we take it for *what* it is. In everyday association we learn [to have] a “first acquaintance”, “I know him” and a “good knowledge” of him. The knowledge that is built up while associating with another actually exists in the assumption that actions and behaviors observable under particular circumstances will be repeated under changed circumstances. We gradually become familiar with another on the basis of his actions in everyday life situations. When now a pronouncement must be made about this person the judge exhausts his *knowledge based on impressions* that rests on the verbalization of the habitual actions of that person by qualifying them in terms of particular personal traits and, e.g., he is “known” as friendly, hardworking, contradictory, interfering, hot-tempered, moody, conceited, proud, stubborn, intelligent, stingy, extravagant, honest, old-fashioned, relieved, narrow-minded, willful, impatient, timid, flexible, submissive, effeminate, etc.

Already in 1933 Vernon⁷⁴ showed that these personal traits attributed to another person depend on the situation in which he finds himself and the role relationship he is in. Even so, there is agreement with Van Strien⁷⁵ when he emphasizes that “Characteristics are not objective quantities that lie hidden in a person in the way chemicals have their properties. They are the result of the appeal that goes out to this special person who is in this relation to the judge.”* The better we learn to know someone, the more we also discover the numerous exceptions to general qualifications and the more nuances we discover about his personal traits and we know that the other can never be known by merely searching for externally perceivable personal traits or characteristics or even by giving too much value to his habitual conduct.

The emotional impression another’s conduct can make on us can be very successful by means of characterizing [someone] via our

*[Eigenschappen zijn geen objectieve grootheden, die als chemicalien hun eigenschappen hebben. Ze vormen de neerslag van het appel dat er in deze situatie uigaan op deze speciale persoon, die in deze relatie tot de beoordeelde staat]

“understanding”. However, where this involves delivering an “objective” judgment and making this “characterization” of another or about this person’s expected comportment, then these characteristics can be very precarious, according to Van Strien.⁷⁶

It is clear that so-called “pure” objectivity is not possible in the human sciences because reality always remains a subject-signified reality. Meaningful wholes within a value-system can only be *understood* and not *measured*.

Sartre⁷⁷ indicates that the natural scientific approach of reducing the concrete to the abstract is a “mental chemistry” that brings a person not closer to but farther from the real underlying motives. Therefore, use must be made of a different method in order to penetrate to an understanding of another.

Luijpen⁷⁸ says, “The unconcealedness of the other as other is the open door through which the phenomenologist eventually will once again enter.”* Strasser⁷⁹ sees in phenomenology primarily a method for entering into natural experiencing with the bracketing of all subjectivity and scientific foreknowledge and penetrating to the essence of the phenomenon. According to Snijders⁸⁰ the task of phenomenology for psychology is to disclose primordial human experiencing, and for Binswanger⁸¹ psychology is “Dasein playing with itself.”** Snijders⁸¹ also emphasizes that psychology does not remain with describing but subsequently strives to penetrate to the level of explaining and reflecting on the evidences of the natural lifeworld is an important task.

To understand and explain another, then, it is primarily necessary to “enter” his lifeworld, i.e., in its past and present structure.⁸³ One must put oneself in the place of another and see the world with his own eyes.

Buytendijk⁸⁴ talks of “stepping into another mode of existence.”*** Each *knowing* is a form of *being* and each being is a *being-in-*

* [De onverborgenheid van die ander als de ander is de open deur waardoor de fenomenoloog eindelijk weer eens binnen gaat]

** [Spiel des Dasein mit sich selben]

*** [in een andere modus van bestaan treden]

opposition, and Van Strien⁸⁵ also says that when a person really wants to learn to know another he must try to penetrate into his experiential world, into his “interiority”, one must listen to the other, not only to his words but also to his silences, his frames of mind, his body.

“Empathizing” thus involves making the others structuring of his lifeworld visible and this subjective empathizing, as understanding a fellow person *in his world*, amounts to placing yourself in the lifeworld of the other and determining what meanings the world has from his standpoint. Communication with the other is important but the other does not impart himself but the way in which he signifies the world because as a person he continually is the center of giving meaning.

This “empathizing” is also possible because I encounter the other as the center of his own world with personal meanings. Van Strien⁸⁶ says, “I empathize with the other when I try to see reality with his eyes, thus the meanings that things and events have for him. I do not enter into an inner room of his consciousness but I transport myself into his world. To make myself part of this world the shared things must be [interpreted] as ‘mine’ and ‘ours’. In order to be able to understand the other a re-structuring of the meanings that I give to ‘myself’ and my world is necessary. The *totality of reality* receives this [meaning] from the other as center, as a new meaning giver.”*

Consequently, there is mention that the other is *encountered* and within this encounter he shows himself as a “conscious-being-in-the-world”⁸⁷. Strasser⁸⁸ qualifies the encounter as “the communication of persons in a situation that is meaningful for them.”** Buytendijk⁸⁹ says that this encountering, as a personally interested participation in each other, is the foundation for participating in the real essences

* [Ik leef mij in de ander in, wanneer ik tracht de werkelijkheid met zijn ogen te bekijken, in de betekenissen dus die dingen en gebeurtenissen voor hem hebben. Ik treed niet binnen in de binnekamer van zijn bewustzijn, maar ik verplaats me in zijn wereld. Voor een deel maak ik ook zelf deel uit van deze wereld, evenals ‘mijn’ en ‘onze’ gemeenschappelijke dingen. Om de ander te kunnen verstaan is ere en herstructurering nodig van de betekenissen die ik aan ‘mijzelf’ en aan mijn wereld verleen. De *totale werkelijkheid* krijgt zo, vanuit de ander als centrum, een nieuwe zingeving]

** [het communiceren van personen in een situatie die voor hen zinvol is]

of existence, as such. It is the “knowledge of the love” that the other shows for us in his concrete being human, which is the only way to the full interiority of a fellow person, according to Buytendijk.⁹⁰ There is no talk of one person “examining” the other but of one person who encounters another in a human situation.⁹¹ As far as this encountering knowledge is concerned, it is “connecting inner coherencies in terms of purposive moments of sense in opposition to external coherencies with the help of causality and external regularity”*, according to Van Strien.⁹² Thus there is mention of meaningful connections. In contrast to these meaningful coherencies there are the “blind” connections of nature that do not allow one to grasp their real “why”. Therefore, use must be made of *concepts* that adequately verbalize this inner coherency and *terms of characteristics* that only have relevance for the practical usability of the person and reject those relevant to reactions to stimuli from the environment.⁹³ Thomae⁹⁴ emphasizes that for a “dynamic interpretation” only those terms are important that have something to say about the way in which an individual existence unfolds itself from inside to outside. To grasp the meanings of another person, the thing-like, fixed language of a reductionist psychology is not appropriate. In this regard, Van Strien⁹⁵ says, “language has provided thousands of terms for characteristics for talking about all of the nuanced ways in which persons appear to us that are like the arrows in a Middle Ages battle; they don’t travel far and don’t penetrate the external armor. There is another way of viewing needed to penetrate behind the observable surface.”** Buytendijk⁹⁶ points out, e.g., that when one looks at the terminology of depth psychology of “... repression, controlling, ... , having conflicts and making peace,”*** this remains a mythological representation of moments that in fixated introspection are disclosed in the interior, while only *turning into oneself* and in an

* [leggen van innerlijke samenhangen, aan de hand van doelen zin-momenten, gesteld tegenover het leggen van uitwendige samenhangen met behulp van causaliteit en uitwendige regelmaat]

** [duizenden eigenschapstermen die de taal voor alle nuances waarin personen aan ons verschijnen praat heft, zijn alsde pijlen in een middleeuws gevecht; ze reiken niet ver en dringen niet door een uitwendig pantser. Er is een andere wijze van beschouwen noodig om door te dringen de zichtbare oppervlakte]

*** [zich annemen, verdringen, beheersen, zich nestelen, conflicten hebben en vrede sluiten, van controleurs en douanebeambten, portiers en chercheurs]

understanding relationship with the other is one able to grasp that person in his living existence.

Instead of the above there is the more compassionate, more intimate language of an encounter.⁹⁷ Some concepts essential for understanding another are encounter, openness, concern, well-being, trust, going-out-to-another, responsibility, morality, independence, free choice, interiority, tenderness. In terms of such language, Strasser⁹⁸ is allowed to see how the rational and non-rational streams flow together in an image of “the unique personality”^{*} in the objectivity of the lovingly viewed fellow person. Buytendijk⁹⁹ points to the liberating power of the word that lifts the viewed depth above the haphazardness of the situation.

It must also be emphasized that the encounter not only gives rise to purely intuitive knowledge of the existence project,¹⁰⁰ and in no sense is there a subjectivistic judgment about the other since the investigator also again withdraws himself from the interpersonal situation. A sufficient distance must be arrived at and the relation is viewed from a distance. Van Strien¹⁰¹ says the more this distanced viewing is brought about the more understanding insight is acquired as a subject of study. The relation then becomes a professional relation and there is objectivity because it is an objectivity that rests on objectivity-in-subjectivity, the only way one can arrive at true objectivity about another person.

To disclose a human being as a *person* in his *being-situated* is also to discover that he continually becomes *different* and he *himself* has a role in this. It also is discovered that the *being-situated* of a child as a person always includes a *being-situated-pedagogically* and thus it is necessary to investigate him in this pedagogical situation if one wants to arrive at an understanding of this unique child. In addition, it is also discovered that a child’s becoming different in a pedagogical situation includes *becoming an adult*, an event in which the child *himself* also has a role. In the following section attention is given to a child’s becoming different in his being situated pedagogically.

* [die einmalige Personlichkeit]

5. A CHILD IS COMMITTED TO EDUCATION

From personological anthropology a more accountable study of the child came to the pedagogical¹⁰² especially since the 1930's.¹⁰³ In a search for who the child (as a human being) is, Heidegger,¹⁰⁴ Langeveld,¹⁰⁵ Oberholzer¹⁰⁶ and others also brought to light a “new” child anthropology. Langeveld arrived at the now well-known statement that *a child is someone who himself wants to be someone* and *a child is someone committed to education*. He says “Without human educating [upbringing] a human child cannot become a person. That a human being is a being who brings up (educates), who is brought up (educated) and who is committed to upbringing (being educated) is one of the most fundamental characteristics of the human image.”^{107*} One thus arrives at the ontological-anthropological pronouncement that educating is a category of human *Dasein* that a child cannot be considered to be without.¹⁰⁸

As such, educating is “help with becoming”. The child has the world of the adult as his destination and it is precisely the tension between his not-yet adulthood and his adulthood that makes educating possible.¹⁰⁹ The pedagogical is there where responsibility is expressed in the form of a protective bondedness, says Faure.¹¹⁰

Ter Horst¹¹¹ says, “Educating is a continual ‘conversation’ with the child; the ‘words’ and the topics change and the more the child learns to ‘speak’, the greater his contribution.”** According to Viljoen¹¹² the child’s becoming human shows itself in a pedagogical perspective “as embodying dialogue as changing dialogue”. At first he carries on a dialogue *with* the educator but gradually also by means of the educator with things and the other, and eventually *independently* of the educator.¹¹³

Thus, there is an elevation in level¹¹⁴ as an *elevation in dialogue* and that the child will continually give meaning to life contents, will realize values and make choices on a higher level. Dialogue elevation, as the acquisition of (specific) meanings, is a matter

* [Zonder menselijke opvoeding wordt het mensenjong geen mens. Dat de men seen weze is dat opvoed, opgevoed wordt en op opvoeding is aangewezen, is zelf een van de fundamenteelste kenmerken van her mensbeeld]

** [Opvoeden is een voortdurend ‘gesprek’ met het kind; de ‘woorden’ en de onderwerpen veranderen en naarmate het kind beter leert ‘spreken’ wordt zijn inbreng groter]

involving parents and children together, what Lubbers¹¹⁶ qualifies as “symmorphosis”, and that, as such, is realized in the daily event of educating.

For Landman¹¹⁶ educating is helping a child with meanings. This helping a child with meanings, with conscience forming,¹¹⁷ with this giving form together [symmorphosis],¹¹⁸ moral activation,¹¹⁹ his being-addressed as a person,¹²⁰ help to moral self-determination,¹²¹ to acceptance of independence,¹²² to conquering freedom¹²³ and acquiring responsibility occur in a pedagogical situation in which an encounter occurs between a morally independent, responsible *adult* and a child who is becoming responsible and independent with an eye to the child’s becoming adult such that he himself will make responsible choices and decisions in freedom and on his own account.

The fruitful tension between a child’s need for help and independence,¹²⁵ between what he is (not-yet adult) and what he ought to be (adult) leads to his dialogue with the world continually changing. His dialogue progressively, though very gradually, becomes more like that of an adult. Consequently, Landman¹²⁶ also says, “thus becoming is dialogue elevation.”

Much has already been brought to light about *adulthood*, as such, but as far as the *event* that leads to it is concerned, there is still much room for research.

According to Landman¹²⁷ adulthood is reached in terms of an event of accompanied dependence entwined with accompanied independence with the aim of self-accompanied independence; thus, on his way to adulthood, a child is *accompanied* by an adult. However, this accompaniment includes supporting a child to *himself* realize his becoming adult as a continually progressive breaking through the momentary situation with the aim of expanding and shifting the horizon of his own lifeworld.

As a *person*, as being educatively situated, lifeworld-establishing-in-the-world, who on the basis of the primordial fact of child-being, i.e., that he himself gladly wants to be someone and to become, he is

continually involved in cultivating and transforming the world into a world-for-him.

This establishing and expanding a lifeworld entails that there continually be a progressive acceptance of responsibility, that the child himself progressively makes morally independent decisions and subsequently acts on them, that he increasingly identifies with norms, etc.¹²⁸

The child *himself* gradually *elevates* the level on which he carries on a dialogue, on which he accepts responsibility, on which he makes choices and on which he realizes values.

It is precisely the fact that a child is *becoming-adult-in-the-world* that distinguishes him as a *child*. Only when this “person becoming adult” changes into an “adult person becoming” does he stop being a child and he also takes leave of the event of educating.

As far as this self-becoming is concerned, in addition, it involves the continually breaking-through of insight;¹²⁹ a firm bonding;¹³⁰ an acceptance of life as a saying yes to values;¹³¹ and taking an adequate position¹³² with respect to these matters. And now the question is *how* this is realized. For an answer to this question, psychopedagogics must be consulted.

6. PSYCHOPEDAGOGICS AS A PEDAGOGICAL DISCIPLINE

It has already become clear that *becoming* amounts to the continually progressive breakthrough of the horizon of one’s own lifeworld¹³³ on the basis of which a child also continually becomes different. This becoming different then essentially refers to the unfolding of a gestalt that initially was present in a pedagogical event as possibility, according to Viljoen.¹³⁴

The child-as-person continually is called into existence when he *actualizes his personal potentialities*. These personal potentialities always are available as the *psychic-life-as-potentiality* that then manifest themselves in its actualization as an event of becoming and learning in terms of particular forms of actualizing the psychic life by means of various modes.

Actualizing means that personal *potentialities* are converted into personal *actualities* and that the becoming child continually changes psychic life potentialities into actualities.

From the above, if the event of becoming adult of a unique child is to be understood, it is necessary that his actualization of his psychic life in his educative situation be grasped. Psychopedagogics, whose object of study is the actualization of the childlike psychic life in education, is the pedagogical discipline that addresses this matter.¹³⁵

For example, psychopedagogics has shown that from the beginning a child carries on a psychic life actualizing dialogue with the world. As a totality-in-function he communicates with reality and continually becomes different. Hence, Beets¹³⁸ also says, “Human development presupposes existential communication.”* This communication, as an event of becoming, continually progresses as a meaningfully coherent total event in terms of exploring, emancipating, distancing, differentiating and objectifying¹³⁷ by way of experiencing,¹³⁸ willing, lived-experiencing, knowing and behaving in terms of sensing, attending,¹³⁹ perceiving, imagining and fantasizing, thinking, actualizing intelligence, remembering¹⁴⁰ and observing.¹⁴¹

Psychic life actualizing by a child as person in his situation of education changes the contents of his educative reality to a reality-for-him and broadens his lifeworld as he continually becomes different. In this actualizing he is involved in carrying on a dialogue under educative accompaniment.

In chapter four there is further consideration of the event of becoming adult, as such, in terms of a child actualizing his psychic life and these few words suffice for now.

7. EDUCATING DOES NOT NECESSARILY SUCCEED

* [Menselijke ontwikkeling veronderstelt existentiële communicatie]

From the foregoing the child's actualization of his psychic life in terms of becoming adult simultaneously implies personal becoming. Adequate personal becoming, then, implies that a child continually actualize his psychic life adequately in which case there also is a correspondence between the level of adulthood already attained and that level that now ought to have been reached.

Also this personal becoming of a child as becoming adult requires from a child an *active going out* to the appealing reality of educating as well as *active accompaniment* of him by an adult. These particular *activities* of adult and child are called into existence in terms of realizing the pedagogical structures, a matter that includes a task for both. The task character of the event of educating and the child's becoming adult testify to the fact that this is not an automatic occurrence and confirms the truth that personal thriving is not merely a "predetermined and fixed course of maturation".¹⁴²

A good course of educating a child and his optimal becoming adult cannot be guaranteed because the adult, the child or both might participate inadequately in the educative space in which they find themselves. An ideal educative climate also does not exist because of the bald fact that we live in an imperfect world inhabited by imperfect beings, says Van der Zeyde.¹⁴³

Langeveld¹⁴⁴ also says that many rights and wrongs are passed on to the becoming child, "much that is good pedagogically happens, much that is wrong has happened. But insofar as the educand is really *influenced*, everything is not enumerated in a mechanistic and fixed way as a command is but it is assimilated. This assimilation can proceed unfavorably so the result is superficial, bad, wrong; it can also progress favorably and still result in superficiality or failure if, e.g., the pedagogically undesired does not appear to be noticed, or explanations are treated as a trivial game."* Thus, the absence of particular normative moments in the educative

* [veel dat een goed paedagogische uitwerking, veel dat gehad zou hebben. Maar voor zover het de opvoeding werkelijk *raakt*, wordt alles niet mechanistisch opgejomen en vastgelegd zo-als hetgeboden word, maar ver-werkt. De verwerking kan ongunstig verlopen, en ze kan ook in gunstig zin oppeervlakkig of averechts uitvallen, als nl. Het paedagogisch ongewenste blijkt niet opgemerkt, goed uitgelegd of en bagatelle behandeld te zijn].

situation can work to promote or restrain education. Thus, there must be an adequate ordering so that the child will not become entangled in the chaos of conflicting meanings.¹⁴⁵

The dialogic character of educating speaks clearly in the previous thoughts and Ter Horst says that the “conversation” is sometimes a dispute with shouting and indignation but that it always remains a dialogue and the child and educator ask questions, express opinions, call to account, accuse, ask for help. In addition he¹⁴⁷ says the educative dialogue offers a perspective to the extent that with input from a total person one carries on a total dialogue with full reality, and dialogue impeding factors in an educative situation are education impeding factors. Vermeer¹⁴⁸ says one can conceive of the educative dialogue as a point of intersection of the subjective interpretations of parents and child where short-circuits can arise. At this point of intersection progression can become regression, e.g., when norms that are held to be “obvious” are passed over in silence.

As soon as there is disturbed communication there also is inadequate realization of the event of educating and thus also of a child’s psychic life; such a situation must be qualified as a *problematic situation of educating* because the level of becoming adult of a particular child does not correspond to the level achievable. Thus, accompanying him to actualize his psychic life occurs inadequately and this quickly leads to him finding himself in difficulty and *restrained* in his personal becoming and his becoming adult. Then his personal meanings, as coherencies of possessed experiences, progressively differ to such a degree from generally accepted meanings that they must qualify as *disturbed* meanings. Lubbers, Van der Zeyde, Klinkhamer as well as Ter Horst refer to something that restrains a child¹⁴⁹ as [something] “that impedes him on his way to adulthood.”^{150*}

Where there is a *problematic event of educating* there also is a child in that situation who is *restrained in becoming*; the inadequate realization of the pedagogical event leads to the inadequate actualization of the child’s psychic life by which he becomes

*[dat hem tot hinderpaal is op weg naar volwassenheid]

impeded in his becoming adult. In the following chapter this matter will be dealt with more closely.

REFERENCES

1. Landman, W.A. and Gous, S. J.: *Inleiding tot die Fundamentele Pedagogiek*, Afrikaanse Pers-Boekhandel, Johannesburg, 1969, p. 7.
2. Ibid.
3. Flugel, J. C.: *A Hundred Years of Psychology*, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London, 1953, pp. 108-109.
4. Vliegthart, W. E.: *Algemene Orthopedagogiek*, Wolters-Noordhoff, Groningen, 1970, p. 10.
5. Flugel, J. C., op cit., pp 108-109.
6. Ibid.
7. See Nel, B. F.: *Die ortopedagogiek as wetenskapsgebied van die pedagogiek*, in: *South African Journal for Pedagogics*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1969, p. 1.
8. Flugel, J. C. op cit., pp. 108-109.
9. Nel, B. F.: op cit., p. 2.
10. Ibid.
11. Flugel, J. C.: op cit., pp. 108-109.
12. Pretorius, J. W. M.: *Ortopedagogiek: Terugblik, Stand en Toekomsprospektief*, in: *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 1973, pp. 73-79.
13. Vliegthart, W. E.: op cit., pp. 10-11.
14. Pretorius, J. W.; M: op cit.
15. See Ter Horst, W.: *Een orthopedagogisch gezichtpunt*, in: Van Berekelaer-Onnes, I. A. et al.: *Verduisterd perspectief*, University Press, Leiden, 1972, p. 4.
16. See Lubbers, R.: *Voortgang en nieuw begin in de opvoeding*, Van Gorcum & Comp, 2nd ed., Gent, 1971.
17. See Nel, B. F.: op cit., p. 1.
18. Dumont, J. J.: *Ortopedagogiek, Pedoterapie en Opvoeding*, in: *Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir die Pedagogiek*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1969, p. 45.
19. Hanselmann, H.: *Einführung in die Heilpädagogik*, 6th ed., Zurich, 1962.
20. Moor, P.: (i) *Heilpädagogische Psychologie*, Bern, 1958.
(ii) *Heilpädagogik*, Bern, 1965.
21. Bopp, L.: (i) *Algemeine Heilpädagogik*, 1930.
(ii) *Heilerziehung aus dem Glauben*, Freiburg, 1958.
22. Asperger, H.: *Heilpädagogik*, Vienna, 4th ed., 1965.
23. Cruickshank, W. and Johnson, G. O.: *Education of Exceptional Children*, N. Y., 1958.
24. See Ter Horst, W.: *Mogelijkheden van residentiele orthopedagogiek*, in: Van Berekelaer-Onnes, I. A. et al.: *Verduisterd perspectief*, University Press, Leiden, 1972, p. 130.
25. See Prins, F. W.: *De ontwikkeling van de orthopedagogiek in Suid-Afrika*, in: *Tijdschrift voor Orthopedagogiek*, Vol. 2, No. 9, 1963.
26. Nel, B. F. and Sonnekus, M. C. H.: *Psigiese beelde van kinders met leermoeilikhede*, Work Community for the Advancement of Pedagogy as a Science, University of Pretoria, No. 33, Vol. 9, 1962.

27. See Prins, F. W.: op cit.
28. Vliegthart, W. E.: op cit.
29. Ter Horst, W.: *Proeve van een Orthopedagogisch Theorie-concept*, J. Kok, Kampen, 1973.
30. Van Strien, P. J.: *Kennis en Communicatie in de Psychologische praktijk*, Erven J. Bijleveld, Utrecht, 1966, p. 30.
31. See Delfgaauw, B.: *Beknopte Geschiedenis der Wijsbegeerte*, Het Wereldvenster, Baarn, 1965, p. 105.
32. See Van Strien, P. J.: op cit., p. 30.
33. Munsterberg, H.: *Grundzuge der Psychotechnik*, Leipzig, Barth, 1914, p. 1.
34. Stern, W.: *Uber Psychologie der individuellen Differenzen: Ideen zur einer differntiellen Psychologie*, Leipzig, Barth, 1900.
35. See Van Strien, P. J.: op cit., p. 94.
36. Ibid, p. 32.
37. Ibid, p. 52.
38. Ibid, p. 53.
39. See Meyer, A. M. T. and Nel, B. F.: *Die Wetenskap as Ontwerp*, Academica, Pretoria, 1969, p. 63.
40. See Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H.: *Inleiding tot Ortopedagogiek*, University Publishers and Booksellers, Stellenbosch, 1967, p. 81.
41. Nel, B. F.: *Die problematiek van pedagogiese diagnostisering*, in: *Jubileum Lesings*, University of Pretoria, 1963, pp. 96-98.
42. Drever, J.L.: *A Dictionary of Psychology*, Penguin Books, Baltimore, MD; Revised edition by Wallerstein, H., 1966, p. 230.
43. Nel, B. F.: op cit., Ref. 7, p.11.
44. Van Strien, P. J.: op cit., p. 196.
45. See Dumont, J. J.: op cit., p. 47.
46. Ibid.
47. Drever, J.: op cit., p. 102.
48. See Nel, B. F.: *Fundamentele orienteering in die psigologiese pedagogiek*, University Publishers and Booksellers, Stellenbosch, 1968, p. 109.
49. See Dumont, J. J.: op cit., p. 47.
50. Ibid, p. 44.
51. Van den Berg, J. H.: *What is psychotherapie*, 2nd ed., Callenbach, Nijkerk, 1970, pp. 10-11.
52. Dumont, J. J.: op cit., p.49.
53. See Van Strien, P. J.: op cit., pp. 22-23.
54. See Dumont, J. J.: op cit, p. 49.
55. Rutten, F. J. Th.: *Mensbeelden in de Theoretische Psychologie*, Dekker and Van de Vegt, Nijmegen, 1970, p. 11.
56. Van den Berg, J. H.: in Van den Berg, J. H. et al.: *Persoon en Wereld*, Erven J. Bijleveld, Utrecht, 1953, p. 3.
57. Buytendijk, F. J. J.: *Psychoklogie van de Huisarts*, R. K. Artsenblad, Nijmegen, 1951.
58. Van den Berg, J. H.: in *Persoon en Wereld*, op cit., p. 249.
59. Van den Berg, J. H.: *Menslijk lichaam, menslijke beweging*, Ned. T. Psychol., 1950, 5, p. 298. Also see his: *Metabetlica of leer der veranderingen van een historische psychologie*, Callenbach, Nijkerk, 1956.
60. Ruarus, D. G., Van Raalte, C. R. et al.: *Psychologie voor de*

- Praktijk*, 2nd ed., Stenfert Kroese, Leiden, 1958, p. 579.
61. Gouws, S. J. J.: *'n Besinning oor die ondersoek van kinders met leermoeilikhede*, Opvoedkundige Studies, Faculty of Education, University of Pretoria, No. 53, p. 21.
 62. Also see Van Strien, P. J.: op cit., p. 70.
 63. Windelband, W.: *Geschichte und Naturwissenschaft*, (Rector Lecture), Strassburg, 1894.
 64. Dilthey, W.: *Ideen uber einebeschreibende und zergliedernde Psychologie*, 1894, Ges. Werke v. Leipzig: Teubner, 1924, p. 144.
 65. Also see (i) Van Strien, P. J.: op cit., p. 72. (ii) Nel, B. F.: *Antropologiese aanloop tot 'n verantwoorde Psigologiese Pedagogiek*, University Publishers and Booksellers, Stellenbosch, 1967, p. 32,
 66. See (i) Nel, B. F.: op cit., Ref 65(i), pp. 32-33. (ii) Nel, B. F., Sonnekus, M. C. H. and Garbers, J. G.: *Grondslae van die Psigologie*, University Publishers and Booksellers, Stellenbosch, 1965, p. 89.
 67. Thomae, H.: *Psychologie*, in: Flitner, A. et al.: *Weg zur Paedagogischen Anthropologie*, Quelle and Meyer, Heidelberg, 1963, pp. 80-81.
 68. Allport, G. W.: *Personality: a psychological interpretation*, Constable, London, 1938.
 69. Murray, H. A. et al.: *Exploration in personality*. Oxford University Press, New York, 4th ed., 1949.
 70. Allport, G. W.: *The psychologist's frame of reference*, *Psychol. Bull.*, 1940, 37, pp. 1-28.
 71. Allport, G. W.: op cit., Ref. 68, p. 156.
 72. Van Strien, P. J.: op cit., p. 97.
 73. Allport, G. W.: op cit., Ref. 68, p. 160.
 74. Vernon, P. E.: *The bio-social nature of the personality trait*, *Psychological Review*, 1933, 40, pp. 533-548.
 75. Van Strien, P. J.: op cit., pp. 141-142.
 76. Ibid, p. 142.
 77. Sartre, J. P.: *L'etre et le neant*, Gallimard, 5th ed., Paris, 1948, pp. 643 et seq.
 78. Luijpen, W.: *Existensiele fenomenologie*, Het Spectrum, Utrecht, 1961, p. 200.
 79. Strasser, S.: *Fenomenologiese psychologie en empiriese menskunde*, Van Lochem Slaterus-De Haan, Arnheim, 1962.
 80. Snijders, J. Th.: *Synthese in de psychodiagnostiek*, *Ned. T. Psychol.*, 1952, 7, pp. 146-147.
 81. Binswanger, L.: *Grundformen und Erkenntnis Menschlichen Daseins*, 2nd ed., Niehaus, Zurich, 1953, p. 697.
 82. Snijders, J. Th.: op cit., p. 147.
 83. Van Strien, P.J.: op cit., p. 146.
 84. Buytendijk, F. J. J.: *Het kennen van de innerlijkheid* (Lecture), Dekker and Van de Vegt, Nijmegen, 1947, p. 26.
 85. Van Strien, P. J.: op cit., pp. 137, 249.
 86. Ibid, pp. 162-163.
 87. Luijpen, W.: op cit., p. 200.
 88. Strasser, S.: op cit. p. 140.
 89. Buytendijk, F. J. J.: op cit., p. 26.
 90. Ibid.

91. See Van Lennep, D. J.: *Gewogen-bekeken-ontmoet*, The Hague, 1949.
92. Van Strien, P. J.: op cit, p. 72.
93. See Thomae, H.: *Personlichkeit, eine dynamische Interpretation*, Bouvier, Bonn, 2nd ed., 1955, p. 168.
94. Ibid.
95. Van Strien, P. J.: op cit., p. 142.
96. Buytendijk, F. J. J.: op cit.
97. Van Strien, P. J.: op cit., p. 164.
98. Strasser, S.: *Über die Wertung von Personen, Jahrbuch für Psychologie und Psychotherapie*, 1954, 2, pp. 354-364.
99. Buytendijk, F. J. J.: *Zur Sinnstruktur des Heiligenbeeldes, Jahrbuch für Psychologie und Psychotherapie*, 1952/53, 1, pp. 180-185.
100. See Gouws, S. J. L.: op cit., p. 25.
101. Van Strien, P. J.: op ccit., p. 247.
102. See Meyer, A. M. T. and Nel, B. F.: op cit., p. 67.
103. Nel, B. F.: *Antropologiese aanloop tot 'n verantwoorde Psigologiese Pedagogiek*, op cit., p. 4.
104. Heidegger, M.: *Sein und Zeit, Sehn...*, unveränderte Auflage, Max Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1963.
105. Langeveld, M. J. : *Studien zur anthropologie des Kindes*, Max Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1966.
106. Oberholzer, C. K.: *Die wysgerige antropologie en die Pedagogiek*, in: Cronje, G. (Ed.): *Die wysgerige antropologie en die menswetenskappe*, J. L. van Schaik, Pretoria, 1970.
107. Langeveld, M. J.: *Beknopte Theoretische Paedagogiek*, 4th printing, J. B. Wolters, Groningen, 1952, p. 141.
108. Nel, B. F.: *Antropologiese aanloop tot 'n verantwoorde psigologiese pedagogiek*, op cit., p. 62.
109. Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R.: *Opvoedkunde en opvoedingsleer vir beginners*, University Publishers and Booksellers, Stellenbosch, 1971, p. 33.
110. Faure, J. S. M.: *Die Pedagogiese Diagnostisering en Behandeling van Gedragsmoeilike Kinders deur middle van Spel, met Verwysing na Bepaalde Pedagogiese Kriteria*, HAUM, Pretoria, 1966, p. 51.
111. Ter Horst, W.: op cit., Ref. 29, p. 54.
112. Viljoen, T. A.: *Die kenrelatie gesien in pedagogiese perspektief*, J. L. van Schaik, Pretoria, 1969, p. 68.
113. See Langeveld, M. J.: op cit., ref 107, pp. 38-39.
114. Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R.: op cit., pp. 33-35.
115. Lubbers, R.: *Voortgang en nieuw begin in de opvoeding*, Van Gorcum and Comp, Assen-Gent, 2nd ed., 1971, p. 54.
116. See (i) Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R.: op cit., p. 55 (ii) Landman, W. A. and Roos, S. G.: *Fundamentele Pedagogiek en die Opvoedingswerklikheid*, Butterworths, Durban, 1973, p. 58.
117. Kohnstamm, Ph. A.: *Keur uit het Didactisch Werk*, Wolters, Groningen, 1952.
118. Lubbers, R.: op cit., p. 54.
119. Nel, B. F.: *Antropologiese aanloop tot 'n verantwoorde psigologiese pedagogiek*, op cit., p. 77.
120. Oberholzer, C. K.: *Moderne Persoonsvisies*, reprint from

- Hervormde Teologiese Studies, July 1957.
121. Langeveld, M. J.: *Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek*, 4th printing, J. B. Wolters, Groningen, 1952.
 122. Perquin, N.: *Pedagogiek*, J. J. Romen and Sons, Roermond and Maaseik, 1960, p. 77.
 123. Oberholzer, C. K.: *Die Pedagogiese*, Extra Mura, University of Pretoria, 1960.
 124. Bijl, J.: *Inleiding tot de Algemene Didactiek van het Basisonderwijs*, J. B. Wolters, Groningen, 1960, p. 23.
 125. Ter Horst, W.: op cit., Ref. 29, p. 76.
 126. Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R.: op cit., p. 33.
 127. Ibid, pp. 31, 32.
 128. See Landman, W. A., Roos, S. G. and Liebenberg, C. R.: op cit., p.37.
 129. Perquin, N.: op cit., pp. 16-39.
 130. Rumke, H. C.: *Psychiatrie*, Part I, Scheltema and Holkema, Amsterdam, 1957.
 131. Wijngaarden, H. R.: *Hoofproblemen der volwassenheid*, Erven J. Bijleveld, Utrecht, 6th ed., pp. 77 et seq.
 132. See Sonnekus, M. C. H.: *Die leerwereld van die kind as beleweniswereld*, University Publishers and Booksellers, Stellenbosch, 1968, p. 23.
 133. Also see Viljoen, T. A.: op cit. p. 68.
 134. Ibid, p. 69.
 135. Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.): *Psigopedagogiek: 'n Inleidende oriëntering*, University Publishers and Booksellers, Stellenbosch, 1973, p. 11.
 136. Beets, N.: *De Grote Jongen*, Erven J. Bijleveld, Utrecht, 1954, p. 21.
 137. Sonnekus, M. C. H. (Ed.): op cit. Ref. 135.
 138. Ferreira, G. V.: *Ervaar as psigopedagogiese kategorie*, Pedagogiekstudies No. 74, University of Pretoria, 1973.
 139. Van Niekerk, P. A.: *Aandagsfluktuasie as verskynsel by die onderaktualisering van intensionaliteit, met spesiale verwysing na die agterlike kind*, Work Community for the Advancement of Pedagogy as a Science, University of Pretoria, 1971.
 140. Sonnekus, M. C. H.: *Die leerwereld van die kind as beleweniswereld*, Univesity Publishers and Booksellers, Stellenbosch, 1968.
 141. Van der Merwe, A. A.: *Aanskou as wyse van intensionaliteitsaktualisering in die beleweniswereld van die kind*, Work community for the Advancement of Pedagogy as a Science, Univeria, 1971.
 142. Stander, G. and Sonnekus, M. C. H.: op cit., p. 20.
 143. Van der Zeyde, N. F.: *Opvoedingsnood in pedagogiese Spelbehandeling*, Erven J. Bijleveld, Utrecht, 1962, p. 1.
 144. Langeveld, M. J.: *Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek*, op cit., p. 135.
 145. Ter Horst, W.: op cit., Ref. 29, pp. 26, 61.
 146. Ibid, pp. 54-57.
 147. Ibid, p. 68.
 148. Vermeer, E. A. A.: *Projectiewe methoden bij pedagogische advies- en hulpverlening*, in: Bolleman, Th. G.: *Pedagogiek in ontwikkeling*, Zwijsen, p. 155.
 149. See Van Berckelaer-Onnes, I. A., et al.: op cit.
 150. Ter Horst, W.: op cit., Ref. 29, p. 74.