

## **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 21<sup>st</sup> 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.

**Keywords:** *socialization, child, subjectivization, acting individual, sympathetic reaction, empathy, family, school, school failure, school-family synergy*

### **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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 3. THE SOCIALIZING OPERATION OF SCHOOL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In any case, school is portrayed as an institution constructed by the participating individuals, adults or under-aged, their school experience based on adaptability and, consequently, its studying presupposes a sociological reflection focusing on the acting individuals' activity in the attempt to form school life through constructing their experiential horizon (Dubet, 1994).

School experience is defined by F. Dubet (1994) as a means with which acting individuals combine on an individual or collective level various sensible acts that comprise the school world. Moreover, it is an attempt to compose an identity that conveys a common meaning through which individuals are interconnected within a social whole. In the light of this perspective, socialization and subjectivation are perceived as a process by which acting individuals construct their experience, even from the beginning of their education, while the rationale to organize experiences corresponds to school system elements. This rationale is imposed on individuals – as they are deprived of the possibility to choose – and directs their socializing through certain underlying skills, a fact that characterizes the main operation of education (Dubet, Martuccelli, 1996: 48; Karakatsanis, 1992: 42; Theodoropoulou, 2004: 32).

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

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

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

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

Additionally, from a sociological point of view, in a quest for a more dynamic conception of individual action, sociology orientates to the "restoration of the acting individual" according to A. Tourainc's viewpoint. The individual is considered an acting individual (personally or collectively), while the standpoint about diverse practices and limits of autonomy remains open (Tourainc, 1984). The Subject is not constructed through assuming social roles, exercising rights and participating, but rather through its willingness to create forms of social

232 life conducive to asserting its self and identifying the Other as a Subject. Only when  
233 identifying the other, the transition to the Subject as an acting individual is feasible.  
234 According to Tourainc, education focusing on the person's formation, based on the values of  
235 a certain society and rational knowledge, contradicts the attempt to construct a free Subject  
236 that should direct itself to identifying individual and collective requests, to identifying the  
237 other and aiming at intercultural communication (Tourainc, 1997: 325-351).

**Comment [Z1]:** Need to consistent whether 'O'  
or 'o'

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

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

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

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

Today, although the synergy between school and family is legally imperative, in fact, it does not operate properly. Research data showcase the fragile relations between parents and teachers. In front of a given situation, both teachers and parents (the manner by which parents perceive school requests, objectives and methods differs depending on the social setting) hold a specific way of identifying and interpreting a situation and act accordingly.

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

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

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

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

It is noteworthy that the constructivist perspective (theory of symbolic interaction, ethnomethodology, social phenomenology) directs research towards studying these processes as well as the acting individuals' social interactions through their relations. In this respect, special significance is given to the Subjects' viewpoints, that, according to this viewpoint, construct social reality through giving meaning to people's actions and symbols of encoding. Acting individuals' discourse to express and describe social reality is particularly



317 interesting for researchers who contend that this perspective is the most important part of  
318 social research.

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

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

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

339 All in all, Augustine's human typology establishes the issue of Self throughout the medieval  
340 period and Renaissance (Heller, 1982) up to Descartes (Descartes, 1970: 123; Schulz,  
341 1979) who further utilizes the afore-mentioned distinction of "internal" and "external" human  
342 composition (Taylor, 2007: 215).

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

347 External reality objects are perceived "through our inner intellectual competence", Descartes  
348 argues and "not through our imagination or senses, as we are aware of them in terms of  
349 perceiving them intellectually and not because we see or touch them" (Descartes, 1973, IX 1  
350 26).

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

357 sufficient internality of autonomous discourse orders, that may objectify the world, body and  
358 passions in order to understand and express them in the proper way.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

394 On the other hand, a completely different viewpoint from Hegel's idealist perception, about  
395 the human being's formation of Self and Subjectivity is suggested by Fr. Nietzsche. He is

396 closer to Lamettrie and Holbach's mechanistic theories of the 18<sup>th</sup> century  
397 (Theodorakopoulos, 1974: 228, Vol. II) about consciousness, rather than those of his era.

398 In particular, in his theory about the Superhuman, as it is portrayed in his book *That said*  
399 *Zarathustra*, an attempt is made to eliminate the idealist perspective about the human  
400 being's composition on the one hand, and to provide a visionary description of a "new" and  
401 authentic, exclusively led by its corporality, self. This is so, because the body is the richest  
402 and purest perceived phenomenon: "it is systematically projected without removing anything  
403 from its final meaning" (Nietzsch, n.d., 29). What is directly perceived by the human being is  
404 not its self-reflective consciousness, but its body in which Subjectivity is experienced  
405 (Nietzsche, n.d., 29). The body is essential for the human being and its life and everything is  
406 depended on it: "behind your thoughts and feelings, a powerful master stands, a stranger  
407 wise man that is called Self and resides within your body; it is your body" (Nietzsche, n.d.,  
408 29).

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

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

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

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

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

435 Moreover, in Aristotle's Politics, reference is made to the human being as a political being by  
436 nature, namely a social being. Consequently, in the framework of the afore-mentioned

sociological research and attempting to explore socialization as the dramatization of “social roles” by the following Subjects, the term Homo Sociologicus emerged. This term was used to give meaning to all those characteristics of the human being comprising the outcome of its association, as a Subject, with society, or to put it in existential Philosophy terms, of the human as a being within – its social – being; this meaning is representative of Aristotle’s philosophical course of thinking (Aristotle III 1253 a 1., 1939) and henceforth.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **6. PARENTS’ PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL LIFE**

Throughout 1960-1970 in many European countries, parents’ presence at school is acknowledged, as they gain the right to participate in various school associations demanding better information and transparency about their children’s school performance as well as school operation. In Greece, the idea of school and family cooperation is introduced in the middle of the ‘80s. official documents urge parents to dialogue and cooperation,

476 encouraging them to participate in school life either being present themselves or being  
477 represented.

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

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

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

**Comment [Z2]:** Please check through out the article the symbol of '&' when you have two or more author. I found inconsistency of using it.

In previous times, parents had to participate following teachers' request, as their participation in school activities had not been foreseen. School was not interested in parents' opinion, as a large number of them were considered not to have the proper knowledge to this end. Parents from lower social strata avoided school. Their children's socialization and transition to adulthood along with their integration into social life was basically realized within the family and probably within apprenticeship prior to finding a job (Terrail, 1984, 1990). The family assumed the role to direct children to job opportunities. These families kept distance from school and provided a different socialization that that of the school, especially emphasizing practical knowledge. Privileged families potentially put their offspring in schools that could meet their needs in contrast to non-privileged families that faced materialistic problems (Vedrine, 1971).

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

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

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

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

More analytically, researches focusing on understanding the way in which teachers interpret their relation to parents are proof that parents are evidently absent from assemblies. According to primary education teachers, these parents come from non-privileged socio-cultural environments in their majority, while this attitude cannot be interpreted as lack of interest. Some primary education teachers try to develop deep understanding of the reason why these parents do not come to school to meet their offspring's teachers. They attribute this refusal to the fact that the parents are aware of their children's discouraging performance and, consequently, the teacher will repeat the same recommendations. This fear is probably tied to parents' former negative school experience, a fact that enfeebles even more their communication with school. According to their viewpoint, socio-culturally non-privileged parents are mainly interested in their children's acquiring basic knowledge (C.R.E.S.A.S., 1984; Gogou, 1994). It appears that for these parents the demand for basic knowledge stems from their school past, the traditional school. According to some researches (both through teachers and parents' discourse), these parents consider the traditional school education (reading, writing and arithmetic) of primary importance instead of the broader intellectual development and formation of social relations. Thus, they regard school as the only area to disseminate basic knowledge (Zoberman, 1972; Paillard & Gilly, 1972; Gogou, 1994).

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

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

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

Comment [Z3]: Paillard & Gilly

605 While trying to interpret the teacher-parent inequality, the family is unequally and intensely  
606 criticized, whereas the operation of school is not questioned. A major prerequisite for school  
607 success for children of non-privileged socio-cultural environments and different ethnicities is  
608 the transformation of teachers' beliefs about the popular strata (Rosenthal, Jacobson, 1971).  
609 When the social setting is visible in the form of deficits, teachers cannot proceed to an  
610 optimistic evaluation about the effectiveness of their attempts. Their expectations are  
611 defeatist not only to students, but to their performance as teachers, too.

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

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

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

640 It is also realized that the relations between teachers and socio-culturally non-privileged  
641 parents are fragile, as there is not consistency between school and family values. When a  
642 kind of "cooperation" is eventually formed between popular families and school, it is most of  
643 the latter's adaptation to school models and values (C.R.E.S.A.S., 1984; Gogou, 1994;  
644 Perier, 2005). Researchers consider the quality of relations between teachers and parents of  
645 primary importance and are basically interested in understanding the meaning of both  
646 relations. An attempt is made to understand both through the teachers and parents' discourse  
647 as to what extent parents are involved in their children's school life and the operation of

**Comment [Z4]:** Combine this sentence with the  
next paragraph



school, in general, in order to reveal privileged relations between school and some socio-cultural environments. According to researches, popular families appear distant from school due to their weak schooling in terms of knowledge and their children's socializing (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 addition 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 la vie familiale sous l'ancien régime*. Paris: Seuil.

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

691 Bautier, E., Charlot, B., Rochex, J.-Y. (2000). Entre apprentissage et métier d'élève: 1e  
 692 rapport au savoir A. Van Zanten (Ed.), *Ecole, Etat des saviors*, Paris: La Découverte, 179-  
 693 187.

694 Bautier, E., Rochex, J.-Y. (1998). *L' expérience scolaire des nouveaux lycéens.*  
 695 *Démocratisation ou massification*, Paris: Armand Colin.

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

697 Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J.-C. (1964). *Les héritiers: les étudiants et la culture*. Paris: Minuit.

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

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

700 C.R.E.S.A.S. (1985). *Ouverture: l'école, la crèche, les familles*. Paris: L' Harmattan.

701 Charlot, B. (1997). *Rapport au savoir: Eléments pour théorie*, Paris: Anthropos.

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

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

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

708 Crozier, M., Friedberg, E. (1970). *L' acteur et le système*. Paris: Seuil.

709 De Mause, L. (1985). *Ιστορία της παιδικής ηλικίας*. Αθήνα: Ουμάρι.

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

711 Derouet, J.-L., Henriot, A., Sirota, R. (1990). Approches ethnographiques en sociologie de l'  
 712 éducation: l'école, l'établissement scolaire, la classe. In *sociologie de l' Education. Dix ans*  
 713 *de recherches. Recueil de notes de synthèse publiées par la Revue Française de*  
 714 *Pédagogie*, 139-203. Paris: L' Harmattan.

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

716 Descartes, R. (1973). *Meditations. Oeuvres publiées par Charles Adam - Paul Tannery*.  
 717 Paris: Vrin.

718 Dubar, C. (1991). *La Socialisation. Construction des identités sociales et professionnelles.*  
719 *Paris: Armand Colin.*

720 Dubet, F. (1994). *Sociologie de l'expérience.* Paris: Seuil.

721 Dubet, F., Martuccelli, D. (1996). *A l'école. Sociologie de l'expérience scolaire.* Paris: Seuil.

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

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

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

731 Habermas, J. (1973). Stichworte zur Theorie der Sozialisation. In J. Habermas, *Kultur-und*  
732 *Kritik. Verstreute Aufsätze.* Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp.

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

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

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

736 Joas, H. (1980). *Praktische Intersubjektivität. Die Entwicklung des Werkes von G.H.*  
737 *Mead.* Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp.

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

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

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

742 Lahire, B. (1995). *Tableaux de familles. Heurs et maux scolaires en milieu populaires.*  
743 *Paris: Gallimard/ Seuil.*

744 Lahire, B. (2001). *L'homme pluriel. Les ressorts de l'action.* Paris: Nathan.

- 745 Lichtenstein, E. (1959). *Ausgewählte Schriften von F.D.E. Schleiermacher*. Paderborn: F.  
746 Schöningh.
- 747 Macbeth, A. (1984). *L'enfant entre l'école et sa famille. Rapport sur les relations entre*  
748 *l'école et la famille dans les pays de la communauté européenne*. Office des publications  
749 officielles des Communautés européennes.
- 750 Mollenhauer, K. (1968). *Erziehung und Emanzipation*. München: Juventa Verlag.
- 751 Montandon, C. (1997). *L'Éducation du point de vue des enfants*. Paris: Nathan.
- 752 Montandon, C. (1987). *Entre parents et enseignants un dialogue impossible?* Berne: P.  
753 Lang.
- 754 Montandon, C., Favre, B. (1988). Les relations entre les familles et l'école dans le cadre de  
755 l'enseignement genevois. Perrenoud, Ph., Montandon C. (eds) *Qui maîtrise l'école?*  
756 *Politiques d'institutions et pratiques d'acteurs*. Lausanne: Réalités Sociales.
- 757 Montandon, C., Favre, B., Hutmacher, W., Perrenoud, Ph., Richiardi, J.-J. (1985). *Le*  
758 *développement des relations entre les familles et l'école: à propos des réunions de parents:*  
759 *point de vue et propositions*. Genève: S.R.S.
- 760 Montandon, C., Perrenoud, Ph. (1987). *Entre parents et enseignants, un dialogue*  
761 *impossible ?* Berne: P. Lang.
- 762 Nietzsche, Fr. (X.X.). *Also sprach Zarathustra*. München: W. Goldmann Verlag.
- 763 Paillard, M., Gilly, M. (1972). Représentations des finalités de l'école primaire par les pères  
764 de famille. *Cahiers de Psychologie*, (15), 227-238.
- 765 Perier, P. (2005). *Ecole et familles populaires*. Rennes: P.U.R.
- 766 Platz, C. (ed.) (1902). *Schleiermachers pädagogische Schriften*. Langesala: H. Beyer.
- 767 Poittevin, A. (2005). *Un regard sociologique sur les relations entre enfants dans les familles*  
768 *recomposées*. Bergonnier-Dupuy, G., *L'enfant, acteur et/ou sujet au sein de la famille*.  
769 Paris: ERES, 92-102.
- 770 Rochex, J.-Y. (1995). *Le sens de l'expérience scolaire*. Paris : P.U.F.
- 771 Rochex, J.-Y. (2004). La notion de rapport au savoir: convergences et débats théoriques.  
772 *Pratiques psychologiques*, (10), 93-106.
- 773 Rochex, J.-Y. (1995). *Le sens de l'expérience scolaire*. Paris: P.U.F.

- 774 Rosenthal, A., Jacobson, L. (1971). *Pygmalion a l'ecole*. Paris: Casterman.
- 775 Saint Augustin (1993). *Confessions*. Paris: Folio/Gallimard.
- 776 Schleiermacher, Fr. ( 1882<sup>2</sup>). *Die Christliche Sitte*. Berlin: L. Jonas.
- 777 Schulz, W. (1979). *Ich und Welt. Philosophie der Subjektivität*. Pfullingen: Neske.
- 778 Siano, V. (1985). *L' ecole, la Societe et les paysans, These de doctorat*. Universite de  
779 Provence.
- 780 Singly, F. de (1991). *La Famille. L'Etat des Savoirs*. Paris: La Decouverte.
- 781 Singly, F. de (2007). *Sociologie de la famille contemporaine*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- 782 Spranger, E. (1966). *Lebensformen: Geisteswissenschaftliche Psychologie und Ethik der*  
783 *Personlichkeit*. Tübingen: M. Nimeyer.
- 784 Taylor, Ch. (2007). *Πηγές του Εαυτού*. Αθήνα: Ινδίκτος.
- 785 Terrail, J.-P. (1984). Families ouvrières, ecole, destin social (1880-1980). *Revue Francaise*  
786 *de sociologie*, XXV, 421-436.
- 787 Terrail, J.-P. (1990). *Destins ouvriers. La fin d'une classe?* Paris: P.U.F.
- 788 Terrail, J.-P., Poullaouec, T. (2004). Les familles ouvrières face au devenir de leurs enfants.  
789 *Economie et statistique*, (371), p. 3-22.
- 790 Thin, D. (1998). *Quartiers populaires. L'ecole et les familles*. Lyon: P.U.L..
- 791 Touraine, A. (1984). *Le retour de l'acteur*. Paris: Fayard.
- 792 Touraine, A. (1992). *Critique de la modernité*. Paris: Fayard.
- 793 Touraine, A. (1997). *Pourrons-nous vivre ensemble?* Paris: Fayard.
- 794 Touraine, A., Khosrokhavar, F. (2000). *La recherche de soi*. Paris: Fayard.
- 795 Van Zanten, A. (2001). *L'ecole de la peripherie*. Paris: P.U.F..
- 796 Vedrine, J. (1971). *Les parents et l'ecole*. Paris: Casterman.
- 797 Wigger, L. (1984). Aspekte der Bildungstheorie Hegels. Ein Literaturbericht. *Peidagosche*  
798 *Rundschau*, (38), 625-635.

799 Winkler, M. (1979). Geschichte und Identität. Versuch fiber den Zusammenhang von  
800 Gesellschaft, Erziehung und Identität in der "Theorie der Erziehung" F.D.E. Schleiermachers.  
801 Bad Heilbrunn: J. Klinkhardt.

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

804

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

818 Daskalakis, D., Givalos, M. (eds.) (2011). *Childhood and children's rights*. Athens: A. A.  
819 Livanis.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

829 Kritiki.

830 Dalakas, Th. (1983). *Introduction to Sociology. Issues of Sociology on Education*. Ioannina:

831 self publication.

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

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

834

835

836

837

838