



„Wychowanie w Rodzinie” t. XXXI (3/2024)

Submitted: August 10, 2024 – Accepted: November 14, 2024

Grzegorz PYSZCZEK*

Parental ethnotheories in the perspective of Florian Znaniecki's concept of the humanistic coefficient

Etnoteorie wychowania w perspektywie koncepcji współczynnika humanistycznego Floriana Znanieckiego

Abstract

Aim. The aim of the article is to show how taking into account the humanistic coefficient can influence the study of the ethnotheory of upbringing. It shows what the ethnotheory of upbringing is. The concept of ethnotheory of upbringing arose from the research of the development niche by Sara Harkness and Charles Super. They claimed that, apart from physical, social, and cultural factors, an important element of a child's educational environment are the views of its guardians on upbringing. The basic features characterizing the ethnotheory of upbringing are described. Firstly, it concerns the broadly understood sphere of upbringing. Secondly, it is treated as obvious and indisputable. Thirdly, it is shared not only by individuals, but by the entire community within which caregivers function. The theoretical context in which this issue appeared was indicated. These in-

* e-mail: gpyszczek@aps.edu.pl

Maria Grzegorzewska Academy of Special Education, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Szczęśliwicka 40, 02-353 Warszawa, Poland

Akademia Pedagogiki Specjalnej im. Marii Grzegorzewskiej, Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii, Szczęśliwicka 40, 02-353 Warszawa, Polska

ORCID: 0000-0003-4221-7614

cluded, on the one hand, ethnographic research, and on the other, various types of research on everyday thinking.

Methods and materials. The work uses the concepts of developmental niche and ethnocultural upbringing expounded by S. Harkness and C. Super, as well as the concept of the humanistic coefficient expounded by Florian Znaniecki.

Results and conclusion. The article recalls the concept of the humanistic coefficient presented by Florian Znaniecki. Its fundamental role in social and cultural research was shown. Possibilities of deepening research on ethnotheories of upbringing by referring to this concept were indicated. Firstly, it would be about reconstructing the internal layout of an environment that believes in a certain type of ethnotheory. Secondly, to show the attitudes of this type of environment towards other elements of the upbringing environment.

Keywords: parental ethnotheories, humanistic coefficient, upbringing environment, Florian Znaniecki, upbringing.

Abstrakt

Cel. Treścią artykułu jest etnoteoria wychowania oraz pokazanie, jak uwzględnienie współczynnika humanistycznego może wpłynąć na jej badanie. Koncepcja etnoteorii wychowania wyrosła na bazie badań niszy rozwojowej Sary Harkness i Charlesa Supera. Twierdzili oni, że obok czynników fizycznych, społecznych i kulturowych ważnym elementem środowiska wychowawczego dziecka są poglądy jego opiekunów na temat wychowania. Badania tych naukowców zainicjowały cały szereg badań nad etnoteoriami wychowania w różnych częściach świata. Pokazano podstawowe cechy charakteryzujące etnoteorię wychowania. Po pierwsze, dotyczy ona szeroko rozumianej sfery wychowania. Po drugie, jest traktowana jako coś oczywistego i bezdyskusyjnego. Po trzecie zaś, jest podzielana nie tylko przez poszczególne jednostki, lecz także przez całą społeczność, w ramach której funkcjonują opiekunowie. Wskazano na kontekst teoretyczny, w którym pojawiło się to zagadnienie. Były nimi z jednej strony badania typu etnograficznego, z drugiej zaś – różnego typu badania myślenia potocznego.

Metody i materiały. W pracy wykorzystano koncepcje niszy rozwojowej i etnokultury wychowania S. Harkness i C. Supera, a także koncepcję współczynnika humanistycznego Floriana Znanieckiego.

Wyniki i wnioski. Starano się pokazać fundamentalną rolę koncepcji współczynnika humanistycznego F. Znanieckiego w badaniach społecznych i kulturowych. Wskazano możliwość pogłębienia badań nad etnoteoriami wychowania poprzez odwołanie się do tej koncepcji. Chodziłoby tu o rekonstrukcję wewnętrznej struktury środowiska wyznającego pewnego typu etnoteorię, a także o ukazanie postaw tego typu środowiska wobec innych elementów wychowawczych.

Słowa kluczowe: etnoteoria wychowania, współczynnik humanistyczny, środowisko wychowawcze, Florian Znaniecki, wychowanie.

Introduction

The problem of ethnotheories of upbringing is receiving increasing attention in both pedagogical theory and practice. They seem to be permanent and indelible elements of any pedagogical interaction, although of course, at least in some cases, not always desirable. In this article, we will not deal with the content contained in the various ethnotheories of education. We leave this important issue to the pedagogues. The article is sociological in nature and will attempt to reflect on the social functioning of the ethnotheory of upbringing, its relationship both to the practice of subjects guided by the basic principles of certain ethnotheories and to other conceptions of the norms and principles of upbringing. A number of interesting empirical studies have already been devoted to the issue of the ethnotheory of upbringing (Dryll, 2022). At present, however, there is no satisfactory theoretical treatment of this problem, and this condemns us to an intuitive conceptualisation, the result of which may be that we cover phenomena that are sometimes even significantly different from each other by the same term.

The article is intended to be some attempt to frame the theoretical problems related to the issue of ethnotheory of education. Reflection on such issues requires reference to some theoretical approach. This reference will be the concept of the humanistic coefficient presented by Florian Znaniecki. It is worth mentioning F. Znaniecki in the context of the issue of upbringing. The sociology of upbringing of F. Znaniecki is in fact one of the fundamental components of his general sociological theory. It is not just a set of principles applied to some particular sphere of social life, but its deepest core. Society according to F. Znaniecki is always an educating society. He entitled the first volume of his fundamental *Sociology of Upbringing*.

In the English-speaking area, the term *parental ethnotheories* is used. Elżbieta Dryll uses the term *parental ethnotheory* [etnoteoria wychowania] as the Polish equivalent. Perhaps it is more accurate than the original. Indeed, ethnotheories of teachers and other caregivers are increasingly beginning to be studied.

The first part of the article deals with what an ethnotheory of education is, in which sense the term is used in various research initiatives and in which context it has emerged. In the second part of the article, F. Znaniecki's concept of the humanistic coefficient will be recalled. An attempt will also be made to show the relevance of the principle of the humanistic coefficient for the study of the ethnotheory of education. The intention of the article is to show how referring to this issue can make the reflection on ethnotheories even more profound and precise.

Ethnotheories of upbringing

The issue of ethnotheory of education and several research endeavours related to it have emerged over the last four decades and are becoming increasingly popular. Initial remarks on it were formulated by the classics of this problematic in 1986 (Super, Harkness, 1986). Reception in Poland, however, is so far rather limited. A review article by E. Dryll (2022) in particular has appeared. This theory does not seem, even in a global context, to be well grounded theoretically. The pioneers of research on the phenomenon of ethnotheory of upbringing – S. Harkness and Charles Super – focus primarily on empirical research. They treat the problem of the ethnotheory of upbringing as part of their concept of the developmental niche (Super, Harkness, 1986). Apart from individual articles, there are only collections of texts, e.g., edited by S. Harkness and C. Super, *Parents' cultural belief systems: Their origins, expressions, and consequences* (1996). The lack of a separate monograph does not reflect well on the reception of the issue.

The concept of ethnotheory of upbringing was developed within the broader concept of the developmental niche of S. Harkness and C. M. Super (1996). Considerations of this type have a strong tradition. It is worth mentioning Uri Bronfenbrenner's theory of ecological systems, which originated in the USA, while on the Polish ground – F. Znaniecki's theory of the educational environment. According to S. Harkness and C. Super the developmental niche is formed by three basic elements:

- the physical and social environment,
- the set of foundational parenting practices,
- the psychology of carers.

They categorise the ethnotheories of upbringing in the third group, the realm of the carers' psyche. These are the views of parents or other caregivers regarding the upbringing of their children.

In Poland, the issue of ethnotheory of upbringing has received considerable attention from E. Dryll (2022). She discusses the views of S. Harkness and C. Supera and writes:

[...] most attention is given to a factor that is part of the third element – *parents' cultural beliefs*. But, as can be seen, these are not individual or even shared characteristics of a single family, but ones that characterise the community with which the family identifies. These beliefs have the character of self-evident knowledge, expectations that are not called into question, legitimised by the very fact that “this is what everyone thinks.” The beliefs, called ethnotheories, are concerned with parenting, the child and the mechanisms of development, and result in specific child-rearing practices (Dryll, 2022, p. 43).

Ethnotheories of upbringing can thus be said to be characterised by three basic features. Firstly, they apply to the whole sphere of upbringing. Secondly, they are taken for granted and undisputed. And thirdly, they are shared not only by individuals but also by the entire community within which the family functions. Let us briefly comment on these three basic features of the ethnotheories of upbringing in order to better understand the specificity of their social and epistemic functioning.

Firstly, ethnohistories of upbringing are mainly concerned with matters of upbringing, but necessarily have to look far beyond it. They cannot focus only on the basic techniques of educational influence, namely persuasion, reward and punishment. On the one hand, the aim of upbringing is to arrive at the cultural ideal present in a given culture, so necessarily the ethnotheory of upbringing must be linked to philosophy or religion. On the other hand, it includes the whole complex of issues related to the fulfilment of the role of the child, so, for example, the length of childhood itself or the rights and duties of the child during the different periods of childhood. As a rule, in such a view, the family is a passive collective when it comes to setting both internal and external norms. However, this need not be the case (Dyczewski, 2004; Chądzyńska, Dryll, 2004).

Secondly, it is worth looking at the problem of ethnotheory of education from a purely epistemological point of view. It is not fully discursive knowledge, which can easily be verbalised after appropriate training. However, it is also not “tacit knowledge,” as Michael Polanyi calls such a phenomenon (*tacit* knowledge, sometimes also called personal knowledge) (as cited in Chmielewska-Banaszak, Magier, 2004). This term denotes knowledge that is intuitively obvious, but extremely difficult to verbalise, such as how to ride a bicycle. It is conscious knowledge, or at least relatively easy to become aware of, but lacking systematic justification. The foundation of the epistemological context for the functioning of an ethnotheory of education is the juxtaposition of two epistemic formations. On the one hand, there is academic and expert knowledge, legitimised by the relevant educational and scientific institutions, and on the other hand, the views of the average person concerning a particular sphere of reality, often derived from a multi-generational tradition cultivated by a community.

Thirdly, the problem of the social context in which ethnotheory of education functions is relevant. Which group is the primary point of reference? Does only the group come into play, or also significant others? Who are they in a particular case? We do not have one ethnotheory of parenting adhered to by all lay people, non-experts. There are many. What determines the boundaries of the impact of circular ethnotheories of upbringing? Are they ethnic, regional, class boundaries? This problem is the most relevant issue for the sociologist. We will return to it in the conclusion of this section of the article.

In the aforementioned article by E. Dryll (2022), we find numerous descriptions of studies on different ethnotheories and, at the same time, the differences between them. To illustrate, it is worth describing one such study, the report of which was pub-

lished last year (Song et al., 2023). It seems representative of research on ethnotheories. As in this case, it is often conducted by a team of researchers from a variety of countries (i.e., South Korea, Germany, USA, Nepal, India). These studies are comparative in nature, often comparing countries from European culture with non-European countries (in the case of this study, these are the authors' home countries). The axis of comparison is often cultural diversity juxtaposed with perceptions of the individual self. This issue was popularised by Hazel Rose Markus and Shinobu Kitayama (1991). It is about the difference between an independent self (based on the separateness of the self from other selves) and an interdependent self (based on the convergence of the individual self with other selves). This differentiation is linked to the different forms of interaction occurring within the parenting process. The study involved 472 mothers of children aged 6–7 years from five countries. Care was taken to ensure that the mothers came from the same socio-economic stratum, however. Different research techniques were used. The mainstay was a vignette study that attempted to capture the mothers' reactions to the episodes presented to them. It addressed cultural aspects of mothers' vulnerability. The basis of the study was the women's responses related to episodes focused on one issue: Is it important for the mother to always observe the child closely in order to know when to offer help, or should she wait until the child asks for it? The former attitude – of constant vigilance – has been called active sensitivity, while the latter attitude has been called passive sensitivity. According to the results of the study, mothers from India and Nepal had the most active sensitivity, while mothers from Germany had the lowest. In between the extremes were mothers from the USA and South Korea.

The example of this study demonstrates well the intellectual and empirical specificity of this type of endeavour. After all, research into the cultural specificity of upbringing processes is not something new. They can be found in the classics of anthropology such as Bronislaw Malinowski (1936) and Margaret Mead (1986). With the development of this form of research, a separate discipline emerged—the anthropology of education—pioneered by George Spindler (as cited in Drozdowicz, 2019). Anthropological research dealt with the very structure of the educational process, as well as the influence of a particular form of education on the shape of the basic content of a given culture.

To illustrate the latter, let us recall Japanese psychologist Takeo Doi's 1971 work *Amae no kōzō* (*Anatomy of Dependence*), once famous but now rather forgotten. The work has gained a lot of popularity both in Japan itself and abroad. According to T. Doi, the basis of Japanese upbringing is *amae*, i.e., the pursuit of passive dependence on other people, primarily the mother. A childhood period based on *amae* creates a kind of behavioural-emotional pattern, which is later transferred to other types of social relationships. *Amae* both within and outside Japan have been strongly praised on the one hand and criticised on the other. *Amae* has been seen as the basis of Japanese group solidarity and loyalty, but also as a cause of conformity and suppression of individualism.

Against this background, the specificity of research on ethnotheories of upbringing is clear. Firstly, they mostly have a practical dimension. They arise in pedagogical, educational and paediatric contexts. Secondly, they are often comparative, comparative in nature. Thirdly, they are primarily concerned with parents' beliefs and views. The aforementioned research natures also referred to parents' and carers' beliefs, but much more often sought to observe behaviour. This type of approach often failed to distinguish between purely situational conditioned behaviour and behaviour that is truly desired and wanted by parents.

The problem of ethnotheory of upbringing should not be confused with ethnopedagogy, a term popularised in Poland by Jerzy Nikitorowicz (2017). Ethnopedagogy is primarily concerned with the transmission of values specific to particular ethnic groups. The areas of interaction between ethnotheories of upbringing and ethnopedagogy may intersect. Ethnotheories of upbringing may either accept or reject a particular cultural heritage. Ethnopedagogy may recognise specific beliefs associated with specific ethnotheories as part of the cultural heritage.

Ethnotheories of upbringing understood in this way are often associated with a reception characterised by strong and ambivalent emotions. On the one hand, there are negative emotions as a result of seeing ethnotheories as a set of irrational superstitions whose effects are harmful. On the other hand, there are also positive emotions when one sees in ethnotheories a rich heritage derived from living practice and educational experience. In both cases, however, there is a kind of appreciation of the social role of ethnotheories. In the first case, it is a matter of uprooting them, and in the second of using them, an example of which is the well-known book by the American journalist Jean Liedloff – *Continuum concept* (1975) (Polish edition: *W głębi kontinuum*, 1995). In it, the author describes the child-rearing practices of one of the tribes living in the wilderness in Venezuela and recommends these ethnotheories as fully valid also for contemporary society.

Addressing the issue of ethnotheory of education is certainly influenced by the social and intellectual context in which it is situated. Within the various humanities and social sciences, it has become increasingly common to reflect on the types of views and beliefs that accompany people active in different spheres of culture and social life.

Research is carried out in connection with intercultural encounters of all kinds, in which an attempt is made to reconstruct the knowledge of representatives of other cultures on a given topic. In this context, one often encounters the prefix "ethno" (e.g., ethnobiology, ethnomedicine). The terms "traditional knowledge" or "local knowledge" are also used quite frequently. The classic work on this issue is Clifford Geertz's *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretative Anthropology* (2005).

It is the knowledge of specific ethnic communities, without being discursive and formalised. An initiative of this type was certainly ethnophilosophy, which

grew out of the study of the mentality of Africans (Jedynak, 1995)*. Ethnophilosophy denied the thesis that African philosophy did not exist. It sought to reconstruct it based on the language, rituals and stories of black Africans. It protested against the reduction of philosophy to an institutionalised, discursive transmission.

In addition, attempts are made to reconstruct the content and form of colloquial thinking. In doing so, colloquial thinking is understood as a characteristic of non-experts in a field (on the relationship between expert and colloquial knowledge, see Schütz, 1985). Knowledge of this type is a simplification of expert knowledge**. While ethnographic-type research is generally quite well-known, much less is known about colloquial research. Let us signal three very different examples.

An extremely important initiative of this kind was certainly the current in sociology that emerged in the 1960s called ethnomethodology***. The animators of ethnomethodology referred, moreover, to research procedures shaped within ethnology. The prefix ethno in the term ethnomethodology means that the research was concerned with specific social groups. Within this research, ethnomethodologists sought to access the beliefs of members of these groups. Various types of codes, statutes and other symbolic artefacts that define rules and norms for the creation of group order are considered secondary.

It is worth mentioning the research current known as naive physics, initiated by the Italian psychologist Paolo Bozzi (1991). This current tries to reconstruct the way physical phenomena are seen by a non-physicist: a person who has had no or little contact with academic physics.

* Ethnophilosophies associated with other regions of the world have also begun to emerge. Increasingly, however, these are called *indigenous philosophies*.

**However, one can look for examples of the concept described much earlier. Such a role was certainly played by the reflection on *common sense* clearly visible already in the 18th century within the Scottish school of common sense, whose representative was Thomas Reid (cf. Holowka, 1986). It is worth mentioning the research output related to the experimental philosophy strand (Wysocki, 2011). As far as Poland is concerned, it is necessary to mention the work by Zbigniew Rau, Katarzyna M. Staszyńska, Maciej Chmieliński, Krzysztof Zagórski – *Doktryna Polaków: Klasyczna filozofia polityczna w dyskursie potocznym* [The doctrine of the Poles: classical political philosophy in popular discourse].

***The leading representative of this school was Harold Garfinkel (1917–2011). His book *Studies in Ethnomethodology* was to some extent similar to the proposals of the ethnomethodologists, but starting from a different theoretical premise, Charles Mills' (2017) concept of the sociological imagination. In Poland, this type of approach has resulted in works on the economic imagination of Poles (e.g., Zagórski, Koźmiński, Morawski, Piotrowska, Rae, Strumińska-Kutra, 2015).

Another strongly developing research strand is the psychological study of implicit personality theories (Lachowicz-Tabaczek, 2004)*. This current assumes that the images of personality formed in the course of a human life, concerning both other people and oneself, are largely determined by implicit personality theories. Every person has a hidden personality, which, as the adjective "hidden" indicates, they are not fully aware of. Hidden theories of personality can, in the opinion of researchers, lead to a distorted image of reality, the consequence of which are various types of dysfunctional behaviour.

The two types of research initiatives are often intertwined and often difficult to distinguish between them. It seems that in the case of the ethnotheory of education we are dealing with a conglomerate of both approaches. Jerome Bruner, in his book *Culture of Education* (2010), uses the term *folk pedagogy* for phenomena largely analogous to the ethnotheory of *education*. The Polish edition translates this as "colloquial pedagogy." Such an entanglement of the two perspectives also occurs, for example, in the management sciences, where one speaks of *tribal knowledge*, which is an attribute of the modern corporation. It is also worth mentioning the peculiar offensive of the ethnographic method outside the area of tribal and folk communities, e.g. in Poland this is evident on the ground of schools (e.g., Kawecki, 1996) or various organisations (e.g., Kostera, 2011).

This type of conglomeration, although it may be heuristically fertile in many respects, is not conducive to the clarity of the research approach. Mention was made above of a certain vagueness of the concept of ethnotheory of education in a sociological context. It is perhaps due to the fact that ethnographic-type approaches very often consider the object of their research as an attribute of a distinct community. Culture, including all forms of "local knowledge," is generally the result of mutual interaction and very often intergenerational transmission. The study of colloquialism, on the other hand, generally takes an individualistic view of its object of study. It is concerned with the knowledge of specific individuals, which is the result of society's influence on the individual and his or her personal experience. The similarities in the knowledge of these individuals arise from the similarity of their social situation and not from mutual interaction or intergenerational transmission.

Ethnotheories of upbringing in the perspective of F. Znaniecki's concept of the humanistic factor

The sociology of F. Znaniecki is currently not a leading theoretical paradigm, either within general sociology or within the sociology of education. Several reasons

* Hidden theories of personality are part of popular psychology (folk psychology). It should be distinguished from popular psychology, which is the domain of advice-type literature.

for this can be mentioned. On the one hand, it is certainly related to the peripheral character of Polish sociology, as well as of Polish culture in general, and on the other hand, to the contemporary reserve to refer to the classics, as well as to the creation of more general theoretical concepts (on this subject in more detail: Witkowski, 2022).

F. Znaniecki's sociological ideas are often referred to collectively as culturalism (Halas, 2010). He was unable to agree with all kinds of naturalistic proposals, seeing the source of both social and cultural transformations in the impact of natural factors (e.g., genetic or geographical determinisms). However, he also rejected reducing the dynamics of culture and the social world to purely psychological facts, to changes within the individual self. F. Znaniecki's culturalism was of course the foundation of all his reflection, both on the processes of socialisation and upbringing. For him, upbringing was largely an intergenerational transmission of culture, above all culturally shaped.

Let us not forget that F. Znaniecki was not only a theoretician of education but also a practitioner. It is worth mentioning the sociological school that he founded and the huge thing of his alumni, as well as his projects for creating a new model of education, which was to result in the development of innovative and creative potentials of individuals (Znaniecki, 1998). In the context of the main subject of this article, which is ethnotheories of upbringing and their study, it is worth referring first of all to one of the most well-known issues raised by F. Znaniecki, namely the humanistic factor. This concept is even automatically associated with the name of this Polish sociologist, and for some, it is the quintessence of his intellectual output. It is a concept that is known not only in Poland but also internationally

What is the humanistic coefficient? Let us give the floor to F. Znaniecki himself:

[...] for the scholar [...] the cultural system is realistically and objectively as it was (or is) given to these historical subjects at the time they experienced (or are experiencing) it, having actively dealt with it. In a word, the cultural researcher's data is always "someone else's, never no one else's." This essential feature of cultural data is called the humanist factor (2011, p. 180).

Let us take a sketchy look at some of the implications of the humanistic coefficient principle. The basis of this principle is that the mere external observation of human behaviour is not sufficient for a satisfactory description of human activities and, more broadly, for the discovery of the regularities governing social and cultural life. Knowledge of human behaviour should, according to the principle of the humanistic factor, be supplemented by the beliefs that an individual has in relation to the activity he or she is engrossed in at any given moment. The individual may find the behaviour in question extremely satisfying, in line with his or her accepted lifeline, but also the other way around - he or she may feel compelled to engage in the behaviour in question, for example by social or

natural factors. This is only one of many possible approaches of a particular individual to a particular behaviour. The principle of the humanistic factor does not only involve a concrete action performed here and now. We can also speak of the humanistic factor in the context of the principles and rules that underlie the taking of a specific action. An individual may consider them to be fully credible and consistent with his or her life experience. However, the opposite may be true – a person performs a certain action only because this is what his or her environment expects. He or she may distrust the rules defining the nature of that action, treat them as incomprehensible or even as imposed.

The principle of the humanistic factor can also be applied to experts and institutions, which are guarantors of the correctness of the actions carried out. Experts and institutions can be trusted as well as extremely distrusted. An individual may follow the recommendations of experts even though he or she does not trust them, but fears the consequences of openly contesting expert advice. He or she may also desire a whole range of behaviours and thoughts that are satisfactory to him or her, but in no way disclose this for fear of being considered deviant.

Looking at the issue of ethnotheories of upbringing in the context of the concept of the humanistic coefficient can enrich reflection on ethnotheories of upbringing, enable a more precise definition of the boundaries of the impact of ethnotheories and show the complexity of their structure. This concept states that the analysis of any behaviour and action, whether social or individual, should take into account the attitude of the individual towards these actions. The principle of the humanistic factor in the context of the study of ethnotheories of upbringing points to several important questions that should be posed in this context. Let us select two, in the author's opinion, interesting problems. They do not fully exhaust the issue presented here, but they are important contextual factors that should be addressed by a more in-depth analysis of ethnotheories of upbringing. These problems are:

- the internal structure of the environment associated with some ethnotheory of education,
- the relationship of this environment to other elements of the educational environment.

The question of the internal structure of the environment associated with some kind of ethnotheory of upbringing seems relevant. One may ask what is the point of such an internal structure. The answer to this question seems quite simple. For it is not the case that the guardian always knows how he or she is supposed to act in a given upbringing situation. A situation of a new type requires either self-reflection on how to react or recourse to an external opinion. Although the importance of self-reflection cannot be underestimated, it should nevertheless be assumed that parenting problems generally associated with strong emotional strain will involve some form of recourse to external factors. For this to take place, there must be an adequate network of interactions and associated patterns of behaviour.

As an example of the need to refer to the opinions of external factors, let us look at the issue of situational conditioning of the parenting process. Indeed, the parent and other types of educators may have certain ethnotheories of upbringing, but deviate from them in certain situations. For example, they may be convinced of the important role of children's freedom during adolescence, but a situation of high risk associated with war or crime, for example, causes them to significantly restrict this freedom. The impact of different types of situational factors can be extremely strong and important. These can include, for example, the economic situation, the level of danger, the health situation, the number of children in the family, the encounter with another culture and the emergence of an alternative family or schooling model.

Parents who succumb to situational pressures experience dissonance determined by the current situation. Some decide to migrate to regions where they will be able to raise their children according to their beliefs. Most stay where they are and continue to struggle with the situation. A collective struggle against destructive situational factors is, of course, also possible, but the outcome is always uncertain, as it can end in both winning and losing. Situational circumstances of this kind raise the constant question to what extent a certain educational model can be abandoned in a given situation, and to what extent external circumstances must be resisted. These questions inevitably have to be asked within a certain social circle. Individual responsibility alone may be something that many people are unable to cope with.

Regardless of whether these situational factors cease or become permanent determinants of a given society, in each of these situations there is a long period of disjunction between the practice of education and the accepted ethnotheories of education. This period can only be captured in research by basing it on the principle of the humanistic coefficient. Even if we see from the outside the situation of danger, it is difficult for us to assess how much the members of this community are aware of it, how much they appreciate it, how much they disregard it and how much they overestimate it. The research situation may be complicated by the fact that at least some ethnotheories of upbringing incorporate norms related to certain situational threats, shaped by the heritage of the group.

There are two models for the transmission and formation of the ethnotheory of upbringing. The first is associated with a large family characterised by strong ties. It is generally characteristic of less urbanised areas. Importantly, family ties here largely intermingle with neighbourhood ties. This is the environment most similar to the traditional environment. Upbringing issues are a topic of conversation occurring in everyday interactions here. The impact of intergenerational transmission confronted with the influence of the media, peer groups and school is much weaker than it was in the past.

The second model is related to the small family. As an alternative to family ties, collegiate and friendship relationships involving working together or spending leisure time together are not uncommon. Ties between parents and other parents whose children go to school together are also common. Within these interactions, beliefs about raising children

are formed. These are confronted with the family traditions of specific individuals, as well as with media messages (advice books, TV programmes, blogs, etc.).

Specific environments associated with ethnotheories of upbringing will approach either of these two extreme types, but will generally have their own unique shape. They will intermingle with other environments and form networks of interdependence. Above these networks, the influence of the macro-structure of the national, class and religious types usually spreads, having a strong influence on what happens in the micro sphere. Parents' views on the upbringing of their children (ethnotheories) are closely linked to their opinions, who they trust in the sphere of upbringing and who they fear in this sphere. Only a consistent adherence to the humanistic coefficient principle can enable us to reconstruct specific ethnotheories.

Let us also flag up the question of the attitude of an environment associated with an ethnotheory of education towards the various elements of the educational environment. It seems that this attitude can vary greatly and oscillate from closeness through indifference to covert and sometimes overt hostility.

To show the complexity of the issues posed above, let us refer to F. Znaniecki's concept of the educational environment. According to him, the educational environment "[...] includes [...] all those persons and social groups with which a given group requires or allows [the educated person] to come into contact during its period of preparation for future membership" (Znaniecki, 2001, p. 51). And immediately below, he adds: "[...] no group can exclusively and completely organise [...] the educational environment in its own interest alone, but the requirements of different groups combine, combine and intersect in the most diverse ways" (Znaniecki, 2001, p. 51). It is worth mentioning that the interest of F. Znaniecki's interest in the educational environment is also biographical. He attended school during the period of partition. School education organised by the partitioners was supplemented by the family and youth circles cultivating Polish language, literature and culture (Dulczewski, 1984).

The educational environment in the perspective of F. Znaniecki thus generally has a complex character. The educational interactions of family, school and media coexist. Sometimes they reinforce their messages through this coexistence, while sometimes these messages collide with each other. The phenomena of aversion to an element of the educational environment, e.g. family, school or media, have been well known for a long time. For some, the family may be the primary element of the educational environment, desirable and respected, while for others it may be the opposite. It can be seen as a refuge of security and rootedness, but also as a sphere that hinders development. The educational environment, understood in this way, is an arena for constant contestation and the establishment of alliances from both an individual and a collective perspective. The emergence of such a complex and expansive educational environment is, of course, concurrent with the transformation of the family model from traditional to modern. It is impossible to elaborate on this here. However, it is worth mentioning that the dichotomy of these two models is sometimes questioned. Turkish scholar

Çiğdem Kagitçibasi introduces a third family model: emotional dependency, valuing family values but separating them from economic values (Kagitçibasi, 2017).

Let us pause for a moment on the issue of resentment towards one's own environment. Until a hundred years ago, most of Europe lived in small communities (rural, small-town), based on direct neighbourhood ties that intersected with family ties. This community was the natural context of reference when it came to culture. The basic beliefs of this culture were learnt by the individual in the process of socialisation. The same was true of the beliefs of upbringing. However, powerful social processes were already underway at the time to break such bonds. Mass mobility, whereby the individual took on a different social role from his parents, and mobility made the socialisation process much more complicated than it had been up to that point. The individual began to be influenced by both the environment of origin and the environment he or she entered, for example by obtaining an education. The same is true of migration.

Within these processes, school became one of the primary tools for social advancement, a route to a higher social position in the future than parents (Sorokin, 2009). In this context, the educational demands of the environment in which the individual grew up necessarily had to recede into the background. Many individuals began to have aspirations that they could only realise in the distant future or had no chance of fulfilling at all. Nevertheless, the environments to which they aspired were objects of identification for them, and often much stronger than the environments from which they came. An individual does not necessarily belong to the group with which he or she identifies. In the language of Robert Merton's sociological theory, it can be said that a reference group need not be a participatory group (as cited in Skeris, 1979). A situation in which many people respect the requirements of a particular ethnotheory of upbringing, but generally do not accept it or do not fully accept it, seems possible and real. Following the requirements of the ethnotheory is the result of fear of exclusion and ostracism. Families would prefer to raise their children according to the norms of other backgrounds and often do so to some extent. However, they have to make concessions to the social environment of which they are a part.

It is also possible to see instances of full acceptance of the ethnotheory of the upbringing of one's environment and reserve towards foreign elements, often towards the school. In particular, it is worth mentioning here a number of examples given by a student of F. Znaniecki – Józef Chałasiński – in his study on upbringing in a foreign home (Chałasiński, 1969). This system was common before the development of mass education and involved the active participation of the child in a family other than his own. One could mention the journeyman system in crafts or the several-year stays of noble youth in other manors. In German culture in particular, a distinction was made between the *Lehrjahre* and the *Wanderjahre*, which was an upbringing involving wandering with stops at different homes. At the same time, this *Wanderjahre* was a higher, better and more practical type of education than school education.

In *Pan Tadeusz* [Sir Thaddeus], we find these words spoken by the Judge, which are a kind of apologia for the ethnotheory of the upbringing of the nobility:

We give young people to the capital for education
And let us not deny that our sons and grandsons
They have more book learning from the old ones;
But every day I perceive how the young suffer from them,
That there are no schools teaching to live with people and the world.
It used to be that a young nobleman rode to the lords' courts,
I myself was the Governor's courtier for ten years,
Father Chamberlain, Your Lordship
(Speaking, the Chamberlain squeezed his knees);
He counseled me on public service,
Out of his care, he did not let go until he made a man.
In my home his memory will forever be dear,
Every day I ask God for his soul (Mickiewicz, p. 11).

The full acceptance of one's own environment and its ethnotheory of upbringing is evident here. There is no substitute for the educational practices associated with this environment. Only they guarantee educational success.

The phenomenon of aversion to school can be encountered in many other contexts today. Let us mention the strongly emphasised by Pierre Bourdieu and Basil Bernstein aversion of the lower social classes to school as a tool of labelling (as cited in Bielecka-Prus, 2010), as well as the desire of some middle-class circles to create forms of home education alternative to school (Budajczak, 2004; Holt, 2007). In the latter context, it is worth mentioning the home education movement of the Polish intelligentsia of the turn of the 20th century (Jurczyszyn, 2013).

In both cases: both the negation and the acceptance of the environment associated with a particular theory of education, we are unable to grasp these phenomena without recourse to the principle of the humanistic factor. Both problems can be reduced to one basic one. In the life of an individual, there may be a long-standing discord between his or her behaviour and the principles he or she professes. Without recourse to the principle of the humanist coefficient, we are unable to get to the essence of a particular educational and social situation. The issue of the ethnotheory of upbringing is extremely relevant and important. It is impossible to eliminate ethnotheory from the areas of the educational process. It may or may not be an important and valuable factor of educational influence enabling a vivid response to concrete and current problems. The already existing, extremely interesting research output in this field should be continuously deepened on methodological and epistemological grounds.

References

- Bielecka-Prus, J. (2010). *Transmisja kultury w rodzinie i w szkole: Teoria Basila Bernsteina*. [Transmission of culture in the family and school: Basil Bernstein's theory]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Bruner, J. (2010). *Kultura edukacji* [Culture of education]. Kraków: Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych Universitas.
- Budajczak, M. (2004). *Edukacja domowa* [Home education]. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Chałasiński, J. (1969). *Spółeczeństwo i wychowanie* [Society and upbringing]. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Chądzyńska, M., Dryll, E. (2004). Etos rodzinny – wspólnota znaczeń wyrażająca się w strukturze autonarracji ojców, matek i ich dzieci [Family ethos – the community of meanings expressed in the structure of self-narratives of fathers, mothers and their children]. *Studia Psychologiczne*, 42(2), 17–26.
- Chmielewska-Banaszak, D., Magier, E. (2004). Wiedza milcząca: Jawne versus utajone: Nowe spojrzenie na poznawcze i społeczne funkcjonowanie człowieka [Tacit knowledge: explicit versus latent: New insights into human cognitive and social functioning]. *Zagadnienia Naukoznawstwa*, 4(162), 751–763.
- Doi, T. (1980). *The anatomy of dependence*. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Drozdowicz, J. (2019). *Antropologia edukacji: Studium różnicy kulturowej w społeczeństwie otwartym* [Anthropology of education: A study of cultural difference in an open society]. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Wydziału Nauk Społecznych Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza.
- Dryll, E. (2022). Rodzina w systemie społecznym: Klasyczne teorie i badania psychologii międzykulturowej [The family in the social system: Classical theories and research in cross-cultural psychology]. *Psychologia Wychowawcza*, 66(24), 36–59. DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0016.0963.
- Dulczewski, Z. (1984). *Florian Znaniecki: Życie i dzieło* [Florian Znaniecki: Life and work]. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.
- Dyczewski, L. (2004). Kreatywna rola rodziny w kształtowaniu dziedzictwa kulturowego i rozwoju społeczności lokalnej [The creative role of the family in shaping cultural heritage and community development]. In: G. Soszyńska (Ed.), *Rodzina – myśl i działanie* (pp. 71–86). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Polihymnia.
- Garfinkel, H. (2007). *Studia z etnometodologii* [Studies in ethnomethodology]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Geertz, C. (2005). *Wiedza lokalna: Dalsze eseje z zakresu antropologii interpretatywnej* [Local knowledge: further essays in interpretative anthropology]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

- Hałas, E. (2010). *Towards the world culture society: Florian Znaniecki's culturalism*. Frankfurt am Main – New York: Peter Lang.
- Harkness, S., Super, C. M. (Eds.) (1996). *Parents' cultural belief systems: Their origins, expressions, and consequences*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Harkness, S., Super, J. (1992). Parental ethnotheories in action. In: I. E. Sigel, A. V. McGillicuddy-DeLisi, & J. J. Goodnow (Eds.), *Parental believe system: The psychological consequences for children* (pp. 373–391) Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Holt, J. (2007). *Zamiast edukacji: Warunki do uczenia się przez działanie* [Instead of education: Ways to help people do things better]. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.
- Hołówka, T. (1986). *Myślenie potoczne* [Thinking colloquially]. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Jedynak, S. (1995). *Ex oriente lux. Szkice filozoficzno-antropologiczne dla miłośników kultur Wschodu* [Ex oriente lux. Philosophical and anthropological sketches for lovers of Eastern cultures]. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Jurczyszyn, M. (2013). Nauczanie domowe w Królestwie Polskim na przełomie XIX i XX wieku [Home schooling in the Kingdom of Poland at the turn of the 20th century]. *Pedagogika Rodziny*, 3(1), 19–29.
- Kagitçibasi, C. (2017). *Family, self, and human development across cultures: Theory and applications*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. DOI: 10.4324/9781315205281.
- Kawecki, I. (1996). *Etnografia i szkoła* [Ethnography and school]. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.
- Kostera, M. (Ed.). (2011). *Etnografia organizacji* [Ethnography of organisations]. Sopot: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Lachowicz-Tabaczek, K. (2004). *Potoczne koncepcje świata i natury ludzkiej* [Colloquial conceptions of the world and human nature]. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Liedloff, J. (1995). *W głębi kontinuum* [In the depths of the continuum]. Katowice: Dom Wydawniczo-Księgarski Kos.
- Malinowski, B. (1936). Native education and culture contact. *International Review of Missions*, 25, 480–517.
- Markus, H. R., Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224–253. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224.
- Mead, M. (1986). *Płeć i charakter w trzech społecznościach pierwotnych* [Sex and Temperament in three primitive societies]. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Mickiewicz, A. (n.d.). *Pan Tadeusz* [Sir Thaddeus]. Retrieved October 29, 2024, from: <https://wolnelektury.pl/media/book/pdf/pan-tadeusz.pdf>.

- Mills, C. (2017). *Wyobraźnia socjologiczna* [Sociological imagination]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Nikitorowicz, J. (2017). *Etnopedagogika w kontekście wielokulturowości i ustawicznie kształtującej się tożsamości* [Ethnopedagogy in the context of multiculturalism and continuously shaping identities]. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.
- Rau, Z., Staszyńska, K. M., Chmieliński, M., & Zagórski, K. (2018). *Doktryna Polaków: Klasyczna filozofia polityczna w dyskursie potocznym* [The doctrine of the Poles: classical political philosophy in popular discourse]. Łódź – Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Schütz, A. (1985). Światły obywatel: Esej o społecznym zróżnicowaniu wiedzy [An enlightened citizen: Essays on the social differentiation of knowledge]. *Literatura na Świecie*, 2, 269–284.
- Skeris, P. (1979). *Teoria grup: (Studium mechanizmów interakcji międzyludzkich)* [Group theory: (A study of the mechanisms of interpersonal interaction) [Doctoral dissertation]. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL.
- Song, J. H., Cho, S. I., Trommsdorff, G., Cole, P., Niraula, S., & Mishra, R. (2023). Being sensitive in their own way: Parental ethnotheories of caregiver sensitivity and child emotion regulation across five countries. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1283748. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1283748.
- Sorokin, P. (2009). *Ruchliwość społeczna* [Social mobility]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii PAN.
- Super, J., Harkness, S. (1986). The developmental niche: A conceptualization at the interface of child and culture. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 9(4), 545–569. DOI: 10.1177/016502548600900409.
- Witkowski, L. (2022). *Uroszczenia i transaktualność w humanistyce: Florian Znaniecki: dziedzictwo idei i jego pęknięcia* [Conjugacy and transcendence in the humanities: Florian Znaniecki: the legacy of ideas and its ruptures]. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.
- Wysocki, T. (2011). *Filozofia eksperymentalna jako metodologia filozoficzna* [Experimental philosophy as philosophical methodology]. Wrocław: Tomasz Wysocki.
- Zagórski, K., Koźmiński, A. K., Morawski, W., Piotrowska, K., Rae, G., & Strumińska-Kutra, M. (2015). *Postawy ekonomiczne w czasach niepewności: Ekonomiczna wyobraźnia Polaków 2012–2014* [Economic attitudes in times of uncertainty: The economic imagination of Poles 2012–2014]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Znaniecki, F. (1998). *Education and social change* [Edukacja i zmiana społeczna]. Frankfurt am Main – New York: Peter Lang.
- Znaniecki, F. (2001). *Socjologia wychowania* [Sociology of upbringing]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Znaniecki, F. (2011). *Współczynnik humanistyczny* [Humanistic factor]. Poznań: Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk.