QUA VADIS UPBRINGING?
Quo Vadis audzināšana?

Dace Medne
Jāzeps Vītols Latvian Academy of Music

Abstract. *The necessity to address the topicality of problems of upbringing in a family was determined by active discussions in the public space in Latvia regarding the following issues: problematic (aggressive) behaviour of children (Delfi, 2013), the legitimisation of artificially invented diagnoses (Raipulis, 2008; Medne, 2012), and the imitation of pedagogical activities (upbringing) (Medne, 2012). This discussion is becoming more topical regardless the fact that various types of training are regularly organised for parents.*
The objective of this article discloses an attempt to analyse the social situations of development theoretically as the upbringing context by interpreting the social situation of development as active, equal in rights, humane, systematic, common day-to-day activities both at declarative and implementation levels.
Keywords . *Family, pedagogical "fashion", the Social Situation of Development, Upbringing in the Family.*

Introduction
Ievads

Despite the declared and the most important upbringing values of a person (independence, responsibility and freedom) nowadays, in ordinary daily activities upbringing is frequently characterised by social infantilism (Абраменкова, 2008). When analysing the specific features of the modern social situation, Z. Bauman emphasises that social disorientation is a condition and a result, and by using the idea of autonomy and freedom the main instrument slips away; "nothing can be broken if it is not substituted by something else […] nowadays there is a lack of such patterns, codices and rules that could be followed and that could be chosen as stable land-marks" (Bauman, 2000). In order to implement the idea in practise one should start with the understanding of oneself, reflection and self-criticism (Rubene, 2008) and the social promotion of pedagogical thinking (Böhnisch, Schröer, Thiersch, 2005). Within the context of a family this particular feature of the modern times is substantiated by several social phenomena; on the one hand, there are many discussions in the public space about the behaviour of problematic children (Schneewind, Böhmert, 2008; Medne, 2012), diagnoses are wrongly used in the pedagogical practice (for instance, the diagnosis "hyperactivity") and there exist various artificially established psychological phenomena ("indigo children", "crystal children"), whereas the issue about the family and upbringing and the dominating opinion about upbringing in the society stay in the second place (Medne, 2012; Raipulis, 2008; Bergmann, 2006). Such social phenomenon as pedagogical *"fashion"* are not accidental, they should not be ignored (Bergmann, 2006). In case they are ignored there is a risk that myths of the

modern age might become even deeper as myths arise in a place that lacks knowledge and understanding (Raipulis, 2008), as well as they legally diminish parents' responsibility for upbringing (Medne, 2012). E. Pikler calls them illusions of parents' pride (Pikler, 2007) as they proudly define that their children are more special instead of thinking about their children's behaviour or searching and understanding its causes. Each topical pedagogical *"fashion"* diverts attention from the problem thus making part of the society special and selected, thus splitting the society again. Such interpretation of the society becomes dangerous as it outlines a tendency to emphasise a problem as a phenomenon of an especially selected part of the society instead of focusing on the search for competent pedagogical solutions. In case of such a focus on a problem, the result is finding "the guilty" or "the happy", not looking for a pedagogical solution for practical upbringing. The mass media also maintain and strengthen the popularity of this artificially established phenomenon in the society (Medne, 2012; Кукушин, 2002; Baacke, 1999) as they tend to interpret separate facts that are isolated from the whole and the context, without comments of professionals thus popularising pseudo-opinions about upbringing. However, V. Bergmann strongly defends his position, regardless the specific nature of the social situation, that responsibility for the upbringing of children is the duty of parents (Bergmann, 2006), and years ago M. Mid made an assumption that the society was approaching a situation when "just a small part of families will undertake the functions of parents and upbringing" (Мид, 1988). The analysis of the subject is encumbered with the fact that in each particular cultural environment every person that addresses upbringing issues in a family already has his/her own experience that have formed particular views from which it is quite difficult to free oneself (Mollenhauer, Brumlik, Wudtke, 1978). Upbringing is an equivocal theme because it rather easily intertwines with ideological issues (Walper, 2005). Experience always constructs subjective evaluation: for one person the family is the meaning of social existence, while for another person it can be associated with an ideological fortress created by a patriarchal or matriarchal society thus the opinion about this institution may vary from naïve and sentimental homage till hatred and desire to eliminate it (Mollenhauer, Brumlik, Wudtke, 1978). Hence, it is essential to analyse and interpret the upbringing issues in the family in a scientific manner by offering professional opinions in the public space instead of pseudo-opinions that are rooted in subjective experience.

However, this subject is not merely intriguing: it has more essential and multifaceted reasons that are related to the sustainability and change of humanitarian paradigms and attitudes. T. Kulikova points out that the majority of upbringing problems are related to parents' lack of understanding or even ignorance of pedagogical and psychological dimensions. For instance, lack of knowledge about specific features of various age periods stimulates parents to apply accidental patterns and methods. Lack of knowledge and lack of desire to

establish emotional welfare in the upbringing field promote children's neurosis (Захаров, 2000) and behavioural problems (Medne, 2007; Куликова, 2000).

The opinion that upbringing is a social phenomenon that happens on its own and parents do not have to know anything and do not have to do something special is still present in the society (Куликова, 2000). Accordingly, the family's activities and upbringing in the family is treated as something self-explanatory, they are subjected to constant social changes and they should be analysed as a result of long-term development process of the society. In this respect, it is essential to examine upbringing through the prism of the family as a social individual phenomenon as the family is not isolated from the society's socially ecological context (Baacke, 1999). Moreover, U. Bronfenbrenner points out that the core meaning for a person's development is created by the particular environment that the person perceives, not the fact how this environment actually is seen in the objective reality, accordingly, the subjective experience (evaluation, understanding and feelings) of a person is emphasised (Bronfenbrenner, 1993). Within the framework of this subjective experience parents interpret and exercise upbringing of their children and children develop their experience. The analysed theoretical statements create the affirmation that experience determines upbringing archetypes that frequently serve as unconscious models for parents during the upbringing process of their children.

Theoretical Advancement of the Idea of the Social Situation of Development
Attīstības sociālās situācijas idejas attīstība teorijā

The notion of the social situation of development is not a novelty in psychology and pedagogy. This notion allows us to expand the understanding about upbringing. The context of the social environment, in particular the context of upbringing, is the basic precondition of a person's activities, positions and development in life (Eichhorn, 2003). M. Mid's principal view about the common activities of children and grownups in a group, in the society as a factor that develops the child's personality (Мид, 1988) directly overlaps with the understanding of the notion of the social situation of development. For a child the environment itself changes in every age. An essential factor of the social environment that influences development is emotional experience, respectively, not the social situation as such but the fact how the child experiences, feels and overcomes it will determine what impact this moment will have on the dynamics of development (Выготский, 2001). L. Vygotsky points out that those things that a child has to learn during his/her development exist in the environment all the time since the beginning (Выготский, 2001). Consequently, this idea, when it is integrated in the notion of upbringing, can be interpreted as follows: things that a child learns in a social situation (the social environment) exist in it from the very beginning even if it was not purposefully created by parents or "as if"

purposefully hidden from the child. Development not only simply implements, modifies and combines in-born talents, but provides a new quality for these talents. The environment serves as a source for development; hence, direct cooperation with the social environment is the basis for the development of particular talents, qualities, habits and models of behaviour in a child. In case cooperation with the social environment is disturbed then gifts themselves will never turn into talents and qualities (Выготский, 2001). The social situation of development, as also emphasised by V. Abramenkova, is both the source of development and the driving force of a child's behaviour. Thus, the social environment can both slow down and stimulate development. The social environment (the life position of parents and the society, the philosophical thought (attitude towards oneself, others and the world), understanding, implementation in day-to-day life) in general determines the direction of development, respectively, what and in what way will develop.

However, the attribution of the idea of the directing vector of development to the social environment, its ideal form, indirectly forces the social environment to become aggressive by leaving an unclear social position for the developing person. V. Zinchenko points out that a human being is not just passive, but he/she can become a developing vector of the social environment by creating ideal forms and by attributing different/one's own meaning to the existing reality and things (Зинченко, 2002). Relationships between a human being and the social environment, a human being and any society are active, communicative and dialogical. A dialogue may be friendly, tense, supporting and conflicting. The multiformity of contingent possibilities exists between the social environment and a human being, and it determines the driving forces of development (Зинченко, 2002). V. Zinchenko emphasises that these driving forces of development do not exist either in the social environment or in the human being, but in their interrelation. In his analysis of the development of a human being in the social environment, V. Leferv also expresses a similar idea by using the notion '*vacuum*'. He believes that a person can be present and stay in the social environment although it could be an empty space, he/she can look at it without seeing, move through it as if moving through emptiness, without getting dirty and without leaving footprints, respectively, exist in the social environment similarly to vacuum. The human being is the one who attributes the meaning, fills the social environment (Лефевр, 1996). The human being lives in a specific social environment that consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly influences his/her development. The notion of vacuum leads to the conclusion that the environment is not only reproductive, but also productive, it is an inviting power. Ignorance of the environment in any way brings destruction not only to the person but also to the environment as in such a case the person does not implement his/her mission and does not justify expectations of the environment (Лефевр, 1996). Subsequently, a person has to be an active co-participant of his/her life in order to develop (at any age).

Thus, the social situation of development can be characterised by, firstly, the child's objective status in the system of relations; secondly, the subjective representation of these relations in his/her experience and feelings; and, thirdly, his/her own activities. Consequently, the social environment in the family in its actual representation has a major impact on the implication of development, including the patterns of behaviour that essentially depend on the person's (the child's) activities.

Interaction of the Social Situation of Development in the Society and the Family
Attīstības sociālās situācijas mijsakarība sabiedrībā un ģimenē

The category '*family*' cannot be analysed separately from the understanding of particular persons (members of the family) about this notion (Целуйко, 2007), or it cannot be isolated from the understanding of a particular society about the purpose of development of a personality (Matsumoto, 2000). Each family is unique: its life activities are typical for a particular historical period, the social and cultural environment. The direction of the upbringing process in a family is determined by the attitude of members of the family towards their social situation and accordingly chosen actions (Gergen, 2002). Respectively, the upbringing model is constructed on the basis of true and sustainable convictions, values and attitudes, postulates for members of the family to be together; and this model is implemented in day-to-day situations. So the family and its problems can be interpreted as an institution of pedagogical cooperation that is grounded upon the understanding of the meaning of life of each member of the family; all these aspects form the upbringing philosophy and the pedagogical potential of the family is expressed and implemented according to it.

The meaning of individuality is exercised only in co-existence, and the value of individuality depends on the society's opinions. If the society has a meaningful direction, it supports the upbringing of individualities (Франкл, 2001). Effective basic principles of upbringing can be searched in a particular society as they arouse from it, not that they are invented for it (Durkheim, 2007). D. Baacke believes that without the aspect of tendencies of the society's development the analysis of children's development and upbringing is incorrect (Baacke, 1999). H. Danner also emphasises the interrelation of a human being, upbringing and the society by pointing out that the analyses of individual spirituality, values and objectives identify certain correlation: spirituality, values and objectives in upbringing spring from the culture and the society's spirituality, values and objectives (Danner, 1994). J. Glikman indicates that the purpose, character and content of upbringing always comply with the society's needs (Гликман, 2002). Therefore, in order to understand the direction of upbringing in each period of the society's development one needs to understand the topical tendencies of both the public thought and the dominating philosophical thought about upbringing in

the family. When analysing the process of upbringing in the family, K. Mollenhauer, M. Brumlik and H. Wodtke emphasise that the theory of upbringing in the family substantiates and manages the pedagogical actions only in case these actions lead the person to self-analysis. G. Homentauskas also supports this opinion and admits that the development of a child's personality in the family is a two-way process. By bringing up children parents also develop themselves, while children educate their parents indirectly (until the teenage years) as they choose a particular way in the stream of upbringing, thus educating themselves with the support of parents (Хоментаускас, 2003).

By applying such interpretation of the social situation of development in the society and the family an assumption can be made that upbringing is a lifelong learning competence that is implemented as ordinary mutual learning in the family's common life activities where the main meaning is attributed to persons themselves who use the existing knowledge and create new knowledge.

Context of the Social Situation of Upbringing in the Family
Audzināšanas sociālās situācijas konteksts ģimenē

The unique cooperation in the family V. Slobodchikov and E. Isayev have named "an event that is lived together" (in Russian: событие = co + бытие) (Слободчиков, Исаев, 2000). This phenomenon of 'being together' is an important precondition of human development by which independence and freedom of each person is recognized (Сластенин, 2004). On the basis of the analysed theoretical concepts one can conclude that the social situation of development in the family is the subjectively interpreted and objectively constructed reality. Day-to-day activities in the family are planned, organised and adjusted by taking into account both the objective situation and the subjective interpretation of the objective situation. By viewing the values and attitude towards the world, oneself and others as the basis of modern full-fledged upbringing in the family, the process of upbringing as one of the criteria of the social situation of development should be formed as an organised system of experienced situations. The situation does not consist merely of condition and rules, but it involves specific cooperation with people, things and information; however, the notion '*situation*' regardless its socially-psychological essence, has also pedagogical representation (Голованова, 2004). *The situation of development* requires from parents the application of upbringing methods, as well as caution (Schneewind, Böhmert, 2008) as it involves direct importunity of upbringing (Domke, 1997): for instance, with the help of situations parents can model cases of experience and development that children could use as independent experience; but by using importunity they can also promote opposite effects of development. It is logical that upbringing in the family is the day-to-day implementation of the pedagogical function and it comprises both the subjective and the objective aspects. Accordingly, each family develops its

individual paradigm of upbringing that has empiric basis and that shows the signification of individual experience (Выготский, 2001). Upbringing in the family is a subjective process; however, objective preconditions and objective conditions are required for the implementation of this process in life and activities. The objective aspect is the social situation of development that is formed by the upbringing space and its ecology (Medne, 2010). In the upbringing field, when a grown-up acts purposefully the natural development and activities of a child proceed in time and space; there the child finds personally significant activities in accordance with his/her interests and the child's personal meaning is fortified. As a result, the needs of each member of the family are satisfied, the values are further advanced and attitudes are developed. Externally similar social situations do not mean that the psychological field is always the same. The social situation becomes psychological on the basis of the person's topical needs and/or the experience of a fact, an event or a process. Before a person reacts to any objective situation, he/she filters it through internal subjective conditions (interiorises them) by attributing the situation a personal meaning (Леонтьев, 2003). In practice one can judge about the upbringing field according to its dominating values, the attitude towards oneself, other and the world (the philosophical thought, the overall position, traditions and emotional feelings. Thus the upbringing field in the family is a relatively restricted upbringing environment where the declared and/or hidden philosophy dominates and as a result of cooperation the following aspects are provided: balanced opportunities for the satisfaction of needs, the advancement of values and the dynamics of personal significance of attitude. Hence, both the subjective and the individual aspects overlap in the upbringing field thus forming an entirety. The social situation of development in the family is a multidimensional mutual being together and it manifests in the implementation of the upbringing functions.

Conclusions
Secinājumi

The theoretical analysis of the problem leads to the following conclusions:
- Upbringing is related to the perception and understanding of a particular society about the upbringing process and objectives by implementing the philosophy of upbringing in the family (attitude towards oneself, others and the world), consequently, upbringing as a process has to be analysed in close interrelation of the society and the family;
- Upbringing patterns and methods as the only way to reach the objective of upbringing is a convenient synecdoche at any level of the society. Such interpretation limits the possibilities of solutions for the problem; in case upbringing methods do not turn into the way of thinking about upbringing

(philosophy), their use becomes similar to the imitation of upbringing activities instead of conviction;

- The social situation of development in the family represents the attitude of members of the family towards their social situation and accordingly chosen actions (upbringing methods);
- The social environment determines both the child's development in general and his/her behavioural models; respectively, both the declarative and the hidden thinking of parents (their philosophy of life and upbringing) dominate thus influencing the demonstrated behaviour.

Kopsavilkums
Summary

Nepieciešamība pievērsties audzināšanas problemātikas aktualizēšanai ģimenē, noteica kārtējās aktīvās diskusijas Latvijas publiskajā telpā par: bērnu problemātisku uzvedību (agresīvu) (http://www.delfi.lv/news/national/politics/izm-rosina-agresiviem-berniem-uz-laiku-aizliegt-apmeklet-skolu.d?id=42555694), mākslīgi izveidoto diagnožu leģimitizāciju (Raipulis, 2008; Medne, 2012), pedagoģiskās darbības (audzināšanas) imitāciju (Medne, 2012). Šī diskusija aktualizējas, neskatoties uz faktu, ka tiek regulāri organizētas dažāda formāta apmācības vecākiem.

Daudzus gadus sabiedrībā valdīja viedoklis, arī kā dominējošais ir šobrīd, ka audzināšanas kvalitātes nodrošinājums ir tikai izmantotie audzināšanas paņēmieni. Šī brīža situācija ar bērnu uzvedības problēmām rosina uz jautājumu skatīties plašāk, respektīvi, ka audzināšana ir ne tikai izmantotie audzināšanas paņēmieni, bet sociālā situācija ģimenē un sabiedrībā kopumā, jo „izraujot" bērnu no sociālās vides konteksta, vai pat pretnostatot viņu esošajai videi, tiek iegūta izkropļota bērna attīstības kopaina (Абраменкова, 2008).

Raksta mērķis ir mēģinājums teorētiski analizēt attīstības sociālo situāciju kā audzināšanas kontekstu, interpretējot attīstības sociālo situāciju kā aktīvu, līdztiesīgu, humānu, sistemātisku kopēju ikdienas dzīvesdarbību gan deklaratīvā, gan realizācijas līmenī.

Problēmas teorētiskā analīze, rosināja secināt, ka audzināšanas paņēmieni kā vienīgais audzināšanas mērķa sasniegšanas veids ir ērta sinekdoha jebkurā sabiedrības līmenī. Šāda interpretācija ierobežo problēmas risinājuma iespējas, jo, ja audzināšanas paņēmieni nekļūst par audzināšanas domāšanu (filozofiju), to izmantošana kļūst par audzināšanas darbības imitāciju, nevis pārliecību, kā arī attīstības sociālā situācija ģimenē ir tās locekļu attieksme pret viņu sociālo situāciju un atbilstoši izvēlēta rīcība (audzināšanas paņēmieni).

Literatūra
Bibliography

1. Baacke, D. (1999). Die 6- bis 12 jährigen. Einführung in die Probleme des Kindesalters. Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Verlag. 437.: 247.–287., 385.– 407.
2. Bauman Z. (2000). Liquid Modernity. Cambridge: Polity Press. 228.: 25.-29.

3. Bergmann, W. (2006). Gute Autorität. Grundsätze einer zeitgemässen Erziehung. Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Verlag. 216: 10.–205.

4. Böhnisch, L., Schröer, W., Thiersch, H. (2005). Sozialpädagogisches Denken. Wege zu einer Neubestimmung. Weinheim und München: Juventa Verlag. 317.: 225.–288.

5. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1993). Die Ökologie der menschlichen Entwicklung. Natürliche und geplante Experimente. Frankfurt am Mein: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH. 298.: 19.–59., 199.–268.

6. Danner, H. (1994). Methoden geisteswissenschaftlicher Pädagogik. München, Basel: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag. 352.: 31.–113.

7. Delfi (2012). IZM rosina agresīviem bērniem uz laiku aizliegt apmeklēt skolu. Pieejams *http://www.delfi.lv/news/national/politics/izm-rosina-agresiviem-berniem-uz-laiku-aizliegt-apmeklet-skolu.d?id=42555694* (access 17.02.2013.).

8. Domke, H. (1997). Gar nicht erzogen – und doch ausgezeichnet erzogen. Überlegung zur Gestaltung familialer Bedingungen des Aufwachen.//Macha Hildegard, Mauermann Lutz. Brennpunkte der Familienerziehung. Weinheim: Deutscher Studienverlag. 241.: 74.–97.

9. Drucker, F.P. (1992). The Age of Discontinuity. Guidelines to Our Chenging Society. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers. 402: 214.

10. Durkheim, È. (2007). Erziehung und Soziologie.//Baumgart Franzjörg. Erziehungs-und Bildungstheorien. Bad Heilbrunn: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt. 301.: 21.–23.

11. Eichhorn, C. (2003). Eltern sind nicht immer schuld. Warum manche Kinder schwieriger sind. Stuttgart: Klett-Kotta. 174.: 26.–55.

12. Gergen, J.K. (2002). Konstruierte Wirklichkeiten. Eine Hinführung zum sozialen konstruktionismus. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer GmbH. 308.: 137.–206.

13. Matsumoto, D. (2000). Culture and Psychology. People Around the World. Wadsworth, Thomson Learning Inc. 668.: 222.–237.

14. Medne, D. (2007*). Kā strādāt ar hiperaktīviem bērniem*. Rīga: RaKa.236.

15. Medne, D. (2010). *Audzināšana ģimenē Latvijas transformatīvajā sabiedrībā*. Rīga: LU izdevniecība. Promocijas darba kopsavilkums. 74.

16. Medne, D. (2012). Pedagoģisko vērtību interpretācija žurnālā "Mans mazais".*LU rakstu sērija Pedagoģija un skolotāju izglītība Nr. 781*. 231.: 174. - 185.

17. Mollenhauer, K., Brumlik, M., Wudke, H. (1978). Die Familienerziehung. München: Juventa Verlag. 224.: 11.–144.

18. Pikler, E. (2007). Friedliche Babys – zufriedene Mütter. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: fgb. 222.: 42–131.

19. Raipulis, J. (2008). Dažādu aplamību izplatīšanās iespējamās negatīvās sekas. *Sabiedrība un kultūra. Rakstu krājums X.* Liepāja: LiePA. 547.: 412.–418.

20. Rubene, Z. (2008). *Kritiskā domāšana studiju procesā*. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds.

21. Schneewind, K., Böhmert, B. (2008). Kinder im Grundschulalter kompetent erziehen. Der indirektive Elterncoach „Freiheit in Grenzen". Bern: Verlag Hans Huber. 192.: 9.–77.

22. Walper, S. (2005). Familie Erziehungskompetenzen. Beziehungsklima und Erziehungsleistungen in der Familie als Problem und Aufgabe. Weinheim: Juventa Verlag. 164.: 11.–97., 121.–136.

23. Абраменкова, В. (2008). *Социальная психология детства*. Москва: Per Se.

24. Выготский Л. (2001). *Лекции по педологии*. Ижевск: Издательский дом Удмуртский университет.

25. Голованова, Н. (2004). *Социализация и воспитание ребенка*. Санкт-Петербург: Речь.

26. Гликман, И. (2002). *Теория и методика воспитания*. Москва: ВЛАДОС.

27. Кукушин, Вадим (2002). *Теория и методика воспитательной работы*. Ростов-на-Дону: МарТ.
28. Куликова, Т. (2000). *Семейная педагогика и домашнее воспитание*. Москва: АКАДЕМІА.
29. Захаров, А. (2000). *Как предупредить отклонения в поведении ребенка*. Москва: Эксмо.
30. Зиновьев, А. (2008). *На пути к сверхобществу*. Москва: Астрель.
31. Зинченко В. (2002) *Психологические основы педагогики*. Москва.gardarki
32. Лефевр В. (1996). *Космический субект Москва*. Москва: Издательство: Когито-Центр.
33. Леонтьев, Д. А. (2003). *Психология смысла*. Москва: Смысл.
34. Сластенин, В. (red.) (2004). *Методика воспитательной работы*. Москва: АКАДЕМІА.
35. Слободчиков, В., Исаев Е. (2000). *Психология развития человека*. Москва: ШКОЛЬНАЯ ПРЕССА.
36. Мид, М. (1988). *Культура и мир детства*. Москва: Наука.
37. Целуйко, В. (2007). *Психологические проблемы современнои семьи*. Екатеринобург: У-Фатория.
38. Франкл, В. (2001). *Психотерапия на практике*. Санкт -Петербург: Речь.
39. Хоментаускас, Г. (2003). *Семья глазами ребенка*. Москва: РИПОЛ Классик.

Dace Medne	Jāzepa Vītola Latvijas Mūzikas akadēmija
	Kr. Barona iela 1, Rīga, LV-1050, Latvija
	e-mail: dace.medne@hotmail.com
	Tel.: +371 29255656