



# Early Intervention in Special Education and Rehabilitation



Beograd 2016.

# Early Intervention in Special Education and Rehabilitation

THEMATIC COLLECTION OF INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE

Belgrade, 2016

Early Intervention in Special Education and Rehabilitation  
Thematic Collection of International Importance

Publisher

University of Belgrade – Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation  
Publishing Center of the Faculty

For publisher

PhD Snežana Nikolić, Dean

Editors

PhD Snežana Nikolić, Professor  
PhD Radmila Nikić, Associate Professor  
PhD Vera Ilanković, Professor

Reviewers

PhD Brayan P. McCormick, Professor, Indiana University Bloomington,  
United States of America  
PhD Calogero Foti, Professor, Tor Vergata University in Rome, Italy  
PhD Fadilj Eminović, Associate Professor, University of Belgrade – Faculty of  
Special Education and Rehabilitation, Serbia

Processing and printing

Planeta print, Belgrade

Cover design

Boris Petrović, MA

Technical Editor

Biljana Krasić

Circulation 150

ISBN 978-86-6203-086-3

*By decision no. 3/9 from March, 8th 2008. The Teaching and Research Council of the University of Belgrade – Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation initiated Edition: Monographs and papers.*

*By decision no. 3/122 from August, 30th 2016. The Teaching and Research Council of the University of Belgrade – Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation has given approval for the printing of Thematic Collection "Early Intervention in Special Education and Rehabilitation".*

## **BIOLOGICAL, ANTHROPOLOGICAL, AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSTRUCTS OF CHILD AND CHILDHOOD**

*Zorica Matejić Đuričić & Mirko Filipović*

*University of Belgrade – Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation, Serbia*

### SUMMARY

*This paper presents the results of research of fundamental biological, anthropological and psychological constructs of child and childhood. Dealing with the problem of early development from the evolutionary and ethological perspective, the critical analysis of the main elements of ethogram of the child has been done, i.e. very high degree of newborn helplessness and immaturity, nonspecialized development of vital functions, high degree of plasticity of behaviour, and biological system of attachment. In the context of these evidences, the basic constructs of new anthropology of childhood and education, as well as, the new paradigm of sociology of childhood have been presented. In the framework of "social perspective" the child is discovered as the active actor of its education and development. In conclusion, the major developmental achievements have been summarized and, by pointing out the following statement: that early childhood is developmental period that has regular flows and universal development in the part that refers to the process of realization of hereditary potential of the individual, while the development of higher mental functions primarily depended on the social and cultural context in which the personality of the child develops.*

Key words: early childhood, ethogram of child, animal educandum, anthropology of child, psychological achievements

### INTRODUCTION

Early childhood is a unique, remarkable and very significant stage in life span development of each individual. In just a few years, from a single fertilized cell develops entire organism with all the recognizable physical characteristics (at least in outline) with all the psychosocial characteristics of an adult. Dramatically fast, intensive, and "massive" developmental changes in this period are unrepeatable and totally incomparable with the changes that follow. In early childhood occurs most radical transformation in life: from biologically immature, helpless and totally dependent beings, the child grows into a relatively mature human being, an autonomous member of the community and competent representatives of a given culture.

Developmental changes during early childhood are straight right a small "Copernican revolution"!

Starting from specific dynamics of developmental changes and specific context of development, the most scientists agree that early childhood covers the first three years of life. On the other hand, under the division of mental ontogenesis that rely on strict age (biological) criteria, early childhood is associated only to the second and third year of life, and sets as a development period which follows the period of prenatal development

(development before birth), the newborn period (first postnatal weeks), and the infant period, which covers the first year of life. Finally, with regard to the specific criteria of periodization of psychic ontogenesis within various developmental theories (especially of the Russian authors) – early childhood are often “spread” into the ages to school and covers the first six years of the child’s life (Šmit, 1991, Kon; 1991; Qvortrup et al., 1994).

Interest in the study of childhood was divided between (or, rather, has been consolidated in the context) of different disciplinary fields: biology, psychology, cultural anthropology, history, sociology. Disparate facts about the characteristics and principles of early child development interact, connect and integrate into a general picture of children and childhood in which they remove and erase strict disciplinary boundaries (Šmit, 1991; Kon, 1991; Matejić Đuričić, 2010).

### **Biological framework of childhood investigation**

Considering the problems of early development from an evolutionary perspective, faced with the fact that progress on the evolutionary scale followed by increasingly longer period of childhood, biologists seek to discover and prove the deep evolutionary sense of prolonged childhood within the more complex species. The conclusion is unique and can be taken as generally accepted view: getting longer period of dependency and more time needed to achieve sexual (reproductive) maturity, do not represent a “luxury” or “random error” of evolution, but on the contrary, one of the necessary and important achievements.

In his “new biology”, Adolf Portman, one of the leading biologists of the 20th century, explicitly explains this fact: the man cub is much more helpless and in relation to the total life-span development, more helpless a longer period of time than the offspring of other species; *“a child is born with a physical system to survive, but it is completely unprepared mentally to function as a human being”* (Portmann, 1965:41).

Phenomenon of fertilization high level of immaturity and unfinished specialization of almost all functions at birth, speaks of Portman, follows a new property, built in long-term processes of phylogenesis of homo sapiens: *“high plasticity behavior, and endless opportunities for learning”* (ibid.: 42).

In this sense, although seemingly “unfinished biological”, the child is at an advantage compared to the offspring of other animals, because his phylogenesis (development under positive selection pressure) ensures an extended period of learning and development. In short, prolonged childhood is one of the indicators of evolutionary advancement of the human race, because incomplete development in the prenatal period, “open space” for postnatal organism try different options, training and learning and hence, build more complex behaviors and developed a more complex form of adaptation to changing environmental conditions.

Like the tortoise from Aesop’s Fables, the child win in the final, after a long and persistent rising!

Ethology, descriptive scientific discipline, which appears on the border of the merger of psychology and biology, and that deals with the behavior of animals (including humans) in natural conditions, has recognized the big evolutionary significance and

importance of childhood as a period of extended dependencies, and included this feature in Ethogram of Man (Mussen, 1976; Lorenz, 1970; Morris, 1970). Ethogram of man as the most developed living species including the list of all those distinctive qualities that make it stand out and rise above other species, including his closest evolutionary relatives: anthropoid apes.

In response to the question: What is it that makes a man a man? – ethology states, next, characteristic of the human species, properties: standing upright (release upper extremity conditions are created for the construction and use of weapons); speech (use of language allows the most advanced forms of communication, but also new processes of mediated knowledge); higher forms of intelligence (the ability to providing the highest form of adaptation to changing environments and enables man to overcome the natural limitations and amplifies his powers); high plasticity of behavior (the ability of multiple behavior modification under the action of variable environmental conditions) and biologically determined system of attachment (Matejić Đuričić, 2012).

For ethology, the study of animal behavior and determining ethogram of different living species, is the way to better understanding of the true nature of man.

In the multitude of distinctive properties (the man is an animal that walks upright, thinks and speaks, feels) is one trait stands out: reason or rationality. This property is central in Aristotelian construct of man as *Homo Rationale* and also embedded in the biological classification of species (homo sapiens). In a commentary on Aristotle's description of man as a rational animal (homo rationale) Ernest Cassirer pointed out that this description did valid, but it is not complete and sufficient because the rationality is only a part of something much broader and more fundamental: the ability of forming symbols. Man is the animal symbolicum, being that create and create their symbolic world. Cassirer thus explains his theoretical views:

*"Instead of dealing with the things themselves, the man constant twists them in consciousness... Even in practice, the man does not live in the world of irrefutable facts and only in accordance with their immediate needs and desires. In fact, he still lives among imaginary emotions, in hopes and fears, fantasies and dreams"* (Cassirer, 1946:25).

The child does not reveal the symbols of the world right now and all of a sudden, but the child has *"certain psychoneurological characteristics, as part of the biological equipment, enabling him to gradually creates the symbolic network, subtle cobweb of human experience"* (Šmit, 1991:72).

Biological theories of language point out that speech is (read: the symbolic function) innate ability specific to the human species (Lennneberg, 1964) providing a series of "biological evidence". All representatives of the human race are some common biological characteristics relevant to the speech: the dominance of the left hemisphere; Maturing speech zone, motor and sensory center are necessary conditions for understanding and production of speech; Regardless of intellectual abilities (except in cases of profound mental retardation) every human being learns to speak; For all children around the same age groups adopt the language and produce speech, and not only to what should be taught, but it would be very difficult to control and prevent the use of their language and speak out; Deaf children spontaneously develop specific (natural) sign language, and children whose parents are deaf, and have preserved hearing itself, easily and quickly acquire language, with minimal exposure to speech and language modelsetc.

The child transformation from biological into social being achieved primarily thanks to the process of language acquisition. This statement will be appeared in a number of psychological and sociological constructs of child and childhood, relying on the biological fact about the nature of man as a being who possesses "collective heritage of the speaking species".

The process by which language and other basic potentialities of Nature would be realized, has received its special name: the process of humanization, literally becoming a man. In the process of humanization, the child slowly and gradually builds speech and acquires the language, but also all the other characteristics that distinguish man as a special type of mercury: standing upright, multiple forms of intelligence, multiple forms of feelings, and especially important feature: sociability (Man is a zoon politicon, social animal, as Aristotle defined a long time ago.).

In this way, speaking about biological givens of human being, biology is opened up new perspectives for the study, environmental or educational framework in which to realize the child inherited potentialities should be realized.

### **From biology to anthropology of education**

Biological equipment that brings the birth of a baby is not a "given", but "givens", potentiality and "chance" for one of the many lines of development. A child is not born with the status of a man, but toward the status of man, short and very accurately concludes Ashley Montagu, adding that the human race "*prematurely called reasonable animal*", because the child still in the process of development and education should prove to possess the qualities of man". In this context, the author has noted:

*"Biological potentialities can be developed without environmental impact. This is the case with physical abilities, but even more with the mental capabilities. Developing psychic abilities really possesses infinite possibilities under the action of variable environmental conditions"* (Montagu, 1955:85).

The miraculous power of the child, explains further Montagu, is not an achievement, but a promise, a promise that under "secure environment" she or he will develop all the characteristics that distinguish a human being.

*Cub monkeys is much more successful than human babies, but the promise of a child exceeds the clearest monkeys* (ibid: 87).

The new anthropology of childhood postulates attitude of the child as an *animal educandum*, the being who has to learn and educate in order to develop all the characteristics of the human species (process of humanization) as well as all the individual characteristics that distinguish it as a separate, unique and unrepeatable personality (process of individualization). In the background of this construct is biological understanding of childhood, after which the child exists as immature, incomplete, unfinished person, a person in the becoming, and on the other hand, the performance of adults as a responsible, mature, experienced person, ready to assume the role of protector and process controller of child development and education (Qvortrup, 1998). In this way, the processes of education receive a key role in the interpretation of child development. More specifically, in the framework of this approach the rough boundary between development and education has been removed.

In order to develop, the child must learn and educate. On the other hand, education is always incorporates the development progress of the child, and so education becomes a necessary constituent of mental ontogenesis, and child development – essential constituent of education.

Education is seen as a process of constant interaction between the child and the adults who care about him (which emphasized the active, participatory role of the child), and the main purpose and objective of this process is the formation of a mature person who will be trained to take on itself the role of educators.

Ideas about child as an animal educandum developed in the sixties of the last century, the Dutch psychologist Langenfeld (Langefeld, 1956; 1988). Although it is a new language of development and education, many will agree that the basic ideas are not new. Originally, these ideas belong to L. S. Vygotsky, to creator of modern Russian psychology. In the research in the field of development and education Vygotsky ideas are omnipresent, even when the authors belong to different theoretical orientations and are not reported directly to his “fondness” for Vygotsky (Santrock, 2004; Van der Veer & Valsiner, 1991).

For the child, noted Vygotsky, the natural environment is always the social shaped environment. Due to the high degree of vulnerability, social environment is essential for physical and psychosocial child survival, and therefore it is not only the frame, but a source of development for the child.

The key term describing the child’s embeddedness in the social environment is the concept of primary sociality. The primary sociality not to be understood as an innate “sociability” of the child, but as an innate need of baby, because of its special position of dependence, from the beginning shall enter into social relationships with other people, and despite the fact that it possess very limited innate mechanisms and means of communication, baby communicates.

*“An infant is unable to satisfy any vital need by it self... most elementary and basic needs can not be met otherwise than with the help of another man ... Path over the other, path over the other man is the main path of child development in this period” (Vigotski, 1996, III: 62).*

Construct the child as animal educandum is virtually a copy of the “first paradox of development”, in the manner previously defined by Vygotsky. The basic principle of development within this educational framework, somewhat earlier, described Maria Montessori, by the child brief message: “Help me to do it by myself!”

### **Historically and culturally variable notions about children and childhood**

In the perspective of cultural anthropologists, historians and sociologists, who reviewed the significance and importance of childhood in terms of cultural, historical and social development of man, the environment has become the primary focus of interest, however, the research moved from the organism (as individual representatives) to society and culture. Immaturity of children is a biological fact, but the way of understanding immaturity is a cultural thing, it explicates this position La Fontaine (La Fontaine, 1979).



Basic dimensions that change with time and society/culture are: (a) the participation of children in the areas reserved for adults; (b) collective (social) image on child competence, level of autonomy and responsibility of the child; (c) child- adult relations (Matejić Đuričić, 2012).

Diverse research in this area can be summarized in two separate problem circles: the first relates to the study of childhood in historical perspective; another problem relates to the cross-cultural studies contributing to understanding the development and upbringing of the child, depending on the specific social and cultural environment in which children grow up.

Breaking the illusion of a fixed and universal understanding of child and childhood in particular contributed to a classic comparative surveys on the development and socialization of children in the so-called "primitive societies" (Mead, 1963; Benedikt, 1967; Malinovski, 1971) and research in the field of "ethology of childhood" conducted by the Russian psychologist and anthropologist Igo Kon (Kon, 1991).

In an excellent discussion of the history of childhood (reviewed the basis of analysis of the available literature of memoirs, teaching literature, paintings and other historical documents.) Philip Aries convincingly demonstrated how the concepts of child and childhood are changeable, flexible (or: relative), and how changes in their use.

*"In medieval society, the experience of childhood did not exist; this does not mean that the children were neglected, rejected or abused. The experience of childhood is not the same as the sympathy for the children. It corresponds to the awareness about specificity of the child, awareness about what makes a child different from an adult. Such consciousness did not exist" (Aries, 1989: 176).*

Until the 17th century, European societies fostered notion of the child as a small copy of the adult man (homunculus) and thus ignored qualitative characteristic of the child in relation to adult and ignored childhood as discreet period in relation to other developmental stages. "Being a child" has been simply conceptualized as being dependent person who can not independently take care of himself.

The first evidence for this claim Aries finds in the analysis of paintings child is presented as "a small adult" without proper anatomical characteristics that distinguish children; kids wear adults clothes and dance "adult" dance; they have not their own games and toys, but already share them with adults etc. Due to the high mortality of the children, child was seen as a small, fragile creature, which can disappear at any moment.

Analysis of classical languages also confirms that medieval Europe does not know the concepts of child and childhood in the modern sense of meaning. Linguistic history shows, for example, that the word "childhood" in the English language appears at the end of the 12th century. The rich Latin language possessed the words: *infant* (in the literal sense: he who does not speak), *puerri* (son and the younger servant) and *progenies* (gender, birth, origin, lineage, offspring); these terms are used as labels for the "child". Nonspecific linguistic roots for the terms "child" and "childhood" are also found in the analysis of ancient Greek and Slavic languages.

"The discovery of the child and childhood" (Aries) comes in the period of the industrial revolution, labelled by major social changes and the new division of labor. The critique of industrial society, in which children, also, suffer the burden of hard

work, cast a new light on childhood as a particularly sensitive period in the life of man. In this criticism, the Swiss-French "educator" Jean Jacques Rousseau, was ahead and was among the first who recognize specific "nature of the child" and the unique world of childhood.

Increasing "discrepancy between the world of the child and the adult world" (this is the loudest talked by Ruth Benedict) is embedded in the modern collective notion of children and childhood, and this fact most directly illuminates the new position of the child in society.

The "old" sociological concept of child and childhood A. Milić explains as following:

*"In recent history, the children were in the shadow of parents and parenthood, The children were in an inferior social status and dominance of the parents over children was considered as obvious and self-evident fact"* (Milić, 2001:153).

Loyd de Mause (1974) made a subtle analysis of historical change in practice of chilrearing. Following the dimension of the parent-child relationship throughout history, from the tribal community to this day, this author stands out six typical patterns:

Infanticidal: Child sacrifice and infanticide among tribal societies;

Abandoning: Early Middle Ages upbringing practice includes fosterage, outside wet nursing, oblation of children to monasteries and nunneries, and apprenticeship;

Ambivalent: In later Middle Ages "ambivalent" parents tolerated extreme love and hate for the child without the two feelings affecting each other;

Intrusive: Until 18th century, children had to be formally "disciplined", threatened with hell; use of guilt.

Socializing: In the 19th century, parents began to use of "mental discipline"; teaching children to conform to the adults' goals, socializing them. Rise of compulsory schooling. The socializing mode is still the main mode of upbringing in the West.

Helping: This pattern is typical for the 20th century. the helping parent tries to assist the child in reaching its own goals rather than socializing him or her into adult goals. Children's rights movement, deschooling (de Mause, 1974).

Previous findings of historical analysis is fully compatible with the conclusions of contemporary sociologists of childhood. They argue that with the new movement (which begins with a baby boom in the US) *"public and scientific discourse leads to a kind of hypertrophied emphasis childhood and excessive glorification of the child, both at the family level, and the level of overall social evaluation of the position of the child and childhood"* (Milić, 2001: 154).

Another important innovation in the assessment of the changed position of the child in modern society refers to the abandonment of the dimensions of the future as a key variable in explaining the period of childhood. In other words, instead of the projected goals for the future, the scientific focus has shifted to the "current time" and the children's everyday livings; without adultocentric position and projection, childhood is accessed from the subjective perspective of the child as the main actors of his/her life (Wallon, 1964).

Starting from basic ideas of French sociologists, it is possible to point out the third important change by bringing new discourse childhood. These are the contradictions and tensions that plague the adult-child relationship (Burdije, 2001). Despite strong

glorification of child and childhood, in fact, there is a natural asymmetry that divides the world of the child and the adult world (parents). Dichotomised position, generating tensions in this relationship, can be represented through the following divisions:

- (a) the superiority of (adult) – inferiority (child);
- (b) power – weakness;
- (c) maturity – immaturity;
- (d) competency – incompetency;
- (e) control – freedom;
- (f) autonomy – dependency;
- (g) responsibility – non-responsibility etc.

The key term describing the “Magic Pass” from the world of the child into the adult world is the concept of socialization. The child is “*immature, irrational, incompetent, asocial, acultural*” and on the other side, *the adult is mature, rational, competent, social and independent individual* – explains Mackey, and adds that new construction of childhood as social fact requires a redefinition of this division (Mackay, 1973:28).

The child actively participates in (its) processes of education and socialization, and the world of a child is a special social reality which should be a separate subject of study. Child’s play, peer relations, relations between the sexes, sex and gender differences, schooling and social and academic status of scholars, the position of the child in the family, sibling relations, etc. All this constitutes the corpus of attractive research topics that contribute to a better understanding of new image of childhood (Filipović, 2012).

In a critique of traditional concept of socialization, James and Prout (1994) emphasize the need to be overcome “confusion” between the individual and the person, or a child as a representative species (individuals) and the child as a representative of a culture (person). The new paradigm of sociology of childhood, is built on a new maxim: the child is a social actor, and childhood is a particular part of the social reality!

### **Psychological constructs of child and childhood**

Traditional child psychology were “trapped” by the problems of internal development of the individual at the level of organism, regardless of whether they were explained as a result of learning or maturation.

Organismic model, in other words, focused on internal processes of improvement of the child within the different domains of development (physical, sensory, perceptual, motor, intellectual, language, social-emotional, and moral development). A significant step forward in redefining the basic postulates of the organismic model explanations of the development is done by Piaget with the concepts of cognitive constructivism.

According to Piaget, the child’s development is epigenetic, self regulatory process that has its own internal logic, and therefore does not include social learning mechanisms and social mediation and regulation (Piaget, 1972; Ivić, 1993; Matejić Đuričić, 1976; Matejić Đuričić, 1991; Matejić Đuričić & Stojković, 2012). In a critical assessment, Wallon would find a nice metaphor that describes this development as a kind of “Robinsonian development”, for a child, like small Robinson, leads a lonely battle with (physical) universe thanks to its own cognitive competence.

Environment, physical and social, have the same importance, and their role is to “aliment” internal development (Piaget, 1972). A parent, teacher or educator needs only to encourage children to develop their self-discovery strategy, for “...*just free exploration and child’s independent efforts can produce positive results, both in terms of school success, as well as the general flow of socialization*” (Piaget, 1963: 92).

In Piaget theoretical projection, a child is an active subject, the creator of its internal development (Psychological development) and active participant in the process of its own education (Psycho-social development). More precisely, Piaget “pedagogy” unambiguously states: education is the process of creating designer, inventor and innovator (Piaget, 1963; Satterly, 1987).

Piaget’s theoretical model was created in the spirit of strong Cartesian (rationalistic) tradition in psychology, so the majority of critique has been focused on his “pancognitivism”, the view that over-emphasizes the role of cognitive factors in global child development. The second part of Criticism comes from the representatives of the “cultural relativism”; they attack Piaget’s position of universal and unchanging progression in child’s cognitive process, and completely ignoring the social context in which mental development takes place.

Piaget has a ready answer to this critique. In the paper, published under the pretentious title “Piaget’s view,” Piaget explains that there are two lines of mental ontogenesis, namely: psychological development (internal changing of an individual) and psycho-social development (individual development in specific social context) and both of these views has the same legitimacy in psychology (Piaget, 1972). Piaget decides to deal with internal changes in the child’s cognitive advancement, interested primarily in logic, and not in the content of development.

In line with previous division, in developmental psychology there is one more great theoretical system. That is “social constructivism” of Lev Vygotsky, dealing with psycho-social development and formative role of social environment in the process of child development.

Vygotsky rejects all “maturation thesis”, according to which the “generative invasions in development” are determined by heredity, while the role of the environment are reduced only to encouraging and accelerating development. At the same time, Vygotsky says a strong deviation from all “empiristic thesis”, according to which the social environment is only better or worse framework that provides the conditions (aliments) to the child’s individual learning processes.

Vygotsky’s idea of socially mediated development speaks something else and much more significant: social environment has essential formative role in child development. In the short view on Vygotsky’s sketches for the theory of “cultural-historical development”, it is important to emphasize several key positions:

(a) Highpsychic functions of man are historically variable; despite the fact that human biology has not changed significantly in the process of historical phylogenies, psychic life of modern man is qualitatively different from the psychic life of “primitive man”;

(b) During ontogenesis, all mental functions appear on the scene twice: first, as interpsychic, then, as intrapsychic category; the origin of child mental development is in social relations;

(c) Construct of primary sociality explains the connection between biology of the child /high degree of helplessness) and social environment as the constituent of child development (social mediated development);

(d) Two basic forms of social intercourse between adult-child (affective and cognitive communication) are the operationalization of the construct of social mediation;

(e) The concept of zone of proximal development (ZPD) defines the relationship between development and learning (education) and shows that what a child can do it alone speaks of his development in the "present day", while what the child can do with the help of adults testify about his development in "tomorrow day" (Vygotsky, 1971; 1978; 1996; Ivić, 1993).

Previous analysis shows that the key to Vygotsky pedagogy has contained in the belief that "learning is always tugging development"; in other words, the source of change in the development and upbringing of the child should be sought in the domain of social mediation by the adult (parents and for the child other significant figures).

Fundamental psychological construct of child and childhood, primarily concept of Piaget and Vygotsky, are contained in discussions of periodization of development. In summarizing the debate in this field, Kon indicates the multidimensionality of the concept of development stage, and in this regard suggests "differentiation of different ages" (Kon, 1991). Those are: biological age (calendar age), social age (reached the level of maturity of the child in the exercise of their positions in the world of other people), psychological age (level of general mental advancement of the child) and subjective age self-awareness. In interpreting different line ages, Kon calls for Vygotsky's concept of developmental crisis. Developmental crisis are defined as a specific "point" in development, highlighted the key changes that require new forms of child adjustment (ibid: 27).

First developmental crisis occurs in the newborn period (the transition from intrauterine to extra-uterine environment); second developmental crisis covers the first year of life (walking upright and speaking out); next, it follows a developmental crisis of "three year" (formation of "psychic I" and building new types of social relationships) and the crisis of 7 year which was ending, by formation of social I and self-concept (Vygotski, 1996).

Unlike Piaget, who he general concept of adaptation performed on biological constructs (cognitive adaptation is analogue of organic processes) for Vygotsky adaptation of a child is always a social construct, derived from the social environment and the process of mutual child-adult communication.

## CONCLUSION

The foregoing discussion confirms that the concepts of the child, childhood and mental development in a whole, are under pressure of social and historical context. The social context determinate "collective awareness" (dominant social views of the child) that further define the choice of theoretical framework, establishment of the theory of development and education, and, finally, the very concrete plan of empirical research.

Modern research confirms that the timber end of the period of early childhood is marked by numerous and various development achievements, gradually integrated into a unified whole, and despite the different speeds and the pace of progress in certain areas of development, form a unique psychic structure.

How does, in the shortest form, look this development achievements of the child during early childhood?

1. Big physical changes include, above all, a high degree of maturity of the nervous system that controls the full mental and physical development of the child. Regular physical development includes the stable functioning of the physiological systems, and health anatomical development process in regards to differentiation of tissues and organs. Striking and the most visible indicator of physical development (growth) refers to the increase in skeletal muscle mass; in only a few years, body weight of the child is five times higher, while the height been almost tripled. The proportion of the body has changed significantly, and the arrangement of body fat is redistributed, and a six-year old child look like as the "little man".
2. At the end of early childhood, it has been reached a remarkable level of maturity of the motorzone, which allows the child the practice very complex motor activities and the acquisition of numerous motor skills. On the basis of major developmental changes lies biological process of establishing motor control movements of the body and its parts, which in the first line allows improving locomotion (walking) and apprehension (reaching, and manipulating of object).
3. Along with the process of the rapid motor progression sensory-perceptual capacities of the child, resulting in formation of stable sensorimotor schemes that allow comprehensive perception of reality and its parts. In this sense, motor and perceptual development are inextricably linked with the rapid progression of cognitive during this period.
4. In terms of intellectual functioning, the end of early childhood was marked by the appearance of concrete, objective, conceptual thinking and despite the lack of experience and knowledge, a child in a qualitative sense, approached adult logical thinking.
5. On the level of language development, a six-year child of orderly development, adopted a comprehensive linguistic structure, so, the basic phonological, semantic, syntactic and grammatical features of his speech at all resemble adult speech.
6. The emotional life of six year-old is relatively rich, and the number of experienced and recognized feelings are approaching to emotional capacities adults. Also, in this period, the child for the first time managed to postpone the emotions (in terms of successful regulation of emotional behavior) response, and, above all, control negative emotions such as anger and rage.
7. Due to the domain of social functioning, the child at the end of early childhood reaches the initial (but "enough") level of autonomy, that in certain circumstances of rejection and isolation from family, would provide an independent survival and relatively successful adaptation in the social world.

8. On the domain of moral development, the child at the end of early childhood child exceeds the threshold of heteronomous morality (judgment based on the external consequences) and took the first steps of an autonomous moral reasoning.

The total development achievements of the child should be linked to three basic characteristics of childhood, such as: Early childhood is the period in which the individual is a long time totally dependent on others (a); This is a period of intensive maturation and varied learning where the child try out different options and gain skills necessary for life in the community of adult members of society (b); Early childhood is a time of preparation for the future, so in that sense, early experiences often leave lasting and indelible traces in the life of every individual (c).

Finally, early childhood is period that has regular flows of development and universal development patterns in the part that refers to the process of realization of hereditary potential of individual, while the development of higher mental functions primarily depends on the social and cultural context in which the personality of the child develops. So, the discrepancy between the world of the child and the adult world still exists.

#### REFERENCES

1. Arijes, F. (1989). *Vekovi detinjstva*. Beograd. ZUNS.
2. Benedikt, R. (1976). *Obrasci kulture*. Beograd. Prosveta.
3. Cassirer, E. (1946). *Essay of man*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
4. DeMause, L. (1974). *The history of childhood*. New York: Harper and Row.
5. Filipović, M (2013). *Škola i društvene nejednakosti*. Beograd. Xisperia edu.
6. Hess, H. E. (1970). Ethology and Developmental psychology. In: Mussen. P. H. (ed.) *Manual of Child Psychology*. Wiley and Sons inc. New York.
7. Ivić, I. (1984). Predstave o detetu i detinjstvu u savremenoj razvojnoj psihologiji. *Psihologija*, 3, 27-34.
8. Ivic, I. (1993). *Teories of mental development and educational outcomes*. OECD. Paris.
9. James, A. & Prout, A. (1997). *Construction and re-construction of Childhood; Contemporary Issues in the Sociological study of Childhood*. Rotledge Falmer. London. New York.
10. Kon, I. (1991). *Dete i kultura*. ZUNS. Beograd.
11. Lorenc, K (1970). *O agresivnosti*. Zagreb. Epoha. Matica Hrvatska.
12. Matejić Đuričić, Z. (1976). Prilog naučnom zasnivanju pojma razvoja u psihologiji. *Psihologija* 1-2. 117-123.
13. Matejić Đuričić, Z. (1991). Vigotskova skica za teoriju kulturno-istorijskog razvoja. Predgovor za knjigu: L.S. Vigotski, *Osnovi defektologije*. Beograd. ZUNS.
14. Matejić Đuričić, Z. (2010). *Uvod u razvojnu psihologiju*. Fasper. CIDD. Beograd.
15. Matejić Đuričić, Z. (2012). Nove konceptualizacije razvoja i vaspitanja. *Specijalna edukacija i rehabilitacija*, vol 1 (2), 267-284.
16. Matejić Đuričić, Z., & Stojković, I. (2012). *Psihologija inteligencije*. Fasper. CIDD. Beograd.
17. Milić, A. (2001). *Sociologija detinjstva*. Beograd: Čigoja štampa.
18. Moris, D. (1970). *Goli majmun*. Zagreb. Epoha. Matica Hrvatska.
19. Montegau, A. (1955). *The Direction of Human Development: Biological and Social Bases*. New York: Harper and Row.

20. Qvortrup, Jens, Marjatta Bardy, M., Giovanni Sgritta, G. & Helmut Wintersberger, H. eds. (1994). *Childhood Matters: Social Theory, Practice and Politics*. Public Policy and Social Welfare 14. Aldershot, UK: Avebury.
21. Piaget, J. (1963). *To Understand is to Invent, The Future of Education*. Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth. Middlesex. England.
22. Piaget, J. (1976). *The Child and Reality*. Penguin Books. New York.
23. Pijaže, Ž. (1972). Pijažeovo gledište, *Psihologija*, 1-2, 85-99.
24. Portman, A. (1964). *New path in biology*. New York. Harper & Row.
25. Satterly, D. (1987). *Piaget and Education*. In: R. L. Gregory (ed.). *The Oxford Companion to the Mind* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
26. Santrock, J. (2004). *A Topical Approach To Life-Span Development*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
27. Smith, H. J., Higgins, S., Wall, K., & Miller, J. (2005). *Interactive whiteboards: Boon or bandwagon? A critical review of the literature*. University of Newcastle Upon Tyne.
28. Šmit, V.H.O (1991). *Razvoj deteta; Biološki, vaspitni i kulturni okvir proučavanja*. Beograd. ZUNS.
29. Valsiner, J. (1991). *Understanding Vygotsky. A quest for synthesis*. Oxford: Basil.
30. Valsiner, J. (1997). *Čovekov razvoj i kultura*. Beograd. ZUNS.
31. Vigotski, L. S. (1971). Učenje i razvoj u predškolskom periodu. *Predškolsko dete*, 4, 365-373.
32. Vygotski, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge University Press.
33. Vigotski, L. S. (1996). *Sabrana dela*. Tom III i IV. Beograd, ZUNS.