Opinion Article

Family and school cooperation to child – acting individual's socialization

.

ABSTRACT

The child's socialization and multifaceted psycho-emotional development is directly associated with the synergy of the two basic socializing carriers, family and school. At first, child – subject's development and identity are analyzed, emphasizing the contradiction between its autonomy and the inevitable monitoring by adults within the family and school framework. Then, the role of the family as a socializing carrier to the relational structure of "I" (parent) and the "Other" (child) is clarified, while at the same time light is shed on the importance of parents' ability to empathize with the child, known as "sympathetic reaction". Following that, a comparative historical review of changing standpoints about the child's social role from the Roman Empire until the 21st century is carried out. Moreover, the child's socialization process and its psycho-emotional development as dual socialization are studied, through the synergy between family and school, emphasizing the teacher-parent relation. The main objective is to showcase the smooth synergy and cooperation of the two carriers in order to ensure teaching and educational experiences, to eliminate school failure, to mitigate social-school pathogenic phenomena, inequalities as well as conflicting or competitive relations between parents and teachers. Finally, the main objective of this paper is to showcase a healthy democratic pedagogical-social model in which equal opportunities for qualitative education will be ensured. This form of education will target the promotion of social coherence, citizenship and the subject's emancipation towards a multifaceted development of its social, spiritual and mental abilities.

1. CHILD POSITION AS SUBJECT AND ACTING INDIVIDUAL

Nowadays, the child is considered an independent being having rights and obligations, while at the same time it is identified as a biological being characterized by the fragility and sensitivity pertaining to this age and which the adult has to protect. This means that managing various situations is not easy since children are obviously fully autonomous to be able to manage their emotions on the one hand, while they are regarded as beings protected under the parental shield on the other. Continuous and personal monitoring by external

26 factors is, indeed, necessary to enable the child to gradually develop stable self-control
27 abilities (Eleftherakis, 2018:51).

28 In particular, through the afore-mentioned emotional relation the child entity is
29 understandably identified as an entity full of deficits: it does not have a consistent lawful
30 personality, it is not able to form its life unpromptly and energetically, to freely and
31 independently participate in the political, cultural and social life, not is it able to basically
32 identify its rights and obligations (Karakatsanis, 2003: 47). In a few words, the child is
33 identified as immature, a criterion that historically reflects the practices of neglect and
34 infanticide during Ancient Greek and Roman times, the perception of it being a "tabula rasa"
35 that has been modified as from the 16th century and henceforth, a creature to be tamed and
36 controlled during the 18th century, to subjugate and lead during the 19th century and an entity
37 with particular needs to be met during the 20th century (Dimopoulos, 2012: 74). In the
38 framework of this ancillary view the immaturity of childhood is conceived as an inalienable
39 right of every human being, a right that overlies social, economic and cultural sizes.

40 Afterwards, an important point in the evolution of the perception about the child's being,
41 identity and social role is the period in mid 20th century. In western societies particularly from
42 the 2nd World War up until today, child mortality has decreased due to the development of
43 medicine and processing of hygienic rules, falling of birth rates, smaller number of children
44 per family as well as passing laws about childhood. In 1989 the International Convention on
45 the Rights of Children was composed, pertaining to individuals below 18 years old. It is of
46 global dimension and gives priority to the child's right to health and education along with the
47 right to voice their opinion about their own affairs. The child is conceived as a Subject with
48 special features and autonomy ever since the day it was born. Even though the child is
49 identified with special rights, exercising these rights is done by parents or other legal
50 representatives, responsible for its survival and security (Guidetti, Lallemand, Morel, 2000).

51 Moreover, Janusz Korczak played a crucial role to this Convention. It was the ideas of this
52 Polish pediatrician that inspired the composition of this Convention since 1920, as he was
53 the first to defend the child's rights emphasizing respect to childhood and the necessity to
54 transform education based on democracy, identifying the child's status and the continuous
55 communication between adults and children (Korcza, 2006). In his work, he puts forward a
56 revised perception about childhood and its understanding as a period of the human being
57 evolution. According to this standpoint, the child is at the same time an emotional, social,
58 cognitive and political being, having skills and being able to choose its social relations and
59 education.

60 However, the dimension of childhood must be taken into consideration in the light of social
61 and cultural diversity. More specifically, childhood cannot be considered universal and
62 neutral in all cultures since it is currently widely accepted that the developmental stages are
63 determined depending on the social and cultural circumstances in which the child develops
64 as a Subject and acting individual. Diversity of languages, family patterns, learning pace,
65 different interests, aims and manners of learning reflect a multitude of childhood.

66 It is noteworthy that during the '60s, the historian Ph. Ariés introduced a new perspective of
67 childhood (Ariés, 1973) in which he regards it as a social construction tied to the social
68 framework. Henceforth, childhood is conceived as a social time period with its own cultural

69 features. The child is studied as a Subject, an acting individual, who participates in social
70 exchanges and consuming practices.

71 To conclude, scientific works in psychology and pedagogics as well as popularizing certain
72 research data tied to child's development and education contributed to transforming adult
73 perceptions both about the child and its educational practices. The increasing number of
74 women working was conducive to creating multiple nursery schools and kindergartens.
75 Children's schooling contributes, in this way, to their alternating forms and conditions of their
76 socializing.

77 According to a certain sociological perspective, the cultural models, norms and values of a
78 society are internalized through socializing (family and school) which does not pertain only to
79 a transfer of cultural models, norms and values, but rather contributes to constructing the
80 social identity (Dubar, 1991).

81

2. THE "SYMPATHETIC REACTION" BETWEEN THE PARENT-CHILD RELATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF EMPHATHY IN A HEALTHY SOCIALIZING MODEL

85 The relationship Adult-child constitutes an especially controversial subject under
86 investigation from multiple fields (pedagogical, psychoanalytic, sociological). It deserves to
87 mention that the more prominent dipole which constitutes a cause of concern, in other words
88 the "immaturity" of the child, in comparison with the "mature" adult. The laity grounds-
89 unidiomatic-scolding that compares an adult with a child in the occasion of deprecation of
90 the immature attitude of a subject is of major concern. Nonetheless, the tendency to
91 reversion back to the childish point of view consists the parents' most essential capability
92 and psycho-emotional aptitude in order to create a relationship of empathy between the
93 adult parent and the underage child.

94 As it is mentioned by Lloydde Mause in the beginning of his sensational book "History of
95 childhood", "Center power for the change in History isn't neither technology, nor economics,
96 but the psychogenetic changes in the personality, which occur because of the consecutive
97 parent-child interactions from generation to generation" (de Mause, 1985: 18)

98 Therefore, discovering that the changes that show up in the historical evolution of the
99 childhood, conceived as a consequence -basically in suspense- more and tighter approach
100 of an adult and a child, down to the psychological phenomenon of retrogression in the ability,
101 in other words, the consecutive generations of parents trying to infiltrate the psychological
102 age of their children and that the inheritance of all the cultural achievements of a generation
103 succeeds with the transition of the psychological structure from generation to generation. It is
104 believed by the psychoanalytical theory that the further evolution and development of our
105 civilization it cannot be achieved, but from only the symmetric empirical connection between
106 parents with their children; an emotional situation deep and fully sentimental understanding
107 of children's needs and their satisfaction, acquaintance to the psychoanalytic world, so long
108 as "likeable reaction".

109 Especially, this emotional outgoing opening of the parent and the caustic connection with the
110 child, one legalized form "childish", which consists of anyways, against L. De Mause, innate
111 need of every adult, separating sociable and technological changes or utilitarian
112 anticipations, are able to bring upon unexploited emotional changes about to improve, to
113 begin with within the family and following the social whole, under requirement surely
114 occupation from the child and the corresponding special experience earning and experience
115 from the psychological irritation and the comprehension in his sentimental and possibly
116 conscious structures (de Mause, 1985:18).

117 Subsequent, with the approach of the childish psyche it appears that the adult is winning a
118 new stance as towards the existence of their own individuality: He understands that the
119 assumption as a person doesn't consider a plain and lucky incident, but an inside experience
120 which drives him to experience, to meet and conquer himself, to the point which his
121 relationship with "I" becomes more loving, a relationship "narcissistic".

122 Moreover, from inside the above approach of distinctness of the child, as adjourn, tightening
123 the psychological view of the person besides more probing, not only opposite to inwardness
124 of his personal "I", but also across the inwardness of others.

125 Reviving, also, a human himself as the inwardness inside him from the psych and his
126 distinctness of the Other, experiences simultaneously with a new and deeper way the world,
127 feeling this favorable familiarity inside of him, so that he can convert into individual bravery
128 and vigor for action and creativity because though effectiveness and not through his
129 forcefulness of every action creditworthy and is counted only with reduction to an object, so
130 both of them -power and object- combine after all so they constitute one unbreakable
131 wholeness, through which the empathic experience of the Other gets experienced the world,
132 as much as the nature as the community, as a world of living forces, which penetrate and
133 continue and the same human, which understands the reality way more authentic, adjacent
134 dialectical against it, as against a real "I".

135 Within the afore-mention sentimental relationship which gets recognized although as it's
136 obvious, the childish entity, as one entity implicit deficits: It doesn't have the consistent
137 towards a fair system legitimate personality, it isn't capable to form its life selflessly and
138 energetically, to take part freely unaffected in the policy, cultural and social life, neither is in
139 position to know the liabilities and its royalties, at least fundamentally (Karakatsanis, 2003:
140 47). It is known briefly that the child is immature; one criterion which reflects historically in
141 the practices of infanticide and the abandonment around the Hellenic and Roman antiquity,
142 in the perception of a "tabula rasa" which forms against will from the 16th century and
143 henceforth, a creature which needs to tame and control around the 18th century to dominate
144 and guide around the 19th century and as one being with particular needs which we need to
145 satisfy in the 20th century (Dimopoulos, 2012: 73 ke.) and the frame of this subsidiary
146 validation it can be finally perceivable the immaturity of the childhood as an inalienable right
147 of every human; a right which is overriding the social, economic and the cultural sizes.

148 **3. THE SOCIALIZING OPERATION OF SCHOOL**

149 The Epicenter of the classical theories of socializing consists the social Institutions which
150 favor the acting individuals within the internalization norms, values and rules so they reenact

151 efficiently social roles, highlighting the each prominent activity and behavior against the
152 everyday transaction with Others. Between those socializing institutions, we see exceptional
153 notice to enjoy for a long period of time the family and the school.

154 The family mostly in its diverse forms contributes against the sociological research (de
155 Singly 1991, 2007) decisively in the socialization of the child and the young, not really
156 because, through those identifying functions which it involves, they transfer steady and
157 unchanged reverend roles that recommend the social cicatrize, as much as because the
158 frames provided opportunities and ways of wise arrangement between the relations between
159 its members on an intergenerational basis.

160 Similar realizations were revealed about the Greek school institution, which has undergone a
161 deep transformation by establishing the Modern Greek language as the official language to
162 educate children from all social strata, making its opening to society (Xochellis, 1980;
163 Karafyllis, 2002: 49). In this respect, it is invited to settle the disturbed relational exchanges
164 within a new framework of perception, that of the labor market and its principles, i.e.
165 competitiveness and the mechanisms that pertain to school life universality.

166 A fundamental operation of school is that of allocating social positions through the
167 individuals' composed Subjectivity and Self, given that they resemble them, verifying
168 basically the conclusions of social scholars like Vilfredo Pareeto (Dalakas, 1983:15) and the
169 so-called reproduction scholars (Bourdieu, Passeron, 1964; Baudelot, Establet, 1971). In
170 other words, school is attributed an operation and responsibility to form and develop a social
171 and cultural individual consciousness, being able and willing to staff, operationally and
172 productively, a certain position in a certain society.

173 Therefore, school socialization is unfolded in school organization based on rules, scheduled
174 learning and social relations in the framework of which the student, as acting individual,
175 internalizes norms and skills and is habituated in playing social roles and by orientating to a
176 profession is getting ready to gradually commence its productive integration into society,
177 which it is obliged to staff (Dubet, 1994).

178 Through school opening to all social strata and its subsequent massiveness, a reformed
179 educational policy necessity was highlighted. It puts forward new educational objectives
180 resulting in the individuals' changing expectations, both students and teachers', opening of
181 school to society. However, it means a direct and among them connection resulting in
182 underlying new requests and assuming new responsibilities by both sides. It ensures free
183 education on behalf of the society and the communal composition of knowledge provided as
184 well as the development of juvenile mass culture on behalf of school.

185 Within this new framework, a new policy is consolidated by school, placing its interest on
186 teachers and students' practices, who as acting individuals, ought to continuously reflect on
187 their practices in order to act effectively and being associated with the Others in a positive
188 sense, not to be exclusively restricted to their social role, especially in case it prevents their
189 productive professional occupation as it was conceptualized within their education.

190 In any case, school is portrayed as an institution constructed by the participating individuals,
191 adults or under-aged, their school experience based on adaptability and, consequently, its

192 studying presupposes a sociological reflection focusing on the acting individuals' activity in
193 the attempt to form school life through constructing their experiential horizon (Dubet, 1994).

194 School experience is defined by F. Dubet as a means with which acting individuals combine
195 on an individual or collective level various sensible acts that comprise the school world.
196 Moreover, it is an attempt to compose an identity that conveys a common meaning through
197 which individuals are interconnected within a social whole. In the light of this perspective,
198 socialization and subjectivization are perceived as a process by which acting individuals
199 construct their experience, even from the beginning of their education, while the rationale to
200 organize experiences corresponds to school system elements. This rationale is imposed on
201 individuals – as they are deprived of the possibility to choose – and directs their socializing
202 through certain underlying skills, a fact that characterizes the main operation of education
203 (Dubet, Martuccelli, 1996: 48; Karakatsanis, 1992: 42; Theodoropooulou, 2004: 32).

204

4. FAMILY AND SCHOOL AS SOCIALIZING CARRIERS IN A SYNERGY FRAMEWORK

207 Smooth synergy of the socializing carriers, family and school, is a neuralgic importance
208 objective and should be successful in order to secure a healthy socializing environment for
209 the child.

210 Educating the democratic citizen, namely the formation of a democratically empathized
211 citizen respecting the rights of the individual and minority groups is a crucial issue assumed
212 by the family, school and broader society to be completed through a process of socializing
213 (Eleftherakis, 2011: 48).

214 In particular, the contemporary family does not monopolize children's socializing, since
215 school also plays an important and supplementary role to their socializing. To better
216 understand children's socializing, some researchers are interested in children's experiences
217 by studying their behaviours, acts or strategies tied to their education and socialization both
218 in family and school as well as their perceptions about educational processes and emotions
219 tied to them, about the relation among family members, their friends, peers and teachers
220 (Poittevin, 2005; Montandon, 1997). According to this standpoint, socializing is a process in
221 which the child, as an acting individual of its socializing and education, plays a crucial role.
222 Adopting a constructivist perspective about studying children's modes of socializing, special
223 research emphasis is placed on their narrations (Montandon, 1997).

224 Additionally, from a sociological point of view, in a quest for a more dynamic conception of
225 individual action, sociology orientates to the "restoration of the acting individual" according to
226 A. Tourainc's viewpoint. The individual is considered an acting individual (personally or
227 collectively), while the standpoint about diverse practices and limits of autonomy remains
228 open (Tourainc, 1984). The Subject is not constructed through assuming social roles,
229 exercising rights and participating, but rather through its willingness to create forms of social
230 life conducive to asserting its self and identifying the Other as a Subject. Only when
231 identifying the other, the transition to the Subject as an acting individual is feasible.
232 According to Tourainc, education focusing on the person's formation, based on the values of

233 a certain society and rational knowledge, contradicts the attempt to construct a free Subject
234 that should direct itself to identifying individual and collective requests, to identifying the
235 other and aiming at intercultural communication (Tourainc, 1997: 325-351).

236 Moreover, as regards school, focusing on the concept of the Subject and its
237 conceptualizations showcases a different manner of sociological approach of children's
238 school performance, taking into consideration the individual's social status and the concept
239 of social experience (Dubet, 1994). Socializing and constructing the Subject are determined
240 as the process through which acting individuals construct their experience. Children of
241 different socio-cultural environments have their own life experiences and, consequently, their
242 own way of identifying and conceptualizing social and school reality. To construct new
243 knowledge, teachers should take into consideration children's different experiences aiming
244 at constructing emancipated learning.

245 Similarly, through the concept of experience, an attempt is made to understand the manner
246 of children's thinking and acting and interest is placed on the meaning given by children
247 about their school course as acting individuals of their socializing as well as offered school
248 knowledge. The issue of children's relation to knowledge pertains to the meaning and value
249 given by the child to knowledge and suggested school activities. This conceptualization is
250 tied to values, expectations and experience of the Subject, the families' habitus coming from
251 different social environments. Children and their families' different viewpoints contribute to
252 their school experience meaningfulness. The offered school knowledge is appropriated by
253 children only in the case they consider it meaningful. On the contrary situation, children are
254 not able to respond to this knowledge. In other words, knowledge is appropriated by some
255 children and is consequently tied to differentiated manners of school experience and
256 socialization (Rochex, 1995, 2000, 2004; Lahire, 1993, 1995; Charlot, 1997, 1999, 2003;
257 Bautier, Rochex 1998; Charlot, Bautier, Rochex, 1992).

258 It is noteworthy that since children's school course depends on the quality of relation
259 between school and family, special research emphasis was placed on understanding the
260 relations between parents and teachers. Thus, ongoing reference is made to children and
261 parents' rights, to parents' participation in school-related decisions, especially those directly
262 tied to their offspring.

263 Teachers, in particular, interact with children from various socio-cultural settings and
264 nationalities and consequently they ought to broaden, revise and reflect on their practices,
265 taking into consideration students' heterogeneity, especially tied to appropriate used
266 pedagogic methods and constructing their relation with their students' parents. In former
267 times, there was no relation between school and family, while the means for group
268 expression were lacking and families were rather critical to school. The limits of relations
269 between families and school are determined by the school institution and teachers.
270 Generally, parents are not welcomed in the school and the relation between teachers and
271 parents, as they are currently perceived, were absent in big cities, whereas in rural areas the
272 role of the teacher was completely different from that in cities (Vedrine, 1971).

273 Today, although the synergy between school and family is legally imperative, in fact, it does
274 not operate properly. Research data showcase the fragile relations between parents and
275 teachers. In front of a given situation, both teachers and parents (the manner by which

276 parents perceive school requests, objectives and methods differs depending on the social
277 setting) hold a specific way of identifying and interpreting a situation and act accordingly.

278 All in all, they, as acting individuals, develop sensible interpretations and behaviors, which,
279 given that they are not understood by the others, tend to become the epicenter of
280 misunderstandings. Both generalize and, depending on some negative experiences they
281 had, are led to bilateral mistrust and limited contacts (Montandon, Favre, Hutmacher,
282 Perrenoud, Richiardi, 1985; Montandon, Favre, 1988; Montandon, 1987; C.R.E.S.A.S.,
283 1985; Ballion, 1984; Gogou, 1994). As regards children's school performance and their
284 general integration into school, apart from transformations tied to school inner operation, the
285 cooperation among different socio-cultural environments plays a crucial role. It is a point of
286 encountering common entities, which should be based on a continuous and productive
287 dialogue.

5. A RESEARCH APPROACH TO EDUCATIONAL RELATIONS: THE ISSUE OF INDIVIDUAL SUBJECTIVIZATION

290 While exploring the parents – teachers' relation in order to ensure the socializing framework
291 for the child, it is noteworthy that school teachers interact with parents and children on a
292 daily basis, representing a wide range of socio-cultural diversity, depending on their origin.
293 The manner in which teachers perceive this diversity and its corresponding origins is directly
294 tied to school and its operations, depending on the established democratic perspective.

295 In particular, research interest is placed on the relations between school and families
296 characterized by the afore-mentioned diversity, while an attempt is made to explore the
297 consequences risen from these relations, their stability or instability, as well as discovering
298 potential activities conducive to productive cooperation between teachers and parents.
299 Students' school success corresponds directly to educational coherence established
300 between school and family. Lacking communication between parents and teachers is one of
301 the major causes of students' school failure of non-privileged socio-cultural groups.
302 Sociological studies about the relation between teachers and parents focus on exploring
303 their social relations in order to find the way in which they perceive the relation between
304 them as well as the kind of experiences gained in their encounters. Analyzing school
305 processes, therefore, is not associated only with external factors affecting them, but also
306 with acting individuals' social relations within the school institution. Analyzing their discourse,
307 understanding their subjective perceptions and expectations along with the nature of their
308 social interactions is sought after.

309 It is noteworthy that the constructivist perspective (theory of symbolic interaction,
310 ethnomethodology, social phenomenology) directs research towards studying these
311 processes as well as the acting individuals' social interactions through their relations. In this
312 respect, special significance is given to the Subjects' viewpoints, that, according to this
313 viewpoint, construct social reality through giving meaning to people's actions and symbols of
314 encoding. Acting individuals' discourse to express and describe social reality is particularly
315 interesting for researchers who contend that this perspective is the most important part of
316 social research.

317 Consequently, it is possible to study this action in the form of people's strategic practices
318 while socializing, given that the basic criterion is the concept of the acting individual and
319 mutual interactions among Subjects. The concept of the acting individual is strongly
320 associated with the Self and the Subject; a creative Subject, able to participate in social
321 affairs and changes (Tourainc, 1984, 1992, 2000).

322 Therefore, identifying the person as an acting individual, or else an active Subject, which is
323 currently the dominant view about the human being, according to social sciences, is an
324 anthropological and ontological view, relatively recent, whose prerequisites of articulation are
325 deep rooted in the past. This is because the concern about forming the person as Self is
326 found in Ancient Greece and its main philosophers, Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics as well as
327 its forming as Person, with its meaning stemming from the Roman era and medieval years
328 by the first Christian scholars.

329 Augustine, for instance, in "Confessiones" (Saint Augustin, 1993; XXXIX, 72), based on the
330 platonic perception about human composition (Politeia: 443d) detects in the human being an
331 internal element that makes up the "Self", a basic distinctive criterion between people of
332 ancient times and those of Christian times (Taylor, 2007; 215, etc.). According to Augustine's
333 typology, the obsolete human being was a "homo exterior", an external human being
334 contradicting to "homo novus", a new type of person, "homo interior", directed to the human
335 being. The inner person is their soul in which truth resides, whereas the external one is the
336 body and its senses, the storing memory of impressions coming from the outside world.

337 All in all, Augustine's human typology establishes the issue of Self throughout the medieval
338 period and Rennaisance (Heller, 1982) up to Descartes (Descartes, 1970: 123; Schulz,
339 1979) who further utilizes the afore-mentioned distinction of "internal" and "external" human
340 composition (Taylor, 2007: 215).

341 Moreover, according to Descartes, human being's internality is basically the act of thinking,
342 which, based on an orderly arrangement of its representations, is led to proper internal
343 conception of the external reality, as in the – according to stoic models- governing our
344 passions, which is the essence of morality.

345 External reality objects are perceived "through our inner intellectual competence", Descartes
346 argues and "not through our imagination or senses, as we are aware of them in terms of
347 perceiving them intellectually and not because we see or touch them" (Descartes, 1973, IX 1
348 26).

349 Nevertheless, the person is invited, at the same time, to disentangle from the world and their
350 sensory corporality so that as an external observer, to adopt an instrumental attitude towards
351 them and detect the causal link between world situations or their body, in order to better
352 understand it. Thus, rationality is not basically defined in terms of order, according to
353 Descartes, but exclusively in terms of criteria on the basis of which orders are created in the
354 scientific course of thinking. The human being's selfness does not eventually appear as a
355 sufficient internality of autonomous discourse orders, that may objectify the world, body and
356 passions in order to understand and express them in the proper way.

357   Additionally, German Idealism seems to elevate the issue of Self and Subjectivity, in the
358   framework of philosophical debate about consciousness, at a level too high for Descartes'
359   rationalism, while being rejected by all anti-metaphysical scholars who mainly followed the
360   behaviorists Watson and Skinner, even the "social" self-declared "behaviorist" G. H. Mead
361   (Joas, 1980:11).

362   What is more, Hegel's basic viewpoint, accepted even by Behaviorism, and expressed in his
363   work *Intellect Phenomenology*, especially in the notorious sub-chapter "Autonomy and Non-
364   Autonomy of Self-consciousness: Authority and Slavery", is the belief that to compose a
365   person's Subjectivity, in terms of structure and process, it is necessary to identify another,
366   strange Self and Subject. In contrast to the Platonic perception, Hegel contends that forming
367   and unfolding of a Self cannot be achieved unless it is reflected to another object Self.

368   As it regards its forming process – at the same time perceived as an educational process –
369   (Wigger, 1984: (38) 625-635), Hegel describes in detail all the stages through which the Self
370   should undergo to its final composition.

371   At first, it is Self-consciousness in its simple form "in self" and due to excluding every Other,
372   it is merged in itself. Both its essence and reality are incorporated in "I" which is strongly
373   associated with the self and, in terms of ontological size, it is Unique. Every other
374   contradicting entity, despite its self-consciousness (Hegel, 1952:143), is pointless for the "I",
375   while it composes a negative category with its contradicting otherness.

376   According to Hegel, gaining self-consciousness is described by Hegel as an acute to death
377   contradiction between Master and Slave, during which their primary unity is split into two,
378   resulting in an emerging clear self-consciousness in the above form of "Self".

379   To prevent the enslaved consciousness from reflecting itself, it has to abstain from desires
380   and pleasures which like every externalized energy are at the Master's service in the
381   framework of this process. However, this enslaved consciousness, under the condition that it
382   does not disappear in the Master's consciousness, gains its self-consciousness.

383   As a result, this process of self-awareness, during which a non "self" consciousness is
384   turned into a "self" consciousness is perceived by Hegel as the formulation of the Self. The
385   Other must necessarily exist for the Self self-awareness along with its direct association with
386   its "I":, acting both bi-subjectively and reflectively.

387   All in all, the person's complete Subjectivity is the self-reflected Subjectivity interweaved with
388   logical Will, both being pure self-actualization, in terms of their essence (Hegel, 1971: 241
389   Vol.X). Provided that the thinking Will acts only for itself, then it is free. Freedom means "to
390   be the Self within the Other" and it is a fundamental structural element of logical Will and
391   Subjectivity.

392   On the other hand, a completely different viewpoint from Hegel's idealist perception, about
393   the human being's formation of Self and Subjectivity is suggested by Fr. Nietzsche. He is
394   closer to Lamettrie and Holbach's mechanistic theories of the 18th century
395   (Theodorakopoulos, 1974: 228, Vol. II) about consciousness, rather than those of his era.

396   In particular, in his theory about the Superhuman, as it is portrayed in his book *That said*
397   *Zarathustra*, an attempt is made to eliminate the idealist perspective about the human
398   being's composition on the one hand, and to provide a visionary description of a "new" and
399   authentic, exclusively led by its corporality, self. This is so, because the body is the richest
400   and purest perceived phenomenon: "it is systematically projected without removing anything
401   from its final meaning" (Nietzsch, n.d., 29). What is directly perceived by the human being is
402   not its self-reflective consciousness, but its body in which Subjectivity is experienced
403   (Nietzsche, n.d., 29). The body is essential for the human being and its life and everything is
404   depended on it: "behind your thoughts and feelings, a powerful master stands, a stranger
405   wise man that is called Self and resides within your body; it is your body" (Nietzsche, n.d.,
406   29).

407   In addition, within the framework of Hegelian Philosophy about consciousness,
408   Schleiermacher's viewpoint about forming Self and Subjectivity lies. Generally, the Other is
409   liable for this formation, but mainly the organized social whole in which the individual lives,
410   especially education and its educational processes to this end. "Education must form the
411   individual similar to the great moral Whole in which it belongs. The state takes people from
412   teachers, after they have been formed proportionately to it, so that they are able to integrate
413   into the whole life and not theirs" (Schleiermacher, 1959: 68).

414   The individual's composition contains a special Subjectivity totally formed by Universality
415   (Society) and Partiality (Individuality) resulting in differentiated by other Subjectivities that
416   comprise the social body.

417   It is noteworthy that individual composition does not mean subjective uniqueness, as the
418   Others, the Generality must exist in order to achieve composition, a common opinion to
419   which the individual will represent itself: "Gaining the Self depends on a communicative
420   social act" (Winkler, 1979: 74). The Subject needs other Subjects in order to experience and
421   define itself (Schleiermacher, 1822: 118) given that identification with itself cannot be
422   achieved unless a continuous self-actualizing inter-subjective communication exists (Platz,
423   1923: 498). Contrary though, Subjectivization and Socializing form the two aspects of this
424   process (Schleiermacher, 1822: 118), while gaining the Self is a dual synthetic process of
425   subjective Socializing and socialized Subjectivization.

426   It is noteworthy that a special contribution to Selfness and Subjectivization is found to
427   sociological works at the end of the 20th century in an attempt to conceptualize the term
428   Socialization (Dimopoulos, 2012: 86, 97).

429   In particular, on the grounds that an individual's emotional, mental, linguistic and willful
430   composition is due to their "socialization", a lifelong process, several researches were
431   dedicated to socializing institutions and carriers, like family, school, kindergarten, the
432   socializing role of Mass Media, peers, and working places (Gogou, Karakatsanis, 2013).

433   Moreover, in Aristotle's Politics, reference is made to the human being as a political being by
434   nature, namely a social being. Consequently, in the framework of the afore-mentioned
435   sociological research and attempting to explore socialization as the dramatization of "social
436   roles" by the following Subjects, the term Homo Sociologicus emerged. This term was used
437   to give meaning to all those characteristics of the human being comprising the outcome of its

438 association, as a Subject, with society, or to put it in existential Philosophy terms, of the
439 human as a being within – its social – being; this meaning is representative of Aristotle's
440 philosophical course of thinking (Aristotle III 1253 a 1., 1939) and henceforth.

441 It should be noted that this does not mean the ontological composition of the ordinary
442 human, not its Subjectivity as a whole "Homo totus", but rather just one type of it. Thus, its
443 ontology and dialectic composition as Self or Individual is divided into what was received by
444 its integration into the social Being.

445 Furthermore, within the framework of the above sociological explorations, particularly of the
446 "theory of roles", J. Habermas being its main representative (Habermas, 1973: 118-195 &
447 195-232), in which the rationally composed human is by large identified with the "balanced"
448 (ausbalancierte) to eventually merge with the "emancipated" (emanzipierte) "autonomously
449 activated" human Subject (Habermas, 1973: 127).

450 Given that the individual of "the theory of roles" is perceived as a continuous adaptation of its
451 "I" in each social system and its demands, Habermas transcends the above theory under the
452 justification that the "individual freedom to act" is underestimated and is led to the theoretical
453 verbalization of the Konzeptus about the "balanced human" seeking its protection as an
454 authentic Subject.

455 It is noteworthy that Habermas introduces the basic terminology about human composition
456 (Habermas, 1973) in combination to the relation among the ability of the Subject to play
457 roles, the composition of society and structural fluidity of social values systems.

458 In particular, throughout detecting this evolutionary composition of the Subject towards the
459 ongoing formed contemporary societies, Habermas studies in detail the Subject's
460 competences and limits of the promoted individual activity within a theory about it with its
461 fundamental element being the concept of the "emancipated human".

462 Habermas' anthropological perspective that regards the composition of the emancipated
463 human in close and direct association with a social being of certain version, could not leave
464 the school micro-society unaffected; an obligation assumed by Klaus Mollenhauer
465 (Mollenhauer, 1968 4) for whom the "educational reality" from which every form of
466 systematic educating theory should stem is primarily realized by the acting individuals that
467 comprise it: teachers, students and parents.

6. PARENTS' PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL LIFE

469 Throughout 1960-1970 in many European countries, parents' presence at school is
470 acknowledged, as they gain the right to participate in various school associations demanding
471 better information and transparency about their children's school performance as well as
472 school operation. In Greece, the idea of school and family cooperation is introduced in the
473 middle of the '80s. official documents urge parents to dialogue and cooperation,
474 encouraging them to participate in school life either being present themselves or being
475 represented.

476 In the countries of the European Union in particular, attempts have been made by school
477 authorities and teachers to better inform parents and involve them more in school life. A

478   certain survey was conducted to 3.086 schools of the European Union, out of which 1.744
479   responded, a percentage of 56,55%. The subject of this survey was the description of the
480   existing relations between family and school in 9 member states of the European Union. It
481   should be mentioned that Greece had not entered the European Union at the time when the
482   survey began (Macbeth, 1984). The results of this survey come from a coincidental contact
483   and not through a scheduled action. Thus, such a relation cannot be considered as
484   "cooperation". Teachers argue that schools had been operating in the long run without
485   intensified contact with families as well as the professional independence of the teaching
486   personnel. They underline the specialized nature of education and refer to parents'
487   indifference each time an attempt is made to improve this relation. The parents-teachers
488   relation is specifically considered to have lost its significance from the moment children
489   become adolescents and increasingly intend to assume responsibility for their decisions
490   (Macbeth, 1984).

491   More specifically, the researchers studied the communication structures between school and
492   family. Pamphlets and general assemblies are two forms of communication between school
493   and parents. Pamphlets and information bulletins come from four different categories: the
494   Ministry of Education, schools, parents' associations and other organizations. The majority of
495   pamphlets sent to parents in the sampling European schools belonged to the category "basic
496   information". According to researchers, although these pamphlets contain basic information,
497   they establish a certain relation between school and family. School general assemblies are
498   the second form of communication. Primary education documents 1,5 assemblies annually
499   and Secondary education documents 1,8 assemblies annually. Schools that do not organize
500   general assemblies are due to the fact, as they contend, that they do not have a hall
501   available for such events. Other schools avoid such assemblies because they regard them
502   as practically impossible to hold any important discussions. In the same survey, the teachers
503   who criticized parents' indifference, also denounced the small even non-existent parent
504   participation in the school general assemblies. However, according to the researchers,
505   parents' indifference is probably due to the nature of these assemblies rather than to
506   parents' indifference about their offspring education. In such assemblies issues of general
507   interest are inevitably put at the forefront, while classroom-related assemblies are
508   considered more personal, less formal and more beneficial.

509   Starting from the '60s, in particular, educational policies in various countries, namely the
510   countervailing programs in the USA, educational priority areas in England and France, as
511   well as in contemporary Greece, are a proof that this issue is of primary importance in the
512   educational environment. These policies intended to inform and educate parents of non-
513   privileged social strata as well as their participation in their children's school activities
514   (Derouet, Henriot, Sirota, 1990). According to them, to decrease school failure, it is important
515   to target the transformation of relations among the involved social actors that is parents and
516   teachers, between children and parents and between children and teachers.

517   In previous times, parents had to participate following teachers' request, as their participation
518   in school activities had not been foreseen. School was not interested in parents' opinion, as
519   a large number of them were considered not to have the proper knowledge to this end.
520   Parents from lower social strata avoided school. Their children's socialization and transition
521   to adulthood along with their integration into social life was basically realized within the

522   family and probably within apprenticeship prior to finding a job (Terrail, 1984, 1990). The
523   family assumed the role to direct children to job opportunities. These families kept distance
524   from school and provided a different socialization that that of the school, especially
525   emphasizing practical knowledge. Privileged families potentially put their offspring in schools
526   that could meet their needs in contrast to non-privileged families that faced materialistic
527   problems (Vedrine, 1971).

528   Moreover, job crisis around 1970 resulted in a gradual undermining of the labor class and its
529   enfeeblement to integrate into society through labor (Dubet & Lapeyronnie, 1992; Van
530   Zanten, 2001). Henceforth, the inter-generation transition of social positions is not realized
531   off schools. Research data of this time period document the demand for schooling of those
532   children coming from underprivileged social strata. The majority of these parents aspire to
533   salaried, and not manual, positions for their children, aiming at acquiring a school capital for
534   them that would presumably be conducive to their social rise (Terrail, 1990; Terrail,
535   Poullaouec, 2004, 3-22). These parents invest in school as a means to prevent their children
536   from insecurity, everyday economic and social hardships through their integration into the
537   intricate reality and their access to salaried job positions.

538   School education and its certification is not confined to accessing job positions, but goes
539   beyond the construction of individual and collective identities. Assessments and certifications
540   determine, in this way, the student's value and reflect this value along with the family
541   practices to this end. In this vein, school perpetuates social inequalities tied to success
542   through a generalized extension of schooling, which is sometimes perceived as the
543   democratization of school. On the basis of imposing rules and values, school sometimes
544   questions parents' educational practices that are not in line with its expectations, since they
545   are not identical to school demands.

546   It is noteworthy that today, despite the institutionalized cooperation between school and
547   family, research data prove that this is not satisfactory on a practical level. Researches
548   related to this issue show that, even in school where teachers organized a number of
549   assemblies for parents, a misunderstanding can potentially disturb their communication
550   towards a generalized crisis based on their experiences interpretation as well as the bilateral
551   meaning of attitudes and behaviors. This way, the restoration of mutual trust between the
552   acting individuals is not feasible (C.R.E.S.A.S., 1984; Montandon, Perrenoud, 1987; Gogou,
553   1994; Perier, 2005).

554   It should be clarified that teachers' evaluations pertaining to children's behavior and school
555   performance affect to a large extent the family environment, as students are formally or
556   informally the subject of evaluation. School is felt within the family environment every day
557   and unexpectedly. Therefore, family operation is affected in multiple ways by children's
558   school experiences (Montandon, Perrenoud, 1987).

559   More analytically, researches focusing on understanding the way in which teachers interpret
560   their relation to parents are proof that parents are evidently absent from assemblies.
561   According to primary education teachers, these parents come from non-privileged socio-
562   cultural environments in their majority, while this attitude cannot be interpreted as lack of
563   interest. Some primary education teachers try to develop deep understanding of the reason
564   why these parents do not come to school to meet their offspring's teachers. They attribute

565 this refusal to the fact that the parents are aware of their children's discouraging
566 performance and, consequently, the teacher will repeat the same recommendations. This
567 fear is probably tied to parents' former negative school experience, a fact that enfeebles
568 even more their communication with school. According to their viewpoint, socio-culturally
569 non-privileged parents are mainly interested in their children's acquiring basic knowledge
570 (C.R.E.S.A.S., 1984; Gogou, 1994). It appears that for these parents the demand for basic
571 knowledge stems from their school past, the traditional school. According to some
572 researches (both through teachers and parents' discourse), these parents consider the
573 traditional school education (reading, writing and arithmetic) of primary importance instead of
574 the broader intellectual development and formation of social relations. Thus, they regard
575 school as the only area to disseminate basic knowledge (Zoberman, 1972; Paillad, Gilly,
576 1972; Gogou, 1994).

577 To sum up, school success is characterized by the acquisition of a culture which is partially
578 strange to socio-culturally non-privileged parents' culture. They did not study for a long time,
579 while in most cases they were weak students without having received any rewards. They
580 perhaps recall their school life experiences which they feel more intensely on an emotional
581 level, making it more difficult to establish a proper relation with school. Teachers' discourse
582 about these parents reveals that their attitude is less critical and more conformist towards
583 school in comparison to the socio-culturally privileged parents' attitude who value school
584 knowledge. Socio-culturally non-privileged parents interpret their children's mean or bad
585 performance through biological determinism (Paillar, Gilly, 1972; Gogou, 1994). Research
586 findings pertaining to farmers' families proved that their children's individual value is of
587 deterministic importance (Siano, 1985). In other words, these farmers do not accept their
588 children's failure without a critic against school and its consistent selective operation. The
589 ideologies of charisma and meritocracy are still domineering.

590 In particular, the importance of external environmental conditions pertaining to school
591 inequality, has been somehow recognized (number of students per classroom, teachers'
592 training, material and cultural possibilities, etc.). Yet, the final word is monopolized by
593 children's innate characteristics that is, their competences and values. In other words, they
594 try to interpret their children's difficulties on the basis of the ideology of the charisma without
595 criticizing the operation of school.

596 It is often the case that a student's behavior in the classroom and their bad or mean
597 performance is interpreted upon the socio-cultural condition of the family (uneducated
598 parents, unemployed parents, divorced parents, etc.). These students' discouraging school
599 performance is attributed to conditions not merely tied to materialistic hardships, but also to
600 their parents' educational and cultural deprivation. In this way, the child's family environment
601 is considered deficient, resulting in some teachers' interpretations about these students'
602 differentiation in relation to their social origin (C.R.E.S.A.S., 1978).

603 While trying to interpret the teacher-parent inequality, the family is unequally and intensely
604 criticized, whereas the operation of school is not questioned. A major prerequisite for school
605 success for children of non-privileged socio-cultural environments and different ethnicities is
606 the transformation of teachers' beliefs about the popular strata (Rosenthal, Jacobson, 1971).
607 When the social setting is visible in the form of deficits, teachers cannot proceed to an

608   optimistic evaluation about the effectiveness of their attempts. Their expectations are
609   defeatist not only to students, but to their performance as teachers, too.

610   Furthermore, studying the relations between popular family environments and school, as a
611   carrier of socializing, showcases problems tied to studying popular strata and their relation to
612   school (Thin, 1998).

613   It is noteworthy that the popular families' relation to school is not identical to the one of
614   parents coming from other social strata. The former parents' interest in their offspring's
615   school life and their involvement in it is their unique way that cannot be identical to that of
616   middle and upper social classes. The models of socialization and social exchanges of the
617   privileged social environments are not in line with those of non-privileged parents or
618   migrants. The families from non-privileged social strata have their own socializing rationale
619   (about authority or the relation to school knowledge or the relation to time), according to
620   relevant studies (Thin, 1998). Analyzing the socializing rationale does not differ from B.
621   Bernstein's standpoint in relation to family and socialization types (Bernstein, 1975). Popular
622   families experience their offspring's schooling through their own socializing rationale, as a
623   different situation, since they have their own way of thinking, observing and acting. Studying
624   the relation between these families and school is consequently orientated to their own ways
625   of socializing.

626   The practices of these family members are not autonomous and are dominated by the
627   school proper discourse. In other words, they are adapted to school demands, while they
628   perceive the "non-legitimacy" of their practices that is the difference from school socializing.
629   Cultural and educational socializing rationales stemming from these families are often
630   perceived in a negative manner on behalf of the school (time, pace of life, verbal exchanges
631   between children and parents, utilization of free time, etc.), since their socializing rational is
632   not in line with that of the school. Research based on teachers and parents' viewpoints
633   shows that popular families do not keep a distance from school due to their weak schooling
634   in terms of knowledge and their children's socializing. Researchers are mainly interested in
635   the way by which popular families perceive school actions in relation to school knowledge,
636   the imposing conditions in the framework of their socializing rationale (Dubet, 1994; Dubet,
637   Martuccelli, 1996; Charlot, 1997, 1999; Charlot, Rochex, Bautier, 1992; Rochex, 2004).

638   It is also realized that the relations between teachers and socio-culturally non-privileged
639   parents are fragile, as there is not consistency between school and family values. When a
640   kind of "cooperation" is eventually formed between popular families and school, it is most of
641   the latter's adaptation to school models and values (C.R.E.S.A.S., 1984; Gogou, 1994;
642   Perier, 2005). Researchers consider the quality of relations between teachers and parents of
643   primary importance and are basically interested in understanding the meaning of both
644   relations. An attempt is made to understand both though the teachers and parents' discourse
645   as to what extent parents are involved in their children's school life and the operation of
646   school, in general, in order to reveal privileged relations between school and some socio-
647   cultural environments. According to researches, popular families appear distant from school
648   due to their weak schooling in terms of knowledge and their children's socializing
649   (C.R.E.S.A.S., 1984; Gogou, 1994; Perier, 2005).

It is clear, therefore, that these social relations cannot be analyzed, while ignoring the authority relations. A better understanding of power relations could lead teachers to other types of relations to the families from different socio-cultural environments at the benefit of all children. The concept of power is central to every analysis tied to social dynamics. Power, according to M. Crozier and E. Friedberg, implies coercion, a special ability to dominate people. It is a form of power imposed on others through addiction and coercion. Authority cannot be considered the characteristic of a group, as it exists within a social relation. It is regarded as an inequality, a different power aiming at domineering a person or group. The authority of the expertise implies a form of dominance by a knowledgeable person, as the others have not acquired this knowledge that attributes certain ability in a certain area. Society is unequally constructed and exercising authority depends on the position attained by each person in the social hierarchy (Crozier & Friedberg, 1977).

According to the above, the relations of power establish a competitive game in which certain players participate. The relation between students' families and school are certainly inscribed on the two different types of institutions with asymmetric power as well as on a broader social and cultural framework which is competitive and conflicting regarding individual or collective interests. However, establishing competition and imposing knowledge that ignores the knowledge of others along with personal declarations often end up in passivity and dead ends, making cooperation difficult and ineffective. In this vein, the dialogue between parents and teachers is not equally established (Gogou, 1994).

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

To conclude eliminating school failure can be achieved through transformations concerning the operation of the school institution (a way of working between adults and conditions of learning proposed to children), secondly amendments of the relations between school and its environment: cooperation with all the families, opening the district and the environment, integration into the community. Especially, without the transformations which concern the inside operation of school, a decisive role is being played in the cooperation among all acting individuals, a continuous and true dialogue with students' families from all the social-cultural and ethnic environments.

Finally, the education is a fundamental human right, and a public good and concerns all stages of life, that is from preschool education up to Higher education, as well as lifelong education on formal, non-formal and informal frameworks of education. Consequently, the main focus on the social aspects of education and training of acting individuals could be its contribution to ensure equal opportunities for quality education, which will aim to promote social cohesion, citizenship, as well as subjects' emancipation.

REFERENCES

Ariès, Ph. (1973). L' enfant et 1a vie familiale sous 1'ancien régime. Paris: Seuil.

Baudelot, C., Establet, R. (1971). *L' ecole capitaliste de la France*. Paris: Maspero.

689   Bautier, E., Charlot, B., Rochex, J.-Y. (2000). Entre apprentissage et métier d'élève: 1e
690   rapport au savoir A. Van Zanten (Ed.), Ecole, Etat des saviors, Paris: La Découverte, 179-
691   187.

692   Bautier, E., Rochex, J.-Y. (1998). L' expérience scolaire des nouveaux lycéens.
693   Démocratisation ou massification, París: Armand Colin.

694   Bernstein, B. (1975). Language et Classes Sociales. Paris: Minuit.

695   Bourdieu, P., Passseron, J.-C. (1964). *Les héritiers: les étudiants et 1a culture*. Paris: Minuit.

696   C.R.E.S.A.S. (1978). *Le handicap socio-culturel en question*. Paris: E.S.F.

697   C.R.E.S.A.S. (1984). *Ouverture: L' ecole, 1a creche, les familles*. Paris: L' Harmattan.

698   C.R.E.S.A.S. (1985). *Ouverture: 1'éco1e, 1a crèche, les familles*. Paris: L' Harmattan.

699   Charlot, B. (1997). Rapport au savoir: Eléments pour théorie, París: Anthropos.

700   Charlot, B. (1999). *Le rapport au savoir en milieu populaire. Une recherche dans les lycees*
701   *professionnels de banlieue*. Paris: Anthropos.

702   Charlot, B., (2003). La problématique du rapport au savoir. Maury S., Caillot M., (Eds.),
703   Rapport au savoir et didactiques, Paris: Faber, 33-50.

704   Charlot, B., Bautier, E., Rochex, J.-Y. (1992). *Ecole et savoir dans les banlieues et ailleurs*.
705   Paris: Armand Colin.

706   Crozíer, M., Fríedberg, E. (1970). *L' acteur et le systeme*. Paris: Seuil.

707   De Mause, L. (1985). *Ιστορία της παιδικής ηλικίας*. Αθήνα: Θυμάρι.

708   De Singly, F. (2004). *Sociologie de la familles contemporaine*. Paris: Armand Colin.

709   Derouet, J.-L., Henriot, A., Sirota, R. (1990). Aproches ethnographiques en sociologie de 1'
710   education: 1'eco1e, 1'establissement scolaire, la classe. In *sociologie de l' Educatíon. Díx ans*
711   *de recherches. Recueil de notes de synthese publíees par la Revue Francaise de*
712   *Pedagogie*, 139-203. Paris: L' Harmattan.

713   Descartes, R. (1970). *Philosophical Letters*. Oxford: University Press.

714   Descartes, R. (1973). *Meditations. Oeuvres publiees par Charles Adam - Paul Tannery*.
715   Paris: Vrin.

716 Dubar, C. (1991). La Socialisation. Construction des identities *sociales et professionnelles.*
717 *Paris: Armand Colin.*

718 Dubet, F. (1994). *Sociologie de l' experience. Paris: Seuil.*

719 Dubet, F., Martuccelli, D. (1996). *A l' école. Sociologie de l' experience scolair.* Paris: Seuil.

720 Eleftherakis, Th. (2018). School knowledge and democratic society: from heteronomy to
721 autonomy. In S., Nikolaou, Th. Eleftherakis, E. Kalerante, et al. (Eds), *New challenges to*
722 *education and democracy. Sociological and pedagogical approaches of democratic*
723 *education.* Athens; Gutenberg, 39-81 (written in greek language).

724 Eleftherakis, Th. (2011). Political socialization and education; Pedagogy of democratic
725 citizen in School. In V. Oikonomidis, & Th. Eleftherakis (Eds), *Education, Democracy and*
726 *Human Rights*. Athens; Diadrasi, 48-100 (written in greek language).

727 Guidetti, M., Lallemand, S., Morel, M-F. (2000). *Enfants d' ailleurs, d' hier et d' aujourd'hui.*
728 Paris: Armand Colin.

729 Habermas, J. (1973). Stichworte zur Theorie der Sozialisation. In J. Habermas, *Kultur-und*
730 *Kritik. Verstreute Aufsaitze.* Frankfurt/M: Suhrcamp.

731 Hegel, G.W.F. (1952). *Phanomenologie des Geistes*. Hamburg: J. Hoffmeister.

732 Hegel, G.W.F. (1971). *Werke in zwanzig Banden* Vol. X. Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp.

733 Heller, A. (1982). *Der Mensch in der Renaissance*. Lowenisch: Maschke Hohenheim.

734 Joas, H. (1980). *Praktische Intersubjektivitaet. Die Entwichklung des Werkes von G.H.*
735 *Mead*. Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp.

736 Karakatsanis, P. (1997). Die Affektenlehre der Stoa. *Philia*, (1), 29-37.

737 Korczak, J. (2006). *Comment aimer un enfant. Le droit de l' enfant au respect.* Paris: Laffont
738 R. / collection Réponses.

739 Ladsous, J. (1995). *Janusz Korczak.* Paris: PUF.

740 Lahire, B. (1995). *Tableaux de familles. Heurs et maleurs scolaires en milieu populaires.*
741 Paris: Gallimard/ Seuil.

742 Lahire, B. (2001). *L' home pluriel. Les resorts de l' action.* Paris: Nathan.

743 Lichtenstein, E. (1959). *Ausgelviilte Schriften von F.D.E. Schleiermacher*. Paterborn: F.
744 Schoningh.

745 Macbeth, A. (1984). *L 'enfant entre l'ecole et sa famille. Rapport sur les relations entre*
746 *l'ecole et la famille dans les pays de la communaute europeenne.* Office des publications
747 officielles des Communautés européennes.

748 Mollenhauer, K1. (1968). *Erziehunk und Emanzipation*. Munchen: Juventa Verlag.

749 Montandon, C, (1997). *L' Éducation du point de vue des enfants.* Paris: Nathan.

750 Montandon, C. (1987). *Entre parents et enseignants un dialogue impossible?* Berne: P.
751 Lang.

752 Montandon, C., Favre, B. (1988). Les relations entre les familles et l' école dans le cadre de
753 l' enseignement gen*évois.* Perrenoud, Ph., Montandon C. (eds) *Qui maitrisel l' école?*
754 *Politiques d' institutions et pratiques d' acteurs.* Lausanne: Réalités Sociales.

755 Montandon, C., Favre, B., Hutmacher, W., Perrenoud, Ph., Richiardi, J-J. (1985). *Le*
756 *développement des relations entre les familles et l' école:* à propos des reunions *de parents:*
757 *point de vue et propositions. Gen*ève: S.R.S.

758 Montandon, C., Perrenoud, Ph. (1987). *Entre parents et enseignants, un dialogue*
759 *impossible ?* Berne: P. Lang.

760 Nietzsche, Fr. (X.X.). *Also sprach Zaratustra*. Munchen: W. Goldmann Verlag.

761 Paillard, M., Gilly, M. (1972). Representations des finalites de l'ecole primaire par les peres
762 de famille. *Cahiers de Psychologie*, (15), 227-238.

763 Perier, P. (2005). *Ecole et families populaires*. Rennes: P.U.R.

764 Platz, C. (ed.) (1902). *Schleiermachers padagogische Schriften*. Langesalsa: H. Beyer.

765 Poittevin, A. (2005). *Un regard sociologique sur les relations entre enfants dans les familles*
766 *recomposes. Bergonnier-Dupuy, G., L' enfant, acteur et/ou sujet au sein de la familles.*
767 Paris: ERES, 92-102.

768 Rochex, J.-Y. (1995). *Le sens de l 'experience scolaire*. Paris : P.U.F.

769 Rochex, J.-Y. (2004). La notion de rapport au savoir: convergences et debats theoriques.
770 *Pratiques psychologiques*, (10), 93-106.

771 Rochex, J-Y. (1995). *Le sens de l' experience scolaire.* Paris: P.U.F.

772   Rosenthal, A., Jacobson, L. (1971). *Pygmalion a l'ecole*. Paris: Casterman.

773   Saint Augustin (1993). *Confessions*. Paris: Folio/Gallimard.

774   Schleiermacher, Fr. (1882[2]). *Die Christliche Sitte*. Berlin: L. Jonas.

775   Schulz, W. (1979). *Ich und Welt. Philosophie der Subjektivitilt*. Pfullingen: Neske.

776   Siano, V. (1985). *L' ecole, la Societe et les paysans, These de doctorat*. Universite de
777   Provence.

778   Singly, F. de (1991). *La Farnille. L'Etat des Savoirs*. Paris: La Decouverte.

779   Singly, F. de (2007). *Sociologie de la famille contemporaine*. Paris: Armand Colin.

780   Spranger, E. (1966). *Lebensformen: Geisteswissenschaftilche Psycologie und Ethik der
781   Personlichkeit.* Tubingen: M. Nimeyer.

782   Taylor, Ch. (2007). *Πηγές του Εαυτού*. Αθήνα: Ινδικτος.

783   Terrail, J.-P. (1984). Families ouvrieres, ecole, destin social (1880-1980). *Revue Francaise
784   de sociologie*, XXV, 421-436.

785   Terrail, J.-P. (1990). *Destins ouvriers. La fin d'une classe?* Paris: P.U.F.

786   Terrail, J.-P., Poullaouec, T. (2004). Les families ouvrieres face au devenir de leurs enfants.
787   *Economie et statistique*, (371), p. 3-22.

788   Thin, D. (1998). *Quartiers populaires. L'ecole et les familes*. Lyon: P.U.L..

789   Touraine, A. (1984). *Le retour de l'acteur*. Paris: Fayard.

790   Touraine, A. (1992). *Critique de la modernite*. Paris: Fayard.

791   Touraine, A. (1997). *Pourrons-nous vivre ensemble?* Paris: Fayard.

792   Touraine, A., Khosrokhavar, F. (2000). *La recherche de soi*. Paris: Fayard.

793   Van Zanten, A. (2001). *L'ecole de la peripherie*. Paris: P.U.F..

794   Vedrine, J. (1971). *Les parents et l'ecole*. Paris: Casterman.

795   Wigger, L. (1984). Aspekte der Bildungstheorie Hegels. Ein Literaturbericht. *Peidagosche
796   Rundschau*, (38), 625-635.

797 Winkler, M. (1979). Geschichte und Identitat. Versuch fiber den Zusammenhang von
798 Geselschaft, Erziehung und Identitat in der "Theorie der Erziehung" F.D.E. Schleiermachers.
799 Bad Heilbrunn: J. klinkhardt.

800 Zoberman, N. (1972). Attentes de parents vis-a vis de l'ecole maternelle. *Cahiers de*
801 *Psychologie*, (15), 239-246.

802

803 Aristotle. (1993). *Politics vol.*I, Collected works 1. Athens: Kaktos.

804 Aristotle, (1939). *Politics*, vol. III, (transl. P. Lekatsa). Athens: Zacharopoulos.

805 Ballion, R. (1984). Des rapports à construire. *Le groupe familial.* 5, 77-89.

806 Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J.-C. (1970). *La reproduction.* Paris: Minuit.

807 Gogou, L. (1994). *Social interactions. Social representation. What teachers say about*
808 *parents.* Athens: Poreia.

809 Gogou, L. (2010). *Understanding social phenomena and perspectives of social research.*
810 Athens: Grigoris.

811 Gogou, L. & Karakatsanis, P. (2013). Child's position as an acting individual between the
812 institutions of school and family. Conference proceedings with International Participation.
813 Childhood: Sociological, Cultural, Historic and Pedagogical Dimensions. Athens: 11-14 April.

814 Daskalakis, D. (ed.) (2008). *Poverty, Social Exclusion and Childhood.* Athens-Komotini: Ant.
815 N. Sakkoulas..

816 Daskalakis, D., Givalos, M. (eds.) (2011). *Childhood and children's rights.* Athens: A. A.
817 LIvanis.

818 Dimopoulos, V. (2012). *Philosophy of Education.*Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis.

819 Theodorakopoulos, I.(1974). *Introduction to Philosophy.vol.* II, Athens: self publication.

820 Theodoropoulou, E. (2004). *The incision of Philosophy to Education. Introduction.*
821 Educational Texts 14. Athens: Atrapos.

822 Karakatsanis, P.(1988). *The marx, Marxist and neo-marxist philosophy on Education.*
823 Thessaloniki: Kodikas. .

824 Karakatsanis, P. (1992). *The Philosophy of Education.* Thessaloniki: Kodikas*.*

825   Karakatsanis, P. (2002). *The Stoic Philosophy on Education*. Athens: Atrapos.

826   Karafyllis, A. (2002). *Modern Greek Education. Two centuries of reform attempts*. Athens:
827   Kritiki.

828   Dalakas, Th. (1983). *Introduction to Sociology. Issues of Sociology on Education*. Ioannina:
829   self publication.

830   Xochellis, P. (1980). *Fundamental problems of pedagogy.* Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis bros.

831   Plato (n.d.). *Politeia*, (transl. I. N. Gryparis). Athens: Zacharopoulos.

832

833

834

835
836