Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies

3(2): 1-13, 2019; Article no.AJESS.46029
ISSN: 2581-6268

Family - School Cooperation about Child – as Acting Social Individual

Gogou Lela[1*], Elefterakis Theodoros[2], Kalerante Evaggelia[3] and Giavrimis Panagiotis[4]

[1]University of Western Attica, Greece.
[2]University of Crete, Greece.
[3]University of Western Macedonia, Greece.
[4]University of Aegean, Greece.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. Author GL designed the study and wrote the protocol. Author ET wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Author KE managed the literature searches. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJESS/2019/46029
Editor(s):
(1) Dr. Osman Cardak, Professor, Necmettin Erbakan Universitesi, A. K. Egitim Fakultesi Matematik ve Fen Bilimleri Egitimi Bolumu- Fen Bilgisi Egitimi ABD, Turkey.
(2) Dr. Ana Sofia Pedrosa Gomes dos Santos, Assistant Professor, Faculdade de Motricidade Humana, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal.
Reviewers:
(1) Zahyah Hanafi, Asia e University, Malaysia.
(2) Zarinah Arshat, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia.
(3) Ignatius Isaac Dambudzo, Zimbabwe Open University, Zimbabwe.
Complete Peer review History: http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/46029

Opinion Article

Received 10 October 2018
Accepted 20 December 2018
Published 12 January 2019

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

**Corresponding author: Email: ekalerante@yahoo.gr;*

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

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

The middle of 20th century signifies a switching perception about child identity and social role. As from the 2nd World War up to these days, child mortality rates fell across western societies due to medicine and hygiene development and passing laws about childhood protection. 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 children's right to health and education along with the right to voice their opinion about their own affairs. On this basis they are conceived as Subjects with special features and autonomy. Despite the changing perception, children's rights are exercised by parents or other legal representatives responsible for child survival and security [4].

It is noteworthy that the Polish pediatrician Janusz Korczak has served as inspiration to the above Convention. 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 its continuous communication with adults [5]. In his work, he puts forward a revised perception about childhood and its understanding as a period of the human being evolution, in the sense that children are emotional, social, cognitive and political beings with skills and abilities to define their social relations.

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 well-understood that the developmental stages are determined depending on the child as Subject and acting individual social and cultural circumstances. Diversity of languages, family patterns, learning pace, different interests, aims and manners of learning reflect a multitude of childhood [6].

It is noteworthy that during the '60s, a new perspective about childhood as social construction tied to the social setting was introduced by the historian Ph. Ariés [7]. Henceforth, childhood is conceived as a social time period with its own cultural features. The child is studied as a Subject, an acting individual

participating in social exchanges and consuming practices.

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

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

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 emphasizes the school – family relation characterized by the aforementioned diversity, while an attempt is made to explore the consequences from these relations, their stability or instability, as well as discovering potential activities conducive to productive teacher - parent cooperation [6]. Students' school success corresponds directly to educational coherence established between school and family. Lacking parent - teacher communication 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 and 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 about constructing social reality through meaningfulness to people's actions and symbols of encoding. Acting individuals' discourse about social reality is particularly interesting for researchers who contend that this perspective is the most important part of social research.

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

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

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

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

of structure and process, it is necessary to identify another, strange Self and Subject.

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

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

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

To conclude, Habermas [21] introduces the basic terminology about human composition 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, he detects this evolutionary composition of the Subject towards the ongoing formed contemporary societies, by thoroughly studying the Subject's competences and limits of the promoted individual activity within a theory about the concept of the "emancipated human".

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

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

As Lloyd De Mause mentions [22] at the beginning of his well-known 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".

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

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

Consequently, approaching the child's emotions is beneficial to the adult in terms of a new attitude tied to the individuality of the latter. Parents understand that they do not exist randomly, but this is all an inner experience urging them to become aware of themselves so that their relation with their Ego becomes more "narcissistic". Furthermore, based on this approach to the child as the "Other", parents are able to become more pervasive to their personal "Ego" as well as to other people's inwardness.

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

4. THE SOCIALIZING OPERATION OF SCHOOL

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

Similar realizations were revealed about the Greek school institution, having undergone deep transformation by establishing the Modern Greek language as the official language to educate children from all social strata, making its opening to society [24,25]. 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 Pareeto [26] and the so-called reproduction scholars [27,28]. In other words, school assumes responsibility to form and develop 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 through profession orientation gets ready to gradually commence its productive integration into society, which it is obliged to staff [29].

Through school opening and its subsequent massiveness to all social strata, the necessity for reformed educational policy is highlighted. It puts forward new educational objectives resulting in students and teachers' changing expectations. This means creating direct bonds among each other 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 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 [30].

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

School experience is defined by F. Dubet as a means by 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 [31,32,33].

5. 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, as well as participation in school life either being present themselves or being represented.

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

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

Starting from the '60s, in particular, educational policies in various countries, namely the countervailing programs in the USA, educational priority areas in England and France, as well as in contemporary Greece, are a proof that this issue is of primary importance in the educational environment. These policies intended to inform and educate parents of non-privileged social

strata about their participation in their children's school activities [35]. According to them, school failure can decline based on the transformation of parent-teacher, parent-child and child-teacher relationship.

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 [36,37]. The family assumed the role to direct children to job opportunities. These families dissociated themselves from school and provided a different socialization than that of 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 [38].

Moreover, job crisis around 1970 resulted in a gradual undermining of the labor class and its enfeeblement to integrate into society through labor [39,40]. Henceforth, the inter-generation transition of social positions is not realized off schools. Research data of this time period document the demand for non-privileged children schooling. 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 [37,41]. 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 certification are not confined to accessing job positions, but rather go 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. In other words, despite organizing meetings 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 [42,43,44,45].

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 [43].

More analytically, researches focusing on understanding the way in which teachers interpret their relation to parents are proof that parents are evidently absent from meetings. 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 [42,44]. 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 basic knowledge dissemination [46,47,44].

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 [44,47]. Research findings pertaining to farmers' families proved that their children's individual value is of deterministic importance [48]. 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, parents 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 [49].

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

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

The practices of these family members are not autonomous, while dominated by the school proper discourse. In other words, they are adapted to school demands, while they perceive the "non-legitimacy" of their practices that is the difference from school socializing. Cultural and educational socializing rationales stemming from these families are often perceived in a negative sense on behalf of the school (time, pace of life, verbal exchanges between children and parents, utilization of free time, etc.), since their socializing rational is not in line with that of the school. Research about teachers and parents' viewpoints shows that popular families do not keep distance from school due to their weak

schooling in terms of knowledge and children's socializing. Researchers are mainly interested in the way by which popular families perceive school actions in relation to school knowledge, the imposing conditions in the framework of their socializing rationale [29,33,53,54,55,56].

Moreover, the relations between teachers and socio-culturally non-privileged parents are fragile, as there is not consistency between school and family values. When a kind of "cooperation" is eventually formed between popular families and school, it is mostly of the latter's adaptation to school models and values [42,44,57]. Researchers consider the quality of relations between teachers and parents of primary importance and are basically interested in understanding the meaning of both relations. An attempt is made to understand both through the teachers and parents' discourse as to what extent parents are involved in their children's school life and the operation of 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 [44,46,57].

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 [58], implies coercion, a special ability to dominate people. It is a form of power imposed on others through addiction and coercion. Authority cannot be considered the characteristic of a group, as it exists within a social relation. It is regarded as an inequality, a different power aiming at domineering a person or group. The authority of the expertise implies a form of dominance by a knowledgeable person, as the others have not acquired this knowledge that attributes certain ability to a certain area. Society is unequally constructed and exercising authority depends on the position attained by each person in the social hierarchy.

Thus, based on 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, yet competitive and conflicting, framework regarding individual or collective interests. However, establishing competition and imposing knowledge that ignores the knowledge and personal declarations of others often ends up in passivity and dead ends, resulting in difficult and ineffective cooperation. In this vein, the dialogue between parents and teachers is not equally established [44].

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

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

In particular, the contemporary family does not monopolize children's socializing, since school also plays an important and supplementary role to this end. To better understand children's socializing, some researchers are interested in children's experiences by studying their behaviors, acts or strategies tied to their education and socialization both in family and school as well as their perceptions about educational processes and emotions, along with relations among family members, friends, peers and teachers [59.60]. According to this standpoint, the child as an acting individual plays a crucial role to its socializing. Moreover, its narrations are emphasized in terms of constructivism [60].

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

requests in the framework of intercultural communication [61].

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

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

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

Teachers, in particular, interact with children from various socio-cultural settings and nationalities and consequently they ought to broaden, revise and reflect on their practices. At the same time, they take into consideration students' heterogeneity, especially tied to appropriate pedagogic methods and their relation to parents.

In former times, there was no relation between school and family, while the means for group expression were lacking and families were rather critical to school. The limits of relations between families and school are determined by school and teachers. Generally, parents are not welcomed in the school and the relation between teachers and parents, as they are currently perceived [69], were absent in big cities, whereas in rural areas the role of the teacher was completely different from that in cities [70].

Today, although the school – family cooperation 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 hold a specific view of identifying and interpreting a situation and act accordingly. It should be noted the manner by which parents perceive school requests, objectives and methods differs depending on the social setting.

All in all, they, as acting individuals, develop sensible interpretations and behaviors, which, not being understood by the others, tend to become the epicenter of misunderstandings. Both sides generalize and, depending on some negative experiences they had, are led to bilateral mistrust and limited contacts [71,72,73,74,75,44]. 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.

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

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

In this respect, effective parent – school collaboration can be feasible when their relationship is one of trust, continuous dialogue, ideas sharing and mutual respect. Given the

demands of contemporary societies, both sides must strive to help children develop in a multi-faceted way. This means that apart from cognitive development the parent – school collaboration should also be directed to helping children shape their identity in relation to their surrounding environment. In this sense, they can develop a strong sense of community which entails respect and mutual acceptance towards the others, both in school and society [76].

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

Finally, it should be noted that education is a fundamental human right and public good and it 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. Consequently, the main focus on the social aspects of acting individuals' education and training could be its contribution to ensure equal opportunities for quality education, which will aim at promoting social cohesion, citizenship, as well as subjects' emancipation.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Eleftherakis Th. School Knowledge and Democratic Society: From Heteronomy to Autonomy. In S. Nikolaou Th. Eleftherakis, E. Kalerante, et al. (Eds), New challenges to education and democracy. Sociological and Pedagogical approaches of Democratic Education. Athens; Gutenberg. 2018;39-81. (written in greek language).
2. Karakatsanis P. The Stoic Philosophy on Education. Athens: Atrapos; 2002.
3. Dimopoulos V. Philosophy of Education. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis; 2012.
4. Guidetti M, Lallemand S, Morel M-F. Children of elsewhere, yesterday and today. Paris: Armand Colin; 2000.
5. Korczak J. How to love a child. The Right of the Child to Respect. Paris: Laffont R./ collection reponses; 2006.
6. Milne B. The history and theory of children's citizenship in contemporary societies. New York: Springer; 2013.
7. Ariès Ph. Child and family life in ancient systems. Paris: Seuil;1973.
8. Touraine A. The return of the agenet. Paris: Fayard; 1984.
9. Touraine A. Critic of modernity. Paris: Fayard; 1992.
10. Touraine A, Khosrokhavar F. Researching the self. Paris: Fayard; 2000.
11. Saint Augustin. Confessions. Paris: Folio/Gallimard; 1993.
12. Plato (n.d.). Politeia, (transl. I. N. Gryparis). Athens: Zacharopoulos.
13. Taylor Ch. Sources of the Self. Athens: Indiktos; 2007.
14. Descartes R. Meditations. Oeuvres publiees par Charles Adam - Paul Tannery. Paris: Vrin; 1973.
15. Joas H. Practical intersubjectivity. The advancement of works of G.H. Mead. Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp; 1980.
16. Hegel GWF. Phenomenology of the Intellect. Hamburg: J. Hoffmeister; 1952.
17. Nietzsche Fr. (n.d.). That said Zaratustra. Munchen: W. Goldmann Verlag.
18. Theodorakopoulos I. Introduction to Philosophy. vol. II, Athens: self publication; 1974.
19. Schleiermacher Fr. Die Christliche Sitte. Berlin: L. Jonas; 1882[2].
20. Gogou L, Karakatsanis P. Child's position as an acting individual between the institutions of school and family. Conference proceedings with International Participation. Childhood: Sociological, Cultural, Historic and Pedagogical dimensions. Athens: 2013;11-14.
21. Habermas J. Keywords on the theory of socialization. In J. Habermas, culture and critic. Frankfurt/M: Suhrcamp; 1973.
22. De Mause L. History of Childhood. Athens: Thymari; 1985.
23. De Singly F. Sociology of contemporary family. Paris: Armand Colin; 2004.
24. Xochellis P. Fundamental problems of pedagogy. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis bros; 1980.

25. Karafyllis A. Modern Greek Education. Two centuries of reform attempts. Athens: Kritiki; 2002.
26. Dalakas Th. Introduction to sociology. issues of sociology on education. Ioannina: Self Publication; 1983.
27. Bourdieu P, Passseron J-C. The heirs: The students of culture. Paris: Minuit; 1964.
28. Baudelot C, Establet R. The capitalist school of France. Paris: Maspero; 1971.
29. Dubet F. Sociology of experience. Paris: Seuil; 1994.
30. Hicks M. Teachable Moments: Using Everyday Encounters with media and Culture to Instill Conscience, Character, and Faith. New York: Howard Books; 2015.
31. Dubet F, Martuccelli D. At school. Sociology of school experience. Paris: Seuil; 1996.
32. Karakatsanis P. The Philosophy of Education. Thessaloniki: Kodikas; 1992.
33. Theodoropoulou E. The incision of Philosophy to Education. Introduction. Educational Texts 14. Athens: Atrapos; 2004.
34. Macbeth A. The child in school and its family. Relationships in the school and family in the countries of the European Union. Office of official publications of the European Union; 1984.
35. Derouet J-L, Henriot A, Sirota R. Ethnographic approaches and sociology of education: School, school establishment, classroom. In Sociology of education. Ten years of research. A collection of publishers' summaries for the French Review of Pedagogy. 1990;139-203. Paris: L' Harmattan.
36. Terrail J-P. Families of workers, school, social destination (1880-1980). Review of French Sociology XXV. 1984;421-436.
37. Terrail J-P. Fortunes of workers. The end of a class? Paris: P.U.F; 1990.
38. Vedrine J. Parents and school. Paris: Casterman; 1971.
39. Dubet F, Lapeyronnie D. The segments of exile. Paris: Seuil; 1992.
40. Van Zanten A. The school of the periphery. Paris: P.U.F; 2001.
41. Terrail J-P. Poullaouec T. Families of workers on becoming their children. Economie et statistique. 2004;371:3-22.
42. C.R.E.S.A.S. Opening: School, Kindergarten, family. Paris: L' Harmattan; 1984.
43. Montandon C. Perrenoud, Ph. Between parents and teachers, a dialogue impossible ? Berne: P. Lang; 1987.
44. Gogou L. Social interactions. Social representation. What teachers say about parents. Athens: Poreia; 1994.
45. Perier P. School and popular families. Rennes: P.U.R. ; 2005.
46. Zoberman N. Parents' expectations from nursery schools. Cahiers de Psychologie. 1972;15:239-246.
47. Paillard M, Gilly M. Representations of meaning of primary school by the fathers of the families. Cahiers de Psychologie. 1972;15: 227-238.
48. Siano V. School, the society and the farmers, Doctoral thesis. Universite de Provence; 1985.
49. C.R.E.S.A.S. The handicap socio-culture under question. Paris: E.S.F.; 1978.
50. Rosenthal A, Jacobson L. Pygmalion at school. Paris: Casterman; 1971.
51. Thin D. Popular segments. School and families. Lyon: P.U.L.; 1998.
52. Bernstein B. Language and social class. Paris: Minuit; 1975.
53. Charlot B. A relationship of knowledge: Elements for theory. París: Anthropos; 1997.
54. Charlot B. The relationship of knowledge in the popular environment. A Research on High School Professional of The Suburbs. Paris: Anthropos; 1999.
55. Charlot B, Bautier E, Rochex J-Y. School and knowledge in the suburbs and elsewhere. Paris: Armand Colin; 1992.
56. Rochex J-Y. The notion of the relation of knowledge: Convergences and theoretical debates. Pratiques Psychologiques. 2004;10:93-106.
57. Crozíer M, Fríedberg E. The actor and the system. Paris: Seuil; 1970.
58. Eleftherakis Th. Political socialization and education; Pedagogy of democratic citizen in School. In V. Oikonomidis, & Th. Eleftherakis (Eds), Education, Democracy and Human Rights. Athens; Diadrasi. 2011;48-100 (written in greek language).
59. Poittevin A. A sociological view on the relation between children in recomposed families. Bergonnier-Dupuy, G., The child as actor and / or subject in the center of the family. Paris: ERES. 2005;92-102.
60. Montandon C. Education from children's point of view. Paris: Nathan; 1997.
61. Touraine A. Can we live together? Paris: Fayard; 1997.

62. Davis-Kean P, Tang S. (eds.). Socializing Children through Language. 1st edition. Boston: Elsevier; 2016.
63. Rochex J-Y. The sense of the school experience. Paris : P.U.F. ; 1995.
64. Rochex J-Y. School experience and process of subjectivation. The high and the middle. Professorial Thesis for the University of Paris III; 2000.
65. Lahire B. Writing culture and school inequalities: Sociology of School Failure in the Primary School. Lyons: PUL; 1993a.
66. Lahire B. Boards of families. The lucky and unlucky school in popular environments. Paris: Gallimard/ Seuil; 1995.
67. Charlot B. The problem of the relationship of knowledge. Maury S. Caillot M. (Eds.), Relationship of knowledge and didactics. Paris: Faber. 2003;33-50.
68. Bautier E, Rochex J-Y. The school experience of the young high school students. Democratization or Massification. París: Armand Colin; 1998.
69. Grant KB, Ray JA. Home, school, and community collaboration. Culturally Responsive Family Engagement. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications; 2015.
70. Singly F de. Sociology of the contemporary family. Paris: Armand Colin; 2007.
71. Montandon C, Favre B, Hutmacher W, Perrenoud Ph, Richiardi J-J. The development of relations between families and school: Appropriateness of parents' reunion: Point of view and proposals. Genève: S.R.S; 1985.
72. Montandon C, Favre B. The relation between families and school in the framework of Genevan teachers Perrenoud, Ph. Montandon C. (eds) Who controls school? Politics of Institutions and Practices of Agents. Lausanne: Réalités Sociales; 1988.
73. Montandon C. Between parents and teachers: A dialogue impossible? Berne: P. Lang; 1987.
74. C.R.E.S.A.S. OpeningQ School, kindergarten, family. Paris: L' Harmattan; 1985.
75. Ballion R. The relationships under construction. The familiar group.1984;5:77-89.
76. Epstein J. School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools. 2nd edition. New York: Routledge; 2010.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/46029