

CHAPTER I

STATING THE PROBLEM, PROGRAM OF STUDY AND METHODOLOGY

“To write of the treatment of children’s behavior problems is a hazardous undertaking.” - Carl R. Rogers, The clinical treatment of the problem child.

1. INTRODUCTION

The historical course of pedagogics is characterized by a search for a solution to the multiple problems which a human child encounters on his/her way to adulthood.

These problems concern an increased complexity through a fast succession of changes in social structure and the physical environment. Where previously, a degree of uniformity and even solidarity within some communities could be observed, these changes have brought about great diversity and even a clashing of prevailing life- and worldviews have arisen.

Thanks to the contributions of the modern communication media, boundaries between countries, nations, and their cultures today have faded away. The homogeneity of a community has declined, and within each group, even in small intimate groups such as the family and household, the obviousness of tradition has been displaced or seriously doubted. In many cases, conflicting opinions prevail between parents about the norms relevant to educating their child. Parents can no longer be certain that what they give their children is going to be adequate for the changing circumstances in which they live and are going to live in the future as adults. Industrialization, urbanization, high-density housing, prosperity, longer life expectancy, over-population, and pollution are a few additional unsettling factors with which a modern person must deal. Deviancy and derailment increase alarmingly, even with children. This child deviancy shows a variety of symptoms. That these

symptoms are noticed in passing by a variety of institutions which also provide help regarding them on a large scale is generally acknowledged.

From all appearances, however, it seems as if the desired success of the help provided is not always attained, and by some institutions, there are even misgivings expressed about their effectiveness.

2. STATING THE PROBLEM

2.1 Introduction

Childhood is a complicated matter and is realized imulti-dimensionally, which means its deviancies can arise in a variety of forms. With this possibility, there also is the continual increase in population, which allows the diversity of problems to increase and many more “interested ones” “address” child problems by extending a helping hand.

Because of the large number of children with problems, it also is a relatively general practice that almost any person who feels inclined, provides help to troubled children, to get the better of the problem. Nowadays, these children are treated by physicians, psychologists, social workers, occupational therapists, speech therapists, remedial teachers, art and drama instructors, etc. It even happens that a child receives help from more than one such therapist simultaneously. There is an eclectic use of techniques derived from one or another specialized trend, such as, e.g., psychotherapeutic techniques which were designed to treat the neuroses of adults, or learning theoretical practices based on animal experiments. Especially when there is multidisciplinary work done in providing help, often overlaps, conflicts, gaps, and deficiencies arise in the help because of the inadequate child [philosophical] anthropological foundation of these practices.

A child is seen as being “deviant” in one or another respect, and the help provided is directed to eliminating or neutralizing it. Thus, a closer reflection on “deviancy” and the help related to it is called for.

2.2 The “deviant” child

2.2.1 Introduction

With a closer exploration of the currently confusing situation, questions arise which need answers to promote a greater degree of orderliness.

In the first place, there must be clarity must be clarity about what is meant by “deviancy” with respect to a child on his/her way to adulthood. For example, there is reference to deviancy regarding a child’s given personal potentialities which, thus, ask for special intervention to then help a child reach his/her best possible actualization. In addition, a “deviancy” is related to a child’s behaviors and personal actualization. Thus, it appears that there are terms by which one can talk about a deviancy.

Hence, it is necessary to determine the basis on which a child can be identified as needing help, since, in large measure, this determines the nature of the help provided. Further, it is important to determine what has given rise to the deviancy. Clarity must also be acquired about how it is possible that some children develop “differently,” and about what constitutes the difference.

A child in need of help is not only dependent on help from an adult but, indeed, is entitled to it.

2.2.2 Reasons for deviancy [for s Chridtian]

That deviancy appears is generally accepted. What gives rise to a deviancy or what its cause has remained a difficult question with which each provider of help is continually confronted.

Before a therapist can intervene in the life of a fellow person, he/she must be clear about the question of why deviancies occur and, although all persons make mistakes, why do some deviate in such a way that they do not recuperate spontaneously?

With this, suddenly we are confronted in our midst with the old dispute of whether a human being is essentially good or bad.

According to the insights of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, as discussed in his widely known work, “Emile”, a human being is good by nature and will develop to the good if he/she is allowed to learn from his/her own experiences at his/her own tempo, in his/her own way. It is because of interfering with his/her natural impulses and propensities that he/she derails. According to this view, everything is good as it comes from the hand of the Creator, but deteriorates in human hands (Huijts, 1922). This view of the perfection of the inviolate natural person finds its consequences in the missionary acts of theologians, such as Reed and Van der Kemp during the early history of South Africa.

The view of the goodness or positive inclinations of a human being is still not yet outdated and appears in the views of contemporary psychotherapists, such as Carl Rogers and Janov. They hold the view that an individual has a personal core which directs him/her positively and, thus, he/she can solve his/her problems him/herself. The only contribution a therapist provides is to offer maximal opportunities for development. If a child is allowed to really feel his/her pain and appropriate it (Janov, 1973), and on his/her own responsibility at his/her own tempo to experiment with the reality (Rogers, 1965 and Axline, 1977), he/she necessarily will restore him/herself.

In essence, this is an evolutionistic view, i.e., a person continually develops and grows in a positive direction. Any intervention disturbs this positive inclination and leads to derailment.

The logical consequence of such a view is that a therapist must work in a non-directive way. No direction showing, guidance, teaching, or steering is necessary to bring about recovery; on the contrary, such intervention is entirely superfluous, meaningless, and obstructive. A derailed child does not need this. He/she will recover if given the opportunity. In the non-directive idiom, therapy amounts to an opportunity for a child to help him/herself irrespective of his/her age, potentialities, or the nature of his/her situation.

For a Christian, the view of the human being as good is unacceptable. Accordingly, a person and, thus, also a child, is not

self-sufficient and able to overcome any stumbling block without the help of God and fellow persons.

However, there also are differences between the opinions of Roman Catholics and Reformed Protestants in this regard. The Roman Catholic accepts that, despite the fall of man, with each person, there is an extension of God present. This implies that a person can be good even though his/her tendency is toward evil (L. Berkhof, 1971). The implication of this for therapy is that a therapist can find links with the existing goodness, but that steering and direction are needed so a person can develop positively.

The Reformed Protestant believes that, although God has created the human being as good, as what the story of creation in Genesis 1 and 2 explains to us, after the fall of man, his/her nature became so depraved that, by nature, he/she is inclined to hate God and his/her neighbors (Summary of the catechism question and answer 7), and he/she is not able to do good unless he/she is reborn with God's mercy. Thus, there is only hope for love of God and the neighbors for those who are born again.

This matter of giving love has implications for the practice of helping children. Perquin (1966) declares, frankly, that love is a pedagogical category. Love, in this regard, has nothing to do with awakening sympathy. For someone to have love also means for him/her to seek the good (H. Berkhof, 1969). Erich Fromm (1950) believes that breaking the most important few rules of living, e.g., to love thy neighbor as thyself, is the origin of spiritual deviancy. Love must be shared to continue to exist. Thus, the implication for a therapist is, by a purposeful intervention to bring a child to give love and not only be the receiver. According to Fromm, whatever changes occur outside this central insight are superficial and of short duration.

Acceptance of the fall of man, as a fact of being, commits a therapist to a directive approach. Frankl's (1969) logotherapy is an example of such a non-authoritarian, directive practice of giving help, which rests on the insight that a person can not necessarily change for the better by him/herself (Ungersma, 1961). Thus, it is necessary that one who is troubled be confronted with particular facts of being

which he/she would not necessarily have come to on his/her own. Because of the “common grace” of the Creator, recovery and progress are possible because He let His sun rise on evil and good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust (Matthew 5 verse 45).

2.3 Some current theories of the origin of deviancy

2.3.1 Introduction

Irrespective of the overarching question about good and bad, several researchers have tried to disclose more immediate, specific reasons for deviancy.

In a comprehensive study project by the personnel and senior students of the “Institute for the study of mental retardation and related disabilities” of the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, U.S.A., a survey is made of the existing theories of child deviancy. In his foreword to the first part of the report, Rhodes (1977, p. 13) mentions that, currently, a rapid increase has occurred in knowledge about human behavior. The fact that these insights are unstructured and often unorganized give rise to confusion rather than clarity.

Indeed, this is true. Almost each individual researcher has appeared with a contributing causal factor for child deviancy. Hence, a total image is overdue. The pronouncements are not without merit, but unfortunately, they do not contribute to the clarification of and greater insight into the problem. Rather, the problem is muddled and further concealed.

However, the team of researchers has succeeded in organizing the multiplicity of data regarding the origins of child deviancy into five models. According to them, all theories belonging to a specific model must have the following in common:

- a shared methodology (e.g., clinical laboratory testing or statistical analyses).
- agreement with respect to explaining behavior (e.g., a

sociological basis).

- a shared acceptance of the impetus at the foundation of child behaving (e.g., conditioning or biogenesis).
- a shared technique for intervening (e.g., behavior modification), and
- a general agreement with other theories in the model, irrespective of differences in particulars.

It is found that the prevailing views about child deviancy can be grouped into the following five models:

the behavior theoretical
the psychodynamic
the biophysical
the sociological and
the ecological models.

A sixth grouping, i.e., the so-called “anti-theoretical”[or contra-theoretical] is added because it is found that a few of the modern views of educating do not belong in one of the other groups. However, they differ from each other such that it is not justified to unite them in one model.

2.3.2 Applying the models

Epistemologically, a model is the figuring forth of a specific slice of reality which is designed with a specific aim. A general function is to serve as a reminder of what is already known. An additional function is to use the model, in place of the original, to make new discoveries. A third function is for explicating. According to Bullock and Stallybras (1977), as well as Broadbeck (1968), in interdisciplinary [research], a model has an additional use, i.e., as an ideal type. Here, a model is applied as an analog. Processes and events which are well-known in one field of study are used to explore another.

2.3.3 The behavior theoretical model

Proponents of this direction of thought state that deviant behavior is the result of faulty learning. Everything which is learned can be unlearned. Thus, any negative behavior can be unlearned. Some theoreticians equate learning with conditioning. These theorists do not begin with unobservable psychic processes which follow a stimulus-response sequence, according to Russ (1977). They only study outwardly observable responses. According to this view, emotional disturbances are maladaptive behavior.

Pavlov is the father of this line of thinking. Watson, Skinner, Thorndike, and Wolpe, however, have made contributions. Today there are many variations of the original theory, and this direction of thought finds high approval with child therapists, especially where they must struggle with large numbers of children. Relatively quick results are obtained, especially with behavior modification.

The great contribution made by behavioral psychologists to child deviancy is the insight that it is not possible to study [directly] the “psychic life” of a child. A person (also a child) manifests his/her psychic life in his/her behaviors. From the various ways he/she behaves with respect to the surrounding life reality, it can be “read” that he/she has actualized his/her psychic life, that he/she has learned, and that now he/she is different.

In trying to study behavior in its essences, it is isolated and analyzed to its basic constituents, i.e., reflexes, and reactions to stimuli. With this, human behavior is oversimplified and attenuated by reducing it to responses like other species.

If it were true that all deviations are the result of defective learning, and that what is learned can be unlearned, a child would be delivered to his/her teachers who can change his/her behavior at his/her discretion by teaching him/her the desired behavior.

However, this leaves out of consideration the matter of a child’s will and his/her freedom to choose. Each adult who has ever been involved with a child in a learning situation knows that a child will not learn if he/she does not want to. If it is not meaningful for

him/her to actualize his/her learning potentialities, no adult can make him/her learn.

That conditioning and habit forming are facets of human behaving which can be changed by behavioral therapy is not doubted. However, to equate learning with conditioning is to oversimplify and gloss over reality.

Although the behavior theoretical model pertinently indicates how [some] deviancies arise, no specific indications are given of what counts as a deviancy.

2.3.4 The psychodynamic model

Often, the terms psychoanalytic and psychodynamic are used interchangeably. The former explains and studies intra-psychic functions, while the latter interprets the intra-psychic functions more broadly and considers the concept of experience.

Sigmund Freud is the founder of this theory, and Erik Erikson, Adler, and Jung built on it.

According to this line of thought, human behavior is the result of the workings of unconscious impulses which result from heredity and the experiences of the first five or six years of life. The part of Freud's theory which is relevant to child deviancy deals with psychosexual development.

It falls outside the scope of the present study to give a rendering of the Freudian theory of child sexuality. However, it is noted briefly that, he divides child development into stages and that child emotional problems are ascribed directly to disturbances of psychosexual development. The differences among the various stages are in the physical locality of the satisfaction of pleasure. If a child passes through these stages undisturbed, he/she reaches full-fledged adulthood. The phases are:

- the oral phase, which is subdivided into oral-dependent and oral-sadistic phases,
- the anal phase,

- the phallic phase,
- the latent phase and
- the genital phase.

Derailment occurs from excessive satisfaction of desires at a specific stage, denial of satisfaction at a specific stage, or a quick transition from one phase to the following. Derailment also results from constitutional factors (Rezmierski and Kotre, 1977).

Fixation in the oral-dependent phase results in a person being passive, over-dependent, gullible, and easily frustrated. Fixation in the oral-aggressive phase results in a person being sarcastic, argumentative, and pessimistic. Such a person fails to elicit love and attention from others.

Problems arising from the anal phase are perfectionist neatness or, on the other hand, filthiness, stubbornness, stinginess, cruelty, wild outbursts, and the loss of spontaneity.

Derailment during the phallic phase results in boasting, aggression, and self-satisfaction with boys. In girls, the result is “shrewdness,” or a tendency to degrade people (Wolman, 1960).

Erikson has expanded on Freud’s developmental phases and has included the entire lifespan in his phases. He believes a person moves from one phase to another because of a crisis.

According to him, a crisis is a turning point, a decision between progression or regression (Rezmierski and Kotre, 1977). If then a child makes a faulty choice, deviancy arises. Thus, a person must choose between:

- trust and mistrust (up to one-year of age),
- autonomy and shame (toddler to four-years),
- initiative and guilt (four- to six-years),
- industry and inferiority (primary school years),
- identity and confusion (puberty),
- intimacy and isolation (adolescence) and
- generativity and stagnation (adulthood).

Rezmierski and Kotre (1977) come to the justified conclusion that becoming adult is in no sense a uniform matter.

From this concise rendering of the nature and origin of child deviancy, seen from a psychodynamic frame of reference, there is a direct connection between the phase in which a child derails and the nature of the problem. Indeed, Erikson describes the nature of the deviancy less rigidly and allows greater room for interpretation, e.g., of the concepts of “stagnation” or “inferiority”. A great variety of deviant behaviors, thus, can be brought home under these umbrella terms. Nevertheless, he takes the standpoint that specific deviancies appear only at specific times in life, e.g., if between his/her fourth- and sixth year, a child deviates from the assumed pattern of development, he/she shows guilt instead of initiative. According to this narrow view, guilt cannot first appear during a later phase of life.

A classical psychoanalyst, such as Melanie Klein, who has done pioneering work in exploring small children via child play, believes that even at 18-months, a little child can show guilt (Klein, 1963, pp. 23-25).

If such a young child feels guilty, it must be about something that, following his insight, he/she ought to have known differently. The presence of feelings of guilt and a troubled conscience presumes an awareness of norms. Being aware of prevailing norms of the community (even the intimate family home), understanding their implication, and striving to live up to them are matters which become fully developed with approaching adulthood. In the everyday lifeworld, no toddler shows these insights. Indeed, it is possible that a four- to six-year-old momentarily might feel guilty if he/she has overstepped particular rules, but problematic feelings of guilt which check further personal development tally more with puberty and the ensuing years. Thus, it seems that the narrow and rigid division of the phenomena of deviancy, according to chronological phases of life, is highly debatable.

According to the psychodynamic model, child psychological development progresses lawfully and is predicted to be the same for all children. No room is allowed for the uniqueness of the person.

With certainty, and against a predictable tempo, he/she is steered from one crisis to the next. A child him/herself has no role in his/her personal realization; he/she is delivered to the intrapsychic conflict of the phase of life he/she is dealing with. According to Erikson, he/she has an extremely limited choice between progressing and regressing. This is merely a very interesting theoretical opinion which is inconsistent with reality.

This model allows no room for the influence of educating in a child's course of becoming. According to the proponents of this line of thinking, the nature, extent, and quality of the educative relationships have no influence on a child. The aim an educator has in view in intervening with a child is irrelevant, the course which educating takes, even serious offenses against a child, have no consequences, in any case, not after the sixth year of life when a child is already weaned and toilet trained.

Parental input is limited to maintaining a delicate balance between over-gratification and frustration by denying pleasure at the various questionable psychosexual stages.

The avoidance of deviance appears to be almost impossible and, according to the psychoanalytic view, each child is predisposed to deviance if he/she does not get psychoanalytic help. Klein (1963, p. 31) says, "Analysis does much to strengthen the child's as yet feeble ego and help it to develop by lessening the excessive weight of the super-ego, which presses on it far more severely than it does on full-grown persons". Thus, she believes that child conscience presses so heavily that feelings of guilt arise – there is an innate imbalance, and a child is pushed toward deviancy. Child conscience is a heavy burden and plays no role in awakening responsibility with a view to the future.

Proponents of the psychodynamic model, in exploring child deviancy, ignore the fact that a child is always situated, that he/she is always in a relationship, and that, of these, the educative relationship is of cardinal importance for a child becoming a full-fledged adult. Interesting is the fact that Erikson has a readiness to see that child educating is an essential of adulthood, but he does not realize that educating is essential for a child.

An additional merit of Erikson's theory is the insight that child becoming adult only occurs when there is a breaking away from homeostasis, a lack of tension, and a lack of exertion. He believes progression is attainable only through crises. This view might be debatable, but the underlying thoughts, i.e., that a move away from acquiring pleasure and satisfying impulses are necessary for attaining full-fledged adulthood no doubt have merit.

2.3.5 The biophysical model

In reaction against the established standpoint of some psychologists that psycho-sociological factors are predictive of deviancy, the proponents of the biophysical model believe that organic factors are of considerable importance (Sagor, 1977).

This direction of thought has really gained momentum in opposition to the slogan "there are no problem children, only problem parents".

Following the opinions of proponents of the biophysical theories, a child can be predisposed to deviancy because of hereditary factors, deviant pre- and post-natal development, poor birth circumstances, malnutrition, extreme absence of post-birth sensory stimulation, illness and trauma. Thus, this has to do with an illness image which is manifested in behavioral deviations. For example, anxiety is explained in terms of a child's inability to perceive reality because of perceptual problems which, in their turn, are attributed to neurological problems. Autism is ascribed to a defect in development rather than a faulty development of certain brain centers; child psychoses are ascribed to the fact that a child's biological equipment provides inadequate protection against external stimuli (Sagor, 1977).

Bender, Gesell, Ornitz, Karlson, and Rimland are among the better-known proponents of this line of thinking.

The view that a child is born as a "tabula rasa" on which parents at will can "write", i.e., all child weaknesses, defects, and problems can be ascribed exclusively to parents, is so one-sided and in conflict

with everyday life reality that it has given rise to a backlash from the other extreme. Proponents of the biophysical model believe that parental influence and other interpersonal relationships have no influence on child behavior.

Not only is a child thought of apart from his/her interpersonal situatedness, but a total chasm is crated between a child and his/her world. Matters such as his/her self-understanding, relationship to concrete and abstract things in the surrounding physical reality and his/her relationship to God and his/her concept of time in which his/her future perspective is embedded, are left out of consideration.

According to this view, a child is totally delivered to his/her body.

It is an extremely deterministic view which leaves no room for child intentionality, the possibility of choice, initiative, and attributing meaning. It is accepted, e.g., that hormonal changes related to sexual maturation necessarily have noticeable behavioral expressions as a result. All children in their physical puberty who are exposed to the same stimuli will then behave in a corresponding way. This is extremely questionable.

The reality of life shows that each child is a unique individual who signifies his/her situation and therewith his/her bodiliness in unique, personal ways. His/her living (experiencing) his/her changed body on an affective level, his/her cognitive signifying of it, and his/her normative taking a position toward it are directed from his/her own unique personal potentialities as well as his/her unique possessed experience. Regarding his/her lived experiencing, his/her willfulness, his/her experiencing, and possessed knowledge, he/she is unique and different from any other child, and this directs him/her to give a unique response to a situation.

The experience of a child is that the form his/her possessed knowledge has become is based on his/her own intentional standing open for reality, on the one hand, but also on the extent to which reality has been unlocked for him/her by his/her educators. The didactic interference his/her parents must make with him/her while educating him/her is directly connected with the extent to which a

child orients him/herself to reality. The degree of guidance he/she received regarding his/her own puberty has an influence on the position he/she takes toward this matter, and which then can be read from his/her behaviors.

Not only the didactic interference of the parents, but also the example they present in exemplifying a norm, give their child an indication of what is expected from him/her as proper behavior, irrespective of the bodily stimuli. The quality of the educative relationship, the course and aim-directedness of the parental acts of educating result in the state of his/her person- and norm-identification. The fact that he/she gladly obeys those with whom he/she identifies, and wants to live up to the norm he/she accepts as valid, result in a child behaving in different ways than is expected because of his/her physical state.

That serious disturbances in the delicate physical balance of bodily behaving can be influenced leaves no doubt. However, that this is the only or even most important causative factor of child deviancy is doubted most strongly.

2.3.6 The sociological model

According to this way of seeing deviancy is the consequence of the violation of the rules which hold in the community. Particular attention is focused on which factors promote or hinder conforming, as well as the relationship between rule enforcers and rule breakers.

According to Emile Durkheim, human needs are inclined to continually increase to a point where, practically, they are insatiable and frustration is awakened. This frustration gives rise to deviant behavior. Behavioral codes, rules, and norms established by a society restraining the uncontrolled increase and, thus, avoids frustration. A community which puts a high premium on marital chastity, e.g., discourages sexual promiscuity. With quick changes in the social order, the inhibitory results of community norms slacken or decline, and the individual's level of aspiration continually increases. Societal change often appears so quickly that a community cannot succeed in establishing substitute norms, and

this gives rise to various forms of deviancy such as, e.g., “mental illness” (Des Jarlais, 1977).

At the beginning of the twentieth century, various theoreticians, such as Thomas, Zaniecki, Burgess, Faris, and Dunham studied the social decline in cities and conclude that social disorganization reign supreme in specific areas of the city. Where such phenomena arise, there is a dismantling of the orderly, generally accepted ways of interhuman contact. The community no longer “carries” its members, it no longer offers the usual ways of meeting the needs of fellow humans. The opportunity to develop and maintain a healthy psychic life of the inhabitants, young and old, is taken away. Decline and deviancy are the result. As expected, social pathological phenomena such as crime, family disintegration, begging, child neglect, prostitution, etc. prevail, but also there is a high percentage of mental illnesses in the inhabitants.

Not only does social disorganization bring about deviancy, but disorganized areas attract deviancy to other areas. Persons who find it difficult to conform to what holds as proper in a specific community, move out and find refuge in the disorganized areas of the city.

It is obvious that the proponents of this direction of thinking devote little attention to child deviancy, except for juvenile delinquency. Often “juvenile” means adolescents – that age group that is not yet adult but no longer considered to be children (Beets, 1965, Jappan, 1949). Where attention is given to the specific needs of a child, this concerns the mater of physical care. By “child neglect” mainly is meant physically holding back food supplies (Nel, 1966). In Child Law (No. 33 of 1960) of the R.S.A. there is an actual distinction made between neglect and needing care. The latter is an attempt to cover the non-physical neglect of a child. The description this Child Law provides is a reference to a bodily—social-psychological condition. There is a need for a clearer understanding of neglect from a pedagogical perspective (Nel, 1966).

Attempts to describe child deviancy from the sociological model greatly emphasize labeling or creating types. It has to do with the role a child plays in the community, in the degree to which he/she

holds him/herself to the rules regarding his/her role and the predictability of his/her symptoms (Des Jarlais, 1977).

Advocates of this model find that deviancy of a child cannot be viewed as a detached entity. In contrast to the psychodynamic theoreticians and the proponents of the biophysical models, they do not believe the reasons for child deviancy are inherent in a child him/herself but arises from defective interpersonal relationships. It must be viewed as a breakthrough which they have arrived at the insight that a child nowhere on earth appears isolated and cannot arrive at adulthood without the input of fellow adult persons. Only in interhuman connections can he/she exist and survive. When deviancy arises, it does so in connection other human beings.

However, a child is involved in a multiplicity of interpersonal relationships. He/she is enmeshed in small, intimate groups, larger groups, communities, society and even a nation. These relationships do not have equal amounts of influence on deviancy. However, the model remains deficient in differentiating and illuminating what is essential to the various relationships in terms of child becoming adult and becoming deviant.

It is with great merit that the sociological theorists have recognized that humans live normatively, they establish and then follow rules. They also bring up their children according to specific rules, and norms and expect them to conform. Also, there is the insight that a particular relationship arises between the enforcer and the follower of rules, and then specifically the violators of rules. However, a closer description and illumination of these specific relationships in terms of a child are not made. It is obvious that the relationship between father and son as rule enforcer vs rule follower is, e.g., distinguishable from the relationship between municipal authorities and school children. Indeed, there are essential differences, and the sociological model remains lacking in illuminating these differences.

Durkheim's theory links up with the psychodynamic view, i.e., that deviancy is inherent to the person. He/she is a slave to his/her needs and only strives to satisfy them. In this striving, he/she unavoidably directs him/herself to failure, frustration and deviancy if the rules that his/her fellow persons exemplify to him/her do not

bring him/her to change. This implies that a person him/herself is not capable of greater moderation and can only live in harmony with his/her fellow persons because of the ordering rules of society.

This view of human deviancy is related to the view of a Reformed Protestant, i.e., that a person is not able on his/her own to be good and is inclined to everything evil. Only from the Law of God does he/she learn to know his/her deviancy. Were it not for God's general mercy, all persons would smash themselves to a pulp for time and level-headedness. The category of general mercy, then, also explains why non-Christian ordered communities can survive and their children can be brought up to adulthood.

There is no doubt that socially poor conditions in disorganized areas of the city make it almost impossible for parents to adequately bring up their children. Especially Perquin (1966) provides commentary from a pedagogical perspective on the fact that society has a place in creating an environment within which it is possible for parents to bring up their children. Thus, a child only can become a full-fledged adult if his/her environment is bearable.

Child deviancy also arises in well-organized areas of cities and rural districts. Consequently, it seems that socially bad conditions are not an essential causal factor of childlike deviancy. That aggravating circumstances can create or bring to a head even latent or potential child deviancy is readily admitted. Hence, the sociological model remains deficient in disclosing the essential nature of child deviancy and the real essentials of its cause.

The greatest defect of this model is its inclination to group and label children into types such as the juvenile delinquent, the indigent child and the vandalistic child. In this way, the uniqueness of a child, his/her individual, unrepeatable potentialities and needs, as well as the uniqueness of his/her situation are left out of consideration.

2.3.7 The ecological model

This approach to explaining child deviancy uses ecological theories such as those established by biologists. From insights regarding the

interaction between an individual organism and its natural, physical environment, it is attempted to study a person's place in and interaction with his/her environment. The assumption then is that a disturbance in a relationship between an individual and his/her environment upsets the order and system of nature.

Each species, including humans, has through evolution, developed a state of adjustment to a specific environment or ecosystem. Thus, he/she fits into the food chain maintained in that ecosystem. Not only are his/her needs satisfied, in his/her turn, he/she is an indispensable chain for the survival of others. If this delicate balance is disturbed, disharmony arises that leads to deviancy and decline. Because of the close entwinement and interdependence of all lives within the an ecological system, a chain reaction occurs, and the total system is affected.

The proponents of this line of thinking stress the necessity of studying an individual in his/her natural surroundings. As soon as he/she is removed from his/her ecosystem, other influences, relations, and connections arise which lead to acquiring a changed image or impression of him/her. Thus, whoever wants to study a person, or child must do so there where he/she is to be found, i.e., in his/her lifeworld. As soon as one removes him/her to an organization, laboratory, or other test local, one breaks his/her ecological situatedness and one destroys the object of study.

There is a close affinity between the ecological and the sociological model for studying child deviancy. Viewed ecologically, the social system of a city or district is an integrated part of the ecosystem of that area. Matters such as forming groups, communicating, and acculturating are of ecological importance.

Different from proponents of the sociological model, ecologists and especially medical ecologists direct a lot of attention to a child in the ecosystem. Faris and Dunham, whose work *Mental disorders in urban areas* appeared in 1939, distinguish the following preconditions for child mental health and cultural integration (Feagans, 1977):

- intimacy among the child and members of his/her

- primary group,
- reasonable consistency in influencing the child, and
- reasonable harmony between home influence and that of institutions outside the home.

After an overview of research results from biologists, anthropologists and sociologists of children in the ecosystem, Feagans (1977) finds that there are innate personal characteristics which are going to determine in which degree and whether a child is going to harmoniously mesh with his/her ecosystem. Once again, this amounts to the well-known convergence theory that behavior is determined by an interaction between heredity and environment (Stagner and Karowski, 1952).

This model begins from a naturalistic view of being human. A person is reduced to an extension of an animal. The same lawfulness and ordering principles applicable to studying animal behavior are made applicable to a human being.

That human beings have characteristics in common with animals is a generally accepted fact. However, that he/she communicates with his/her surrounding reality in the same way is not acceptable. In the ways a person, as a totality in function, communicates with his/her surrounding world (Umwelt), he/she differentiates him/herself from all other known beings. Ungersma (1961, p. 23) cites Viktor Frankl's nice example of an airplane that is parked at a hanger. It possesses the same electrical wiring, metal sheets, etc. as what another mechanical apparatus shows. However, it is only when it is in flight that all these sub-parts function together to transport passengers through the air to a destination that it really acquires the sense and meaning of an airplane.

As a crown of creation, a human being takes his/her place in the wonderful order of the earth. He/she does not stand apart from nature and other living beings which are part of his/her physical surroundings. However, there is little reason to assume that the unique way of being human is to be studied following the same model as studying the other species that dwell on earth with him/her. Interdependence does not presume equivalence.

To try to place an individual person's surrounding world into an ecosystem, all environmental factors, i.e., all factors external to a person, must be subsumed under the concept of system. The term then is so broadly interpreted that it is meaningless.

It is admirable that the proponents of this model have arrived at the insight that a person is always situated and that any attempt to isolate him/her and study him/her in other circumstances, introduces such change that the phenomenon is destroyed. Thus, a deviant child must be studied there where he/she presents him/herself in the reality of life.

But no attempt is made to show the mutual coherence of the constituents of a child's ecosystem. Hence, one cannot say with certainty what causative factors lead to deviancy, other than merely indicating a disturbance in balance. Also, this indication is stated so broadly and widely that it is of little value to practicing child psychologists who want to ascertain the nature of child deviancy and its causative factors.

2.3.8 The anti-theories

Rhodes and Tracy (1977) bring under this heading those variegated theories which have to do with the presumption that child deviancy is the result of institutions in the modern technological culture, such as schools, churches, industries, capitalism, and war. These lead to alienating a person from his/her true feelings, conscience, bodily sensations, fellow persons and even God. Goodman (1980, p. 12), in his work, *Growing up absurd*, states the matter as follows, "... our abundant society is at present simply deficient in many of the most elementary objective opportunities and worthwhile goals that could make growing up possible".

According to this view, children who grow up with these cultural "genes" are predisposed to deviancy. Only those who break away from social institutions ("the establishment") have any hope of overcoming deviancy. The rest are simply "useless and cynical bipeds," according to Goodman (1960, p. 14).

These theories have appeared between the early 1950's and the late 1960's. The children who are referred to hereafter as being "degenerate, useless, dehumanized youth," thus, are the generation born after World War II. They had become the hippie cult, the flower children who were disillusioned with the hypocritical, decadent society that they had inherited from their parents and who had tried to live in "love and peace".

As Rhodes and Tracy (1977) indicate directly, the pronouncements of these theorists regarding the origin and nature of deviancy are so diverse that they cannot be strung together into a model. However, what is conspicuous is the uninterrupted note of embitterment, such as what Bron (1977, p. 457) illustrates by the following striking stanza:

"Crushed
Schematized by you
I am no longer me becoming
only you
Caught in a cage."

Because of the diversity of these theories, it is not possible to evaluate them as a unity. The interconnecting factor, however, is the denial of any personal role in the state of matters. The world and human society apparently are in such a perilous state because of the assistance of others. According to these theoreticians, the deviant children who have arisen in these communities did not have a role in or co-responsibility for their deviancy. Indeed, it is accepted that they could have become different if they were allowed to be so. From themselves, their physical constitution or innate potentialities, there is no reason why each could not develop optimally. It is a one-sided view and an oversimplifying of the problem of deviancy.

Experiments with new structures of social organization, unconventional school instruction, loose family groupings, etc. are not unknown. Indeed, not one of these experiments, to date, has arrived at an acceptable alternative which disengages child deviancy.

Janov (1971 and 1973), and his co-workers have relieved many parents and children of their “pain” via his “primal therapy,” and tried to lump them together in groups to form the core of a new community. However, still no proof exists that a “painless” existence protects children from future derailment. His view that pain (in the broadest sense of the word) causes deviancy, including that pain caused by the parents, even during birth, is shown to be adequate.

Viewed pedagogically, this exemption from all blame or co-responsibility of a child does not speak well. Frankl (1976) indicates that a person can grasp the meaning of his/her life when he/she arrives at the insight that in life, he/she is the one questioned. According to him, the primary question to which an answer must be found is not what life owes a person but what a person is indebted to, to be able to lead a meaningful life. Unwillingness to accept the inevitable plunges a person into an existential crisis. Also, a child cannot escape this.

Despite the diversity of these anti-theories, there is no long-term evidence of their merits.

2.4 The pedagogical explanation of deviancy

2.4.1 Introduction

The six models for exploring child deviancy, which especially are used in America, Britain, and Europe, with the exception of the ecological view, also are found in South African practice. In addition, in our country, deviancy in children is explicated from a pedagogical perspective.

Especially in the Transvaal and Cape Provinces, thanks to the influence of the University of Pretoria, the Rand Afrikaans University, the Pedagogical Services of the Transvaal Department of Education, as well as the Universities of Stellenbosch and Port Elizabeth, this view of child deviancy is in vogue. The pedagogical view concerning child deviancy is less known at some institutions which intervene with child problems, mainly because the literature and documentation in this regard is relatively recent and, the fact,

that almost all existing publications on modern pedagogical thinking in the R.S.A. have appeared in Afrikaans.

The pedagogical model, which embodies the structures of adequate educating, and the related adequate becoming of a child, are applied in exploring problematic educating and child restraints in becoming. Problematic educating and restrained child becoming are the field of study of orthopedagogics. This also explains why orthopedagogics does not disclose and apply its own categories in its theorizing, but avails itself of the existing categories which have been disclosed by the various pedagogical part-disciplines (Van Niekerk, 1978). Deviancy is recognized in terms of what is adequate [the disclosed categories]. In other words, it is from knowledge of the proper or the desired that the “problem” is evaluated. The acceptable, proper, or desired furnish the aims and focuses for any intervention to eliminate the deviancy. The pedagogical places the orthopedagogic in relief. That is, it is from the pedagogical that the orthopedagogic is knowable. The pedagogical provides a model for orthopedagogics.

2.4.2 Deviancy as inadequately becoming adult

That a child becomes different daily, for the good or the bad, is a fact of life which is seen by anyone who has had the opportunity to observe a child there where he/she appears. In the current literature, this becoming different is denoted by a variety of terms, such as growth, development, and maturation.

These concepts are applied to a human child, as well as little animals, and even plants very assuredly. However, this violates the essentials of the event by referring to and verbalizing a *human child* with these terms. A careful researcher who wants to study the change which occurs with a child, thus, is obligated to use terminology which verbalizes what is essential of the phenomenon. In this case, there is a turn to a term which verbalizes the uniqueness of a child, what distinguishes him/her from the young of other species. The use of the term *becoming* to indicate this essential human event. This term has already found acceptance with child psychologists who proceed from a phenomenological approach.

At the Faculty of Education of the University of Pretoria, thanks to the pioneering work of Sonnekus (1973) and his co-workers, the essences of becoming have been disclosed (Van Niekerk, 1978). Now it can be accurately indicated what occurs when a child gradually becomes different, that he/she, who was born a helpless baby, becomes, until eventually he/she has become an independent adult. This change from dependence to independence, from ignorance to knowing, from non-responsible to responsible, from unformed to formed, from child to adult is called *becoming*.

The concept becoming embraces and presumes physical growth and development and the bodily changes which are related to maturation. However, it also includes the fact that a child, as person, has essential personal potentialities at his/her disposal. Other than in the case of his/her physical attributes, which develop involuntarily, or which can be elicited by stimuli into responses, these personal potentialities are realized by the intentional directedness of a child him/herself. What he/she possesses as potential, must be transformed into reality by the input of the child him/herself. He/she must realize or actualize his/her personal potentialities. This realizing confirms a psychic life. A child unfolds as a person when he/she actualizes his/her psychic life. Its adequate actualization is a precondition for adequately becoming.

Because a child is not yet independent and responsible, he/she cannot arrive at adulthood alone, without help, guidance, support, and direction from a responsible adult. Thus, he/she is committed to being educated or brought up. Only from the safety of an educative situation can he/she, with security, direct his/her intentional consciousness to actualizing his/her psychic life, so that he/she becomes a person in life, and not merely exist as a member of his/her species. Educating is essential for becoming (Nel, 1968).

When educating progresses inadequately, becoming is damaged. By inadequate educating is meant that the essences of educating, parts or moments of the event which cannot be thought away (Landman, 1977), are present in disturbed or attenuated ways. This can be a qualitative or quantitative deficiency. Because educating is a

precondition for the adequate unfolding (becoming) of personal potentialities, defective educating impedes becoming. Then, the course or event of becoming is restrained such that its tempo decreases and a child on his/her way to adulthood is delayed. Thus, from this impediment, he/she is late in becoming adult or, if the problematic is not eliminated, this can result in his/her being retarded, such that he/she only becomes partially adult. Indeed, in serious cases, a child does not reach adulthood.

When a child is born as a helpless being, he/she is immediately in an educative relationship with his/her parents. This is the first and most primary relationship in a child's life. However, there is nothing he/she can do to ensure that his/her parents will accept, embrace, and educate him/her in love. However, what is given with being a child is primordial trust and openness, which entail that a child, without any contributing or causal reasons, accepts that his/her parents mean well by him/her, that they will support him/her to overcome his/her helplessness until he/she becomes adult. Koster, (1972, p. 9) says, "If a child receives his trust, he ventures to genuinely obey". For a child, obedience is a great risk because it is a step into the dark in complete trust that the person to whom he/she gives unconditional obedience means well by him/her. This primordial openness for, directedness to, and trust in his/her parents make educating possible. A child lends him/herself to this.

If there is this trust and willingness to be recognized and directed by his/her parents in love and responsibility, from his/her relationship with them, which is carried by understanding, trust, and authority (Landman, 1971), a child, in safety and security, can venture to unfold his/her personal potentialities (Sonnekus, 1976). As a person, a child has at his/her disposal psychic life potentialities which will not necessarily unfold in specific phases of life. The precondition for actualizing personal unfolding is an adequate situation of educating.

If such an educative situation is lacking in some respect, a child, as a not yet morally independent, not yet responsible, not yet knowing, not yet experienced being, is exposed to failure. Each such failure results in his/her possessed experience being unfavorable after

giving meaning to him/herself and his/her surrounding world. A child does not yet have an established life- and worldview and, in his/her judgment of him/herself, his/her fellow persons and the things around him/her, he/she is dependent on those adults he/she knows and trusts, and with whom he/she identifies. Moustakas (1959) says that parents are often ignorant of leaving the impression that a child is someone with less human dignity [than an adult]. A child's view of him/herself, and the meaning he/she gives to his/her own existence, is a consequence of his/her experiences of his/her interhuman relationships. When parents offend him/her in his/her human dignity, he/she inherits a possessed experience of feelings of guilt. He/she becomes anxious. He/she no longer can differentiate between perceptual and cognitive order because of his/her labile emotions which continually overwhelm him/her. Actualizing his/her psychic life suffers.

Parents who attest that they have love for their child but, nevertheless, would be glad if he/she were different, force him/her to conform to their wishes and desires. This child does not gain an insight into his/her own unique, meaningful existence. Self-knowledge and self-understanding are essences of adulthood and, thus, it is an aim of educating (Landman, 1970). Indeed, this child doesn't succeed in discovering his/her own identity. "It is this loss of self which is his basic suffering" (Moustakas, 1959, p. 25). This view is confirmed by Janov (1973, p. 147) and Koster (1972, p. 13).

A child ought to become adult. To be a child is not improper, but to remain one is unacceptable in all human communities (Landman, 1971). Irrespective of which content is given to the normative image of adulthood, an adult expects that his/her child will become an adult. What is expected, desired, or acceptable is that there will not be a stagnation or regression but an increase in the direction of adulthood, as what this holds in the community of concern. A child must *become*.

Sonnekus (1973) and his co-workers have found that a child becomes by exploring, differentiating, distancing, objectifying, and emancipating. A child does this when he/she experiences, wills, lived experiences, and by knowing. The latter are ways in which he/she actualizes his/her psychic life. That the psychic life has

been actualized, and that becoming has progressed are manifested in child behaving. In the changed ways in which a child behaves, it is disclosed that he/she no longer is what he/she was previously. He/she has learned something which has modified his/her attribution of meaning to reality. Because he/she has learned and now gives meaning more adequately (Sonnekus and Fereira, 1979), he/she communicates on a higher level of becoming. According to Van der Stoep (1972), following Klafki's line of thinking, a child learns only when he/she unlocks him/herself for reality. He/she directs his/her intentionally, in openness, to reality through active willful effort, by attending, by actualizing his/her affective, cognitive, and normative personal potentialities.

Unlocking him/herself for reality, however, is not sufficient. A double unlocking must occur. Reality must be unlocked for the child and made accessible by someone who already commands it and who understands the child's state of becoming and deficiencies in knowing. To ensure that the knowledge acquisition occurs within a safe relationship, a child must be accompanied by someone who is ready to support and accept responsibility for him/her. Such a person must be an adult who is already morally independent and has a grasp of the slice of reality under consideration.

Thus, this pedagogical view conflicts with the views of particular "anti-theorists" and psychodynamic theorists who, in their intervention with a child, work in non-directive ways. It denies the presumption that a child will him/herself arrive at relevant insight only if he/she is allowed to interact with reality at his/her own tempo and for his/her own satisfaction. According to the pedagogical view, adequate learning which results in [positive] becoming is realized only from an educative situation.

Bondesio (1977) points out that, when a child has learned and has become, this is read from his/her behaving. In his/her behaving, he/she shows that now he/she gives different meaning to reality. From the ways he/she behaves, it appears that he/she wills, experiences, lived experience, and knows. If a child shows, in his/her behaving, that he/she controls life content on a higher level, he/she has come closer to adulthood, and he/she has learned. Thus, learning is a way in which the psychic life potentialities are

actualized. Learning is paired with becoming; the one is a precondition for the other. A child who adequately explores, emancipates, distances, differentiates, and objectifies can sense, perceive, observe, imagine, fantasize, think, and attend. There is a harmony between the course of learning and becoming (Van Niekerk, 1976). This mutual connection is well known to child psychologists. Carl R. Rogers, in 1969, with the appearance of his insightful *Freedom to learn*, makes a plea that teachers must notice and accommodate the becoming child in their classroom. However, he does not mention *becoming*, itself, but emphasizes that the psychic life is actualized on three levels, i.e., the emotional, the knowing, and the normative (Cyril Burt, 1925).

As admirable as this insight is, it is “doubtful if the complexity of human behavior as it appears as a gestalt can be understood at all if it is not first studied as separate components and then are placed again in the gestalt complex”, according to Villiers (1975, pp. 24-25). The disclosure of the essences of learning and becoming and then, subsequently, indicating their mutual coherence and connections is accomplished by Sonnekus (1975) in his work *Onderwyser, les en kind (The teacher, the lesson and the child)*.

Since a child, on his/her own initiative, at his/her own tempo, and on his/her own responsibility, cannot arrive at a harmonious grasp of the reality of life surrounding him/herself and, thus, be able to master the cultural heritage of his/her community, the help, guidance, provision of help and direction of an adult are needed, and this input is educating a child (Landman and Gous, 1969).

Traditionally, in English, “opvoeding” is translated as “education” which, however, became connected with the narrow sense of a school dealing with formal curriculum-bound contents. Nowadays, there are indications that there is a coming to the insight, even in the Anglo-American sphere of influence, that educating has a much broader meaning. Skuy (1975, p. 86) agrees with Gunzburg when he asserts that “everything we do to develop and stimulate the child’s competence is educative”. Van der Stoep (1968 and 1969) and his co-workers have contributed greatly to illuminating the coherence of teaching and educating.

Finally, a child ought to become, from within an adequate educative situation, to that level of adulthood which is allotted to him/her as an individual. For this, mutual input is required from a child as well as his/her educators. If the educating is problematic, a child's becoming and learning progress disharmoniously. Restraints in becoming, learning problems and even gaps in becoming arise. The child has derailed and deviated from the path of becoming.

2.5 The current practice of providing help

Since the 1950's, the provision of specialized help, as educative help to children with behavior- and learning-problems has enjoyed attention, also in the R.S.A. Thanks to the flourishing of pedagogical thinking in the Netherlands and Germany, quick progress in the study of pedagogics occurred, and in the R.S.A. as well. Especially in the Transvaal and in S.W.A., the local education authorities had proceeded to appoint educationists in their ancillary services. There was a definite growing awareness of the educative distress of these children, and an attempt was made to provide them with educative help. Pedagogics figured prominently in this practice, but there seemed to be a disharmonious emphasis on insights from one or, at most, two of the part-perspectives. There was little mention of therapy as an orthopedagogic practice, which attests to an integration of insights from the part-disciplines, each of which throws a separate perspective on the global phenomenon of educating.

At the University of Pretoria, deep insights were arrived at regarding the connection between inadequate educating and personal degeneration. Thus, it had become necessary to search for a theoretical structure from a convergence of knowledge from the various part-disciplines of pedagogics, which can serve as a foundation for establishing an accountable pedotherapy on behalf of a child impeded in becoming adult.

A pedagogically founded practice of providing help makes a clearly outlined aim possible regarding the personal manifestation of a particular child with problems, and offers guidelines for effective action. Even by a superficial reflection of some practices, especially

the so-called child psychotherapeutic, little attention is given to this and other important aspects.

A deviant child has become different from what he/she ought to have become. Usually, this has occurred over a long period of time. Eliminating the deviance also implies that the child must become “different,” once again, but now as he/she ought to be. This is in anticipation that such a change cannot be accomplished in a few hours.

A general drawback which resounds from the practice of providing help to a child is that psychotherapy with children is particularly time consuming. Especially in the case of child psychoanalysis, one hundred sessions are not seen as excessive. Even then, a therapist succeeds only in bringing a fraction of pressing psychic contents to a re-lived experiencing, and the therapy should still be continued. Researchers such as Rosenthal and Levine (1971) indicate that, for other forms of psychotherapy, the average duration is 39.9 weeks when a child has one session per week. Such a lengthy provision of help not only steals time but has economic implications for the parents, the therapist, and the state.

This lengthy duration can be attributed to a lack of clearly delimited aims of relevance to a specific child. Frequently in therapy, a child is confronted with exploratory questions until the parents, teachers, and therapist observe a general improvement. There are no restrictions placed on the availability of the therapist, and no clear aims are stated in advance. The conclusion or suspension of help then is an additional difficult situation. Because there is not a final aim stated in the prognosis, no one is sure when the therapy is finalized. The conclusion of therapeutic contact is a knotty question asked in practice by many providers of help to children.

Arising from this deficiency in delimiting and precisely formulating aims is the matter of evaluation. If a therapist has no clear aim in sight, he/she cannot determine if he/she has succeeded in reaching it. Thus, there is a lack of clear criteria or yardsticks in terms of which the success of the therapeutic results can be gauged. Attempts at quantifying and finding exact quantitative yardsticks have enjoyed much attention, especially from psychometricians.

The results of this comprehensive research has continually seemed to be useless for a practicing therapist, for the simple reason that each person and each troubled child, and his/her therapist is unique. Also, each human and problem situation is unique. A child and his/her problems do not lend themselves to being standardized or quantified.

The inadequateness of psychometric and statistical evaluating is not unique to the therapeutic practice. Every teacher who is involved with a child in a learning situation is confronted with the same knotty question, i.e., where is the evidence that this child, who was ignorant and unskilled about specific learning content, is now knowledgeable and skillful, such that he/she has a grasp of the content can, in proper and acceptable ways, manage and apply it in everyday life situations?

Didactic pedagogics is explicitly involved with searching for an answer to this question. Meaningful guidelines already have been established for the practice of teaching with an eye to the effective course of a lesson. During a lesson, a child becomes different in terms of new content, in the sense that he/she is supported to effectively integrate new meanings into his/her experiential world.

Therapeutic intervention with a deviant child aims to support him/her in attributing new meaning, and it is evident that:

To become, and, thus, to become different, a child must actualize his/her psychic life potentialities. Psychopedagogics is that pedagogical part-perspective which is specifically concerned with the actualization of a child's psychic life [within an adult-child educative relationship]. Children who enter any kind of therapy show gaps and deficiencies in actualizing their psychic life. Thus, a therapist who wants to be of help to a child must acquire knowledge of the findings of psychopedagogues. However, merely acquiring this knowledge is not sufficient. The practice, on behalf of a child, must reflect such insight. Clarity must be acquired about what is involved in the actualization of the psychic life of a specific deviant child because he/she also remains a child who is *learning* and *becoming adult*.

That a therapeutic event, in its essence is an educative event, is accepted in the current literature, beyond any doubt. The slogan that a therapeutic event is a learning event resounds widely. However, when it is a child who learns in a specific relationship to an adult, it is an event of educative teaching. In his work, *Voortgang en nieuw begin in de opvoeding [Progress and new beginning in education]* (1971) Lubbers discusses this matter in detail. What educating is, in its essence, is the area of study of fundamental pedagogics. Any practice of providing help to a child which aims at his/her progress and change in the direction of additional becoming, and, thus, in the direction of adulthood, must be grounded in the essences of educating.

The current practice of providing help to a deviant child shows a conspicuous resemblance with procedures in vogue in helping adults and children. This immediately raises the question of whether a practice designed for adults, as it is, can serve as an effective practice for children. Because [philosophical] child anthropology shows that a child is not merely a miniature adult, this not only raises the question of differences among them but also compels the question of whether a child in therapy must be approached in a different way than an adult. To acquire an answer to these questions, the researcher is compelled to also acquire thorough knowledge of relevant [philosophical] child anthropological findings. In designing a *pedotherapy*, i.e., a child therapy which is useable and applicable exclusively on behalf of a child, the investigator must ascertain *who* this child is, in what ways is he/she to be distinguished from an adult and what his/her specific needs and distress are.

The above clearly reflects that a deviant child, and the help he/she needs, must be examined from different points of view. However, practice requires a point of departure from a theory which is the result of an integration of relevant knowledge of a particular deviant child. This confronts the investigator with the question of whether there is such a theory.

2.6 The orthopedagogic

From the above, it is inferred that there already is a broad knowledge structure of a child as a person and as educatively situated, which includes his/her becoming adult and the fact that there also are problems which can arise in this context. The pedagogical perspective, which is concerned with problematic educating, is known as orthopedagogics. By taking note of the different findings about a becoming child-in-education, by integrating them, and interpreting their relevance for problematic educating, provide a point of departure for establishing an accountable theory. Thus, the investigator is faced with the task of clearly showing what this theory building entails and, along with that, show how one can arrive at designing a practice.

Since the orthopedagogic is a practice-directed science, a theory established also must have relevance for practice. A theory which does not have relevance for practice is merely a thought-construction which is cut loose from the reality one is trying to verbalize.

As far as the present study is concerned, the aim of orthopedagogic theorizing is to delimit, order, and illuminate the pedotherapeutic event, itself, as the slice of reality of concern, such that it helps a practicing pedotherapist in his/her search for answers to questions such as the following:

- How is a therapeutic aim determined for a unique child?
- Can the therapist prepare him/herself for a session and present specific content?
- How is content selected?
- What methods or techniques can be used to confront a child with the content?
- What criteria are applied to evaluate a child's progress?
- How is it determined if the therapy has succeeded in reaching its aim and, thus, is completed?

The need of a child therapist is well summarized in the words of De Villiers (1975. P. 24) "... the treated problem must be formulated *specifically*, the aims to be therapeutically attained must be spelled out *specifically*, the therapeutic procedures to be followed must be indicated *specifically*". There is an attempt to provide such answers

so a pedotherapist can be of help to a child with greater purposefulness, less time wasted, and greater professional self-confidence.

3. PROGRAM OF STUDY

In a search of possible answers to the problems which have arisen in the previous sections of this chapter, the following program of study is followed:

With the aim of exploring and evaluating the current practice of providing help to a deviant child, in Chapter II, there is a review of what has been done in this regard in the R.S.A., and criteria are laid out for evaluating the accountability and effectiveness of this help.

In the light of the already established orthopedagogic foundation of providing help to a child with problems with his/her becoming adult, in Chapter III, there is a brief discussion of orthopedagogic theory building. Because pedotherapy is essentially educating, clarity must also be acquired about what this phenomenon essentially includes, and in what regard the insights established by fundamental pedagogics and psychopedagogics are embraced. Didactic pedagogics already has clearly answered questions about the professional intervention with a child during his/her acquisition of new contents and meanings. In particular, the implications this has for the specialized intervention with a deviant child also is ascertained.

To determine what the difference is between a child, as a person, and an adult, as a person, there also is a linking up with accountable [philosophical] child anthropological findings in a search for clarity in this regard, and especially with an eye to laying out the implications this has for designing a pedotherapeutic practice.

Since helping a deviant child includes an educative task, particularly, an orthopedagogic task, it also is shown how the orthopedagogic, via integrating the implications of this educative task for a deviant child, influences designing a pedotherapeutic practice. This information appears in Chapter IV.

In Chapter V, it is shown in terms of a practical exemplar how the therapeutic structure becomes embodied in practice.

In Chapter VI, the study is ended with a summary and illumination of the most important findings from which possible recommendations are made with an eye to the possible improvement of practice; also additional research is suggested.

4. DISCUSSION OF METHOD

An exploration of the available literature on the topic is done to select the most relevant works so a clear image can be attained of the main overseas currents of the practice of providing help to children. This is limited to this approach because the European and Anglo-American situations are comprehensively documented in contrast to the R.S.A., where literature in this connection is relatively meager.

This exploration is followed by a literature study during which the various main currents in this practice of helping children is critically evaluated in terms of pedagogical criteria with the aim of providing reliable findings about reasons for success as well as to show possible deficiencies.

As a result of the mentioned literature study, a questionnaire is compiled to serve as a guideline for a research interview that is conducted with heads of child guidance institutes attached to universities and where therapists are prepared.

The research interview is limited to university institutes because these organizations have research and a training task. Theory as well as practice, thus, is available to the researcher. An additional motivation for choosing institutes is the fact that the plural nature of the composition of the population in the R.S.A., as well as the urban or rural surroundings of the universities can be considered by the researcher.

At the completion of this research, an attempt is made to account for the gaps observed by means of a theoretical study of the phenomenon by means of a phenomenological penetration of its

essences. A phenomenological approach is used to attempt to disclose the phenomenon itself. The investigator is obligated to use this approach because of the unique nature of the problem considered, and the firm conviction that this is the only method which allows the “human” of a child in distress to correctly appear. A more complete description of this concept is provided in the section dealing with the child [philosophical] anthropological foundation of pedotherapy.

Because of the gaps and deficiencies of controlled experiments which behaviorists often use, this is seen as an inadequate method because of the comprehensiveness of variables which must be controlled. In a pedotherapeutic event, it is almost impossible to control all the environmental and human factors which arise. The findings resulting from such a study, at best, can be indicated vaguely, and do not justify the cost and stake involved. This opinion is confirmed by researchers such as Bergin and Strupp (1972) and Skuy (1975).

Also, the use of statistical methods, however sophisticated, do not illuminate what is essential to the phenomenon. The changes which occur regarding a child’s being a person, the actualization of his/her psychic life potentialities, his/her unique attribution of sense and meaning to the world are matters which are not quantifiable. Indeed, a pedotherapeutic event is not quantifiable. It is a human event which occurs between persons in the everyday lifeworld. All attempts to transform the event into a test situation where its course is controlled and measured, suddenly destroys the object of study, i.e., changing a child as a subject, because of the interpersonal event between him/her and a fellow person, i.e., a therapist who also is involved in the event as a subject.

Strupp says directly, “New techniques in psychotherapy, unlike new drugs, are not developed in the laboratory, tested, and then applied, but typically they are ‘invented’ and applied long before they are tested” (Bergin and Strupp, 1972, p. 435). A new approach or method in providing help to children who are bogged down and derailed in their becoming cannot be established by using methods borrowed from the natural sciences without modification.

Thus, it is the task of a scientist who wants to investigate the psychic life to penetrate it with understanding and then clearly describe it. This approach is only fruitful when a researcher is ready to be involved in the phenomenon as a subject there where it is, as it is. When he/she brings to bear all his/her human potentialities in encountering a fellow person in distress and subsequently can distance him/herself to think without prejudgment, he/she can theorize by verbalizing what is true and genuine of the phenomenon.

5. FINALLY

The optimal utilization of human resources in the R.S.A., at this juncture in time, has become a greater imperative than ever before. The challenge which speaks from the knotty situation in which we are involved directs an appeal to each educator and child to utilize his/her potentialities in such a way that he/she can make his/her full contribution. With this study, an attempt is made to provide some basic contributions in striving for the ideal of a people with able-bodied children. [Written at the imminent end of Apartheid in South Africa—G.D.Y.]