

CHAPTER 3

SOME PSYCHOLOGICAL-PEDAGOGICAL CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING CHILD LIVED-EXPERIENCING

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with designing some psychological-pedagogical criteria for evaluating the lived-experiences of a child. These criteria are categories with evaluative significance,⁽¹⁾ and each can be formulated as an evaluative question. For example, are the child's potentialities for lived-experiencing actualized? Does he lived-experience security and trust? Does he lived-experience his affective relationships as stable? Is the child's intelligence actualized? Does he explore his world? Is he progressing to moral independence? Is there an awakening of conscience?

On the one hand, these criteria are used to evaluate the pedagogic acceptability⁽²⁾ of the educator's intervention with the child and of the activities and events flowing from this intervention; in other words, from a pedagogic perspective, these criteria are used to evaluate the psychic aspects of the child's affective, cognitive and normative guidance (education) to determine if opportunities are provided and support and assistance are given for actualizing his potentialities. On the other hand, these criteria are psychological-pedagogical (or psychology of becoming) yardsticks for evaluating the child's level of lived-experiencing and thus of his becoming; that is, the child's responses to the appeals the educator and reality direct to him, as well as the ways he actualizes his own potentialities, are evaluated.

For the sake of scientific systematization and clarification, a distinction is made among criteria for evaluating pathic, gnostic and normative aspects of lived-experiences. It is emphasized that these are merely distinctions because these aspects cannot be thought of or disclosed apart from each other. (The unity among the pathic, gnostic and normative were repeatedly indicated in Chapter 2).

A child's psychic-spiritual becoming and, therefore, also psychological-pedagogics as a science, concerns the actualization (realization, implementation, concretization, conversion into reality) of a child's potentialities.⁽³⁾ For Nel⁽⁴⁾ this means "awakening

the child's psychic-spiritual potentialities" through educating. Therefore, the basic or primary criterion is the question of whether the child's potentialities for lived-experiencing (pathic, gnostic and normative) are actualized. Additional secondary criteria and guidelines flow from this.

For the psychologist-pedagogue all of this involves disclosing the aspects of a child's lived-experiencing as psychic moments in the pedagogic situation. Pathic, gnostic and normative lived-experiences are ways of being directed (of intentionality) that have to be pedagogically awakened, formed, refined and differentiated. In the pedagogic situation, a child's lived-experiences are "educated" and humanized and the adult directly influences them. Child lived-experiencing means being intentionally directed to reality; the educator has to give a course to this intentionality.

For a child, the pedagogic situation, as life world, also is a potential experiential world; in other words, for him it is a lived-experienced situation. Therefore, here, a pedagogic situation is proclaimed to be clearly a situation within which pathic, gnostic and normative aspects stand out and that then are lived-experienced by a child. It is this lived-experiencing of a child that is disclosed, understood, described and evaluated here. In this way there is an attempt to arrive at an evaluative knowing or understanding (qualitative) of a child rather than a quantification of him through measuring, quantifying and objectifying.

It is difficult to delimit the entire range of what is pedagogically acceptable or desirable. Therefore, the following criteria are only a few examples of many possibilities.

2. PSYCHOLOGICAL-PEDAGOGIC CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING A CHILD'S LIVED-EXPERIENCES

(a) Criteria for evaluating pathic (affective) lived-experiences:

(i) Primary criterion: actualizing pathic potentialities of lived-experiencing: Langeveld is the originator of this criterion because of his emphasis on the pathic aspect of lived-experiencing security,⁽⁵⁾ of bodiliness,⁽⁶⁾ of helplessness,⁽⁷⁾ of emotional warmth,⁽⁸⁾ of loving pampering,⁽⁹⁾ of affective appeal⁽¹⁰⁾ and affective response.⁽¹¹⁾ Here the evaluative

questions are: Is the child's pathic lived-experiencing favorable for his becoming? Is his becoming impeded by feelings of helplessness, uncertainty, insecurity, anxiety, etc. that he cannot assimilate or overcome?

This criterion also includes the question of whether a child in his pathic lived-experiencing is neglected by an emotionally impoverished educating. In this connection, Langeveld says, "Emotionally impoverished educating leaves a child more helpless than desired, and he is not assisted to develop his own emotional life because he is not appealed to, not allowed to be responsive in the world of emotions."⁽¹²⁾

A child's emotional life has to be optimally humanized, awakened and appealed to before particular affective lived-experiences are possible for him, e.g., before he can respond in desired ways to his being addressed pathically or before he can initiate favorable affective relationships. Here the concern is with educating the child's affective being-there (existence, intentionality) and with forming his emotional life.

A child has a primary need for love, warmth, coziness, friendliness, coddling, pampering, etc. In this respect, Muller-Eckhard⁽¹³⁾ emphasizes "the child's longing for love, need for tenderness and to be able to surrender completely ... " He refers to " a child's primordial lived-experiencing of longing for loving sympathy ... "⁽¹⁴⁾ and adds, "In a child's longing for love is a deep-seated need to be understood, to be accepted, to be valued."^{(15)*} When this longing is not met and satisfied, the child will not be in a position to really have intense love in his life.⁽¹⁶⁾

If this primary criterion is not satisfied, one finds an affectively neglected child where emotional deficiencies then lead to affective distress and affective hunger. Nel⁽¹⁷⁾ refers to "defective affective forming" while Vedder⁽¹⁸⁾ and also Rienstra⁽¹⁹⁾ see affective neglect as the condition where a child does not receive the love, affection and emotional warmth needed for his optimal emotional development. A child also can receive too much love that leads to

* Moments of lived-experiencing here mean that a child feels loved (pathic/affective), knows he is accepted (gnostic/cognitive) and is something of value (normative). To know one is accepted also is a lived-experiencing on a higher-distanced level.

an egocentric disposition toward the world. On the other hand, too little love cultivates indifference and disinterest.⁽²⁰⁾

(ii) **Secondary criteria:**

Loving care: consistent with the above primary criterion is the question of whether a child is lovingly cared for; it is precisely through loving care that his pathic potentialities are actualized. This question involves whether a child is sufficiently cared for, i.e., if he receives what he needs for his physical growth as well as for his unimpeded psychic-spiritual becoming. It also involves the question of the loving and coddling that are paired with this physical care.

Nel⁽²¹⁾ refers to the pedagogic meaning of loving care and to the far-reaching influence of mother care and mother love on a child's becoming independent. Caring for a child presumes loving care, otherwise it is not human care.⁽²²⁾

Perquin⁽²³⁾ says the following about loving care: to be an educator is to have loving care for the becoming child. Only this form of love provides the spontaneous response to a child's needs and desires. Love embraces the child's total, entire well-being and thus demands the educator's complete effort because it has to penetrate to a person in his uniqueness and wonderfulness. He also indicates some basic preconditions for the personal lived-experience of love between parents and children that can serve as additional criteria for the educator⁽²⁴⁾: "the most profound lived-experience of family togetherness is **mealtime**." During mealtime parents and children should spend time talking. "Also **bedtime** is an exceptionally important lived-experience in a child's life that should not be disturbed by unpleasantness." Parental protection and care have to allow a child to feel secure. In addition, a child should feel his parents' supervision, guidance and authority in his school, play and sports activities. Finally, Perquin says a child ought to fulfill his religious duties in his heart-felt contact with his parents. According to him,⁽²⁵⁾ the principle is that the parent has to guide his child and understand him.

A child lived-experiences his helplessness as a need for loving care. If he receives this loving care, it gives him the impetus for further becoming because he feels safe and secure. (See further on). Nel⁽²⁶⁾ indicates "that **loving** care is the educator's primary and most important task ... The parents' execution of this task not only has an affective-formative effect on the child but the intimate lived-

experience by the parent of affective spiritual satisfaction necessarily deepens parenthood spiritually by which the child's education hits fuller stride, becomes more directed and is transformed into a more concrete form."

Loving care is lived-experienced by a child on different levels depending on his level of development already attained. For example, an infant and young child lived-experience loving **physical** care⁽²⁷⁾ on an extremely vital-pathic level that serves as a precondition for later lived-experiencing loving care on a higher, gnostic level. An example of this latter level is an older child's lived-experiencing loving **spiritual** care,⁽²⁸⁾ i.e., "the activation of the spiritual dimension of being a person."⁽²⁹⁾ Loving spiritual care includes pedagogic moments such as accepting a child as he is, personal forming, forming conscience, responsibility, values and will or character.⁽³⁰⁾ (See further on).

Security: for Langeveld,⁽³¹⁾ "lived-experiencing security arises only with a showing of love." We have learned to know a child as a being who needs and seeks security. He finds this security in his parents and others. For him,⁽³²⁾ if a child is to become a person (humanized), this very minimal precondition has to be met. Lived-experienced security is a precondition for a child's exploring the world and thus for his emancipation to adulthood.

Oberholzer⁽³³⁾ and, following him, Landman⁽³⁴⁾ present the criterion of "the success of affective security." Landman continues, "A child has to be offered a secure space from which he can explore and to which he can return as soon as he lived-experiences insecurity."⁽³⁵⁾ Thus, a secure space has to be offered a child; in the case of a learning child this means a secure space for learning (Sonnekus).

Muller-Eckhard⁽³⁶⁾ refers to a child's longing for security and his intense need to fully trust the educator in order to surrender and entrust himself to him. This longing demands of the parents unconditional devotion. Also, Garbers⁽³⁷⁾ stresses the very important role played by feelings of security in a young child's development." In this connection, Van der Stoep⁽³⁸⁾ sets the didactic-pedagogic criterion of security that, along with stability, certainty and safety, (literally) means to bring to rest. The learning child has to be brought to rest, to a (pathic) standstill (stability) and be called on to reflect in order to guarantee a firm grasp (understanding-gnostic) of reality. In terms of lived-experiencing,

this view is stated as follows: lived-experiencing of stability, certainty, security and tranquillity are pathic and serve as preconditions for the gnostic lived-experiencing of reflection and understanding; thus, they are pathic preconditions for gnostic occurrences. A lack of security leads to anxiety that is detrimental to the further development of bodily and psychic "functions" because the child cannot defend himself and thus feels completely **powerless**; Nieuwenhuis⁽³⁹⁾ says this feeling **paralyzes** a child.

In comparison with a pathic lived-experience of security, two modes of being directed demanding that a child lived-experience on a higher gnostic level are self-security⁽⁴⁰⁾ and trust. In his becoming, a child gradually has to lived-experience security on his own initiative. A child who habitually lived-experiences security is able to distance himself to self-security and self-confidence. Instead of pathic dependence on the security offered by others, the child progresses to a self-security on a gnostic level through an objective assimilation of contacts and linkings with reality as well as through a gnostic attunement to (understanding of and insight into) his own situation.

Langeveld⁽⁴¹⁾ explains how, in connection with a child's self-discovery, the distance from the secure world of the family increases and now he is secure by himself. Soon, as an adult in a world where insecurity is continually familiar, he will have to provide security to his children himself. Thus, self-security points in the direction of morally independent adulthood and to the habitual gnostic disposition of an adult.

There is a very close connection between the **feeling of security** (pathic-gnostic lived-experience) and the **awareness of trust** (gnostic-pathic lived-experience).⁽⁴²⁾ Yet one can distinguish clearly between the two. Nieuwenhuis⁽⁴³⁾ does this as follows: "a first difference between **security** and **trust** seems to me to be that security **expresses a condition in which one finds oneself** (pathic)* while trust **includes a certain degree of activity** (gnostic)* ." In the second place, trust is "a more developed object of consciousness" than is security⁽⁴⁴⁾ and thus it is lived-experienced on a higher gnostic level.

Connected with his self-differentiation ("subject-object split"), in lived-experiencing trust, a child distances himself from a pathic to a

* Inserted by the author.

gnostic trust, "from a vague to a clearer awareness, from an intuitive to a more or less sharp, rational level."⁽⁴⁵⁾ Pathic trust is not rationally founded. It is non-rational, unlimited, uncritical, original, unconditional; therefore, it can be called "blind". Gradually, blind trust makes way for a consciously founded, critical trust (gnostic).⁽⁴⁷⁾

With broken trust, a child lived-experiences himself as left in the lurch, as abandoned and betrayed and with related feeling of hate, anxiety and uncertainty.⁽⁴⁷⁾ Broken trust hinders a child in distancing from a pathic to a gnostic level of trust. In repeatedly lived-experiencing betrayal, blind trust is changed into blind mistrust and infantilizing or a disturbed relationship of trust can result. Here "prevention is better than a cure ... (because) it is an extremely difficult task to re-establish a trust in life for a child who has been abandoned."⁽⁴⁸⁾

A child's becoming involves distancing from the lived-experience of loving care (vital-pathic), via the lived-experience of security (pathic), through pathic trust and gnostic trust to self-security and self-confidence on a gnostic level. Thus, the educator's task is "to help a dependent child become strong and independent ... Hence, a feeling of security arises that places a child in a position to explore further, to distance himself more from the trusted to a greater awareness of his own power."⁽⁴⁹⁾ Thus, a child's lived-experiences of security and safety are clear yardsticks for evaluating the adult's pedagogic intervention.

Bodiliness: of all experiencable things, our body is that which is most our own, that which we least stand opposite. In so far as a person lived-experiences himself as a self-moving subject, his own body is his access to the world.⁽⁵⁰⁾ A person cannot approach himself, others and the world without lived-experiencing his body.⁽⁵¹⁾ In and through his bodiliness (corporeality) a person lived-experiences pathically, gnostically and normatively.

During a child's entire flourishing, his psycho-spiritual becoming is connected with his bodily potentialities and his lived-experiences of them. According to Langeveld⁽⁵²⁾ this becoming also should be viewed in terms of the biological mediation of the body (biological moment of becoming) with its processes and functions; a person cannot be understood without considering his body and his lived-

experiences of it. As an example, Langeveld⁽⁵³⁾ mentions puberty that so clearly is connected to bodily phenomena.

A child's bodily lived-experiences clearly involve his naive, original, vital-pathic lived-experience of this biological aspect, although the gnostic is always present, e.g., in knowing one's own bodily potentialities, bodily limitations (helplessness or defects), bodily changes during puberty. (See Beets, N., **Lichaamsbeleving en sexualiteit in de puberteit**).

The psychology of the body and of bodily lived-experiences is a very broad field that cannot be treated extensively at this time. Here, only the following evaluative questions are posed: Does the child or youth lived-experience his own body favorably or does it mean for him a restraint in his total becoming? How does the educator act in order to support the child in accepting and assimilating his bodily deficiencies? Is the child's bodily care adequate? A child's lived-experience of helplessness is also a lived-experience of bodily helplessness. It is precisely a deficiency or defect in the biological aspect that is felt in the person as a whole, e.g., with a strong lived-experience of helplessness.⁽⁵⁴⁾

Stable affective relationships: it is especially on the basis of the expositions by Sonnekus⁽⁵⁵⁾ and Rienstra⁽⁵⁶⁾ that the criterion of the lived-experience of stable affective relationships is posed. According to Sonnekus⁽⁵⁷⁾ security is the basic foundation for stable, affective relationships between child and adult and thus for the child's trusting readiness to participate emotionally in the world. "The entire **event of becoming** ... is rooted ... in the trusting relationship between adult and child, as a stable affective relationship ... that also contains a pedagogic task."⁽⁵⁸⁾

The evaluative question regarding the lived-experience of affective relationships in the child's situation also concerns how **stability** in affective relationships is lived-experienced by the child.

Rienstra⁽⁵⁹⁾ also indicates how emotional ambivalence between adult and child burdens the child. Not only does the child remain extremely childlike (infantile) in his emotional life, but these unstable affective relationships show themselves in the form of learning and behavioral problems as well as in feelings of insecurity and anxiety. The child becomes so occupied with his own involved emotional problems that he is not adequately open to what he has to

learn at school.⁽⁶⁰⁾ Thus, he is not affectively ready to distance himself to the cognitive.

(b) Criteria for evaluating gnostic (cognitive) lived-experiences*

(i) Primary criterion: actualizing gnostic potentialities: on the one hand, this yardstick places demands on the adult educator (parent and teacher) to educate a child to actualize his gnostic potentialities; on the other hand, the child has to actualize his intellectual potentialities. He has to give a positive response to the gnostic appeal directed to him.

The actualization of gnostic potentialities also can be expressed in terms of a few other criteria such as actualizing intelligence, breaking through the surrounding world, insight, learning, understanding, knowing, being aware, thinking, perceiving, cognitive orientation, distancing, intellectualizing. Some of these are presented below as criteria.

For Sonnekus⁽⁶¹⁾ this criterion involves the child actualizing his intelligence as a mode of being and the adult educating the child to responsibly actualize it. "The actualization of this power to break-through (intelligence), as a **cognitive mode of being**, is however subject to the intentional directedness of the child, to a lived-experiencing on a gnostic level supported by pathic lived-experiencing."⁽⁶²⁾ Thus, a child needs the help and support of an adult to adequately actualize his intelligence; this involves the role and meaning of educating. On the one hand, by presenting norms to him, a child has to be educated ethically-normatively to responsibly actualize his intelligence.⁽⁶³⁾ He designs what for him is a new, meaningful experiential world; "he discovers new **values** for his acts of intelligence and he **lived-experiences** their **meaning** gnostically-pathically."⁽⁶⁴⁾ "But, on the other hand, **affective educating** to security in trust, to overcome his helplessness and to a **readiness to participate** (affectively) are equally important. Thus, a child also has to be emotionally readied to explore **intelligently**, to intelligently go out to and venture into his world," says Sonnekus.⁽⁶⁵⁾

* Since in a didactic situation the emphasis is on gnostic lived-experiences, these criteria also will be presented as didactic criteria.

The ways of lived-experiencing that are preconditions for actualizing intelligence, namely, (i) a directedness, as lived-experiencing on a gnostic level (intention to learn), supported by (ii) pathic lived-experiencing, as well as (iii) by ethical-normative lived-experiencing also hold for a child's other (cognitive) modes of living such as learning, insight, intellectualizing, and distancing. In other words, a child has to be educated to actualize each of these cognitive ways of being as ways of learning.

Van der Stoep⁽⁶⁶⁾ views the event of forming (as a didactic event) as assisting a child to reach his own adulthood (that includes the optimal actualization of potentialities). For him, the formative event (as didactic assistance by an adult) involves deepening, broadening, improving and enlarging a child's lived-experiencing potentialities and his sphere of lived-experiencing.⁽⁶⁷⁾

In categorical forming (Klafki), reality is unlocked for a child and the child unlocks himself for reality.⁽⁶⁸⁾ "Unlocking reality for a child can only occur because as a child (person) he is oriented to learn. Stated formally, each child shows an intention directed to learning," says Van der Stoep.⁽⁶⁹⁾

Some didactic-pedagogic criteria flow from these views. Is the child being formed? Are his potentialities broadening and deepening? Is reality unlocked for the child? Does the child unlock himself for reality? Does the child show an intention to learn? In this, is the child supported by his pathic and ethical-normative lived-experiences?

In terms of Van der Stoep's view⁽⁷⁰⁾ the criterion of objectification (distancing) is relevant here. The child is presented with the demand to objectify or to distance himself from reality (objective-realistic-gnostic attunement to reality) to gain a proper (clear, unbiased judgment) perspective on a particular structure of reality. Therefore, objectification is viewed as an "intentional achievement by the child";⁽⁷¹⁾ this objectification is for the child a learning achievement.⁽⁷²⁾

Van Hiele's⁽⁷³⁾ useful definition of insight gives rise to the following important evaluative question: Does the child act in an intentionally adequate way in new situations? In other words, insight is dependent on the child's pathic-gnostic directedness

(intentionality), thus on his pathic-gnostic **attunement** to a new situation in reality.

Lastly, according to Langeveld's descriptions, the criterion of intellectualizing (synonymous with actualizing intellectual potentialities) is fathomed in terms of objectification (distancing) from a pathic to a gnostic level. In intellectualizing "there is not merely a change in the knowing relationship to the world because whenever the gnostic-knowing relationship changes, so does the pathic-emotional. When one knowingly encounters the world, he loses the feeling of mystery, threat and tension of feelings. Consequently, the child's affectivity also changes ... Thus, intellectualizing essentially includes distancing **my** world to an 'object'. **My** feelings come up for discussion. Things become viewed objectively ... "⁽⁷⁵⁾

The essential contribution of the school to a child's intellectualizing, thus, is evaluated as follows. "A school is equal to its task if an emotional distance is created and the pupil is imparted with an available knowledge of methods and essential facts that make thinking-knowing possible," says Langeveld.⁽⁷⁶⁾ Once again, here is the didactic-pedagogic yardstick: Has intellectualizing occurred? Has the child entered a knowing relationship with the world? Is there affective distance that makes possible an objective view or things as well as thinking?

It is clear that an encompassing didactic task arises from these evaluative questions regarding a child's gnostic lived-experiences and since this is a matter for didactic-pedagogics, it will not be dealt with further.

(ii) Secondary criteria:

Habitual gnostic disposition on a childlike level: earlier it was indicated that a habitual pathic disposition is expected of a younger child and that a gnostic disposition is demanded of an older child and adult. Thus, with reference to a child of approximately nine years, the following question can be asked: do his ways of lived-experiencing point to a gnostic disposition or is there mention of infantility? From approximately nine years, gnostic demands can be made of a child on a more formal level. However, without the desired gnostic disposition he will not be able to meet these demands.

It is emphasized that the concern here is not with the gnostic disposition of an adult; only that disposition is called for of which a child is capable. In this regard, Sonnekus⁽⁷⁷⁾ calls attention to the fact that a younger child (to approximately nine years) is primarily pathically disposed (to sensing or pre-cognitive learning) in his learning involvement with things. For an older child, lived-experiencing shifts to a gnostic level and he learns, distinguishes, compares (perceives, thinks). This shift includes breaking through his pathic, sensing to a distancing from his own subjective sensing to the level of the objective-factual. Thus, here learning is directed to acquiring **knowledge**.⁽⁷⁸⁾

Vliegthart⁽⁷⁹⁾ studied children with reading and spelling problems and their relationship to the world. He found that the pathic and gnostic lived-experiences of these children are markedly differentiated; they are essentially bound to primarily emotional and sensory lived-experiences of the world and with this there is an immediate, vital being bound all of which continually intrude on and dominate these children to such an extent that attempts to lived-experience (gnostic) order in terms of formal systems easily become emotionally-vitally flooded. These children are unable to "step out of" their emotional, vital connection with things and events to a more distanced relationship with them. Thus, the productive intertwining of being emotionally and knowingly with things and the cognitive ordering and controlling of them are inadequately actualized, so says Vliegthart.⁽⁸⁰⁾

Finally, Van Gelder⁽⁸¹⁾ says that with affective immaturity an objective relationship with work does not arise and is a factor that impedes the normal learning event.

Initiating gnostic relationships: when a person is described as an "initiator of relationships,"⁽⁸²⁾ the criterion used here regards the child as initiator of gnostic or learning relationships to things and others. This criterion is related to the preceding one. This matter is discussed thoroughly by Sonnekus⁽⁸³⁾ to whose work the reader is referred. Briefly, Sonnekus⁽⁸⁴⁾ view is as follows: the initiative for learning relationships (as primarily gnostic relationships) emanates from the child himself but is directed and supported by the adult. A child lived-experiences his modes of learning pathically as well as gnostically and on varying levels of differentiation, but to really learn, an initiative to distance himself is required. For example, the learning world of a younger child primarily has a pathic flavor, while

an older child mostly manifests a gnostic initiative. This important shift from a pathic to a gnostic lived-experiencing of learning usually occurs at approximately nine years.

With this matter of gnostic relationships, along with the view of the child is an initiator of such relationships, there is mention of the cognitive aspect of the pedagogic adult-child relationship, seen as a psychic aspect of the pedagogic situation. In other words, this involves the relationship of understanding or knowing between educator and child and the evaluative question is whether the educator and child understand and know each other.

Misunderstandings between educator and child can seriously hinder the child's becoming because it is especially the child's becoming adult that is at stake in this cognitive being together of educator and educand. In this regard, Muller-Eckhard⁽⁸⁵⁾ is concerned with the fate of the child who is not understood. Thus, his book is called **Kinderen vragen bergip** (Children ask for understanding). The child asks for understanding from the adult educator regarding his encounter with the domain of adulthood and regarding his difficult transition **from** the subjectively established, vital-pathic, primordial lived-experience of the world of a child (i.e., free, unrestrained, arbitrary, undisturbed, boundless, happy-go-lucky, unrealistic, trustworthy, desirous) **to** the world of the adult with its demands for order, soberness, efficiency, objectivity, time-boundness, etc.⁽⁸⁶⁾ Thus, Muller-Eckhard indicates that when loving interest and understanding by the parents are wanting, there arise "a confused and confusing lived-experience,"⁽⁸⁷⁾ and also a desire for power, feelings of aggression, guilt, anxiety and distress.⁽⁸⁸⁾

Unresolved conflict can be psychopathological for a child.⁽⁸⁹⁾ The child becomes "sick" because of what his parents take to be education, especially because of a lack of real understanding. Muller-Eckhard says such parents are the fate of their child.⁽⁹⁰⁾ Regarding the child not understood, Muller-Eckhard⁽⁹¹⁾ indicates further that "the child likely will show life-long suffering and damage because this lack of understanding occurs at such a critical time. The child becomes disturbed in his entire psychic development, mostly in the form of restraint. And why? Because then the child lives in a sphere that does not support the spiritual."

Perquin⁽⁹²⁾ says that love (in its deepest essence) is a precondition for understanding a child. Love makes the educator at one with the child, with his concerns, desires, thoughts. No chilly understanding,

quick-witted analysis, clever argument can take the place of the goodwill which alone gives rise to self-sacrifice, patience, tact and persistence.

From the above, the criterion of loving **understanding** arises, and thus it also becomes an evaluative question regarding the child's gnostic lived-experiences of the adult's pedagogic (i.e., didactic) intervention as a lived-experience of **understanding**.

Exploration: "The 'inclination to explore' is of extreme importance and one cannot understand psychic development without it," writes Langeveld.⁽⁹³⁾ The criterion of exploration (ver-kenning) is especially fathomed as knowing (kenning) the world (gnostic activity). However, before this can occur, the child has to be affectively ready to participate (gnostic venturing) in Reality⁽⁹⁴⁾ because, although he ventures gnostically, he acts on an affective foundation.

Van der Stoep⁽⁹⁵⁾ views exploration as an activity that undeniably raises the question of learning in the sense of "learning to know" and "learning to master." A child has to become oriented to the things knowable in life. Perquin⁽⁹⁶⁾ indicates that a child is actively involved in his becoming through exploration and emancipation. A child is not only receptive but he also explores. In each exploratory act is a bit of independence because to explore always means "going one's **own** way."

Emancipation has to do with freeing a child via freeing his potentialities, and here the emphasis is on freeing or actualizing his cognitive potentialities. Van der Stoep⁽⁹⁷⁾ posits emancipation as a didactic criterion that includes factors such as exploring, lived-experiencing his own security, but also at the same time a new (changed) form of the learning person's involvement in reality. Emancipation points to a readiness and willingness to explore. The child loosens himself further from the adult. Also, regarding his conscience, he discovers values, norms and opinions that direct his life to what is proper, writes Van der Stoep. The evaluative question here is whether the child explores his world, and if he is becoming emancipated; with what disposition (attitude) does he explore the world? Regarding his gnostic lived-experiencing, does he also show that he is someone who eagerly wants to become someone himself, someone who wants to know, learn, discover?

Work disposition (attitude): the disposition to work is a disposition distanced **from** a pathic, carefree form of existence **to** a gnostic-realistic focus on work, task and product. Thus, it is related to a work attitude, lived experienced tasks, a readiness for work, school, etc.

A disposition to work is a child's readiness to accept tasks and then direct himself to the stated aim until it is achieved as well as possible.⁽⁹⁸⁾ A disposition to work is initiated by an affective readiness to direct oneself gnostically, yet this disposition refers further to the child being able to overcome gnostically the difficulties he encounters in completing the task he has accepted.

(c) Criteria for evaluating normative lived-experiences:

(i) Primary criterion: actualizing normative potentialities: clearly, a child's becoming is an open event, "open for discovery, open to the intervention of good and bad influences and experiences ... open for identifying with others and what they do."⁽⁹⁹⁾ (Among other things, norms and values).

The issue here is awakening and forming a child as spirituality regarding his norms and regulating, routinizing and disciplining. The child's striving life (passions, drives, sentiments, volitional life, emotional life) has to become directed by normative lived-experiences. His egocentricity, pathic obstinacy and ungoverned emotionality have to develop to a level-headedness, a controlled emotional life and norm-directed activities--thus to a lived-experience of affective stability that is a favorable precondition for being directed gnostically and normatively. This includes socializing the child since normative lived-experiences involve a becoming towards others, learning to take fellow persons into consideration.

The matters of norming, awakening conscience, freedom and responsibility, authority and moral independence all are closely related. In this connection the reader is referred to the criteria proposed by Oberholzer,⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ namely, norm-centeredness, sympathetic, authoritative guidance, validity of demands of propriety and conquering freedom.

Through the authority by which an educator exemplifies norms, a child acquires confidence about them. A young child also lived-

experiences authority on a pathic level because he cannot separate it either from the person as the mere conveyor of authority, or from that person's physical presence.⁽¹⁰¹⁾ By distancing himself from this (pathic) lived-experience of authority (docility) to a higher gnostic level, authority increasingly becomes less a consequence of the personal connection with the conveyor of authority (i. e., the adult) and more a consequence of the norms which are given form in the exercise of authority.⁽¹⁰²⁾ Thus, lived-experiencing the authority of the norm itself (obedience) is seen as more gnostic-distanced compared with lived-experiencing authority as the authority-of-the-educator (docility). Just as obedience is a way of being on a higher gnostic level than is docility, identification with the norm, as such, is on a higher level which distances the norm from an identification of it with the educator, as such.

Perquin⁽¹⁰³⁾ also emphasizes the necessity for authority in educating. He says the confidence that the parents **have everything to say** is obvious and necessary for a child. Not only does a child take refuge in his parents and expect love and care from them, he also gives them his trust and knows that he has to obey them; thus, he grants them their **authority**.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾

Under "loving spiritual care" Nel⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ includes the spiritual-emotional acceptance of a child, forming his person, conscience, responsibility, values, will and character. He⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ says, "The following tasks, with their aspect of lived-experience, are awakening conscience, responsibility, awareness of values, deep spiritual feelings, i.e., all that a spiritual dimension implies and that is inseparably connected with willful choices and decisions ... this especially concerns confronting a child with the normative, thus with values, with the demands of propriety and forming his will toward the good so that later he can choose in freedom."

The problem of pedagogic neglect arises when the educator does not fulfill the demands of this criterion. This topic is elaborated on by Nel,⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ Rienstra⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ and Vedder⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ among others. Vedder⁽¹¹⁰⁾ says, "There is mention of **pedagogic neglect** when too few demands for self-restraint are posed, when no norms are taught." Thus, a child is educationally neglected when an educator does too little in his educating, guiding, exercising authority and discipline. Pedagogic neglect, then, is an **educative deficiency** resulting from a pedagogic aim and pedagogic steps that are inadequate. Then the parents invite a deficit in their pedagogic intervention with their

child; they hold him to too few particular norms and demands; they leave him too free to direct himself to what he finds immediately satisfying. This freedom means he receives inadequate guidance.⁽¹¹¹⁾ Thus, the evaluative question regarding normative lived-experiences is how does a child lived-experience the educative norms his parents emulate for him?

(ii) **Secondary criteria:**

Lived-experience of norms and values: Van der Stoep⁽¹¹²⁾ says, "When adults and children are dependent on each other, pedagogic norms and values (the **contents** of educating) hold unconditionally and (understandably) demand unconditional obedience." On the one hand, this involves a pathic lived-experiencing of norms and values. The close interweaving of feelings and values (in terms of the work of Max Scheler) has already been pointed out. On the other hand, there is mention of a child's gnostic lived-experiencing of norms, i.e., the demands of propriety. Here the question is whether a child understands the norms, e.g., religious norms and values.

For Perquin⁽¹¹³⁾ it is important that educating be directed to acknowledging values and the respect that accompanies their acceptance. Respect indicates that there is more in things than one can see. Respect is a wondering (pathic lived-experience) as well as a search for insight (gnostic lived-experience). A respectful attitude toward life is the only possibility for becoming a sharer of values. Thus, respect means being bound to values.

An essential definition of educating includes a confrontation with life values; there has to be an integration of educating to adulthood and of life values. Flourishing to adulthood is accomplished by discovering, integrating and prioritizing values on the basis of their intrinsic meaning.⁽¹¹⁴⁾ Perquin confronts educating with the following evaluative question: to what extent and how is the integration of values contributing to the youth's inner development?⁽¹¹⁵⁾

Awakening conscience: according to Kohnstamm⁽¹¹⁶⁾ the central problem of educating is forming conscience and whoever says conscience says responsibility. Thus, through educating, something **in** the child has to be formed, namely, conscience. In this way a child is educated to being a "personality."⁽¹¹⁷⁾ The self-judgments of one's actions in order to discharge his responsibilities is a function

of **conscience**. Conscience is at the core of all lived-experiences of being responsible, says Bigot.⁽¹¹⁸⁾

Con-science is a knowing (gnostic lived-experience) as well as a felt knowing (pathic lived-experience) but especially a knowing that one deviates (or not) from norms, values, laws, customs, conventions, etc. (normative lived-experience). Conscience is closely related to lived-experiencing responsibility, duty, guilt, religion, choices and freedom.

Langeveld⁽¹¹⁹⁾ holds that conscience is a **feeling structure** in that emotional norms are lived-experienced and thus implicit values are known. (Thus, pathic, gnostic and normative lived-experiences also are actualized here). Langeveld⁽¹¹⁹⁾ and also Knoop⁽¹²⁰⁾ view chastisement as an awakening and sharpening of conscience. The aim of purposeful "pain" is to improve a child morally.

Viktor Frankl's⁽¹²¹⁾ view of the spiritual unconscious, as the "center" of human existence (a person), is also of pedagogic importance. The phenomenon of **conscience** is rooted in the spiritual unconscious. The lived-experience of conscience unlocks for a person that which yet ought be, the value potentialities which ought to be actualized (**ought** in a moral sense).⁽¹²³⁾ For this author, the concern here clearly is with potentializing, activating or awakening conscience.⁽¹²⁴⁾ This forming of conscience is indeed pedagogic forming.

Dienelt⁽¹²⁵⁾ views educating to responsibility in terms of Frankl's existential analysis. He also emphasizes the spiritual reality of a person, the autonomy of spiritual existence and a person's **striving for meaning**. This has to do with the meaning of human existence and the task character of life for which a person is responsible.⁽¹²⁶⁾ A person has to become aware of his being-responsible (lived-experience of responsibility). He has to come to himself; in other words he has to become fully aware of his responsibility.⁽¹²⁷⁾ Instead of the "unrestrained development" characterizing American education, it has to be directed to governing the child's emotional life and forming his conscience.⁽¹²⁸⁾ The major task of pedagogy, thus, is "educating to responsibility .. to having a conscience," says Dienelt.⁽¹²⁹⁾

In light of the above line of thought, the following criteria for conscience are proposed: is the child chastised; is his conscience awakened and sharpened?

Sense and meaning: as a lived-experiencing I, and thus as intentionality directed to his world, a child can do nothing else than give sense and meaning to his world and to lived-experience this sense and meaning. Lived-experience was already described as intentionality and, therefore, as an act of giving sense and meaning. Moments of lived-experiencing also are moments of sense and meaning and the reverse. Lived-experiencing is a concerned involvement with reality. "Giving sense and meaning and lived-experiencing point to an existential-ethical involvement with reality and to one's own responsibility," writes Landman.⁽¹³⁰⁾ Now, the evaluative questions are what sense and meaning does the child give to his world, how does he lived-experience this sense and meaning, is this lived-experiencing favorable to his becoming? How responsible is the child's existential-ethical involvement with reality?

Van der Stoep's⁽¹³¹⁾ category of giving meaning also can be posed as a criterion. In light of his explication, the matter of giving sense and meaning can be used as a criterion for child lived-experiencing: this involves giving meaning to (and ordering) reality as an act of intentional consciousness. Thus, reality acquires meaning for a child. Giving meaning carries the interaction between reality and the intention to learn (lived-experience of learning). There are aspects of implicit meanings (that lie in the things themselves) and explicit meanings (that a child attributes to things), says Van der Stoep.⁽¹³²⁾ He clarifies further: "giving meaning and the totality of reality that a child goes out to are closely and inseparably related because in both cases these **aspects of lived-experience** (i.e., giving meaning and the totality of reality) are primary. Thus, in learning a child is continually busy lived-experiencing and deepening the meanings of the series of situations by which his behaviors, interpretations and mastery of future situations are defined to a degree."⁽¹³³⁾

Moral independence (responsibility and freedom): with the criterion of moral independence, it is necessary to mention freedom and responsibility. A child has to be educated to freedom, not **from** something but **to** responsibility. A child is not free from the spiritual (lived-experiences) that address him.⁽¹³⁴⁾ Moral

independence is clearly a gnostic-normative lived-experience. Freedom and responsibility mean that a person (particularly an educand on the level of a child) can respond in distanced ways to his being questioned in terms of known (gnostic lived-experienced) norms.

A child's dependence implies that, for his living and for the spiritual potentialities within him, he needs the help of adults.⁽¹³⁵⁾ Hence, it is only through educating that a child can take personal responsibility for who he is and what he does.⁽¹³⁶⁾ The educator has to help and support a child to continually master that which is given to him in his being human, namely, his fundamental responsibilities.⁽¹³⁷⁾ As soon as an educator neglects to let a child carry all of the responsibility he can carry and neglects to hold him accountable for all he can be responsible for, he no longer is an educator, and he pushes the educand away from his life potentialities and potentialities of lived-experiences, says Langeveld.⁽¹³⁸⁾

The child's freedom is laboriously inculcated through educating. The contrast between "authority and freedom" is, therefore, incorrect: authority **creates** freedom. A child left on his own will not arrive at "freedom" but will fall into chaos, arbitrariness--purely vital, vegetative (vital-pathic) lived-experiences. Human freedom means being bound.⁽¹³⁹⁾

Only when a child has become **independent** is giving support (educating) discontinued.⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ Thus, we speak of adulthood when true independence is achieved and when a person is able to **take a personal position**, when he can direct himself unselfishly to others, when he has also accepted the more important values on intrinsic grounds.⁽¹⁴¹⁾

3. SYNTHESIS

Some psychological-pedagogical criteria were presented in this chapter for evaluating childlike lived-experiences. On the basis of a phenomenologically oriented literature in psychology, pedagogy, didactics and philosophical anthropology, these criteria were further expanded, elucidated and illustrated.

Special concern was given to the basic or primary criteria regarding the actualization of lived-experiences. It was noted how these

criteria (regarding pathic, gnostic and normative lived-experiencing) are intrinsically intertwined, how they are connected and form a unity. No act of lived-experience is possible without its pathic, gnostic and normative aspects. It was indicated that the pathic, gnostic and normative lived-experiences, as a unitary event, involve the child's humanizing, educating, teaching, norming and becoming.

These criteria make demands of the educator for insightful pedagogic directions; also they demand that a child actualize his potentialities of lived-experiencing.

In the following chapter, some examples are given of aspects of childlike lived-experiencing.

VERWIJZINGS REFERENTIES, Ch 3

1. Landman, W. A., en Geus, S. J.: Inleiding tot de fundamentele Pedagogiek, p. 49.

2. *Ibid.*

3. Langewald, M. J.: Ontwikkelingspsychologie, p. 38 en 37.

4. Nel, B. F.: Pedagogische Vervalsionles, p. 18.

5. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 42.

6. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 32 en 83.

7. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 43.

8. *Ibid.*

9. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 42.

10. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 43.

11. *Ibid.*

12. *Ibid.*

13. Müller-Eckhard, H.: Kinderen versus Begrip, p. 48.

14. *Ibid.*

15. *Ibid.*

16. *Ibid.*

17. Nel, B. F.: a.w.

18. Vedder, K.: Inleiding tot de Psychiatrie, p. 152.

19. Rientma, Y.: Kind, School, Gezin, p. 64-67.

20. *Ibid.*

21. Nel, B. F.: Die Opvoeding van die Kleuter, p. 29-33.

22. Nel, B. F.: a.w. p. 29.

23. Perquin, N.: Pedagogiek, p. 125 en 126.

24. Perquin, N.: a.w. p. 132-134.

25. *Ibid.*

26. Nel, B. F.: Pedagogiese Vervalsionles, p. 36.

27. *Ibid.*

28. *Ibid.*

29. *Ibid.*

30. Nel, B. F.: a.w. p. 36 en 37.

31. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 42.

32. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 32.

33. Oberholzer, C. K.: Prolegomena van 'n prinsipiële Pedagogiek, p. 318.

34. Landman, W. A. in Landman, W. A. en Geus, S. J.: a.w. p. 70.

35. Landman, W. A.: a.w. p. 70.

36. Müller-Eckhard, H.: a.w. p. 48.

37. Gertens, J. G. in Nel, B. F., Smeekens, M. C. H. en Garbers, J. G.: Grondslae van die Pedagogie, p. 264.

38. Van der Stoep, F.: Duitsele Grondwette, p. 37.

39. Neuwirth, H. in Berdevelf, W., Frikken, D. en Neuwirth, H.: Kinderpsychologie en oopvoedkundige Psychologie, p. 2.

40. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 43 en 83.

41. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 83.

42. Neuwirth, H.: a.w. p. 1.

43. *Ibid.*

44. *Ibid.*

45. Neuwirth, H.: a.w. p. 2.

46. Neuwirth, H.: a.w. p. 3 en 4.

47. Neuwirth, H.: a.w. p. 4 en 5.

48. Neuwirth, H.: a.w. p. 6.

49. Van der Berg, J. A. F. en Kruisman, A. M. L.: Tweewindred aan Jan, p. 9.

50. Beyersdijk, F. J.: Algemene Theorie der menselike Handing en Beweging, p. 54-58.

51. Perquin, N.: Pedagogiek, p. 68.

52. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 32.

53. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 83.

54. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 43.

55. Smeekens, M. C. H.: Die Leersweld van die Kind as Behewensleereld, p. 3.

56. Rientma, Y.: Kind, School en Gezin, p. 73-75.

57. Smeekens, M. C. H.: a.w. p. 5, 10 en 11.

58. Smeekens, M. C. H.: a.w. p. 5.

59. Rientma, Y.: a.w. p. 73-76.

60. Rientma, Y.: a.w. p. 73.

61. Smeekens, M. C. H.: a.w. p. 73-84.

62. Smeekens, M. C. H.: a.w. p. 78.

63. Smeekens, M. C. H.: a.w. p. 79.

64. *Ibid.*

65. *Ibid.*

66. Van der Stoep, F.: a.w. p. 17.

67. Van der Stoep, F.: a.w. p. 25, 26, 34, 35.

68. Van der Stoep, F.: a.w. p. 18.

69. Van der Stoep, F.: a.w. p. 19.

70. Van der Stoep, F.: a.w. p. 27.

71. Van der Stoep, F.: a.w. p. 74.

72. Van der Stoep, F.: a.w. p. 74.

73. Van Hiele, P. M.: Die Problematiek van het Instel, p. 11.

74. Langewald, M. J.: Scholen en die Mens, p. 101-102.

75. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 101.

76. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 102.

77. Smeekens, M. C. H.: a.w. p. 94, 95, 108.

78. Smeekens, M. C. H.: a.w. p. 95.

79. Vliegenhart, E. W.: Op groepsman Voer, p. 76.

80. *Ibid.*

81. Van Gelder, L.: Oopvoeding en Correctie, p. 87.

82. Beyersdijk, F. J.: Psychologie van de Huislik.

83. Smeekens, M. C. H.: a.w. Hoofstuk 4.

84. Smeekens, M. C. H.: a.w. p. 101, 121, 128, 129.

85. Müller-Eckhard, H.: a.w. p. 162.

86. Müller-Eckhard, H.: a.w. p. 52.

87. *Ibid.*

88. *Ibid.*

89. Müller-Eckhard, H.: a.w. p. 50.

90. *Ibid.*

91. Müller-Eckhard, H.: a.w. p. 51.

92. Perquin, N.: a.w. p. 126.

93. Langewald, M. J.: Oopvoedkundige Psychologie, p. 42.

94. Smeekens, M. C. H.: a.w. p. 11.

95. Van der Stoep, F.: a.w. p. 13.

96. Perquin, N.: a.w. p. 36.

97. Van der Stoep, F.: a.w. p. 28.

98. Perquin, N.: a.w. p. 31 en 32.

99. Langewald, M. J.: a.w. p. 31 en 32.

100. Oberholzer, C. K.: a.w. p. 320-325.

101. Langewald, M. J.: Skolepsie leersweldige Pedagogiek, p. 46.

102. *Ibid.*

103. Perquin, N.: a.w. p. 35, 178-183.
104. Perquin, N.: a.w. p. 35.
105. Nel, B. F.: a.w. p. 37.
106. Nel, B. F.: a.w. p. 37 en 38.
107. Nel, B. F.: a.w.
108. Riemstra, Y.: a.w. p. 105-108.
109. Vedder, R.: a.w. p. 153.
110. *Ibid.*
111. Riemstra, Y.: a.w. p. 105 en 108.
112. Van der Stoep, F.: a.w. p. 39.
113. Perquin, N.: a.w. p. 93 en 94.
114. Perquin, N.: a.w. p. 210.
115. *Ibid.*
116. Kobstanten, Ph., aangehaal deur Bigot, L. C. T.: *Het Kind*, p. 12 en 13.
117. Bigot, L. C. T.: a.w. p. 12 en 13.
118. Bigot, L. C. T.: a.w. p. 13.
119. Langveld, M. J.: a.w. p. 62.
120. Langveld, M. J.: a.w. p. 128.
121. Knoop, M.: *Omgang met Kinderen*, p. 55.
122. Frankl, V. E.: *Die onbewuste God*, p. 25.
123. Frankl, V. E.: a.w. p. 28-31.
124. Frankl, V. E.: a.w.
125. Dierckx, K.: *Opvoeding tot Verantwoordelijkheid*.
126. Dierckx, K.: a.w. p. 15-18.
127. Dierckx, K.: a.w. p. 18 en 44.
128. Dierckx, K.: a.w. p. 43.
129. Dierckx, K.: a.w. p. 45.
130. Landman, W. A.: *Enkele aksologies-ontologiese Momente in die Voor-olwaa-
rensbeleging - 'n Studie in die Wysgerige Antropologie*, p. 56.
131. Van der Stoep, F.: a.w. p. 53 en 54.
132. *Ibid.*
133. Van der Stoep, F.: a.w. p. 54.
134. Langveld, M. J.: *Beknopte teoretiese Pedagogiek*, p. 162.
135. Langveld, M. J.: a.w. p. 92.
136. Langveld, M. J.: a.w. p. 162.
137. Langveld, M. J.: a.w. p. 163.
138. Langveld, M. J.: a.w. p. 48.
139. Langveld, M. J.: a.w. p. 49.
140. Perquin, N.: a.w. p. 41.
141. Perquin, N.: a.w. p. 61.