

Family - school cooperation about child – as acting social individual

Gogou Lela^{1*}, Elefterakis Theodoros², Kalerante Evaggelia³ and Giavrimis Panagiotis⁴

(Put * above the corresponding author and give telephone number, fax number and email ID in the footer)

¹ Professor, University of Western Attica, Greece

² Assistant Professor, University of Crete, Greece

³ Associate Professor, University of Western Macedonia, Greece

⁴ Assistant Professor, University of Aegean, Greece.

ABSTRACT

The child's socialization and multifaceted psycho-emotional development is directly associated with the cooperation of the two basic socializing agents, family and school. At first, the 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.

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

1. CHILD POSITION AS SUBJECT AND ACTING INDIVIDUAL

*ekalerante@yahoo.gr

28 Nowadays, children are considered independent beings with rights and duties, while at the
29 same time, biological beings characterized by age-relevant fragility and sensitivity protected
30 by adults. This means that handling situations is intricate because children must
31 autonomously deal with their emotions, while being under the parental shield. Thus,
32 continuous external monitoring is, indeed, necessary to enable them to gradually develop
33 stable self-control abilities [1].

34 In particular, through the afore-mentioned emotional relation the child entity is
35 understandably identified as one full of deficits, without a consistent lawful personality, not
36 being able to form its life unpromptedly and energetically, or freely and independently
37 participate in the political, cultural and social life. This means that it cannot basically identify
38 its rights and obligations [2]. Briefly, the child is identified as immature, a criterion historically
39 reflecting the practices of neglect and infanticide during Ancient Greek and Roman times.
40 This perception of the child as a “tabula rasa” has been modified as from the 16th century
41 and henceforth. During the 18th century it was viewed as a creature to be tamed and
42 controlled and in the 19th century as one to be subjugated and led. In the 20th century it was
43 viewed as an entity with particular needs to be met [3]. In this framework childhood
44 immaturity is conceived as an inalienable right of every human being, a right that overlies
45 social, economic and cultural sizes.

46 The middle of 20th century signifies a switching perception about child identity and social
47 role. As from the 2nd World War up to these days, child mortality rates fell across western
48 societies due to medicine and hygiene development and passing laws about childhood
49 protection. In 1989 the International Convention on the Rights of Children was composed,
50 pertaining to individuals below 18 years old. It is of global dimension and gives priority to
51 children’s right to health and education along with the right to voice their opinion about their
52 own affairs. On this basis they are conceived as Subjects with special features and
53 autonomy. Despite the changing perception, children’s rights are exercised by parents or
54 other legal representatives responsible for child survival and security [4].

55 It is noteworthy that the Polish pediatrician Janusz Korczak has served as inspiration to the
56 above Convention. He was the first to defend the child’s rights emphasizing respect to
57 childhood and the necessity to transform education based on democracy, identifying the
58 child’s status and its continuous communication with adults [5]. In his work, he puts forward
59 a revised perception about childhood and its understanding as a period of the human being
60 evolution, in the sense that children are emotional, social, cognitive and political beings with
61 skills and abilities to define their social relations.

62 However, the dimension of childhood must be taken into consideration in the light of social
63 and cultural diversity. More specifically, childhood cannot be considered universal and
64 neutral in all cultures since it is currently well-understood that the developmental stages are
65 determined depending on the child as Subject and acting individual social and cultural
66 circumstances. Diversity of languages, family patterns, learning pace, different interests,
67 aims and manners of learning reflect a multitude of childhood [6].

68 It is noteworthy that during the ‘60s, a new perspective about childhood as social
69 construction tied to the social setting was introduced by the historian Ph. Ariés [7].
70 Henceforth, childhood is conceived as a social time period with its own cultural features. The

71 child is studied as a Subject, an acting individual participating in social exchanges and
72 consuming practices.

73 To conclude, scientific works in psychology and pedagogics about children's development
74 and education contributed to transforming adult perceptions to this end, also supported by
75 children early socialization in nursery schools due to the increasing number of working
76 women.

77

78 2. A RESEARCH APPROACH TO EDUCATIONAL RELATIONS: THE ISSUE OF 79 INDIVIDUAL SUBJECTIVATION

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

85 In particular, research emphasizes the school – family relation characterized by the afore-
86 mentioned diversity, while an attempt is made to explore the consequences from these
87 relations, their stability or instability, as well as discovering potential activities conducive to
88 productive teacher - parent cooperation [6]. Students' school success corresponds directly to
89 educational coherence established between school and family. Lacking parent - teacher
90 communication is one of the major causes of students' school failure of non-privileged socio-
91 cultural groups. Sociological studies about the relation between teachers and parents focus
92 on exploring their social relations in order to find the way in which they perceive the relation
93 between them as well as the kind of experiences gained in their encounters. Analyzing
94 school processes, therefore, is not associated only with external factors affecting them, but
95 also with acting individuals' social relations within the school institution. Analyzing their
96 discourse, understanding their subjective perceptions and expectations along with the nature
97 of their social interactions is sought after.

98 It is noteworthy that the constructivist perspective (theory of symbolic interaction,
99 ethnomethodology and social phenomenology) directs research towards studying these
100 processes as well as the acting individuals' social interactions through their relations. In this
101 respect, special significance is given to the Subjects' viewpoints about constructing social
102 reality through meaningfulness to people's actions and symbols of encoding. Acting
103 individuals' discourse about social reality is particularly interesting for researchers who
104 contend that this perspective is the most important part of social research.

105 Consequently, it is possible to study this action in the form of people's strategic practices
106 while socializing, given that the basic criterion is the concept of the acting individual and
107 mutual interactions among Subjects. The concept of the acting individual is strongly
108 associated with the Self and the Subject; a creative Subject, able to participate in social
109 affairs and changes [8] [9] [10].

110 Therefore, identifying the person as an acting individual, or else an active Subject, the
111 currently dominant sociological view about the human being, stems from the anthropological
112 and ontological view, deep rooted in the past and is briefly discussed below.

113 Saint Augustine, for instance, in "Confessiones" [11], was inspired by the platonic perception
114 about human composition [12]. He detected an internal element of the human being that
115 makes up the "Self", a basic distinctive criterion between people of ancient times and those
116 of Christian times [13]. Moreover, according to Descartes, human being's internality is
117 basically the act of thinking, which, based on an orderly arrangement of its representations,
118 is led to proper internal conception of the external reality. External reality objects are
119 perceived "through our inner intellectual competence", Descartes argues, and "not through
120 our imagination or senses, as we are aware of them in terms of perceiving them intellectually
121 and not because we see or touch them" [14].

122 Additionally, German Idealism seems to elevate the issue of Self and Subjectivity, in the
123 framework of philosophical debate about consciousness, at a level too high for Descartes'
124 rationalism, while being rejected by all anti-metaphysical scholars who mainly followed the
125 behaviorists Watson and Skinner, even the "social" self-declared "behaviorist" G. H. Mead
126 [15]. What is more, Hegel's basic viewpoint [16], accepted even by Behaviorism, and
127 expressed in his work *Intellect Phenomenology*, is the belief that to compose a person's
128 Subjectivity, in terms of structure and process, it is necessary to identify another, strange
129 Self and Subject.

130 On the other hand, a completely different viewpoint from Hegel's idealist perception, about
131 the human being's formation of Self and Subjectivity is suggested by Fr. Nietzsche [17]. He
132 is closer to Lamettrie and Holbach's mechanistic theories of the 18th century [18] about
133 consciousness, rather than those of his era.

134 In particular, in his theory about the Superhuman, as portrayed in his book *That said*
135 *Zarathustra*, he provides a visionary description of a "new" and authentic self, exclusively led
136 by its corporality. This is so, because the body is the richest and purest perceived
137 phenomenon: "it is systematically projected without removing anything from its final
138 meaning" [17]. In addition, Schleiermacher's viewpoint about forming Self and Subjectivity
139 lies within the framework of Hegelian Philosophy about consciousness. Generally, the Other
140 is liable for this formation, but mainly the organized social whole in which the individual lives,
141 especially education and its educational processes to this end. "Education must form the
142 individual similar to the great moral Whole in which it belongs. The state takes people from
143 teachers, after they have been formed proportionately to it, so that they are able to integrate
144 into the whole life and not theirs" [19]. The individual's composition contains a special
145 Subjectivity totally formed by Universality (Society) and Partiality (Individuality) resulting in
146 differentiated by other Subjectivities that comprise the social body.

147 It is noteworthy that special contribution to Selfness and Subjectivation is found to
148 sociological works at the end of the 20th century in an attempt to conceptualize the term
149 Socialization [3]. In particular, on the grounds of a lifelong process of the individual's
150 emotional, mental, linguistic and willful composition, several researches were dedicated to
151 socializing institutions and agents, like family, school, kindergarten, the socializing role of
152 Mass Media, peers, and working places [20].

153 To conclude, Habermas [21] introduces the basic terminology about human composition in
154 combination to the relation among the ability of the Subject to play roles, the composition of
155 society and structural fluidity of social values systems. In particular, he detects this
156 evolutionary composition of the Subject towards the ongoing formed contemporary societies,
157 by thoroughly studying the Subject's competences and limits of the promoted individual
158 activity within a theory about the concept of the "emancipated human".

159

160 **3. THE "SYMPATHETIC REACTION" BETWEEN THE PARENT-CHILD** 161 **RELATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF EMPATHY IN A HEALTHY** 162 **SOCIALIZING MODEL**

163 The **adult-child relationship** constitutes an especially controversial **issue under exploration**
164 from multiple fields (pedagogical, psychoanalytic and sociological). It **is noteworthy** that the
165 **most** prominent dipole which constitutes a cause of concern is the child "immaturity", in
166 comparison with the "mature" adult. **The common grounds of expression and reprimand**
167 **comparing an adult to a child in case of disapproving immature attitudes are of major**
168 **concern. Nonetheless, the tendency to reverse to a child perspective forms a parent's most**
169 **essential capability and psycho-emotional aptitude in order to create a relationship of deep**
170 **empathy between the adult parent and the underage child.**

171 **As Lloyd De Mause mentions** [22] at the beginning of his well-known book "History of
172 childhood", "Center power for the change in History isn't neither technology, nor economics,
173 but the psychogenetic changes in the personality, which occur because of the consecutive
174 parent-child interactions from generation to generation".

175 **Therefore, the revelatory changes occurring in the historic evolution of childhood, conceived**
176 **as following up – basically in suspense – and ongoing parent – child approach is due to the**
177 **psychological phenomenon of retrogression. In other words, it is the ability relevant to**
178 **parents' consecutive generations to penetrate into their children's psychological age.**
179 **Moreover, the legacy of all cultural attainments of a certain era is achieved through**
180 **transferring the mental structure across generations. According to the psychoanalytical**
181 **theory, further development of our civilization cannot be achieved but through a symmetric**
182 **empathetic association between parents and children; a fully emotional condition of deep**
183 **understanding of children's needs and and satisfaction, known as "sympathetic reaction".**

184 **This empathetic parent extroversion, in particular, and the identifying association with the**
185 **child, namely a legalized form of "second childhood" is every adult's inherent need**
186 **regardless of social or technological changes or utilitarian expectations. This is possible to**
187 **bring numerous emotional changes towards improvement both in the family and society**
188 **under the condition that the child holds the corresponding experience of emotional stimuli**
189 **and their assimilation by emotional and conscientious structures [22].**

190 **Consequently, approaching the child's emotions is beneficial to the adult in terms of a new**
191 **attitude tied to the individuality of the latter. Parents understand that they do not exist**
192 **randomly, but this is all an inner experience urging them to become aware of themselves so**
193 **that their relation with their Ego becomes more "narcissistic". Furthermore, based on this**

194 approach to the child as the “Other”, parents are able to become more pervasive to their
195 personal “Ego” as well as to other people’s inwardness.

196 When the human revives itself as individuality through the emotions of the “Other”, the world
197 is concurrently being experienced in a new deeper manner. The human becomes more
198 familiar to it. As a result, this experience is turned into potential action and creation and its
199 effectiveness or non-effectiveness is evaluated in terms of an object. Thus, action and object
200 are united into a whole and, through empathizing the Other, the World is eventually
201 conceived and experienced both as nature and society; a World of living forces within the
202 human, enabling him to conceive reality in more authentic terms based on a dialectical
203 relation with the real “You” [22].

204

205 4. THE SOCIALIZING OPERATION OF SCHOOL

206 Socializing institutions, namely family and school, are central to classical theories, as they
207 favor acting individuals within internalized norms, values and rules. This way, individuals
208 efficiently reenact social roles, highlighting each prominent activity and behavior against the
209 everyday transaction with Others. According to sociological research, the family [23]
210 decisively contributes to child and adolescent socializing, mostly due to opportunities
211 conducive to relationship arrangement across generations, rather than to stable transferring
212 of consolidated roles driving from society.

213 Similar realizations were revealed about the Greek school institution, having undergone
214 deep transformation by establishing the Modern Greek language as the official language to
215 educate children from all social strata, making its opening to society [24] [25]. In this respect,
216 it is invited to settle the disturbed relational exchanges within a new framework of perception,
217 that of the labor market and its principles, i.e. competitiveness and the mechanisms that
218 pertain to school life universality.

219 A fundamental operation of school is that of allocating social positions through the
220 individuals’ composed Subjectivity and Self, given that they resemble them, verifying
221 basically the conclusions of social scholars like Vilfredo Pareto [26] and the so-called
222 reproduction scholars [27] [28]. In other words, school **assumes** responsibility to form and
223 develop social and cultural individual consciousness, being able and willing to staff,
224 operationally and productively, a certain position in a certain society.

225 Therefore, school socialization is unfolded in school organization based on rules, scheduled
226 learning and social relations in the framework of which the student, as acting individual,
227 internalizes norms and skills and is habituated in playing social roles and **through profession**
228 **orientation** gets ready to gradually commence its productive integration into society, which it
229 is obliged to staff [29].

230 Through school opening and its subsequent massiveness to all social strata, the necessity
231 for reformed educational policy is highlighted. It puts forward new educational objectives
232 resulting in students and teachers’ changing expectations. This means creating direct bonds
233 among each other resulting in underlying new requests and assuming new responsibilities

234 by both sides. It ensures free education on behalf of the society and the communal
235 composition of knowledge provided as well as the development of juvenile mass culture on
236 behalf of school. Within this new framework, a new policy is consolidated by school, placing
237 its interest on teachers and students' practices, who as acting individuals, ought to
238 continuously reflect on their practices in order to act effectively and being associated with the
239 Others in a positive sense, not to be exclusively restricted to their social role, especially in
240 case it prevents their productive professional occupation as it was conceptualized within
241 their education [30].

242 In any case, school is portrayed as an institution constructed by the participating individuals,
243 adults or under-aged, with their school experience based on adaptability. **Consequently, this**
244 presupposes a sociological reflection focusing on the acting individuals' activity in an attempt
245 to form school life through constructing their experiential horizon [29].

246 School experience is defined by F. Dubet as a means by which acting individuals combine
247 on an individual or collective level various sensible acts that comprise the school world.
248 Moreover, it is an attempt to compose an identity that conveys a common meaning through
249 which individuals are interconnected within a social whole. In the light of this perspective,
250 socialization and subjectivation are perceived as a process by which acting individuals
251 construct their experience, even from the beginning of their education, while the rationale to
252 organize experiences corresponds to school system elements. This rationale is imposed on
253 individuals – as they are deprived of the possibility to choose – and directs their socializing
254 through certain underlying skills, a fact that characterizes the main operation of education
255 [31] [32] [33].

256

257 **5. PARENTS' PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL LIFE**

258 Throughout 1960-1970 in many European countries, parents' presence at school is
259 acknowledged, as they gain the right to participate in various school associations demanding
260 better information and transparency about their children's school performance as well as
261 school operation. In Greece, the idea of school and family cooperation is introduced in the
262 middle of the '80s. Official documents urge parents to dialogue and cooperation, **as well as**
263 **participation** in school life either being present themselves or being represented.

264 In the countries of the European Union in particular, attempts have been made by school
265 authorities and teachers to better inform parents and involve them more in school life. A
266 certain survey was conducted to 3.086 schools of the European Union, out of which 1.744
267 responded, a percentage of 56,55%. The **theme** of this survey was the description of the
268 existing relations between family and school in 9 member states of the European Union. It
269 should be mentioned that Greece had not entered the European Union at the time when the
270 survey began [34]. The results of this survey come from a coincidental contact and not
271 through a scheduled action. Thus, such a relation cannot be considered as "cooperation".
272 Teachers argue that schools had been operating in the long run without intensified contact
273 with families as well as the professional independence of the teaching personnel. They
274 underline the specialized nature of education and refer to parents' indifference each time an
275 attempt is made to improve this relation. The parents-teachers relation is specifically

276 considered to have lost its significance from the moment children become adolescents and
277 increasingly intend to assume responsibility for their decisions [34].

278 More specifically, the researchers studied the communication structures between school and
279 family, **namely pamphlets and general meetings**. Pamphlets and information bulletins come
280 from four different categories: the Ministry of Education, schools, parents' associations and
281 other organizations. The majority of pamphlets sent to parents in the sampling European
282 schools belonged to the category "basic information". According to researchers, although
283 these pamphlets contain basic information, they establish a certain relation between school
284 and family. School general meetings are the second form of communication. Primary
285 education documents 1,5 meetings annually and Secondary education documents 1,8
286 meetings annually. **Not organizing school meetings is** due to not having a hall available for
287 such events. Other schools avoid such meetings because they regard them as practically
288 impossible to hold any important discussions. In the same survey, the teachers **criticizing**
289 **parents' indifference** also denounced the small even non-existent parent participation in the
290 school general meetings. However, according to the researchers, parents' indifference is
291 probably due to the nature of these meetings rather than to parents' indifference about their
292 offspring education. In such meetings issues of general interest are inevitably put at the
293 forefront, while classroom-related meetings are considered more personal, less formal and
294 more beneficial.

295 Starting from the '60s, in particular, educational policies in various countries, namely the
296 countervailing programs in the USA, educational priority areas in England and France, as
297 well as in contemporary Greece, are a proof that this issue is of primary importance in the
298 educational environment. These policies intended to inform and educate parents of non-
299 privileged social strata **about** their participation in their children's school activities [35].
300 According to them, **school failure can decline based on the transformation of parent-teacher,**
301 **parent-child and child-teacher relationship**.

302 In previous times, parents had to participate following teachers' request, as their participation
303 in school activities had not been foreseen. School was not interested in parents' opinion, as
304 a large number of them were considered not to have the proper knowledge to this end.
305 Parents from lower social strata avoided school. Their children's socialization and transition
306 to adulthood along with their integration into social life was basically realized within the
307 family and probably within apprenticeship prior to finding a job [36] [37]. The family assumed
308 the role to direct children to job opportunities. These families **dissociated themselves** from
309 school and provided a different socialization than that of school, especially emphasizing
310 practical knowledge. Privileged families potentially put their offspring in schools that could
311 meet their needs in contrast to non-privileged families that faced materialistic problems [38].

312 Moreover, job crisis around 1970 resulted in a gradual undermining of the labor class and its
313 enfeeblement to integrate into society through labor [39] [40]. Henceforth, the inter-
314 generation transition of social positions is not realized off schools. Research data of this time
315 period document the demand for **non-privileged children schooling**. The majority of these
316 parents aspire to salaried, and not manual, positions for their children, aiming at acquiring a
317 school capital for them that would presumably be conducive to their social rise [37] [41].
318 These parents invest in school as a means to prevent their children from insecurity,

319 everyday economic and social hardships through their integration into the intricate reality
320 and their access to salaried job positions.

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

329 It is noteworthy that today, despite the institutionalized cooperation between school and
330 family, research data prove that this is not satisfactory on a practical level. **In other words,**
331 **despite organizing** meetings for parents, a misunderstanding can potentially disturb their
332 communication towards a generalized crisis based on their experiences interpretation as
333 well as the bilateral meaning of attitudes and behaviors. This way, the restoration of mutual
334 trust between the acting individuals is not feasible [42] [43] [44] [45].

335 It should be clarified that teachers' evaluations pertaining to children's behavior and school
336 performance affect to a large extent the family environment, as students are formally or
337 informally the subject of evaluation. School is felt within the family environment every day
338 and unexpectedly. Therefore, family operation is affected in multiple ways by children's
339 school experiences [43].

340 More analytically, researches focusing on understanding the way in which teachers interpret
341 their relation to parents are proof that parents are evidently absent from meetings. According
342 to primary education teachers, these parents come from non-privileged socio-cultural
343 environments in their majority, while this attitude cannot be interpreted as lack of interest.
344 Some primary education teachers try to develop deep understanding of the reason why
345 these parents do not come to school to meet their offspring's teachers. They attribute this
346 refusal to the fact that the parents are aware of their children's discouraging performance
347 and, consequently, the teacher will repeat the same recommendations. This fear is probably
348 tied to parents' former negative school experience, a fact that enfeebls even more their
349 communication with school. According to their viewpoint, socio-culturally non-privileged
350 parents are mainly interested in their children's acquiring basic knowledge [42] [44]. It
351 appears that for these parents the demand for basic knowledge stems from their school
352 past, the traditional school. According to some researches (both through teachers and
353 parents' discourse), these parents consider the traditional school education (reading, writing
354 and arithmetic) of primary importance instead of the broader intellectual development and
355 formation of social relations. Thus, they regard school as the only area basic knowledge
356 **dissemination** [46] [47] [44].

357 To sum up, school success is characterized by the acquisition of a culture which is partially
358 strange to socio-culturally non-privileged parents' culture. They did not study for a long time,
359 while in most cases they were weak students without having received any rewards. They
360 perhaps recall their school life experiences which they feel more intensely on an emotional
361 level, making it more difficult to establish a proper relation with school. Teachers' discourse

362 about these parents reveals that their attitude is less critical and more conformist towards
363 school in comparison to the socio-culturally privileged parents' attitude who value school
364 knowledge. Socio-culturally non-privileged parents interpret their children's mean or bad
365 performance through biological determinism [44] [47]. Research findings pertaining to
366 farmers' families proved that their children's individual value is of deterministic importance
367 [48]. In other words, these farmers do not accept their children's failure without a critic
368 against school and its consistent selective operation. The ideologies of charisma and
369 meritocracy are still domineering.

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

376 It is often the case that a student's behavior in the classroom and their bad or mean
377 performance is interpreted upon the socio-cultural condition of the family (uneducated
378 parents, unemployed parents, divorced parents, etc.). These students' discouraging school
379 performance is attributed to conditions not merely tied to materialistic hardships, but also to
380 their parents' educational and cultural deprivation. In this way, the child's family environment
381 is considered deficient, resulting in some teachers' interpretations about these students'
382 differentiation in relation to their social origin [49].

383 While trying to interpret the teacher-parent inequality, the family is unequally and intensely
384 criticized, whereas the operation of school is not questioned. A major prerequisite for school
385 success for children of non-privileged socio-cultural environments and different ethnicities is
386 the transformation of teachers' beliefs about the popular strata [50]. When the social setting
387 is visible in the form of deficits, teachers cannot proceed to an optimistic evaluation about
388 the effectiveness of their attempts. Their expectations are defeatist not only to students, but
389 to their performance as teachers, too. Furthermore, studying the relations between popular
390 family environments and school, as a carrier of socializing, showcases problems tied to
391 studying popular strata and their relation to school [51].

392 It is noteworthy that the popular families' relation to school is not identical to the one of
393 parents coming from other social strata. The former parents' interest in their offspring's
394 school life and their involvement in it is their unique way that cannot be identical to that of
395 middle and upper social classes. The models of socialization and social exchanges of the
396 privileged social environments are not in line with those of non-privileged parents or
397 migrants. The families from non-privileged social strata have their own socializing rationale
398 (about authority or the relation to school knowledge or the relation to time), according to
399 relevant studies [51]. Analyzing the socializing rationale does not differ from B. Bernstein's
400 standpoint [52] in relation to family and socialization types. Popular families experience their
401 offspring's schooling through their own socializing rationale, as a different situation, since
402 they have their own way of thinking, observing and acting. Studying the relation between
403 these families and school is consequently orientated to their own ways of socializing.

404 The practices of these family members are not autonomous, while dominated by the school
405 proper discourse. In other words, they are adapted to school demands, while they perceive
406 the “non-legitimacy” of their practices that is the difference from school socializing. Cultural
407 and educational socializing rationales stemming from these families are often perceived in a
408 negative sense on behalf of the school (time, pace of life, verbal exchanges between
409 children and parents, utilization of free time, etc.), since their socializing rational is not in line
410 with that of the school. Research about teachers and parents’ viewpoints shows that popular
411 families do not keep distance from school due to their weak schooling in terms of knowledge
412 and children’s socializing. Researchers are mainly interested in the way by which popular
413 families perceive school actions in relation to school knowledge, the imposing conditions in
414 the framework of their socializing rationale [29] [33] [53] [54] [55] [56].

415 Moreover, the relations between teachers and socio-culturally non-privileged parents are
416 fragile, as there is not consistency between school and family values. When a kind of
417 “cooperation” is eventually formed between popular families and school, it is mostly of the
418 latter’s adaptation to school models and values [42] [44] [57]. Researchers consider the
419 quality of relations between teachers and parents of primary importance and are basically
420 interested in understanding the meaning of both relations. An attempt is made to understand
421 both through the teachers and parents’ discourse as to what extent parents are involved in
422 their children’s school life and the operation of school, in general, in order to reveal
423 privileged relations between school and some socio-cultural environments. According to
424 researches, popular families appear distant from school due to their weak schooling in terms
425 of knowledge and their children’s socializing [44] [46] [57].

426 It is clear, therefore, that these social relations cannot be analyzed, while ignoring the
427 authority relations. A better understanding of power relations could lead teachers to other
428 types of relations to the families from different socio-cultural environments at the benefit of
429 all children. The concept of power is central to every analysis tied to social dynamics. Power,
430 according to M. Crozier and E. Friedberg [58], implies coercion, a special ability to dominate
431 people. It is a form of power imposed on others through addiction and coercion. Authority
432 cannot be considered the characteristic of a group, as it exists within a social relation. It is
433 regarded as an inequality, a different power aiming at domineering a person or group. The
434 authority of the expertise implies a form of dominance by a knowledgeable person, as the
435 others have not acquired this knowledge that attributes certain ability to a certain area.
436 Society is unequally constructed and exercising authority depends on the position attained
437 by each person in the social hierarchy.

438 Thus, based on the above, the relations of power establish a competitive game in which
439 certain players participate. The relation between students’ families and school are certainly
440 inscribed on the two different types of institutions with asymmetric power as well as on a
441 broader social and cultural, yet competitive and conflicting, framework regarding individual or
442 collective interests. However, establishing competition and imposing knowledge that ignores
443 the knowledge and personal declarations of others often ends up in passivity and dead ends,
444 resulting in difficult and ineffective cooperation. In this vein, the dialogue between parents
445 and teachers is not equally established [44].

446

447 6. FAMILY AND SCHOOL AS SOCIALIZING AGENTS IN A COOPERATION 448 FRAMEWORK

449 Smooth cooperation of the socializing agents, family and school, is a neuralgic objective and
450 it should successfully secure a healthy socializing environment for the child. Educating
451 democratic citizens, namely forming empathized citizens who respect the rights of the
452 individual and minority groups, is a crucial issue assumed by the family, school and broader
453 society to be completed through socializing [58].

454 In particular, the contemporary family does not monopolize children's socializing, since
455 school also plays an important and supplementary role to this end. To better understand
456 children's socializing, some researchers are interested in children's experiences by studying
457 their behaviors, acts or strategies tied to their education and socialization both in family and
458 school as well as their perceptions about educational processes and emotions, along with
459 relations among family members, friends, peers and teachers [59] [60]. According to this
460 standpoint, the child as an acting individual plays a crucial role to its socializing. Moreover,
461 its narrations are emphasized in terms of constructivism [60].

462 Additionally, according to Touraine [8] the "restoration of the acting individual" is
463 emphasized. In other words, The Subject is not constructed through assuming social roles,
464 exercising rights and participating, but rather through its willingness to create forms of social
465 life conducive to asserting its self and identifying the Other as a Subject. Moreover, Touraine
466 advocates that education based on rational knowledge and certain social values is against
467 constructing a free Subject that should be directed to identifying individual and collective
468 requests in the framework of intercultural communication [61].

469 As regards school, emphasizing the Subject and its conceptualizations showcases a
470 different manner of sociological approach of children's school performance, taking into
471 consideration the individual's social status and the concept of social experience [29]. Subject
472 socializing leads to individuals' construction of experiences. In this respect, children of
473 different socio-cultural environments have their own life experiences and, consequently, their
474 own way of identifying and conceptualizing social and school reality. To construct new
475 knowledge, teachers should take into consideration children's different experiences aiming
476 at constructing independent learning [62].

477 Similarly, based on the concept of experience, an attempt is made to understand the manner
478 of children's thinking and acting, while the meaning given by children about their school
479 course, namely their socializing and acquired school knowledge is emphasized. Children's
480 relation to knowledge pertains to their valuing knowledge and school activities. This
481 conceptualization is tied to values, expectations and experience of the Subject, the families'
482 habitus coming from different social environments. Children and their families' various
483 viewpoints contribute to their school experience meaningfulness. The school knowledge
484 provided is appropriated by children only in the case they consider it meaningful. On the
485 contrary, children are not able to respond to this knowledge. In other words, knowledge is
486 appropriated by some children and is consequently tied to differentiated manners of school
487 experience and socialization [63] [64] [56] [65] [66] [53] [54] [67] [68] [55].

488 It is noteworthy that since children's school course depends on the quality relation between
489 school and family, **deep understanding of the relations between parents and teachers was**
490 **emphasized.** Thus, ongoing reference is made to children and parents' rights, to parents'
491 participation in school-related decisions, especially those directly tied to their offspring.

492 Teachers, in particular, interact with children from various socio-cultural settings and
493 nationalities and consequently they ought to broaden, revise and reflect on their practices. **At**
494 **the same time, they take** into consideration students' heterogeneity, especially tied to
495 appropriate pedagogic methods and their relation to parents. In former times, there was no
496 relation between school and family, while the means for group expression were lacking and
497 families were rather critical to school. The limits of relations between families and school are
498 determined **by school and teachers.** Generally, parents are not welcomed in the school and
499 the relation between teachers and parents, as they are currently perceived [69], were absent
500 in big cities, whereas in rural areas the role of the teacher was completely different from that
501 in cities [70].

502 Today, although **the school – family cooperation** is legally imperative, in fact, it does not
503 operate properly. Research data showcase the fragile relations between parents and
504 teachers. In front of a given situation, both teachers and parents **hold a specific view of**
505 **identifying and interpreting a situation and act accordingly.** It should be noted the manner by
506 **which parents perceive school requests, objectives and methods differs depending on the**
507 **social setting.**

508 All in all, they, as acting individuals, develop sensible interpretations and behaviors, which,
509 **not being** understood by the others, tend to become the epicenter of misunderstandings.
510 Both **sides** generalize and, depending on some negative experiences they had, are led to
511 bilateral mistrust and limited contacts [71] [72] [73] [74] [75] [44]. As regards children's
512 school performance and their general integration into school, apart from transformations tied
513 to school inner operation, the cooperation among different socio-cultural environments plays
514 a crucial role. It is a point of encountering common entities, which should be based on a
515 continuous and productive dialogue.

516 **7. CONCLUDING REMARKS**

517 **Taking the above into consideration, it can be said that, despite parents and teachers'**
518 **different expectations for children, they both strive to help them develop the fullest of their**
519 **potential. Families are the first environment of socialization for their offspring, providing a**
520 **framework of unconditional love, care as well as emotional and material support. On the**
521 **other hand, schools are considered to be the place in which children potentially develop an**
522 **array of skills and have the opportunity to broaden their horizons.**

523 **In this respect, effective parent – school collaboration can be feasible when their relationship**
524 **is one of trust, continuous dialogue, ideas sharing and mutual respect. Given the demands**
525 **of contemporary societies, both sides must strive to help children develop in a multi-faceted**
526 **way. This means that apart from cognitive development the parent – school collaboration**
527 **should also be directed to helping children shape their identity in relation to their surrounding**
528 **environment. In this sense, they can develop a strong sense of community which entails**
529 **respect and mutual acceptance towards the others, both in school and society [76]**

530 (Epstein, 2010).

531 Therefore, eliminating school failure can be achieved through transformations concerning
532 school operation on the one hand (manner of school-parent cooperation, learning conditions
533 for children) and alterations in the school-family relationship on the other. In other words,
534 school should be opened to all families, the community and broader society. Except for
535 school operational transformations, cooperation among all parties involved in schooling
536 plays a crucial role. This means that a continuous real dialogue with families from various
537 socio-cultural and ethnic environments should be established.

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

544 REFERENCES

- 545
546 [1] Eleftherakis, Th. (2018). School knowledge and democratic society: from heteronomy to
547 autonomy. In S., Nikolaou, Th. Eleftherakis, E. Kalerante, et al. (Eds), *New challenges to*
548 *education and democracy. Sociological and pedagogical approaches of democratic*
549 *education*. Athens; Gutenberg, 39-81 (written in greek language).
- 550 [2] Karakatsanis, P. (2002). *The Stoic Philosophy on Education*. Athens: Atrapos.
- 551 [3] Dimopoulos, V. (2012). *Philosophy of Education*. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis.
- 552 [4] Guidetti, M., Lallemand, S., Morel, M-F. (2000). *Children of elsewhere, yesterday and*
553 *today*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- 554 [5] Korczak, J. (2006). *How to love a child. The right of the child to respect*. Paris: Laffont R. /
555 collection Réponses.
- 556 [6] Milne, B. (2013). *The History and Theory of Children's Citizenship in contemporary*
557 *Societies*. New York: Springer.
- 558 [7] Ariès, Ph. (1973). *Child and family life in ancient systems*. Paris: Seuil.
- 559 [8] Touraine, A. (1984). *The return of the agenet*. Paris: Fayard.
- 560 [9] Touraine, A. (1992). *Critic of modernity*. Paris: Fayard.
- 561 [10] Touraine, A., Khosrokhavar, F. (2000). *Researching the self*. Paris: Fayard.
- 562 [11] Saint Augustin (1993). *Confessions*. Paris: Folio/Gallimard.

- 563 [12] Plato (n.d.). *Politeia*, (transl. I. N. Gryparis). Athens: Zacharopoulos.
- 564 [13] Taylor, Ch. (2007). *Sources of the Self*. Athens: Indiktos.
- 565 [14] Descartes, R. (1973). *Meditations. Oeuvres publiees par Charles Adam - Paul Tannery*.
566 Paris: Vrin.
- 567 [15] Joas, H. (1980). *Practical Intersubjectivity. The advancement of Works of G.H. Mead*.
568 Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp.
- 569 [16] Hegel, G.W.F. (1952). *Phenomenology of the Intellect*. Hamburg: J. Hoffmeister.
- 570 [17] Nietzsche, Fr. (n.d.). *That said Zarathustra*. Munchen: W. Goldmann Verlag.
- 571 [18] Theodorakopoulos, I.(1974). *Introduction to Philosophy.vol. II*, Athens: self publication.
- 572 [19] Schleiermacher, Fr. (1882²). *Die Christliche Sitte*. Berlin: L. Jonas.
- 573 [20] Gogou, L. & Karakatsanis, P. (2013). Child's position as an acting individual between
574 the institutions of school and family. Conference proceedings with International Participation.
575 Childhood: Sociological, Cultural, Historic and Pedagogical Dimensions. Athens: 11-14 April.
- 576 [21] Habermas, J. (1973). Keywords on the Theory of Socialization. In J. Habermas, *Culture*
577 *and Critic*. Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp.
- 578 [22] De Mause, L. (1985). *History of Childhood*. Athens: Thymari..
- 579 [23] De Singly, F. (2004). *Sociology of contemporary family*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- 580 [24] Xochellis, P. (1980). *Fundamental problems of pedagogy*. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis bros.
- 581 [25] Karafyllis, A. (2002). *Modern Greek Education. Two centuries of reform attempts*.
582 Athens: Kritiki.
- 583 [26] Dalakas, Th. (1983). *Introduction to Sociology. Issues of Sociology on Education*.
584 Ioannina: self publication.
- 585 [27] Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J.-C. (1964). *The heirs: the students of culture*. Paris: Minuit.
- 586 [28] Baudelot, C., Establet, R. (1971). *The capitalist school of France*. Paris: Maspero.
- 587 [29] Dubet, F. (1994). *Sociology of experience. Paris: Seuil*.
- 588 [30] Hicks, M. (2015). *Teachable Moments: Using Everyday Encounters with media and*
589 *Culture to Instill Conscience, Character, and Faith*. New York: Howard Books.

- 590 [31] Dubet, F., Martuccelli, D. (1996). *At school. Sociology of school experience*. Paris: Seuil.
- 591 [32] Karakatsanis, P. (1992). *The Philosophy of Education*. Thessaloniki: Kodikas.
- 592 [33] Theodoropoulou, E. (2004). *The incision of Philosophy to Education. Introduction*.
 593 Educational Texts 14. Athens: Atrapos.
- 594 [34] Macbeth, A. (1984). *The child in school and its family. Relationships in the school and*
 595 *family in the countries of the European Union*. Office of official publications of the European
 596 Union.
- 597 [35] Derouet, J.-L., Henriot, A., Sirota, R. (1990). Ethnographic approaches and sociology of
 598 education: school, school establishment, classroom. In *sociology of education. Ten years of*
 599 *research. A collection of publishers' summaries for the French Review of Pedagogy*.139-
 600 203. Paris: L' Harmattan.
- 601 [36] Terrail, J.-P. (1984). Families of workers, school, social destination (1880-1980). *Review*
 602 *of French Sociology* XXV, 421-436.
- 603 [37] Terrail, J.-P. (1990). *Fortunes of workers. The end of a class?* Paris: P.U.F.
- 604 [38] Vedrine, J. (1971). *Parents and school*. Paris: Casterman.
- 605 [39] Dubet, F. & Lapeyronnie, D. (1992). The segments of exile. Paris: Seuil.
- 606 [40] Van Zanten, A. (2001). *The school of the periphery*. Paris: P.U.F..
- 607 [41] Terrail, J.-P., Poullaouec, T. (2004). Families of workers on becoming their children.
 608 *Economie et statistique*, (371), p. 3-22.
- 609 [42] C.R.E.S.A.S. (1984). *Opening: School, kindergarten, family*. Paris: L' Harmattan.
- 610 [43] Montandon, C., Perrenoud, Ph. (1987). *Between parents and teachers, a dialogue*
 611 *impossible ?* Berne: P. Lang.
- 612 [44] Gogou, L. (1994). *Social interactions. Social representation. What teachers say about*
 613 *parents*. Athens: Poreia.
- 614 [45] Perier, P. (2005). *School and popular families*. Rennes: P.U.R.
- 615 [46] Zoberman, N. (1972). Parents' expectations from nursery schools. *Cahiers de*
 616 *Psychologie*, (15), 239-246.

- 617 [47] Paillard, M., Gilly, M. (1972). Representations of meaning of primary school by the
618 fathers of the families. *Cahiers de Psychologie*, (15), 227-238.
- 619 [48] Siano, V. (1985). *School, the society and the farmers, Doctoral thesis*. Universite de
620 Provence.
- 621 [49] C.R.E.S.A.S. (1978). The handicap socio-culture under question. Paris: E.S.F.
- 622 [50] Rosenthal, A., Jacobson, L. (1971). *Pygmalion at school*. Paris: Casterman.
- 623 [51] Thin, D. (1998). *Popular segments. School and families*. Lyon: P.U.L..
- 624 [52] Bernstein, B. (1975). *Language and Social Class*. Paris: Minuit.
- 625 [53] Charlot, B. (1997). *A relationship of knowledge: Elements for theory*. Paris: Anthropos.
- 626 [54] Charlot, B. (1999). *The relationship of knowledge in the popular environment. A*
627 *research on high school professional of the suburbs*. Paris: Anthropos.
- 628 [55] Charlot, B., Bautier, E., Rochex, J.-Y. (1992). *School and knowledge in the suburbs and*
629 *elsewhere*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- 630 [56] Rochex, J.-Y. (2004). The notion of the relation of knowledge: convergences and
631 theoretical debates. *Pratiques psychologiques*, (10), 93-106.
- 632 [57] Crozier, M., Friedberg, E. (1970). *The actor and the system*. Paris: Seuil.
- 633 [58] Eleftherakis, Th. (2011). Political socialization and education; Pedagogy of democratic
634 citizen in School. In V. Oikonomidis, & Th. Eleftherakis (Eds), *Education, Democracy and*
635 *Human Rights*. Athens; Diadrasi, 48-100 (written in greek language).
- 636 [59] Poittevin, A. (2005). *A sociological view on the relation between children in recomposed*
637 *families. Bergonnier-Dupuy, G., The child as actor and / or subject in the center of the family*.
638 Paris: ERES, 92-102.
- 639 [60] Montandon, C, (1997). *Education from children's point of view*. Paris: Nathan.
- 640 [61] Touraine, A. (1997). *Can we live together?* Paris: Fayard.
- 641 [62] Davis-Kean, P. & Tang, S. (eds.) (2016). *Socializing Children through Language*. 1st
642 edition. Boston: Elsevier.
- 643 [63] Rochex, J.-Y. (1995). *The sense of the school experience*. Paris : P.U.F.

- 644 [64] Rochex, J.-Y. (2000). School experience and process of subjectivation. The high and
645 the middle. Professorial thesis for the University of Paris III.
- 646 [65] Lahire, B. (1993a). Writing culture and school inequalities: sociology of school failure in
647 the primary school. Lyons: PUL.
- 648 [66] Lahire, B. (1995). *Boards of families. The lucky and unlucky school in popular*
649 *environments*. Paris: Gallimard/ Seuil.
- 650 [67] Charlot, B., (2003). The problem of the relationship of knowledge. Maury S., Caillot M.,
651 (Eds.), Relationship of knowledge and didactics. Paris: Faber, 33-50.
- 652 [68] Bautier, E., Rochex, J.-Y. (1998). The school experience of the young high school
653 students. Democratization or massification. Paris: Armand Colin.
- 654 [69] Grant K. B. & Ray, J. A. (2015). *Home, School, and Community Collaboration: Culturally*
655 *Responsive Family Engagement*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- 656 [70] Singly, F. de (2007). *Sociology of the contemporary family*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- 657 [71] Montandon, C., Favre, B., Hutmacher, W., Perrenoud, Ph., Richiardi, J-J. (1985). *The*
658 *development of relations between families and school: appropriateness of parents' reunion:*
659 *point of view and proposals*. Genève: S.R.S.
- 660 [72] Montandon, C., Favre, B. (1988). The relation between families and school in the
661 framework of Genevan teachers Perrenoud, Ph., Montandon C. (eds) *Who controls school?*
662 *Politics of institutions and practices of agents*. Lausanne: Réalités Sociales.
- 663 [73] Montandon, C. (1987). *Between parents and teachers: a dialogue impossible?* Berne: P.
664 Lang.
- 665 [74] C.R.E.S.A.S. (1985). OpeningQ School, kindergarten, family. Paris: L' Harmattan.
- 666 [75] Ballion, R. (1984). The relationships under construction. *The familiar group*. 5, 77-89.
- 667 [76] Epstein, J. (2010). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators*
668 *and Improving Schools*. 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.
- 669
- 670
- 671
- 672