

The scientific methods used in pedagogic diagnosis

lecture 05/09/2005/Geel (Belgium)

by Stefan Heckel and Elke Schimkus

The origin business of science is to constitute valid, inter-subjective statements about the object of research at a time.

The methods used in the „Institute for pedagogic diagnosis“ are those of the objective hermeneutics: the analysis of objective data concerning a subjects´ live story and the analysis of records of real symbolic social actions or interactions, either written or oral, visual or involving a combination of different media.

Objective hermeneutics presume:

- An autonomous subject acts by means of universal, constitutive rules of society into an open future.
- These rules generate exclusive courses of action.
- The autonomous subject is obliged to choose an option. Generally this choice is free.
- The subjects´ autonomy is measured according to the latitude of choosing options.
- Individuality abounds in the representative choice of action.
- Individuality is the consequence of different parameters of choice, such as patterns of meaning, habit and character.

The data used in the Institute for pedagogic diagnosis are “natural” records of social actions and objective data.

These transcribed records are not modified in any way before the analysis. The objectives data such as birthday, date of marriage and first day at school for example, are valid in an inter-subjective way. The analysis of objective data is carried out by accepting the fact, that a subject chooses his courses of acting in reference to his very specific life circumstances.

With this basic information we can build a first hypothesis concerning the case. The subjects´ acting is constituted through universal valid rules.

They are –in opposite to laws of nature- structured by meaning.

The sequential analysis of a recorded text brings up the so called latent structures of meaning.

They include the universal constitutive rules of acting as well as the case concerning selection of a subjects rule following acting. The method of sequential analysis of a text is able to reconstruct the latent structures of meaning. The latent structures of meaning are not equal with the meaning the acting subject is aware of. However, these structures can be determined by relating to the acting subjects meaning. Latent structures of meaning cannot be reduced analytically a subjective meaning.

Their determination is based on the periodical constituted structure of social acting.

The understanding of the subjective meaning, the intention represented by the subject, is constitutively dependent on the understanding of latent structures of meaning.

In other words: to be able to act in an autonomous way depends on the ability of a subject to understand these latent structures of meaning.

If the acting subject did not have this ability, the understanding of practical behaviour became equal to arbitrariness. Behaviour, which always is social behaviour, could not come up at all. The every day practical understanding of meaning is a short form of the scientific method.

The connection between every day practical understanding of subjective meaning and explicit-methodical understanding of latent structures of meaning is evident in the case of practical not-understanding.

If the subject does not understand, what his opponent wants, he has to act like a scientist, by looking on the latent structures of meaning.

His question is no longer: what did he mean.

His question now is: what did he actually say, by assuming a level of meaning which is independent from the conscious will of the opponent. The discrepancy between the understanding of acting on the one hand based on scientific methods and on the other hand based on daily-life experience is already explained by this example. The practically acting subject tries to reach his aims always under the pressure of making decisions.

That is why the subject is dependent on the understanding of his partners' intention in the concrete situation.

In contrast the scientist does not have to make any of these decisions; his intention is free from pressure.

Whereas the understanding of a situation during every day life only notices a small part of the meaning lying underneath, the scientists view on behaviour is a total one, which means, that he is able to reconstruct the latent structures of meaning as a whole. Another reason for the above mentioned discrepancy is the fact, that some people, who are still in process of socialisation, have only little knowledge of and about the latent structures of meaning. In some cases the understanding of latent structures of meaning is distorted because of pathological facts.

The „overprotective mother“ for example acts to accomplish her own needs and exploits her own child while doing so. An understanding concerning the latent structure of meaning initially takes place on the level of physical needs. As soon as the child takes its mothers view onto her way of handling for granted, it will interpret the latent structure of meaning in a completely distorted way not as overprotective but as self-abandonment.

We will describe the way the “Institute for pedagogic diagnosis” develops an expert opinion following now. The expert opinion is subdivided into three parts:

- 1. Questions to be answered**

What are the specific developmental problems concerning the client. What are the reasons?

- 2. Answers to the above questions**

Analysis of the objective data and sequential analysis of the text recorded.

- 3. Proposal for an adequate pedagogical intervention.**

II Reconstruction of Juliane Hillens case

Juliane Hillens' striking aggressive behaviour makes it impossible for her to stay at home or in any children home.

Although no psychiatric disease could be found, so she went into the psychiatric clinic for children several times and stayed there for almost one year. The major question concerns the reasons for Julianes´ high level of aggression. We suppose that aggressive behaviour is meaningful, that means it is the subjects´ answer to his social environment.

2. Analysis of the objective data

Paternal grandparents

Date of marriage: not established

Specials in marriage: divorce about 1974

Home: rented flat

Children: Lea Hillen

Klaus Hillen

Else Hillen

Hartmut Hillen

Dagmar Hillen

Paternal grandfather

Klaus Hillen

Date of birth: not established

Place of birth: near the Russian border

Religion: Roman Catholic

Apprenticeship/ profession: not established

Worked at: not established

Exceeded life events:

Klaus and Eva Hillen got divorced about 1974

Klaus Hillen died in 1985

Paternal grandmother

Eva Jauch

Date of birth: not established

Place of birth: not established

Religion: roman Catholic

Graduation: not established

Apprenticeship / profession: housewife, cleaning

Worked at: not established

Exceeded life events:

divorce 1974

Analysis

The number of children, the religion and the grandfathers' place of birth point out to a traditional social environment.

In a traditional environment the person, who has to be socialized, must show independence and role-taking on a high level. That is why individual care-taking of a mother is not in the centre of the view onto a child. On the other side of the above mentioned we have low interest on individuation. Low rates of suicide and divorce are indicators for that. Marriage is more fitting into a traditional standard, than into one of individualized love. From this point of view the grandparents' divorce is unusual and makes a broken down relationship visible.

Maternal grandparents

Date of marriage: not established

Specials in marriage: The couple still lives together

Home: two houses with garden, small town

Children: Clemens Kantelberg, worker, born 1959

Sascha Kantelberg, electrician, born, 1964

Claudia Kantelberg, housewife, born, 1964

Maternal grandfather

Ewald Kantelberg

Date of birth: August 1935

Place of birth: D-Stadt

Religion: protestant, active

Graduation: not established

Apprenticeship / profession: worker

Worked at: Hüls AG

Exceeded life events: -

Maternal grandmother

Jasmin Kantelberg

Date of birth: November 1935

Place of birth: HB-Stadt

Religion: protestant, active

Graduation: not established

Apprenticeship / profession: housewife

Worked at: as cleaner

Exceeded life events: -

Analysis

Julianes mothers´ parents come from a worker class environment and have a solid modern affected marriage. The maternal grandparents´ generative behaviour is a lot more individualised. This couple works to accumulate wealth and status symbols. The fact that the family owns two houses with gardens shows, that the familiar situation must have been financially burdened during the child raising period. For a working class family this accumulation of wealth must have been a time of great abandonment.

This cannot be justified in any way during the adolescence of their children. A conflict between parents and children can be expected.

The grandparents´ active Protestantism presumes a restrictive and listless socialisation of the children. This is even worse for Julianes mother.

Her moral integrity must have been extremely vulnerable from her parents´ point of view, because she is a girl. There for she is more controlled and limited than her siblings. Since Julianes mother is socialized in a twin constellation with a brother, she has to see her parents´ care about her moral integrity as arbitrariness and injustice.

Adolescents´ mother

Claudia Seipel

Born: 15.9.64

Place of birth: BZ-Stadt

Religion: protestant, not active

Graduation: after 10th class

Apprenticeship/ profession: hairdresser, stopped because of pregnancy

Worked at:

T-Dorf hotel, 1997, for 3 month

T-Dorf shopping mall, 1997 for 3 month

K-Stadt airport, 1998, ½ a year

Right now working in a hotel, started there 1.10.1998

Exceeded events of life:

Marriage with Mr. Hillen in 1983 and divorce in 1998

Marriage with Mr. Seipel, divorce handed in

Mrs. Seipel left home, when she was 16 years old, since 1980 she is not in contact with her parents anymore.

Illegitimate child, Thomas Kantelberg, born: 13.09.1983

Analysis

The job as a hairdresser leads us to an orientation on fashion and formality. So we can expect conflicts with her parents. For fundamentalist Protestants fashion tends towards a result of sin and waste. The fact, that Mrs. Seipel discontinued any contact with her parents, shows us a fundamental quarrel between her and them. She also canceled her apprenticeship, which means she denies autonomous behaviour.

Becoming pregnant makes her dependent and has extending consequences concerning an autonomous life. The fact, that Julianes´ mother denies autonomy as a basic principle, shows her undone relief from her parents and her lack of socialisation. The other side is, Mrs Seipel uses father and child to establish this

denial, which means we can expect serious problems concerning the relationship between her and her husband as well as between her and her child. The biography of her career is characterized by rapid changes of jobs.

The evidence is: that Claudia Seipel is unsteady and still enormously dependent on her parents.

Adolescents´ father

Hartmut Hillen

Born: 5.6.1952

Place of birth: C-Stadt

Religion: protestant

Graduation: not established

Apprenticeship/ profession: painter

Worked at: not established

Exceeded life events:

Marriage with Mrs. Seipel 1983, divorce 1989

Problems with alcohol, homeless in between at that time he is attended by SKM (social service for catholic men) K. and lives in a residential establishment for homeless people in K.city.

Analysis

The fact, that Hartmut Hillen is 12 years older than Claudia Seipel, points to a deficit in socialisation.

Because there are no hints to an earlier marriage, we can say, that Mr. Hillen does not have enough sovereignty and autonomy to find someone to marry within a group of same aged people. The above mentioned thesis of instrumentalization is affirmed by the fact that Claudia Seipel marries an elder, probably weaker individual.

She is not able to tell us anything about her husbands´ graduation, which shows, that there is no affective bonding to him.

Mr Hillen marries Claudia Seipel in the year 1983, when she gives birth to an illegitimate child, which is proves the thesis of weakness.

Mr. Hillens' life gets out of order after the divorce from Claudia Seipel, which means he must have been somebody with a traumatic socialisation who tried to find steadiness in this marriage.

Adolescents' parents

Date of marriage: 1983

Specials in marriage: divorce 1989

Home: Establishment for the homeless,
Rented flat

Children:

Alice Hillen/ geb. 19.9.1981 /pupil

Thomas Kantelberg/ geb. 13.7.1983/ pupil

Hans Hillen/ geb. 11.9.1985/ pupil

Juliane Hillen/ geb. 11.9.1985/ pupil

Thomas Kantelberg is the illegitimate son of Mrs. Seipel, divorcee Hillen, and Mr. X (born 13.11.1961)

Analysis

The previous data confirms the image we have made about the parents' relationship.

Eye-catching is that there is another twin-constellation as we had before in Mrs. Seipels' family.

Adolescent

Juliane Hillen

Born: 11.9.1985

Place of birth: T-Dorf

Religion: protestant

Kindergarten: Summer 1990 until summer 1992

Analysis

Juliane went to kindergarten pretty late. (normal with 3 years)

It seems that her mother has difficulties letting her go and that she is not able to give Juliane enough room to develop an adequate autonomous behaviour.

First day at school: Summer 1992 until summer 1996

Type of school after elementary school:

Summer 1996 until 21.03.1997 Secondary-school

Analysis

Leaving school after less than a year, points out a crisis at that time of her life.

Years in school done twice: none

Children homes:

31.5.1990 – 5.7.1996 Kinderdorf H-Stadt

14.6.1991 deprivation of habitation law

3.9.1993 deprivation of parental care (reasons: parents' separation, children neglected, alcohol, father homeless)

April 1992 until 1993 habitation of mother unknown at that time

5.7.1996 – 30.1.1997 children go back to her mother (married again)

31.1.1997 – 20.3.1997 Juliane asks for intake into children home

21.3.1997 – 9.1.1998: another children home in B.G

The group Juliane stayed in did not exist any more, the guardian who was responsible for her is no longer there, Juliane had an intense relationship with this guardian, a nun.

Different children homes, psychiatric clinics and inhabitation by her mother with ambulant help.

Since 24.03.1998 we find Juliane exclusively in psychiatric clinics

Home: since 1 year in a psychiatric clinic in B.town

Exceeded life events:

Repeated theft

Analysis

The most important data are those of the siblings' placement at the different children homes after their parents' partnership broke down, Julianes' returning into her mothers' household, the way back into the children home, the failure of these interventions and the long-time stay in the psychiatric clinic. The way the parents' broke up, affirms the above made statements. It is obvious, that Juliane leaves her home because she cannot endure life like that any longer. We have to presume, that she could not see any perspectives for her future life there.

The former peer group and the nun, who had a good relationship with Juliane, were not in the first children home any longer, so this inhabitation did not work out again. Juliane had imagined that going back there would offer her a positive life-perspective but she becomes deeply disappointed. The hospitalisation in a psychiatric clinic shows, that Julianes' behaviour must have been abnormal, so that there were no other possible ways but to place her in another institution. The reason for this kind of abnormal behaviour is an effect on the loss of her perspectives of socialisation. The changing placements point out, that the youth welfare office did not have a concept, to react to Julianes' situation, except from the trial-and-error-method.

The attempt to bring her back into her mothers' household shows, that the adolescent wanted to come back home and stay with her family. The constant placement in a clinic indicates that a return into the family is not promising.

A longer stay in a psychiatric clinic is always followed by the stigma of being „retarded“ or a „psychiatric inhabitant“. That finally forms an opinion about „being crazy“. This judgement is followed by consequences for the acting subject that is not at all indicated (which are not indicated in any (other) manner):

On the one hand it means: there is no chance to change the situation by myself and on the other hand: the reasons for the mental disorder are to be found in my person.

The results of the sequential analysis:

Erzähl doch mal wie war das denn? Du bist ja dann von dem Heim weg (.) wieder nach Hause das war doch bestimmt erst mal (.) ja war ja was ganz anderes als im Heim ne? Ja Wie war das so? Für Dich? (seufzt) Ja es ging Also es gab auch Schwierigkeiten (.) ewie welche waren das? Ja w-wenn mein Bruder da mein Bruder was

gemacht hat immer auf mich alles auf mich hingeschoben (.) da hat meine Mutter 'n Schuh genommen hat mich damit geschlagen und 'm Zimmer eingesperrt Mhm (..) und dann? Und da hab ich geweint und dann (.) hat's mir langsam gereicht dann bin ich aus'm Fenster rausgesprungen die Garage runt- die Garage runtergesprungen (.) bin ins Heim wieder zurückgegangen.

The interviewer asks Juliane to tell him how it was when she left the children home. She answers (sighing) that it was quiet okay. He now wants to know whether there were difficulties and if yes which ones. She tells us that she got hit with a shoe by her mother and that she was locked in her room, after her brother blame her for things he did wrong. The interviewer wants to know what happened after that. Juliane answers that she cried and that she had enough from all that, she climbed out of the window, jumped from the garage roof and went back to the children home.

The interviewee here says, that her mother treats her and her brother (it is probably her twin-brother) differently. She makes Juliane responsible for things that her brother did. Juliane talks about the obvious injustice within her family, which she could not stand any longer. She could not accept that she got hit regularly by her mother. The unjust treatment by the mother has to be explained. The analogy to her situation of socialisation and to her parents' educational acting is remarkable at that point of view. Childs' socialisation has the essential effect that a guardians' suppressed desires are reactivated. They can be warded by projecting them onto a child.

We can hypothesise that Julianes' mother projected wishes, which she could not accept, onto her daughter. Because of the rigid parental educational dictum Juliane then got sanctified in return. On her level of consciousness she thought that she was right, because she wanted to inhibit, that Juliane was doomed to failure in a way she was. The reason for Julianes' escape from her mothers' house is to be found in a reproduction of her mothers' adolescent situation.

Also es gab auch Schwierigkeiten (.) e- wie welche waren das? Ja w- wenn mein Bruder da mein Bruder was gemacht hat immer auf mich alles

*auf mich hingeschoben (.) da hat meine Mutter 'n Schuh genommen hat mich damit geschlagen und 'm Zimmer eingesperrt Mhm (..) **und dann?** Und da hab ich geweint und dann (.) hat's mir langsam gereicht dann bin ich aus'm Fenster rausgesprungen die Garage runt- die Garage runtergesprungen (.) bin ins Heim wieder **zurückgegangen In das gleiche wo du vorher schon mal warst? (.) Wie ging das dann weiter? Dann war ich da und dann hab ich Schranktürn abgerissen und hab irgendwie welche im Zimmer eingesperrt***

The interviewer wants to know whether there were difficulties and if yes which ones. She tells us that she got hit with a shoe by her mother and that she was looked into her room, whenever her brother did something wrong.

The interviewer wants to know what happened after that.

Juliane answers that she cried and that she had enough from all that, she climbed out of the window, jumped from the garage roof and went back to the children home.

The interviewer now wants to know whether it was the same one as before and how the story went on.

She says that she returned back there and than she tore apart the wardrobe and locked other children into their rooms.

The interviewee tells us, that her bad behaviour started, when she was back in the children home. The way she talks about it makes us believe, that this could be a reaction on her mothers treatment. Obviously she felt, that the situation in the children home is like the one at home.

*und (.) auch Fußball gespielt (.) und dann zu Ostern haben wir immer Kino geguckt und sind also dann im Saal schlafen gegangen (.) **Die haben dich also wieder aufgenommen? Ja In der gleichen Gruppe (.) wo du vorher schon mal warst? Ja nee die al- wo die Gruppe wo ich vorher war die hat ist ähm (..) was haben Sie denn da? **Wo? Hier?** Nee da (.) ach der Kopfhörer **Der Kopfhörer (lacht)** und dann (.) wo war ich denn stehngeblieben? (.) Hmm (überlegt) (..) **Wegen der gleichen Gruppe wolltest du erzählen** Ja ja (.) genau de die Gruppe wurde ge-äh also geschlossen***

Here Juliane lets us know that they played soccer there, on Easter they went to see a movie and they went to sleep in a hall.

The interviewer wants to know whether they inhabited here in the same group, where she had been before.

She tries to answer, but can only manage a few broken down sentences and then asks for the interviewer's earphones. After that she asks where she stopped and the interviewer again asks about the group.

Now she tells us that her former group had been closed down.

Conspicuous in this part is that at the moment when Juliane tries to talk about the situation in the children home, she has great difficulties to complete her sentences. When she returned to that home she found a situation that was traumatic for her. She draws off the attention from that situation, to make sure that the trauma does not become reproduced.

At this point we can construct the structure of that traumatic situation:

She came back with hope, that the social interaction, that she used to enjoy, could be reconstructed. She was shocked, that her former peer group did not exist any more and that her former guardian left the children home.

*Ja ich kann mich nicht mehr so genau dran erinnern warum ich 's gemacht hab aber (.) ich habe mich noch dran erinnert wo wir einfach die Schranktürn abgerissen haben **Mhm (.) und was ist da passiert? Da bin ich nach Bergisch Gladbach ins Heim gekommen (.) und das war ganz okay bis auf dass das da anfang wieder schwierig zu werden und weil ich dann immer andere Schwestern berotzt hab***

Juliane tells us that she cannot remember exactly why she did so, but she remembers that she tore apart a wardrobe.

The interviewer wants to know what happened after that.

She tells us that she went to another children home in B.G.town which was quite okay until it became difficult there, too and she started to spit onto the nuns.

Here the speaker tells us, that she had to change into another children home, because of her aggressive behaviour, which however did not stop there. Interesting is her specification, reporting that she spits onto the other nuns.

She puts the nuns into an opposite position to her former guardian, who was a nun, too. She attacks them, because they represent the trauma that was originally placed

by her former guardian. The interviewee feels betrayed through her mother and her former guardian. But she can only accept these two persons as authorities for socialisation.

Also (.) das war (.) das war besonders schwierig dann (.) in dem Heim (.) das hat dir nicht gefallen? Ja Was war 's genau? (.) Ich konnt mich nicht an die Regeln halten Welche zum Beispiel? (..) Zum Beispiel daß Mittagsruhe ist oder (.) dass wir jetzt nicht rausgehen dürfen Mhm dann bin ich immer einfach abgehaun (...)

In this part the interviewer asks what was so extremely difficult in that children home and what she did not like exactly.

She answers that she was not able to obey the rules for example being quiet during the lunch break and that she left the house, when she was not allowed to.

This is the part of the text, which shows the structure of the interviewees' behaviour very clearly. She tells us, that she is not able to follow the rules in that home. She just could not accept them. There for she had to leave. The employees in that children home are no authorities for socialisation as her former guardian was. Core of any act of socialisation is an exclusive, diffuse social relation, which is called a "mothers' love" or "parental love" in common speech. If a relationship is based on parental love, parents can demand things from their children, which are unreasonable demands. Children will obey because they "love" their parents or their guardian.

If children do not love parents or guardians, they cannot accept their demands. They will rebel against them. In this case that happens via aggression.

The placement in a psychiatric clinic is contraindicated in two different ways:

1. While she stays in the clinic, there is no chance for a positive perspective of socialisation, the time, which is urgently needed for that perspective, is wasted at that point.

The children psychiatric clinic is in this case only enabled to intensify a dysfunction, to produce her later clients.

2. A psychiatric clinic offers a pattern of meaning that finds his only reason in the clients' personality.

This pattern of meaning locks the comprehension of the situation of

socialisation out.

It makes the client believe that he is responsible and inhibits in this case the lack of bonding from the mother.

Das ist wahr (räuspert sich) (.) das stimmt (.) hmm (..) wenn du jetzt nach Hause zurückkämst das wär ja das Liebste was du (.) haben wolltest Ja wie müßte das dann gehen (.) zu Hause (.) Äh also was müßte deine Mutter machen was müßte dein Bruder machen? Die müssen eigentlich gar nichts machen ich muß was ändern Was mußt du ändern? Daß ich nicht immer so direkt motzig werde und nicht direkt ausraste

The interviewer asks Juliane what would have to happen if she could go home right now, what her mother and brother would have to do.

She answers that they will not have to do anything that it is up to her to change.

The interviewer wants to know what she would change and Juliane answers that she should not get into rage that fasten and be as unlikely as before.

The interviewee tells us that there is no need for her mother and her brother to change. It is up to her to do that. In this part of the text it is obvious that Juliane has assumed the clinician's point of view. She is now ready to accept, that the reasons for her deviant behaviour are to be found in her personality. There for, as shown, debonding from her mother is blocked.

3. Result and pedagogical view onto the case

Neither the psychiatric clinic nor the different children homes were able to recognize Julianes´ true problems and were able to give her help to manage daily-live quite normally. The wrong view onto this case made it even worse. If it was possible to control the primary conflict-causing situation, Juliane would have a chance to come back to normal daily-life with a chance for a normal child development. First aim after all should be the normalisation of Julianes´ life circumstances. We think the best setting for Juliane would be one, where she could get away from her mother, who should tell her very clearly, that she does not want to live with her anymore. Only if her mother will do so, she will have a chance to get out of her ambivalent feelings concerning her mother and reactivate her „blocked“ capabilities. Since Juliane stayed in a psychiatric clinic for more than a year and holds on to behavioural patterns, that inhibit her development we think a time-out f. e. a trip with a guardian would be helpful. She should get the opportunity of regular work-out during that time to make sure that her demand for physical needs is satisfied. After that she should come back and live in a group of same aged teenagers, with the opportunity to get therapeutic help concerning her problems with her mother. She should not be alone with that, which means, that this is a very important fact to look at throughout the pedagogic intervention.

Any guardian has to be aware of Julianes´ serious problems and her way of acting out these. Her lack of frustration, her impatience and aggressions are not easy to handle. This behaviour seems to be part of the family history and is the reason for Julianes´ difficulties with her mother, who had the same developmental conditions during her own childhood. Furthermore everybody has to be aware of Julianes´ very special sensibility for disadvantages and preference. In this context it is obvious that Julianes´ affects and the control of her impulsive behaviour must come into the focus, because otherwise she will not have a chance to grow into an autonomous future.