LIETUVOS
EDUKOLOGIJOS
UNIVERSITETAS

Axiology of Socialisation in Families of Nationally Dualistic Provenance

Alicja Szerląg

University of Wroclaw, Department of Historical and Pedagogical Sciences, Institute of Pedagogy,
ul. J. W. Dawida 1, 50-527 Wrocław, Poland, alicja.szerlag@gmail.com

> *World is a big Tower of Babel where God mixed not only languages, but also the culture, customs, passions, interests and where he made an ambiguous creature combining in own self Me and not-Me, myself and the other, the strange one and the known one (Kapuściński, 2007).*

Abstract. Multidimensionality and complexity of the world of a contemporary human is constituted by processes of defragmentation and deconstruction it involves, but on the other hand engages globalization and integration acknowledged within social and cultural orders. Hence, such new circumstances manifested particularly in cultural borderlands require changes in the process of socialisation, which introduces the young generation to such reality. It must be remember, that everyday life of such generation is dynamised by cultural differences of national provenance, which appear due to the national diversity of families, as well as residing in a nationally diverse environment. These two factors significantly influence the process of shaping identity which is a specific" <…> location in a world only within which it can be subjectively assimilated, <…> Identification always takes place within a given social world, <…> subjective assimilation of the identity as well as subjective assimilation of the social world are various aspects of the same process of internalisation, where the significant Others mediate (Berger & Luckman, 2001). Therefore, the individual identity is shaped " <…> in a given group under the influence of a given culture. A human has no other way but to construct the image and concept of own self, or to belong to, and indentify with other(s) only when the group of reference is established, i.e. those important for own self and the cultural heritage." (Nikitorowicz, 2005). As a result, the identity is located within the necessity and the choice (Budakowska, 2005), hence within and beyond borders, between this, what is inherited, and this, where one currently is (Chambers, 1994). Thus particular attention drawn to the quality of the socialisation process taking place in a culturally diverse family environment, where national diversity creates the axiology of a

national and cultural self-identification of the youth, shaping their national identity, often of dual (double) nature. Such phenomenon occurs due to the fact that the world internalised in the course of primary (family) socialisation is entrenched in the awareness of the young individuals (Berger & Luckman, 2001).

Therefore, the above reflections were made by the author a point of reference for the research exploration on axiology of the family socialisation in the context of national duality, occurring in nationally diverse families that have been also living in a nationally diverse environment for generations.

Keywords: *multiculturalism, national diversity, cultural borderland, borderland family, cultural identity, axiology of socialisation in the cultural borderland.*

Introduction

Family home is a unique place where children, with the participation of persons denoting to them, experience (among others) cultural artefacts indispensible for the process of national and cultural self-identification, i.e. the process of establishing own cultural identity. Simultaneously, the attributes of the cultural sphere of a family life shape the attitudes to the cultural heritage of the ancestors, identification with own cultural community, generating in such way approach towards different culture, particularly when a family functions in a culturally diverse local environment, or if the family is culturally diverse itself. Accordingly, the family - parents and children situate themselves in the borderland, which may be of the following nature:

– area or territory located nearby the border or far from the centre (spatial aspect),
– social and cultural contact in a given area between two or more nations or ethnic groups (social and cultural aspect),
– places of shaping new individuals and their cultures (personality-related and cultural aspect),
– social sphere where borders as well as interpersonal and intercultural borderlands are often symbolically determined regardless of the historical place of residence of given communities (cultural and symbolic aspect) (Ogrodzka-Mazur, 2011).

Such borderland nature of a family functioning implies its specific orders, determining the processes of socialisation of young generation and thus the processes of shaping their national and cultural identity. However, the cultural area of manifesting family socialisation is determined by number of factors, among which – according to E. Ogrodzka-Mazur – the most significant include:

– various types of bonds joining given family members (individual character of bonds) and those belonging to other families or social groups (regional, national

and social character of bonds), concurrently contributing to the growth of axiological awareness and sense of subjectivity and identity,

– transmission of cultural heritage within intergenerational transmission in a family in the course of functioning in culturally diverse borderland, conditioning the establishment of a common cultural pattern in confrontation with the features distinguishing the culture of other groups,

– experiencing sense of uniqueness of the familiar community (established on the basis of similarity and closeness), and on the other hand distance towards others (resulting from the awareness of existing differences), defining the nature of the Familiar – the Other relation (Ogrodzka-Mazur, 2011).

Taking these factors into consideration it may be assumed that the axiological importance of the family socialisation cannot be underestimated, particularly in case of cultural self-identification of nationally diverse parents and their children on one hand, and on the other – in the context of establishing their relations with the culturally own community, still engaging the cultural communities of Others, functioning within the same social and cultural borderland. Contemporaneously, the process of shaping identity origins, according to J. Nikitorowicz, from the stage of the assigned-inherited identity, by being born into a given family, culture and upbringing in a given community (relating to the defined family and environmental context), basing on given symbols, values, confession, bonds with people and places, through the acquired identity shaped in the course of socialisation and participation in the activities of groups, communities, organizations and institutions, conditioned by personality-related and cultural features, leading to the stage of consciously acquired identity, experienced as a result of mediation between heritage and social influences (Nikitorowicz, 2000). Nonetheless, this process is predominantly determined by values expressed within the area of family-related, environmental and cultural experiencing due to the fact that culturally oriented socialisation in a family results in axiological diversification within three essential aspects (Szerląg, 2001).

First of all – in consequence of socialisation the mechanism of identification with the tradition of own cultural community occurs, involving imitation of attitudes, views, assessment or even stereotypes, that are defined by the values co-creating the symbolic universe of such community. Hence, such position of values in this universe codifies and legitimates the activity expressed by the members of the cultural community. Moreover, all anticipation acts, referring to the culturally diverse reality are also grounded in values. For this reason, if in a given culture, values favouring understanding and active approach towards cultural diversity are subject to objectivization, then the individual or a group, while in the process of cultural self-identification, assign meaning to these categories of values. Consequently, so called cultural pattern of personality is recognised, i.e. "<…> vision – preserved in the awareness of those constituting local community - of how a member of such community should behave in various situations, what he/she should avoid or overcome. Such pattern based on tradition constitutes in fact a balanced element in

unstable social life, expressing the essence of all, that has been positively verified by the experience of many people <…> significantly influencing social and moral upbringing, as within these areas the tradition particularly matters" (Górniewicz, 1997).

Secondly, the experiences gained by individuals stratify their relations with the surroundings, hence the perception of cultural diversity is defined subjectively by individual system of values of given persons, their feelings, attitudes and possessed knowledge regarding intellectual competences.

Thirdly, multidimensional cultural reality implies diversity within social roles, i.e. the operating subject is constantly exposed to the processes of self-identification in various cultural references. Thus, getting to know own self depends on such references involving its own axiological ingredients. It results in multi-manifesting nature of own "Me", where crucial part is played by the operating-axiological identity (Górniewicz, 1997), as thanks to such axiological awareness of own self a human is able to function among diversity, originating in such case from multitude of social roles.

The above upholds that shaping identity in a culturally diverse environment takes place within given community, i.e. the family, and / or in own cultural community and in relation to the culturally diverse communities by creating axiological areas of cultural self-identification concerning the location of a given cultural borderland. Therefore, referring to the theory of identity-shaping activities by T. Lewowicki, such activities of parents and children in cultural borderlands embrace:

– historical fate, identification with a given territory and a social group;
– cultural diversity including language, customs, religion, transmission of tradition, education and knowledge about symbolic (spiritual) and material heritage of a given society;
– historical genealogy perceived consistently in biological or racial categories as well as from the perspective of personality features which reflect the vision of specific qualities of given groups, including stereotypes;
– economical condition referring to the life standards of a given group;
– needs, life priorities and axiological preferences;
– political, social, economic and ideological context of the interacting between micro- and macro-social groups (also in global aspect).(Lewowicki, 1995).

Accordingly, the identity-shaping activities echo" <…> first of all the stability of the national identity components (the element defining areas of identification), secondly – the diversity of behaviour related to the belonging to a given national group, fate and experiences of such community, and last but not least – changes of the perception of the identity and behaviour" (Lewowicki, 1995). Therefore, each of the mentioned areas constitutes a source of values determining the cultural self-identification in a situation of experiencing national dualism expressing attitude towards representatives of other culture, both within the family, as well as regarding the closest social surrounding. Concurrently, determining axiology of family socialisation of nationally dualistic provenance shall be

considered as cognitively crucial for the process of shaping identity in the circumstances of multiculturalism, particularly in cultural borderlands.

National diversity in the social and cultural sphere of Polish families in Vilnius region

In order to determine the axiology of socialisation in families of nationally dual provenance, the analysis was concentrated on the way families belonging to national minority and living for generation in nationally diverse environment function. The research was conducted among 77 Polish families living in nationally diverse local communities in Vilnius itself and Vilnius region, i.e. places where multiculturalism has been evidently present in the course of the history in the everyday life of its inhabitants, as Vilnius is a multilingual city, a city- palimpsest, a city- hybrid (Venclova, 2001) "Vilnius is a capital city of the free Lithuania. It is both Polish, Belarusian, Jewish, German, Karaim and Russian at the same time. Nonetheless, Vilnius is predominantly Lithuanian <…>" (Jagiełło, 2000). Hence, "Vilnius reminds a unique crossroad on the path of people's migration, an enormous multilingual melting pot, where cultures of many nations have been existing here together for centuries, also with Poles playing their part in this mosaic." (Mażul, 1998).

Such multiculturalism is evident also within Vilnius region, thus the existence of cultural borderlands, historically authorized as places of manifesting the presence of many cultures, especially of national provenance. On that account they constitute an area of many systems of values, traditions and customs generating sense of identity, and national (or) cultural belonging. Accordingly, it is a cognitively intriguing sphere of national and cultural self-identification taking place in the course of family socialisation. For this reason, the research orientation (in symbolic and environmental aspect) tackled nationally dual families (i.e. with Lithuanian citizenship and belonging to the Polish national minority) and living in nationally diverse environment, taking into consideration that the researched families function within direct neighbouring relations mainly with the representatives of Lithuanian (72.7 %), and Russian nationality (54.5 %). Nonetheless, following percentage of international contacts include the Belarusian nationality (16.9 %), as well as small Jewish (5.2 %) and Ukrainian (3.9 %) minority group. The researched made it evident that contacts with own national community are most preferable (85.7 %), however due to significant percentage ratio, positive character of nationally diverse relations must be emphasized, particularly regarding the following groups of neighbours: Russians (very good relations – 49.4 %, good relations – 50.6 %), Lithuanians (very good relations– 41.6 %, good relations – 48.1 %), Belarusians (very good relations – 32.5 %, good relations – 42.9 %), Ukrainians (good relations – 20.8 %) and Jews (very good relations – 6.5 %).As the researched family members indicated, these relations are grounded in values such as tolerance, mutual respect, respect for the national diversity of the neighbours,

good neighbouring relations strengthened by sense of humanity and community, as well as understanding the language of the neighbours. Hence, the national diversity in the area where the researched live should be considered as a factor facilitating functioning in the cultural borderland, implying at the same time activities for the sake of conceptualising a non-dual, cultural area. Moreover, the national diversity within the research families themselves should be also taken into account. In most of the cases members of these families (embracing the generation of grandparents, parents and children) hold nationality of Russian (56 cases), Lithuanian (25 cases), Belarusian (16 cases), Ukrainian (9 cases) and German origin (2 cases). The generational nature of such diversity allows to assume that nationally diverse cultural heritage has manifested and still manifests itself to various degree in the areas of cultural functioning of the researched families. Still, they seem to emphasise the culturally dual nature of such functioning. Therefore, national diversity in the researched families is experienced at many levels. Hence, it may be concluded, that the researched families function with four basic areas, i.e.:

–   the citizenship (civic) one, i.e. Poles as citizens of the Republic of Lithuania, often referred to as Polish Lithuanians,
–   the social (neighbouring) one, i.e. Poles as members of nationally diverse local community,
–   the cultural orientation in everyday practice of a multinational community towards common culture (Lithuania as a homeland, common history, Lithuanian language and education), accompanied by cultural heritage of the ancestors with the exposure of the Vilnius region as a small homeland,
–   the family one, i.e. of Polish, or nationally other cultural self-identification (Szerląg, 2013).

The areas indicated above allow to assume that – as far as the declaration of belonging to Polish national community is concerned – national diversity whether within family or environmental surrounding is grounded in the everyday life of the researched families, evidently situating them in the cultural borderlands.

Cultural connotations of family socialisation

As the research results prove (Szerląg, 2013), the sense of Polishness tackles three essential aspects, i.e. language–culture–confession, that significantly condition the family socialisation of a young generation in the researched families as all the respondents (100%) stressed that the mainstay of the Polishness is language, thanks to which it is possible for the Polish cultural heritage to last and be handed down (36.4 %), facilitating cultural self-identification at the same time. Simultaneously, education in Polish language was also indicated as important factor, expressed as the right to Polish education (31.2 %). The sense of belonging to Polish culture was also manifested by cultivating Polish tradi-

tions, customs and holidays (36.4 %), as well as religion (22 %) and right to cultivate own religious rites during holy masses in Polish related to this issue (16.7 %).

The indicated manifestations of Polishness are reflected in the intergenerational cultural transmission in the researched families. Thus, for 83 % of the respondents, Polish traditions, customs and holidays are the major ways of expressing Polishness that should be taken care of, cherished and handed down from generation to generation in family socialisation. Similar transmission should embrace Polish language – 67 %, cultural heritage of the ancestors – 47 %, as well as faith and praying in Polish – 35 %. Moreover, sustaining respect for the symbols of Polish national culture (13 %), and Polish history (12 %) appear relevant, similarly as care and attention towards Polish folk culture (8 %), that altogether should be accompanied by the sense of pride of being a Pole, still, nonetheless, expressing patriotic behaviours towards Lithuania perceived as a homeland.

Hence, significant awareness among the researched regarding on one hand the manifestations of Polishness and necessity to hand it down to the young generation, and, on the other hand, commitment to the homeland (i.e. Lithuania), acknowledging the diverse nature of family socialisation with Polish and Lithuanian contents from the perspective of which the cultural self-identification takes place. It is also echoed in the types of the researched families, selected on the basis of attitude towards tradition and the transmission of cultural contents in multinational environment. Empirical material, gathered during research, made it possible to classify the researched families by assigning them to the following types, i.e.: type of a family socialising and upbringing ethnocentrically, type of a family socialising and upbringing dualistically, undirected type of a family, type of a family that – while socialising and upbringing – retreat from the ethnic minority group for the sake of integration with the culture of majority group (Nikitorowicz, 2004).

The analysis explicitly proves that the family type dualistically socialising and upbringing is predominant 83.1 % (Szerląg, 2013) with importance drawn to Polish and Lithuanian cultures in such families, that pay attention to Polish culture, as according to them it is the heritage of ancestors that have lived for generation in the Vilnius region. On the other hand, they cultivate Lithuanian culture as it is the national heritage of the country where they have lived for ages, hence considering it as a place of deep rooting (81.8 %). It also explains their sense of civic commitments towards own country (50.6 %), and the cultural heritage of their neighbours (42.3 %). Hence, while upbringing their children they use both Lithuanian and Polish contents. Definitely smaller percentage of the researched families (13 %) constitute the type of a family, which perform socialisation and upbringing ethnocentrically, where Polish culture is the only one accessible and worth cultivating. Such families, having strong attachment to Poland and sense of being Polish, undertake activities for the sake of preserving Polish cultural heritage, and this is their only positive point of reference (including their own national community). Only a marginal percentage of the researched (3 %) can be defined as undirected type, as in such families it is unclear in which culture they wish to bring up their children, i.e. in

Polish, Lithuanian, or both. As a result, the cultural orientation of the socialisation and upbringing processes accidental or situational. For this reason, actions for the sake of cultivating neither Polish nor Lithuanian heritage are undertaken and their attitudes to others do not depend on their nationality. As far as the researched families are concerned, there was no case of the families that would solely identify with Lithuanian heritage despite Polish nationality (hence upbringing children to become good Lithuanians) (Szerląg, 2013).

On the basis of the above reflections a conclusion can be drawn that among the researched families there is both strong identification with Polish cultural heritage, manifested in the practices of family socialisation, as well as deeply rooted awareness of being a citizen of Lithuania, orienting towards Lithuanian cultural heritage. Therefore, taking into account such families, there following phenomena occur, i.e.:

– providing positive examples of mutual recognition for diversity and tolerance, common compromises and respect towards culturally diverse contents;
– socialisation and upbringing bringing individuals and groups closer, joining them on the ground of mutual benefits resulting from such interaction, pointing out common traits as well as positive and negative sides of both parties, leading consequently to the identification with both cultures;
– socialisation and upbringing enabling access to the values presented by various groups concurrently preserving and cultivating own cultural diversity;
– socialization and upbringing influences oriented at preservation and cultivation of selected elements of "own" group with concurrent introduction to participation in the culture of the majority group (Nikitorowicz, 2004).

The above issues evidently locate the researched families in the cultural borderland of nationally dual provenance, determining their opening towards other cultures. Consequently, it helps them to understand and co-establish diverse community within the local surrounding. The factors most significantly integrating the nationally diverse local communities of the researched families include common, everyday problems (35.1 %) good neighbouring contacts (33.8 %), as well as common businesses and affairs (22.1 %). Therefore, the existence of everyday life is principal as it involves relations with the members of the nearest (nationally diverse) social surrounding. Other factors situating such relations in non-dual area embrace common history (19.5 %) mutual culture (11.7 %) common homeland (5.2 %), commonly shared Christian values (11.7 %), place of residence (16.9 %), common care for the future (16.9 %) as well as tolerance and understanding (7.8 %). All these factors are of cultural and social nature, expressed progressively in the context of a local community. Therefore, as a result of everyday interactions in a culturally diverse environment, the worked out contents and principles of a culture determine the quality of life in cultural borderlands and ways of dealing with the sense of national dualism of the researched in the course of family socialisation (Szerląg, 2013).

Axiology of cultural opening in the course of family socialization

The above observations and conclusions coming from the empirical analysis prove, that the researched families function in a social and cultural sphere stratified by sense of familiarity, that determines their openness to the cultural diversity, as they conceptualise own specific axiology of cultural diversification with regards to this, what is closest to them, i.e. both Polish cultural heritage and the culturally diverse local community, with which they identify themselves. Hence, these worlds are familiar to them in terms of cultural affirmation and manifestation. Moreover, it is worth to emphasise that the research exposed values that can be referred to as intercultural with essential general human solidarity, thanks to which, according to J. Nikitorowicz, it is possible to:

– get to know and understand each other, own culture, own world of existence and private homeland as within family and local cultural roots the individuals experience values such as dignity, being able to understand other people, ease the fears, worries and uncertainty;

– overcome tendencies to close within sphere of own values and cultural circle for the sake of opening and understanding others, favouring dialogue, negotiations, respect for the differences and considering all these factors as developmental inspirations;

– accustom to noticing and respecting the others, shaping sensitivity and ability to cooperate expressing mutual cultural enrichment, protecting from simplified and deformed vision of the Other;

– represent open attitudes, consequently strengthening sense of own self-esteem and acceptance, leading to tolerance and acknowledging diversity, as well as searching for common ideas and values (Nikitorowicz, 2001).

Such general human solidarity significantly manifests itself in axiological justifications and reasoning of the researched families with regards to the assumptions of establishing understanding in culturally diverse societies. According to the respondents, the pillars of such understanding are constituted by getting to know the unknown, understanding, agreement and cooperation (68.8 %).Therefore the worked out social process grounded in the awareness of existence and recognition for the cultural diversity and the necessity to open towards it, in order to accustom such an area and find own place in such reality of everyday life in a cultural borderland. Such process should be accompanied concurrently with upbringing to cherish the other people, regardless of their cultural belonging (33.8 %), as well as sense of local, family and homeland community freed from tensions (66.8 %), hence leading to a cultural community. In order to accomplish such stage, it is of key importance to enrich the family socialisation with the following assumptions of shaping cultural openness of the young generation, i.e.: tolerance towards cultural diversity (35.1 %), respect for the common culture (23.4 %), sensitivity towards

other cultures (20.8 %), awareness of the future shared in a common homeland (20.8 %), and knowledge on common history (16.9 %) that altogether should be accompanied by the sense of humanity and general human solidarity (24.8 %). Moreover, it is quite extraordinary that the researched indicated Christian values as those, that may constitute a plane for cooperation and agreement, especially that according to public opinion survey regarding image of Poles in Lithuania and Poland in Lithuanian society, religion is perceived both by Lithuanian and the Polish as a crucial feature of national identity (Gružveskis, Neverauskienė & Pilonkaitė-Sotirovič, 2012).

Therefore, summing up, it may be concluded, that the researched, dealing with experiencing own and others' cultural diversity, search for such symbolic spheres of interactions that would enable establishment of a community regardless of cultural differences. Hence, the natural process of constituting cultural borderland of the individuals and culturally diverse communities, which is a process crucially regulating intercultural interactions in culturally diverse societies.

Conclusions

Vilnius region is a historical, cultural borderland that implies unique areas of social and historical contacts between national communities residing there. The process of shaping national and cultural identity takes place within such spheres, assigning to them specific cultural character, as they generate axiological orders determining the way families function within nationally diverse local communities that define the socialisation of young generation, consolidating their sense of cultural and national belonging. Hence, their identity is shaped in between the cultural inheritance as a result of intergenerational transmission, and the cultural potential of the multicultural everyday life. Thus, the identity-shaping activities of the young generation are constituted by nationally diverse cultural heritage, identification with local communities and the axiology of the cultural borderland, that should be considered as the attributes of family socialisation, as thanks to those factors the self-identification and self-creation take place within the citizenship (civic), social, cultural and family area, where the national dualism is significantly echoed. Hence, it constitutes potential for overcoming cultural barriers and establishing intercultural practices. Thereupon, it may be concluded that the direct experiencing of cultural diversity (within family or local community) is a natural assumption to search for, and constitute the cultural consensus in the borderland. In such way, the naturally founded phenomenology of multiculturalism conceptualises intercultural practices.

References

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (2001). Internalizacjarzec zywistości. In T. Jaworska, & R. Leppert (Eds.). *Wprowadzenie do pedagogiki. Wybórtekstów* (pp. 194–196). Kraków: Impuls.

Budakowska, E. (2005). Współczesnemigracje a nowewyzwaniaw ob ecidentyfikacji narodowo-kulturowej. In E. Budakowska (Ed.). *Tożsamość bez granic. Współczesnewyzwania* (p. 49). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Chambers, I. (1994). *Migracy, Culture, Identity.* London & New York: Routledge.

Górniewicz, J. (1997). Kulturowy wzór osobowości. In T. Kukułowicz, & M. Nowak (Eds.), *Pedagogika ogólna. Problemy aksjologiczne* (pp. 56, 20). Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL.

Gružveskis, B., Neverauskienė, O., & Pilonkaitė-Sotirovič, V. (2012). *Badanie opinii publicznej dotyczącewize runku Polakówna Litwieiwize runku Polski w społeczeństwielitewskim* (pp. 199–200). Vilnius: Art print.

Jagiełło, M. (2000). *Partnerstwo dla przyszłości* (p. 214). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Bellona.

Kapuściński, R. (2007). *Ten inny* (p. 50). Kraków: Znak.

Lewowicki, T. (1995). Problemy to żsamościnarodowej – w poszukiwaniu sposobów uogólnionych ujęćkwestiipoczuciatożsamościizachowań z tympoczuciemzwią zanych. In M. M. Urlińska (Ed.), *Edukacja a tożsamośćetniczna* (pp. 54–56, 61). Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK.

Mażul, H. (1998). My z Niegowszyscy… In J. Surwiłło (Ed.), *O Adamie Mickiewiczu niekonwencjonalnie – od Wilnapo Nowy Jork* (p. 90). Wilno: s.n.

Nikitorowicz, J. (2000). *Młodzieżpograniczakulturowego Polski, Białorusi i Ukrainywobecintegra cjieuropejskiej. Tożsamość, planyżyciowe, wartości* (p. 64).Białystok: Trans Humana.

Nikitorowicz, J. (2001). *Pogranicze.Tożsamość. Edukacja międzykulturowa* (pp. 58–60). Białystok: Trans Humana.

Nikitorowicz, J. (2004). Wartość międzykulturowości. In A. Szerląg (Ed.). *Edukacja kuwartościom* (p. 87). Kraków: Impuls.

Nikitorowicz, J. (2005). *Kreowanietożsamościdziecka* (p. 60). Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.

Ogrodzka-Mazur, E. (2011). Rodzinaidziecko w otoczeniu wielo kulturowym. Relacjemię dzypokolenio weiichrola w przekaziewartości. In T. Lewowicki, E. Ogrodzka-Mazur, & A. Szczurek-Boruta (Eds.). *Edukacjamiędzykulturowa, dokonania, problemy, perspektywy* (pp. 18–20, 22). Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.

Szerląg, A. (2001). *Ku wielokulturowości, aksjologiczny sens wychowania w rodzinie na litewskim pograniczu kulturowym* (p. 60). Kraków: Impuls.

Szerląg, A. (2013). Narodowy dualizm w codzienność i polskich rodzinna Wileńszczyźnie „poprostu". In J. Nikitorowicz (Ed.). *Patriotyzminacjonalizm.Ku jakiejtożsamościkulturowej?* (pp. 160–180). Kraków: Impuls.

Venclova, T. (2001). *Eseje.Publicystyka* (p. 98). Sejny: Pogranicze.

Pedagogika

Socializacijos aksiologija dvigubos tautinės priklausomybės šeimose

Alicja Szerląg

Vroclavo universitetas, Istorijos ir pedagogikos katedra, Pedagogikos institutas,
J. W. Dawida g. 1, 50-527 Vroclavas, Lenkija, alicja.szerlag@gmail.com

Santrauka

Gyvenimas įvairialypėje kultūrinėje aplinkoje reiškia, kad socializacijos procesai įgauna naujų dimensijų, kurios padeda individui įgyti kompetencijų, būtinų bendrauti kultūrinėje įvairovėje. Ypatingą dėmesį būtina skirti šeimos aplinkai, kuri grindžia kultūrinės priklausomybės jausmo formavimąsi, o tos aplinkos kultūriniai požymiai veikia jaunosios kartos tapatumo suvokimą. Kai šeimos kasdieniame gyvenime – pačioje šeimoje arba vaiko artimoje aplinkoje – veikia kultūrinė įvairovė, socializacijos procesas tampa dvigubos tautinės priklausomybės procesu. Tai reiškia, kad šeima gyvena kultūrų sandūros sąlygomis. Todėl ypač svarbi tampa aksiologinė kryptis, kuri sudaro palankias sąlygas perduoti kultūros paveldą, o šį procesą lydi daugiataučio kasdienio gyvenimo įsitvirtinimas kultūroje ir santykių su kitų kultūrų atstovais nustatymas. Šių procesų kokybė lemia galimybę atsiverti bei įsileisti kitas kultūras ir sukurti bendrą kultūrinę erdvę paribio teritorijose. Tuomet pažinimo jausmas ir bendras žmogiškasis solidarumas kartu sukuria tarpkultūrines tradicijas daugiatautiškose vietos bendruomenėse.

Esminiai žodžiai: *daugiatautiškumas, tautinė įvairovė, kultūros paribys, paribio šeima, kultūrinė tapatybė, socializacijos kultūros paribiuose aksiologija.*