

Stanisław Kawula

Discourse on Pedagogy and Family Education

Kultura i Edukacja nr 5, 6-23

2008

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

ARTICLES–STUDIES

Stanisław Kawula

DISCOURSE ON PEDAGOGY AND FAMILY EDUCATION

1. Introduction

At the beginning of the XXI century a young man does have a choice as for the frame of the progress of his adult life. Among all the potential possibilities and valuable for one's life issues, young people the most often choose the marriage-family form which shapes their future. It occurs that the form sets the aim in the lives and defines the place and prestige in modern society. 74,6% of the tested youth associates their future with a family, and accepts a marriage as a basic form of self-fulfilment¹. However, the fourth part of the tested youth considers a partner relationship as the aim of their existence, which shows the far-fetched individualization of Polish youth in the given matter. It seems to mean that nowadays 'in a new social hierarchy even the old forms of marriage and procreation should be chosen and lived at one's own risk' – as it is said by Grażyna Mikołajczyk-Lerman². It occurs, on these grounds, that the young generation becomes responsible for their failure or success of their marriage-family lives shapes, as well as for the partner relationship/cohabitation³.

It is proved by empirically acquired data, from the beginning of the XXI century, that generally the youth has a positive attitude towards marriage institution

¹ T. Biernat, *Społeczno-pedagogiczne uwarunkowania światopoglądu młodzieży w okresie transformacji*, Toruń 2006, p. 270.

² G. Mikołajczyk-Lerman, *Mężowie i żony. Realizacja ról małżeńskich w rodzinach wielkomiej-skich*, Łódź 2006, p. 20

³ A. Kwak, *Rodzina w dobie przemian. Małżeństwo i kohabitacja*, Warsaw 2006.

and family, especially school-attending and studying young people (the age group 18–24), who have mainly noticed positive aspects of family life, not the difficulties associated with it. In the declarations of present generation of young people one can still notice the romantic model of a marriage and family. Young people think that the decision to get married depends mainly on them. The tested young people still believe that getting married and having family, apart from such values as love, success in professional life, is something they are aiming at (the autotelic good). One can say that the most essential motives leading to getting married and having family are: the need to create one's own home and family (having children), the need to show and experience love, life stabilization, and the need to have a partner and a friend. However, one should also pay attention to the fact that the material issues, which may be the reason for reaching the appropriate life standard, and the need to be safe do not play a vital role as for the motives concerning the causes for getting married by the young Polish people are concerned⁴. Taking into consideration all the above mentioned deductions of an optimistic nature we can certainly feel safe as for the future of the marriage-family life in Poland – which may seem to be opposite to the pessimistic demographic and economic forecast⁵.

However, the main subject of the discourse on the contemporary family is thinking whether the everlasting form of social life has become a compulsory phenomenon at present, a phenomenon which results from inalienability of such factors as: culture, society, psychic relations and processes and biological elements of a human being? If one considers the conditionings as being necessary for the family creation then, at the same time, the presence of the phenomenon does not guarantee the durability of the family existence and its functioning in a unique and non-changed shape. A family as a human creation, undoubtedly vital and essential for a human being's life – his or her real dimension – is analyzed and estimated as far as the testing character and ontological truthfulness is concerned. A family in the postmodernists' understanding undergoes meta-narration. Piotr Magier believes that in the mentioned point of view one should not try to explain the family phenomena in the objective categories⁶. The searching trend leads to the conclusions that the family phenomenon as a result of the social and cultural changes is going to undergo changes in the aspect of its function and structure, which con-

⁴ M. Bodnar, *Małżeństwo i rodzina w planach życiowych młodzieży*, the UWM master's thesis, Olsztyn 2004, p. 109.

⁵ M. Sokółski, *Płodność i rodzina w okresie transformacji* [in:] *Współczesne społeczeństwo polskie – dynamika zmian*, J. Wasilewski (Re.), Warsaw 2006, p. 124

⁶ P. Magier, *Rodzina w czasach ponowoczesnych. Próba analizy* [in:] *Współczesna rodzina polska – jej stan i perspektywy*, H. Cudak, H. Marzec (ed.), v. 1, Mysłowice 2005, pp. 33–34.

sequently may lead even to questioning the necessity of its existence. On these grounds the family shapes are going to be formed by subjective relations with culture and are going to depend on the subjective needs, beliefs or the state of the human mind. Franciszek Adamski believes that the need of family existence, the inter-family relations, children-possession, performed functions etc. “become depended on the will of people forming a family”⁷. No other outside subjects are entitled to the integration in family life – among them are ideologies, philosophy or belief trends. Trying to influence their durability and the relation character is equal with the privacy and human freedom infringement. In the opinion of post-modernists giving freedom to a human being, one in deciding of a life character (e.g. habits, morality, or family life forms) is a manifestation of a trust in a human being, his responsibility, understanding, freedom and the natural need for common good⁸. It is definitely a positive aspect of the creation of alternative forms of marriage-family life nowadays; they do give a choice to every individual, a choice of several forms – also in the course of their lives. However, as long as the majority of people is born in a family, they undergo the initial socialization process in different stages of life. On these grounds, it is said that a human being is a family creature (*homo familiens*). In the period of historical development humanity has created different forms of marriage and family life which give us a sense of safety, sometimes less sometimes more, appreciation and belonging (emotional bonds). One may say that there has been no better and profitable form of social and individual life. The lack of family makes us lonely, alienated, and feel social and economical degradation, etc. This is why the value of a family is placed as the first, second or third among all the other existence values⁹. Theologians add that a family is a gift which cannot be replaced, whereas psychologists consider the group as inalienable in the psychophysical and social development of a human being (especially in the early childhood period). However, nowadays one can notice some changes of the family basic function, its structure, shapes and internal relations, which one should think about.

In the present era, also in the period of turbulent changes in the way of human living, varied terms of a global, regional and local character, the family of the beginning of the XXI century undergoes changes, ones which are not often positive

⁷ F. Adamski, *Rodzina. Wymiar społeczno-kulturowy*, Kraków 2002, p. 52.

⁸ Z. Bauman, *Dwa szkice o moralności ponowoczesnej*, Kraków 1994, p. 73

⁹ H. Cudak, *Od rodziny pochodzenia do rodziny prokreacji*, Łowicz 1999; L. Kocik, *Wzory małżeństwa i rodziny: od jednorodności do współczesnych skrajności*, Kraków 2002; K. Slany, *Alternatywne formy życia małżeńsko-rodzinnego w ponowoczesnym świecie*, Kraków 2002.

for its members. One deduces about the crisis and break, about the place where the husband and wife and their children experience life gehenna and private Golgotha. This is why we hear in the daylight – hidden in the past – facts of violence, an abuse of different kind, psychological harassment, and even sexual children abuse, incest acts and infanticide¹⁰. The gift at the beginning of marriage life, full of love, becomes after some time earthly hell. Does it have to be like that? It is for sure only a marginal model of a marriage and family life, however it does develop. At the same time one should notice that the crisis refers to family based on monogamous relations, as well as on partner, group and polygamous ones. Children who do not know their fathers, who live in a child's houses and other care institutions, who live the street prove it. An average Polish man spends only 15 minutes on conversation with his family per day, and only five times a year American grandchildren contact directly with their grandparents¹¹.

A long-term researcher of a Polish family, Professor Zbigniew Tyszka, at the end of the XX century had quite an optimistic opinion on the family condition in the Polish political system transformations. He seemed to think that for a part of a family conditions have deteriorated as far as economic, cultural, psychosocial and procreative factors are concerned; families generate new social pathologies – especially painful as for children because of the defective primary socialization and the later life. The author guesses such a family vision in the contemporary era: "One can say that a family of our times is like a ship in the reach of a storm but in spite of that it manages to float – with a broken mast and water in its deepest depth. And nobody is one hundred percent sure that the ship will reach the port"¹². The success of the next generations and family continuity becomes for an educator an aim, one can even say the port.

2. Socialization and family upbringing

What is so peculiar in a family environment that in spite of the existing conflicts and derivative influences one can find also several positive features?

¹⁰ K. Marzec-Holka, *Dzieciobójstwo. Przestępstwo uprzywilejowane czy zbrodnia?*, Bydgoszcz 2004, p. 46.

¹¹ J.J. Mc Whirter, T. Benedict, A.M. Mc Whirter, E.H. Mc Whirter, *Zagrożona młodzież*, Warsaw 2005, p. 71.

¹² Z. Tyszka, *Kryzys rodziny współczesnej? Zagrożenia, szansa przetrwania* [in:] *Psychospołeczne uwarunkowania zjawisk dewiacyjnych wśród młodzieży w okresie transformacji ustrojowej*, H. Machel, K. Wszeborowski (ed.), Gdańsk 1999, p. 184.

Judith Harris in her known book *Geny czy wychowanie*¹³ reminds a vital element of a family life, one which makes equal the genotype of children and parents and their life environment. The combination of the two elements occurs in the case of a common twin environment up brought in their own family. We can say then that this is the principle of synergy of factors, their co-making in the socialization of children and parents. On these grounds one must agree, at that point, with the theory of convergence.

The conditions of socialization and upbringing in peer group do not undergo the mechanisms. According to J. Harris among peers there exists a widespread mosaic of gene qualities and genotype lottery, as well as the diversity of family life conditions. Francis Fukuyama says that, presently, we only know two ways of separations, in scientific researches, of inborn causes of concrete behaviours from culture conditioned causes. One of them is behavioural genetics, the second one is intercultural anthropology¹⁴, and also non-related people testing (adopted brother and sisters), people who were brought up in the same families. "If the common environment of given family and the model of upbringing have such a large influence, then such people should show a larger feature similarity than the chosen non-related people"¹⁵. However, the author of a book on "the end of a man" has questions, ones which are not explained by the convergence theory. Firstly – each parent who has brought up more than one child knows from the experience that between siblings there are several individual differences as for their behaviours, differences which cannot be explained by either the process of family upbringing or environment influence. A part of the answer one can find in a monograph entitled *Rodzeństwo*¹⁶. Secondly – the people's behaviour is much more differentiated than animals' behaviour because we are far more social, cultural and studying beings, beings that study the behaviour, directly and indirectly, on the basis of the legal rights, social norms, tradition and other influences rooted in the environment and not in the genetics¹⁷. Thirdly – the main problem is defining what the term 'other environment' means. In many environmental cases where the people, who are brought up, live – twins, have several similar qualities owing to the selective choice made by two of them, especially when they are uniovular. The given fact makes it impossible to differ common genetic and environmental factors for the

¹³ J. Harris, *Geny czy wychowanie*, Gdańsk 2000, p. 10.

¹⁴ F. Fukuyama, *Koniec człowieka. Konsekwencja rewolucji biotechnologicznej*, Kraków 2004, pp. 37–38.

¹⁵ Ibidem, p.38

¹⁶ H. Kosten, *Rodzeństwo*, Warszawa 1997.

¹⁷ Ibidem, p. 39

twins. Fourthly – an essential factor of life environment, which may not be noticed by a geneticist, is a mother's womb which has got a strong influence on how, in her genotype, the phenotype develops in a concrete human being. The same foetus in a womb of a different mother may develop in a totally different way if the mother is malnourished, smokes cigarettes, drinks alcohol, takes drugs or suffers from the HIV virus or AIDS disease.

It seems that a familologist should take into account all the highlighted doubts and dilemmas if they want to describe the contemporary family value as a life environment and education environment. Different detailed sciences provide us with more exact arguments concerning the necessity of a family in the contemporary people's lives. However, at the same time everyday life provides us with examples that make us say a few sentences like: "With the family it is better to be with only in a photo", and in an everyday life, a family may become a nightmare or torments for its members. That is why my 'mosaic' or 'hybridism' of the contemporary forms does take into consideration grave and sometimes indefinable issues, which are the expressions of the existing individual or group risk and of the existing crisis (temporary or durable¹⁸).

Empirical analyzes of European families always stress the transformations variant in the dissonance aspect because monogamous families (so-called non-separable) experience, at a great expense, the transformations which lead to the structural and functional crisis. However, they take care of the family strengthening and giving spontaneous or planned help. A German sociologist and social educator, Winfried Noak, characterizes it in four aspects: psychological guidance, family therapy and mediations, social and pedagogical support and joining the family in the social and local society¹⁹. These are the directions of the families' support, families which suffer from a crisis and are at risk, and which function on the level of social and pedagogical efficiency (so-called a family in a norm).

3. In the direction of family pedagogy

Research and informative issues on the contemporary family subject have become an inseparable component of several congresses, symposium and scientific seminars in the international and local scale. It seems to fascinate, repeatedly, by its

¹⁸ S. Kawula, *Mozaikowość rodziny. Szkic do portretu współczesnych form rodzinno-małżeńskich*, Olsztyn 2003, pp. 64–66.

¹⁹ W. Nocka, *Sozialpädagogik. Ein Lehrbuch*, Lambertu, Freiburg im Breslau 2001.

subject immensity of the interdisciplinary character and more and more perfect scientific technique²⁰. However, the matter and family phenomenon is not simple, as well as directive, to interpret in the social practice context. In several areas the theory and practice are divergent. The subject of scientific researches, that is the family, has clear multidisciplinary colouring. The evolutionary changing basic social life unit, and at the same time, a unit which is durable and non-susceptible to rapid changes, is accompanied by scientific reflections of different nature such as: legal, economical, biological, cultural, theological, ethnographic, philosophical, demographic, urban, psychological, social and pedagogical, as well as criminal, deviant and pathological (aberrative). Academic literature, and other ones of the individual and family-logical areas, is, at the beginning of the XXI century, enormous. This is where the new study direction comes from – *the family studies* at the theological departments of universities, which occurs to be a serious misunderstanding. However, at KUL in Lublin the Chair of the Family Pedagogy and the Family Science Institute was founded, which one should notice with great respect.

What should be done for its practical benefit? Firstly, the present family shape and contemporary family situation in the global scale (the world and its regions) – because of the characteristic geographic environment or the social and cultural one, as well as the civilized one, contains several common features which are unified; on the other hand, one can notice many signals suggesting the differentiation of family types, models, and life styles, personality formations in the structural dissimilarity and their functioning. In spite of the peculiarity, one which is economical, historical and cultural, as well as the religious one etc. ‘gamology’ or ‘familistics’ or ‘familology’ were thought several times to be created at some international assemblies, ones which are the multidisciplinary discipline which tests, taking into account many aspects (theory and practice), contemporary families or partner relationships. On these grounds we find the “mosaism” of the subject, a subject which is the main issue of the methodological reflections over the relationships, and family and marriage forms, or their surrogates in the contemporary century. Owing to the facts one finds it necessary to identify among other pedagogical studies the family pedagogy. The basis of its identification is the institution criteria²¹, similarly as we act in the case of school pedagogy, child’s home, or even army or scout pedagogy. One should add also the community aspect when analyz-

²⁰ T. Tyszka, *System metodologiczny poznańskiej szkoły socjologicznych badań nad rodziną*, Poznań 1997, pp. 23–32

²¹ S. Kawula, *Pedagogika a kompleks i system nauk o wychowaniu*, “Ruch Pedagogiczny” 2000, No. 3–4, p. 27.

ing contemporary relationships, and family and marriage forms in different cultural circles²².

However the basic sense of family pedagogy should be found in the analysis of phenomena and processes of variable nature which do happen in a family, ones of which repercussions have or may potentially have the educational aspect (protective, cultural, social, moral, and generally educational). This is why one cannot treat the content and pedagogical reflections on the family, only as the handbook function or the ideological one. However the detailed tips, rules, directives as for the behaviour in the family have and may have also the normative dimension in the family pedagogy. They may express the needed family life standards and behaviour models which may be of praxeological character, or even methodological one²³.

This is the family pedagogy that allows – especially to parents – to understand family incidents or psychosocial mechanisms, and to seek for and be able to influence them according to one's taken model. In the given directive one can find the central thought of social pedagogy, to get to know the given phenomena, and at the same time to change it (the rule: to test and change). The term gamology seems to be rarely used in the empirical researches on the contemporary marriage and family; in Greek: gameo – means 'getting married'; obviously it occurs in several forms, for example: polygamy, bigamy, kidnapping, secretiveness (cryptogamy), polyandry and monogamy. In the mentioned context one can say about gamology. One of its segments is the family and marriage pedagogy and the accompanying reflection²⁴. The family pedagogy differs from e.g. simplified moralistics or ideology (also the religious one) in the fact that, opposite to other levels of individual reflection, or the social one, it expresses the subject of its researches in the ontological, structural, functional aspects, as well as the axiological and normative ones (also taking into account the deviancy and pathology area and the successful biography as well). The results of the scientific findings of family educators – that is establishing the relationship (also the causative type), correctness, and the principles, methods, instructive directives – refer to the acting practice, but also they consider the family as a test, temporary and prospective one. The challenges are becoming a part of the family, and the most important indicator, and the empirical meter of its functioning and specified dangers. These are also beneficial and non-

²² F. Adamski, op.cit., pp. 16–20; A. Kwak, op.cit.

²³ J. Carlton, D. Dinkmeyer, *Szczęśliwe małżeństwo. Szczerłość, otwartość, zaangażowanie*, Gdańsk 2005.

²⁴ A. W. Janke, *Rodzina w badaniach pedagogicznych* [in:] *Encyklopedia pedagogiczna XXI wieku*, T. Pilch (ed.), v. V, Warsaw 2006.

beneficial tendencies of transformations, ones which are noticeable during the human era, transformations that result mainly from the key historical issues²⁵.

When referring to small social groups – besides the descriptive relations – one can differentiate, according to J. Kmity, two kinds of science ‘involvement’ in practical aims achievement (prakseological). The first type can be described as instrumental involvement. It refers to the means indications, means to achieve the aims, and also – in some way – to provide technical and psychological possibilities of their achievement, and is concentrated on technological and psychical efficiency enlargement (the aim – the means). The social and humanistic fields are characterized mainly by axiological involvement which can be expressed by displaying social, and at the same time, personality (individual) aims, aims which deserve to be achieved. Humanistic studies seem to join to wide social practice also by their functions of the world-views character (“world-views valorisation”) and educational character. The appropriate scope of axiological involvement happens to be the motive of the active action of researcher and its proper practical direction. The main condition of the studies or sub-discipline placement is the accomplishment of the cognition tasks, theory creation, one which allows one to describe and explain the phenomena, that is the subject of search of the given discipline²⁶. It contains, in the case of a family or marriage, some axiological references and pedagogical marks and educational effects as for children, it gives them some shape according to so-called theory of generation connections²⁷.

4. From education to the contemporary family pedagogy

The family pedagogy includes in its specificity already mentioned research surfaces and tasks. What about the dynamically changing subject of scientific investigation called the nowadays? What kind of qualities should the contemporary pedagogy, or even family education, have?

The picture of family life, especially in Europe and North America has significantly changed as far as the structure and performed functions are concerned. Quantitative analysis of the appearing various family configurations differ, to a great extent, from the monogamous marriage and the nuclear family that derives

²⁵ K. Jakubiak, *Współdziałanie rodziny i szkoły w pedagogice II Rzeczypospolitej*, Bydgoszcz 1997.

²⁶ J. Piekarski, *Międzypokoleniowa transmisja wartości w środowisku rodzinnym małego miasta*, Łódź 1992, pp. 8–11.

²⁷ M. Plopa, *Psychologia rodziny. Teoria i badanie*, Elbląg 2005.

from it. Other so-called alternative forms of marriage and family life are numerous. Are they dominated by various forms (mosaic ones) or hybrid ones (incoherent)?

According to A. Kwak “irrespective of the relationship form, the family as basic social relationship lasts as long as it responds to the widely accepted human needs²⁸. It takes place both in the inside-generation relationships and the intergeneration ones. This is the reason of the alternative life forms creation in practice. How, in such a situation, can one keep the cognitive distance in relation to the new forms of marriage and family life? What is their constitutive quality, timeless one, and what is – maybe – the temporary phenomenon? Each democratic and open society does not propagate presently in public so-called marriage and family alternative relationships but shows some tolerance toward them.

In this sense, family educator should express all the forms and functioning, mainly because of its modern function for the everyday practice and the education expressed in a prospective way. In this point of view constitutive feature of the pedagogical analysis of a family and various alternative forms is the principle of co-perpetration and co-participation in the creation, beneficial for oneself and other people, personal relations in various relationships. In each educational process, also in the family education, one can find some marks of public pedagogy, individual or group one (trans-subjective). Only in exceptional life situations or the institutional ones, the educational training is result of the scientific one (for example: complimentary schools, monasteries). We say then that pedagogy is one of the studies on a man, one which has its own methodological peculiarities²⁹. Whereas as for education one can talk about it when specific educational actions become a kind of connection of a wisdom thought with a practical one. In most of family environments we encounter only the simple situational education, one which is accompanied by a personal reflection based on one’s own experience (successes or failures) or – rarely – common education, which is a synthesis of thoughts of life co-participants who are close to one another³⁰. Taking into account all the aspects, one can characterize contemporary family education. However in pedagogy one can find the thought and reflection of the third dimension, that is: scientific thinking and discursive one. In the given dimension one can hardly talk about the family pedagogy which should include the above criteria. In spite of that

²⁸ A. Kwak, *Alternatywne formy życia rodzinnego – ciągłość i zamiana* [in:] *Rodzina polska u progu XXI w.*, H. Cudak (ed.), Łowicz 1997, p. 139

²⁹ S. Kawula, *Pedagogika a kompleks i system nauk o wychowaniu...*

³⁰ A. Pałucki, *Personalizm dla pedagogiki zdrowia*, “Szkice Humanistyczne” 2003, v. III, No. 1 and 2, p. 107

the discourse in this area does take place. There various elaborations, detailed and general ones, including several aspects of the contemporary family life but not leading to the knowledge synthesis in the matter. On these grounds my outline happens to be a trial in the description of a family pedagogy integral model, and not only of various educations that one meets in concrete types of families, professional, territorial or religious environments etc.

Zbigniew Kwieciński criticizing the contemporary scientific pedagogy (also the academic one) supports various types of education. "If the main thinking and writing trend concerning education is not called a scientific pedagogy then it may be only the education, which is a unique and durable collection of educational practices, one which may be reconstructed by reflective men of practice, participants of the practices, willing to talk and write about them, defining the algorithms of the stable behaviours and their little innovations, not violating their essence. The source of the continuation of some education dominated pattern cannot be its written or told reconstructions because they are secondary as for the practice"³¹.

The desideratum of the family education construction can be met only by the reflective parents and also the scientists-parents, who are experienced as for the number of family and marriage roles (from the childhood to siblings, from the mother-father roles to being grandparents). On these ground the first textbook on *Family pedagogy* (1997) of the authors: J. Brągiel, S. Kawula and A. Janke, was created. However the criteria cannot be met by 'the theoretical educators' or clergymen (without children).

5. The integral model of the family pedagogy

Let's concentrate on the essential aspects as far as the family functioning, social and educational functions and also other function aspects are concerned. These are mainly family life spheres within the framework of one's own system of inter-human relations. It is a principle and requirement of family examination from both the micro and macro-social position. Various constellations of the spheres let us get to know the real processes and educational family conditions, as well as their subjective and objective shape. The categories can be treated as complex variables in the empirical pedagogical researches on the concrete family or some family types. These are above all:

³¹ Z. Kwieciński, *Między patosem a dekadencją. Studia i szkice socjopedagogiczne*, Wrocław 2007, p. 109.

1. The intention and content of educational interaction. Their range can be very wide, but the most important are: life standards and models as well as the requirements which regulate family members behaviours (everyday ones and in a long perspective) and, above all, the life quality (of children and other family members). In various family and outside family groups and environments the elements may be explained to a different extent, planned and executed (temporarily or for a long time);
2. The social, real role, positions and relations configuration (in the family group relation where one finds 2–3 or even 4 generations);
3. The family structure and the financial, social and cultural conditions where the family members live or meet with – also the support forms;
4. Personal parents features (alternately the grandparents and other family members), influencing the relations with children (for example, willingness to help, responsibility);
5. The power and relation configurations, as well as the attitudes towards one another of the family members according to the exchange and attachment theory;
6. Methods and family life organization, e.g. punishments and prizes, persuasion and coping means;
7. Personal children characteristics constitute an essential element of a family life as a value, family members lives planning, aspects of personality development of child life quality;
8. Process and educational activities helping e.g. the family's identification and identity, values inheritance, equalizing the attitudes towards one another etc.
9. The effects of the family education process, the ones which are the deliberate influence results and those which are created spontaneously and impulsively (for example, a positive self-evaluation – the aspiration level, life plans). Nowadays one can hear more often about the common good and self-fulfillment in the family life, states which are beneficial for the family members.

When characterizing the most vital spheres and pedagogical research categories concerning the family education, one should, at the end of the elaborations, show the main sense of the family pedagogy. Its subjects are – in the wide aspect – various kinds of connections between the already separated variable. The main aim of the sub-discipline is getting to know the mutual relations – because of its practical and interfering functions associated with the optimal forms creation of family factors towards all family members. Family educators are mainly interested

(absorbed) in some kinds of educational and socializing mechanisms, ones which the initiative and effect creating ring are conscious, intentional and creative human activities in the life environment. It is at the same time the characteristic quality of the pedagogical researches on the contemporary family. The family pedagogy can and should evaluate the effects of its diagnostic researches and, at least, suggest the educational intentions toward the analyzed family cases or its types. However, it does not mean the ignorance of other areas and social mechanisms important for family life (among them the impulsive processes, risk factors and family risk). What it really means is the integral, system analysis and the holistic summary of the effects, and the activities and pedagogical, psychological or therapeutic interference form planning³².

As for the families at risk, or the ones which are inefficient or at danger, as far as the basic functions' (caring, rehabilitational and educational, cultural, material, mental, protecting) fulfilment is concerned, one finds that it is really vital to support it or replace by some pro-family institutions. Institutions which support the family functioning, completing its basic tasks (especially the protective and educational ones towards children) and also various forms of the family replacement ("when the natural family lets down"), should constitute a complementarily completing system of social support. I call the state "the kindness spiral"³³. The full substantial shape of it one finds in a group elaboration on contemporary problems that a Polish family encounters at the beginning of XXI century³⁴. Similar characteristics were performed earlier by the group of a priest and professor of KUL in Lublin, Józef Wilk, in a group work entitled *W służbie dziecka*, v. III, Lublin 2003. Other elaborations concerning the role of other institutions which support the contemporary Polish family one can find in a biography. There is a great number of social diagnoses on the contemporary family functioning or disfunctioning. Some of our families let us down, become inefficient and require the outside support or even replacement in the name of children's good.

Non-governmental family support forms in Poland and social companies of various scope (e.g. Red Cross, Caritas Poland) play nowadays really vital roles. The social companies activities in relation to the family and so-called non-governmental forms is generally based on:

³² D.R. Crane, *Podstawy terapii rodziny*, Gdańsk 2004, pp. 85–99.

³³ S. Kawula, *Człowiek w relacjach socjopedagogicznych. Szkice o współczesnym wychowaniu*, Toruń 2004, pp. 61–62.

³⁴ *Współczesna rodzina polska – jej stan i perspektywy*, H. Cudak, H. Marzec (ed.), v 1–2, Myślówice 2005.

- initializing and organizing various forms of protective activities associated with the teenager and child's health protection and meeting the basic biological needs (crisis interference centres);
- helping family as for material, pedagogical and psychological aspects (family support centres);
- social service support, ones which give help to a family in its functioning (social help centres);
- local society activating as far as the protective and educational tasks by social companies are concerned (generally non-governmental and voluntary).

A properly functioning family and the childhood of children being brought up in it should be a very vital area of research for the social pedagogy. A family should be a source of child's development and happy childhood³⁵. The effect of the developmental chances negligence in childhood one can notice in adult life. A family can be compared to some lens with a concentration of macro and micro-social problems – “the good ones and the bad ones”. A lot of educators treat the family education as a reflection and research subject. Andrzej Janke (2006) highlights the need of our thinking moving in the direction of a man and family³⁶. Such an attitude proves the homocentric and family-like, as well as research attitude, characteristic also for social pedagogy and, especially, the family pedagogy; it is not left in the area of everyday pedagogy, one which is understood in a popular way (individual or trans-subjective).

Anna Brzezińska, analyzing the previous socializing and educational strategies in a family, or in other words, the naturalistic attitude (punishment-prize system), proves the relevance of so-called way in the family relations (parents-children). It is a good leadership formula. One can notice it in variable life situations in a family, and it can become a conscious intention of family education. The author tries to prove the relations in such a way:

“Parents influence their children by their behaviour towards each other, by the family day's schedule. On these ground children know that they should say ‘good morning’, that they should not hit in the head, and that they must conform to some norms. If there are no rules at home then the home becomes a home at risk. And I do not call it pathology but I mention a situation where people do not stick to the schedule: eat whenever they wish, go for holidays at different year seasons. The child does not have to be the first day at school and the last one. Parents think in

³⁵ J. Carlton, D. Dinkmeyer, *op.cit.*, pp 83–84

³⁶ A. W. Janke, *op.cit.*

their categories, not the social ones. In the home without rules a child must guess the parent's mood when he or she comes back home from work; moreover, the child must adapt to it. In the parent's opinion the child may seem to be naughty because he or she does not guess the parent's mood properly". If parents keep the principle of a good leadership towards a child then they say: "I know my child's identity and I respect it. I try to protect the social principles but I do not want to break them. I do not tell them what to do and I do not want them to guess what I am thinking about. The educational dilemma is based on the rule: do not destroy the individuality and be only a good man"³⁷. One may make a mistake but they must talk about it. Generally children want to know (presently) a lot about the reasons of our behaviour or the aim of our requests.

However, Zbigniew Kwieciński quotes an opinion which seems to be of a common sense and accurate, an opinion of A. Silbermann on an education role in a contemporary family. "The family education – as he says – is not based on the reflective and systematic answering to a question how *to bring up my child*, but on everyday care in the contemporary contexts by impulse controlled mother or father [...]. The natural impulses come down to two rules of acting: (1) parental behaviour – conditioned by what actually dominates in the society – they place themselves between stiffness (severity) as for the accepted norms and tolerance when breaking them, and (2) they do orientate as for the ability shaping, one that enables us to choose between the competition (one's own benefit) and cooperation with others"³⁸

The two indicated surfaces, (psychological and sociological) educational and socializing, of family functioning complete each other and are positive contexts and references to other areas of contemporary education – especially children and teenagers.

6. The conclusion

In the marriage and family dictionary one can find the term "the family pedagogy" but there is no the pedagogy of a family term. The term "family pedagogy" is described: "as a family education, is a close look at the education in a family with

³⁷ A. Brzezińska, *Podpory najwyższej jakości. Wywiad*, "Pomocnik Psychologiczny" 2007, No. 21, p. 37.

³⁸ Z. Kwieciński, *op.cit.*, p. 108.

a use of accurate methods in pedagogy”³⁹. It seems that an obvious logical tautology endeavour is enough in the matter. Even when referring to the family monogamy it occurs to be too much general expression, mainly formal and not substantial. Should it be enough for the educational regulations of the family function? What is the expression of: “accurate methods?” In the case of most families one can notice rather impulsive socializing and educational processes and not taking use of the pedagogical knowledge. The challenge and task of contemporary times seem to be more and more completed parents’ “pedagogization”, mainly of the young ones or even fiancées, and the creation of “parental schools” (candidates: children, youths). The main point is to shape, within pedagogical culture, various subjects (components) in such a shape that they could accomplish the idea of educating society in the real conditions. It occurs to be possible if we try to achieve, in practice, triple subject model - the model of the family pedagogy, one that accepts parents, school and students’ rights and responsibilities as the education effects. It is possible when accepting the principles of synergy and syntony in the educational influence on the main objects of the educational process, which always includes the psychosocial and cultural contexts⁴⁰. We call the situation a pedagogical principle of complementarity (dividing and merging) of aims, means and forms of human personality shaping in various spheres of their lives. In one word, the family pedagogy has got a main feature, one which is called bio-social and cultural adequacy of basic subjects (the ontological aspect), and the adequacy within the pedagogical influence forms (praxeological aspect). On these grounds one finds its describing and explaining, and at the same time, moderate character and contemporary challenges, referring to the variability of forms (alternativity) of the contemporary marriage and family life in the contemporary world, but at the same time promoting monogamous family model in Poland. This is why one encounters a need of school education in the matter – saying more precisely its reactivation in the form of a popular formula “preparation to family life” or creating new forms of education parallel in Polish society (among others, in public television, publishing houses, all-Polish radio, parishes and registry offices). After that the family pedagogy assumptions are going to take a real shape, and stop being a collection of wishful postulates.

³⁹ *Słownik małżeństwa i rodziny*, bp E. Gozdowski (ed.), Warsaw-Łomianki 1999, p. 238.

⁴⁰ A.W. Janke, *op.cit.*, pp.356–363

THE LITERATURE:

- Adamski F., *Rodzina. Wymiar społeczno-kulturowy*, Kraków 2002.
- Bauman Z., *Dwa szkice o moralności ponowoczesnej*, Kraków 1994
- Biernat T., *Społeczno-pedagogiczne uwarunkowania światopoglądu młodzieży w okresie transformacji*, Toruń 2006.
- Bodnar M., *Małżeństwo i rodzina w planach życiowych młodzieży*, the UWM master's thesis, Olsztyn 2004.
- Brzezińska A., *Podpory najwyższej jakości. Wywiad*, "Pomocnik Psychologiczny" 2007, No. 21.
- Carlton J., Dinkmeyer D., *Szczęśliwe małżeństwo. Szczerość, otwartość, zaangażowanie*, Gdańsk 2005.
- Crane D.R., *Podstawy terapii rodziny*, Gdańsk 2004.
- Cudak H., *Od rodziny pochodzenia do rodziny prokreacji*, Łowicz 1999.
- Fukuyama F., *Koniec człowieka. Konsekwencja rewolucji biotechnologicznej*, Kraków 2004.
- Family, Day, Care, International Perspectives on Policy, Practice and Quality*, A. Mooney, J. Statharn (ed.), London-Philadelphia 2003.
- Harris J., *Geny czy wychowanie*, Gdańsk 2000.
- Jabłoński D., Ustasz L., *Zarys wiedzy o rodzinie, małżeństwie, kohabitacji i konkubinacie. Perspektywa antropologii kulturowej i ogólnej*, Olsztyn 2001.
- Janke A.W., *Rodzina w badaniach pedagogicznych* [in:] *Encyklopedia pedagogiczna XXI wieku*, T. Pilch (ed.), v. V, Warsaw 2006.
- Jakubiak K., *Współdziałanie rodziny i szkoły w pedagogice II Rzeczypospolitej*, Bydgoszcz 1997.
- Kawula S., *Kształty rodziny współczesnej. Szkice familologiczne*, Toruń 2006.
- Kawula S., *Mozaikowość rodziny. Szkic do portretu współczesnych form rodzinno-małżeńskich*, Olsztyn 2003.
- Kawula S., Brągiel J., Janke A. W., *Pedagogika rodziny. Obszary i panorama problematyki*, Toruń 2007.
- Kawula S., *Pedagogika a kompleks i system nauk o wychowaniu*, "Ruch Pedagogiczny" 2000, No. 3-4.
- Kawula S., *Człowiek w relacjach socjopedagogicznych. Szkice o współczesnym wychowaniu*, Toruń 2004.
- Kocik L., *Wzory małżeństwa i rodziny: od jednorodności do współczesnych skrajności*, Kraków 2002.
- Kosten H., *Rodzeństwo*, Warsaw 1997.
- Kwak A., *Alternatywne formy życia rodzinnego – ciągłość i zmiana* [in:] *Rodzina polska u progu XXI w.*, H. Cudak (red.), Łowicz 1997.

- Kwak A., *Rodzina w dobie przemian. Małżeństwo i kohabitacja*, Warsaw 2006.
- Kwieciński Z., *Miedzy patosem a dekadencją. Studia i szkice socjopedagogiczne*, Wrocław 2007.
- Magier P., *Rodzina w czasach ponowoczesnych. Próba analizy* [in:] *Współczesna rodzina polska – jej stan i perspektywy*, H. Cudak, H. Marzec (ed.), v.1, Mysłowice 2005.
- Marzec-Holka K., *Dzieciobójstwo. Przepiętstwo uprzywilejowane czy zbrodnia?*, Bydgoszcz 2004.
- Mc Whirter J.J., Benedict T., Mc Whirter A.M., Mc Whirter E.H., *Zagrożona młodzież*, Warsaw 2005.
- Mikołajczyk-Lerman G., *Mężowie i żony. Realizacja ról małżeńskich w rodzinach wielkomiejskich*, Łódź 2006.
- Nocka W., *Sozialpädagogik. Ein Lehrbuch*, Lambertu, Freiburg im Breslau 2001.
- Okólski M., *Płodność i rodzina w okresie transformacji* [in:] *Współczesne społeczeństwo polskie – dynamika zmian*, J. Wasilewski (red.), Warsaw 2006.
- Pawłucki A., *Personalizm dla pedagogiki zdrowia*, "Szkice Humanistyczne" 2003, v. III, No. 1 and 2.
- Piekarski J., *Miedzypokoleniowa transmisja wartości w środowisku rodzinnym małego miasta*, Łódź 1992.
- Pedagogika rodziny na progu XXI wieku*, A.W. Janke (Re.), Toruń 2004.
- Plopa M., *Psychologia rodziny. Teoria i badanie*, Elbląg 2005.
- Slany K., *Alternatywne formy życia małżeńsko-rodzinnego w ponowoczesnym świecie*, Kraków 2002.
- Słownik małżeństwa i rodziny*, bp E. Gozdowski (ed.), Warsaw–Łomianki 1999.
- Tyszka T., *System metodologiczny poznańskiej szkoły socjologicznych badań nad rodziną*, Poznań 1997.
- Tyszka Z., *Kryzys rodziny współczesnej? Zagrożenie, szansa przetrwania* [in:] *Psychospołeczne uwarunkowania zjawisk dewiacyjnych wśród młodzieży w okresie transformacji ustrojowej*, H. Machel, K. Wszeborowski (ed.), Gdańsk 1999.
- White J. M. Klein D.M., *Family Theories. An Introduction*, London–New Delhi 1996.
- Współczesna rodzina polska – jej stan i perspektywy*, H. Cudak, H. Marzec (ed.), v. 1–2, Mysłowice 2005.