

# The Father who is the School

---

JAAN VALSINER<sup>1</sup>, Professor of Cultural Psychology, Aalborg University

Education is a strange enterprise. It involves people who are dedicated to improve the humanity of the next generation by providing them knowledge, and social institutions which are set up to guarantee that the next generation is oriented towards the societal norms of the previous generations. In other terms—there will be no formal classes given in educational systems in any country, from kindergarten to university, on how to make revolutions in society. At the same time there is a consistent focus—at least in words—on how to make children at all ages creative, innovative, and members of the constantly changing society. Education builds on the positive ethos of engineering—the human beings who are being educated are *made to be different* from who they were before. They are cultivated. The school is a garden where cultivated crops are carefully nourished and the undesirable growth equally carefully weeded out. Yet in great difference from the agricultural image—the “harvested crops” (students finishing with educational certificates) are not up for consumption, but are expected to start cultivating further knowledge in different ways. Educating future knowledge makers is the goal—teachers need to prepare the learners to go beyond them as a result of their teaching what is known to them. To teach WHAT-IS is in the process of educating new generations is oriented towards WHAT-MIGHT-BECOME in the future. Yet the educators do not—and cannot in principle-- know what it is.

There is reciprocity on the other side. Human beings all over the World—old and young—*strive towards* becoming educated (Chaudhary, 2019). Education is a kind of symbolic savior—it would make the educated move forward from their previous social and economic status to better lives. Illiterate farmers in a country—in any continent—would use their hard earned resources to promote the education of their children to the top university levels in foreign countries of high prestige. In places of no school buses or roads children run for long time to reach their schools. The motivation for getting education is high. The belief in the future—WHO MIGHT I BECOME—is crucial for the learners. And—like educators—they also do not - and cannot- know. They can imagine, create their goals, and work diligently towards achieving those. Will they succeed? There are no guarantees.

Education is oriented to establishing the reserve potential for future development by the educators and the learners both of whom are future-oriented. It is precisely at the intersection of such high motivation of the to-be-educated and the equally high motivation of dedicated educators where the question—what is a “school”?—can be asked in theoretical terms. And there is a third—somewhat ephemeral but equally important—agent in this story. We call it *community* but rarely specify what it is. The coordination of the three—school, family, and community-- is the focus of the present Special Issue. It calls for new kind of pedagogy—that of moving activities in school close to the needs of the society beyond the school and building upon students capacities to transcend the normativity of traditional schools in uniting their efforts within

---

<sup>1</sup> The author can be reached at [jvalsiner@gmail.com](mailto:jvalsiner@gmail.com)

community-relevant practices (Rajala, 2019). This forces the family—starting from parents—to re-think their roles and identities (Nakagawa, 2019).

This Special Issue is remarkable in many ways. It is focused on the relationships between three major institutional agents in the making of the educational garden—the school, the family, and the community. A number of crucial issues are addressed. First, it brings to the field of home-school-community relationships a systematic theoretical scheme (Boulanger, 2019c). Secondly it gives us a comparative-cultural (India, Canada) glimpse into the histories of education as it has been used as tool to conquer the minds of new—by force annexed—members of the society (Chaudhary et al, 2019, Moreau, 2019). Thirdly, it brings into the school-home-community relationships discourse the basic principles of dialogical science (Fecho and Lysaker, 2019, Molina, 2019). These relationships are not merely general themes of discourse but can take very concrete forms—when parents join their children in jointly building models of boats (Cattaruzza, Iannaccone and Archidiacono, 2019), or when children are involved in re-designing travel routes (Rajala, 2019). Fourthly the general model of Urie Bronfenbrenner that since 1970s has been used as a basis for looking at school in society is given careful analytic attention (Boulanger, 2019a, 2019b, Molina, 2019). Finally we get a glimpse of innovative pedagogical practices that are oriented towards the parents—who may be brought to the school territory to join their children in joint construction efforts (Cattaruzza, Iannaccone and Arcidiacono (2019).

In the triadic negotiation process between school-family-community goal system that different participants reflect upon one another. Such reflections are necessarily dialogical—as none of the participants can escape from the triangular relationship even if they so wish. There are of course efforts of “home schooling”—which still are interdependent with school curriculae. If a community were to take fully over the formal school so that it be not distinguishable in any form the education system would return to its primitive form where the possibilities to transcend the community needs would not exist. That would mean eliminating the dreams of WHO-I-MIGHT-BECOME because it would be clear that all educated people would become precisely similar members of the community as their parents were. That would hinder any development of the community itself. Finally—if the community were to be excluded—that would be the extreme version of “imposed consensus” between school and family (additive cultural continuity in Figure 2 in Boulanger, 2019c)—the family would lose their children to the totalitarian system of the school.

Interestingly, fears of the “loss of the children” to the school surface in the descriptions of families relations with schools—especially in the case of immigrant families. It is worthwhile to think carefully of the example from the Parent Academy (Matthiessen, 2019)—

*“Cemil: I do my best, but unfortunately, and it is not only mine, but I cannot say to my daughter, “Hey, there is this party but you cannot go,” or “Hey, take care of yourself, you aren’t allowed to drink alcohol.” [...] In my opinion she shouldn’t be allowed out until she was 25 years old, but unfortunately it doesn’t work that way. If my father had said to me, “Hey, don’t drink alcohol” or “Don’t date that girl”, I would have accepted it. But if I say that, then immediately a clever man*

*will say, "Hey you are in Denmark and you are pressuring your kids." They are my kids. But they can take away the child. I don't think it makes sense.*  
*Interviewer: Have you been worried that they will take away your children?*  
*Cemil: Yes, 100%, 100%. But I do it for my kids. I want them to behave" (added emphasis).*

The social representation of *pressure* seems to emerge from all sides. The imaginary representative of the immigrant's new home society is perceived to admonish the parent for putting pressure on the adolescent child. By doing that this hypothetical agent is putting pressure on the parent. The parent wants to put pressure on the child for the child's future ("I want them to behave"). So—a democratic society entails the ideology of *helping* the immigrants but puts them in a position of reception of the help in which the reflection about one's parental identity and that of the future for the child becomes presentable as a pressure. Lives of immigrants in communities give many examples of dramatic events on the borders of customs and laws of different societies (Wikan, 2002). The dialogue here is not back-and-forth communication of different understandings but between various *directions of conduct* that necessarily enter into tension with one another. Social power relations determine the final outcome of the coordination of these directions, and in the end the differences between democratic and non-democratic societies may become negligible.

The theme of *pressure* that emerges as an interesting feature in the triologue between school, family and community is not the only means of dialogue between the participants. This may be countered by fostering the *co-educator roles* in the Atelier (Cattaruzza, Iannaccone and Arcidiacono, 2019)<sup>2</sup>. The ordinary states of the dialogue seem to be those of basic distrust that can—under some conditions—be overcome. Therefore the whole range of dialogical phenomena in this triadic relationships needs to be investigated. Beyond *pressure* and *co-option* there would be other forms, for example *normative symbolic myopia*. The latter can be found in the social perception of educators' role as being always interested in the best developmental outcomes for the learners. The possibility that an educator might selectively give advantage to some of the learners (e.g., preference of the rich over the poor, or vice versa) is not to be considered. The educator is not to have ulterior motives to keep some learners away from opportunities to develop.

In the context of the ambivalence of control over the directions the learners should take it is the boundary-negotiating frameworks such as Parent Academy (Matthiessen, 2009) that may become a framework for pedagogy for the community and school. The latter need to learn from the families. What they can learn is first of all the complex picture of the realities of children's development in the family context. The evidence in the paper by Zazzera et al (2019) of the parent's thinking aloud about "Francesco" is indicative of such complexity:

*"it has been very hard, not because of somebody's responsibility, but because it is hard to put Francesco on the right way, it has been a mess, how can I say... it has been not natural. I mean he (Francesco) is very free, so to force him it was against his nature, although at the end it*

---

<sup>2</sup> The joint activities in the Atelier led to "the positive attitude of parents who *did not perceive the presence of the teacher as a judging observer*, but as a resource person to deal with the complex issue of the formal children's education" (added emphasis).

*was effective. Me too, I am aware, the teachers also perceived a change, a progress. Francesco changed, he is growing up. I was a bit disappointed, but we needed to accept it. It has been very demanding for him. It has been almost a physical effort for him. Afterwards, I knew his excellent results, even the teachers said it. It has been a very hard year for him, but the results are good, not only related to the acquisition of school subject matters, but in a broader sense. Francesco was asked to be part of a group he did not know before, because he did not attend the pre-school; so his integration was good, he started to consider the classmates as his friends. He built friendships since he felt the need to be part of a group. My concern was not on his capacity to learn, no doubts about it, but more on the socialization skills: new teachers, a new context, so finally I have to recognize that we are very very satisfied, everybody, us (the parents), the teachers and himself” (added emphases).*

The theme of *pressures* emerges here again—albeit in a way that demonstrates the dialogicality in a wider sense. Each pressure leads to a *counter-pressure* that can neutralize, or escalate, the former. The reality of family life is non-additive (see Boulanger, 2019c) and that makes it the buffer in relation to all kinds of programs of educational nature that the school and the community invent.

## **THE SCHOOL IS THE FATHER**

While reading through the contributions to the present Special Issue I had a vague feeling of continuity—that of the discontinuity<>continuity issue being a general label that is easy to use, but it camouflages the complexity of processes involved. Boulanger’s (2019c) theoretical efforts point in this direction. Continuity (and discontinuity) are descriptive terms of no explanatory value, but they are eminently usable in social discourses in a society to position the families and the communities in relation with the designated social power holder—which is the social-political institution that sets up the school as the arena for education beyond the knowledge already present in the local community. Nowhere is it more visible than in the missionary education in non-European contexts. Moreau’s (2019) description of the history of education in Quebec is a good example, corroborated by purposeful separation of Amerindian children from their communities into the boarding schools in the 1890s and in the introduction of formal schooling in Africa by the colonial powers.

So –school emerges in the triad family-school-community as its key part—connecting the triad with the social world beyond. For coordination of the triangle the leadership role of school is that of a father—a benevolent, affording various experiments in democratization of education for the benefit of family and community, yet firmly in control when the interests of the socio-political power structure becomes endangered. Both communities and families are relevant for the functioning of the school—yet the school leads the triangle of collaboration.

## References

- Boulanger, D. (2019a). Bronfenbrenner's model as a basis for compensatory intervention in school-family relationship: Exploring metatheoretical foundations. *Psychology & Society*, 11 (1).
- Boulanger, D. (2019b) Representation of parental engagement in poor context: empty parents and full teachers. *Psychology & Society*, 11 (1).
- Boulanger, D. (2019c). Systemic continuity and discontinuity when *crossing* school and family in the community: *Bridging* conceptual and epistemological inquiries. *Psychology & Society*, 11 (1).
- Cattaruzza, E., Iannaccone, A. and Arcidiacono, F. (2019). Provoking social changes in a family-school space of activity. *Psychology & Society*, 11 (1).
- Chaudhary, N. (2019). School-community relations among Indian communities. *Psychology & Society*, 11 (1).
- Fecho, B., and Lysaker, J. (2019) Dialogical Transactions between Schools and Communities. *Psychology & Society*, 11 (1).
- Matthiesen, N. (2019). The Becoming and Changing of Parenthood: Immigrant and Refugee Parents' Narratives of Learning Different Parenting Practices. *Psychology & Society*, 11 (1).
- Molina, M. E. (2019) Dialogicality as a basis for development. *Psychology & Society*, 11 (1).
- Moreau D (2019). Imperialism and Education: a history of the colonial rule in India and Canada. *Psychology & Society*, 11 (1).
- Nakagawa, K. (2019). Possible Worlds for Families in Schools. *Psychology & Society*, 11 (1).
- Rajala, A. (2019). Expanding the context of pedagogical activity to the surrounding communities. *Psychology & Society*, 11 (1).
- Wikan, U. (2002). *Generous betrayal: Politics of culture in the new Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zazzera, I., Pontecorvo, C., and Arcidiacono, F. (2019). The parental representations about their children first literacy acquisition: A case study in a small Italian town. *Psychology & Society*, 11 (1).