

CONFORMITY AND CONTRADICTION CONCERNING MORAL EDUCATION IN FAMILY AND IN SCHOOL

V. IOSIFESCU¹

¹ București University, D.P.I.P.P. Buzău
e-mail: viosifescu@yahoo.com

School and family are the most important environments in terms of awareness training and individual moral behavior. The influences of the two factors should overlap only under the circumstances of respecting the principle of full accordance of approaches. When they are not uniform, the student is facing an ambiguous situation, and his responses are dominated by confusion. This way he will be forced to perform a double role – one in school and the other one at home. This means a dual personality, using the strategy of duplicity (simulation, dissimulation), as an efficient way of adjusting, with serious, long term effects on building the students' character.

Key words: character, attitude, compliance / conflict, duplicity

In a society being for some years in a continuous and serious moral involution, the construction of individual morality becomes crucial for any educational endeavor. Because morality is expressed in all human forms of social, political, economic and professional actions. Actually, the individual has always to choose, no matter what he does, between good and evil, between a moral value and its opponent.

In all educational environments which have moral influences on the individual, family and school emerge their relevance at least concerning the depth of the effects they produce. Because the explicit and implicit objective of school and family concerns building a harmonious personality according to social morality and unitarian moral behavior and conscience, the activities of the two educational factors should intersect only in terms of the principle of unity, of full accordance of actions. We shall further analyze whether school and family always act uniformly in moral education of the child-student., according to their effects.

1. Moral education within family.

In family, moral education is an inductive one, at the level of common sense, most times. Gradually introduced (as participant) in a variety of circumstances with moral significance, the child builds up his own experience step by step, which is sometimes decisive for the moral evolution. Behavior models, the examples given by family will build up morality. The important things here are not the stages of the child's moral development, but family's approach, the values, examples and models that it offers.

The reference points of values of moral education in family, and in school can be found in the board of social values, except that, in our opinion, the family, as the most conservative institution, copies its own values. In other words,

traditional values are largely circulated in family, especially in the conservative families, with a lower level of permeability to social influences, than in other educational environments.

But more important than the significance of moral values (to which children firstly relate to, because of the rules imposed by the family) is the significance of the examples and attitudes of parents, relatives because their power of penetration and of retention in children's behavior is very high. Examples such as selfishness, lying, avarice, attitudes as intolerance, revenge, not getting involved in solving some social problems which do not directly concerns the person shall be retrieved and processed in the child's behavior. We should keep in mind that one of the means of successful moral education is the affective foundation the family is based on. And in many cases this determines the not to follow the path of rationality, but the path of emotions.

Sometimes in the family, in order to ensure the success in school and the socio-professional success, parents have immoral behaviors (giving bribe, having a parallel system of interpersonal relations, breaking the law), with the reason (which for some people is a symbol of love for children) that anything should be done for children and that and that everybody does so.

And this way there appears a certain model of success. Obviously, children at the age when have no sense of good and evil, will take over and internalize the significance of this kind of behavior which are later to become attitudes characteristic for them. And the circle is closed: society shows, through important persons of the public life, this kind of immoral behaviors, which are successful, families take them over for the benefit of their children who, being social actors now, sometimes with a certain position in the social-political hierarchy, will use them to and impose them as attitudes to be followed.

2. Training and moral education in school.

Unlike the family, school stresses on moral education. In this context, in terms of the student's experience, moral education is carried out mainly deductive. In an educational system focused on training and obedience, non-reflexive knowledge and respect of rules become the heart of moral education. Of course, the need for moral instruction can not be, seriously in question. The problem concerns how it should be done and the percentage it should have in the behavior.

Treated fairly and consciously, any piece of knowledge in the field of morality can be functional in intellectual development, but not necessarily in moral development. In other words, moral knowledge acquisition can be considered intellectual curiosities. In order to become functional, they must be able to determine appropriate moral manners. This requires an approach that school, unfortunately, do not properly do: combining knowledge (rationality) with appropriate emotional living. Therefore, school should conduct an experiential moral education, meaning to create sufficient opportunities for the student to link elements with the emotional and volitional knowledge in moral behavior.

Knowledge of the meanings of moral values is an important step, but the practice of virtue is indeed important. Otherwise, students are taught about

selflessness without being selfless, about courage without becoming courageous, about solidity without putting it in practice. Students should be placed in the position to practice morality, because these way relatively stable forms of moral behavior are created. Forcing him to act morally, put him in the position to decide, to test the strength of its convictions. If the decision belongs to him, he will have to be responsible for it. Freely assumed moral duty is not compatible with obligation and do not bear the rigors of coercion. It has its source in an inner impulse, is a result of conviction (2004, p. 96).

In school, the student is an actor who gradually constructs his own experience, by dealing with specific educational situations, mostly informal. They create various methods and strategies to the system of social relations that is included. Are these "creations" are in full agreement with his moral principles and values? The first finding is that at the age of adolescence (if we consider high school students), the process of establishing a system of values is in progress, so no way strongly anchored in the character structure. The second finding, consequently, is that in this situation, students imitate, copy the models (strategies) of social interaction considered successful in the socio-cultural environment they belong to, including at school. Thus, they practice the behaviors that can give the satisfaction of achieving objectives, although they are not in accordance with the values and norms of social morality. They are however in agreement with the circumstances and "force of habit" because (this is the excuse that puts the student in agreement with himself!) "So do all the others ...".

Moral education in school traditionally made is based on values somehow simplified, outlined. The corresponding values schematization conduct a student-type disciplined unruly student, listen to naughty, hardworking - lazy, etc. Proceeding with such typing, most often, the student's personality (much more complex) is ignored. In its educational steps the school should make a much greater emphasis on student individuality. Because it is shown, unadvised, moral education is rather discursive, focused on words, far from the real "dilemmas" faced by the student. Therefore, they do not show receptivity to such a mode of education and, often, are located on different positions from those of the teachers in relation to moral normative way.

3.School and family-conformity or contradiction of educational approaches.

A premise that should induce conformity in moral education approaches made by school and family is a common goal, which we could be identified as the "good" of the student. If the family and school are on the same position as regards the joint effort aimed at students, in terms of their determination (target specific characteristics and modalities), the two institutions may be different. Thus, although family understands the results of the moral education offered by schools, do not always agree on the means used. It accepts in principle the need for a system of norms and rules for the behavior of each student in a school, including the fact that these must be firmly implemented, but disagrees with their imposition of force or, when required, with punishing their own children. Differences of opinions or

moral values between school and family have serious consequences for the child-student. Because it can lead to dual personality of the student, to having double moral roles: some within family and others in school, thereby satisfying different moral requirements.

In school, each student prepares a personal project of development and success. It gives meaning, in fact, to the effort that the student needs to do in school. But the student's project may come in conflict with the logic of organization and normativeness in school. Thus, school may occur as a barrier to student performance (1991). He may readjust the project, can rebalance the personal ambitions with available opportunities. In some situations, however, encouraged and supported by parents, students, using paths and strategies even immoral (in a space that makes this possible), try and often fail to materialize projects (academic success). In this case we may wonder whether the school may object (how much?) the model of moral conduct (inappropriate) strengthened the family. What happens if the values prevailing in the school are not identical to those of the family? Because students' work in school based on its proposed values, their non-acceptance will lead, sooner or later, to violation of moral norms. Sanction will follow, but it is an administrative method, which means that does not solve the real problem: the existence of some opposite or at least different values.

Behaviors and attitudes of family, in terms of interaction and dynamism, family habits, the conception concerning education in general and particularly about moral education, influence the student's moral behavior, and the degree of adaptability to school environment. With this finding, we may wonder whether the school can become a truly democratic space (the existence and ownership of responsibility by students) in conditions in which many families create an educational environment rather libertine, characterized by a kind of exacerbation of development without any constraint.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Dubet, F.R., Cousin, O., Guillemet, J.-Ph., 1991 – *Sociologie de l'experience lyceenne*, Revue Francaise of Education, No. 24.
2. Iosifescu, V., 2004 – *Duplicity and moral education*, Aramis, Bucharest.