LIETUVOS
EDUKOLOGIJOS
UNIVERSITETAS

Axiology of the Borderlands in the Context of Intercultural Education and Socialisation

Justyna Pilarska

University of Wroclaw, Department of Historical and Pedagogical Sciences, Institute of Pedagogy,
ul. J. W. Dawida 1, 50-527 Wrocław, Poland, justine_p@op.pl

Abstract. Borderland societies are subject to processes such as upbringing and socialisation which, contrary to homogenous cultures, take place in a complex cultural, social and political surrounding. Therefore, the course of socialisation and upbringing influences is dynamised by factors absent within culturally homogenous societies. Thus, for instance, the axiology of a borderland focuses on values such as pro-social or cognitive ones, which appear to be the most common and favourable for the intercultural society, enabling dynamic, but harmonious co-existence of various cultures in the borderland. Moreover, axiology taking place in the context of a borderland socialisation is related not only to the intercultural education with which it shares the priorities and goals, but it also tackles the borderland (heterogenic) identity, which is shaped by values specific for such symbolic and material area.

Keywords: *axiological diversification, borderland axiology, Bosnia-Herzegovina, intercultural education, multicultural society, values, socialisation.*

Introduction

Society of intercultural character is specified not only by the presence of individuals belonging to various nations, races or religions, but it is also an area which gathers those, who are advocates of different political viewpoints, seemingly difficult to reconcile (Łobocki, 2002). Each of the cultures existing in a given area presents its unique material and non-material heritage handed down from generation to generation. Moreover, the cultural borderland implies coexistence of various systems of moral values, what - in turn - facilitates pluralism and relativism that reflect the multitude and axiological am-

biguity of the intercultural borderland. According to M. Michalik, "one of the contemporary tendencies is to search for, and articulate, universal values and moral principles that would assist in establishing the civilization of survival, i.e. the civilization of life and peace (Michalik, 2004). However, at this point it is worth to consider the question whether universal morality is possible at all. M. Ossowska acknowledges the phenomenon of "common moral capital of the mankind" (Ossowska, 1963), nonetheless, in order to establish such common sphere shared by all the members of intercultural society, some certain criteria should be met, which according to M. Michalik include: antinihilistic axiological orientation, dynamism (openness to changes), dialogue and discourse, ethic tradition, creative assimilation and last but not least – axiological maximalism (formulating criteria and conditions for moral enrichment of the world's societies) (Michalik, 2004). Such interesting perspective enhances perception of the borderland axiology as a dynamic, inspiring sphere of experiencing diversity not only in the ontological, but also moral context. It takes place due to the fact that dialogue and discourse allows to broaden and widespread commonly accepted values and norms, combine points of views and moral stands, as well as to overcome particularism and stereotypes. Moreover, such approach avoids the trap of universality as "universality is the opposition of diversity, as it is only diversity that makes up the phenomenon appropriate for the open process of thinking that recognizes and cherish differences, individuality and even different life options, moreover <…> in order to embrace this, what's general and common, we must get to know and appreciate this, what's different (Anderson, 1997). As a consequence, the denial of simplified tendency to universalize corresponds with the stages of intercultural learning since such approach does not negate the sheer existence of differences, does not even attempt to join them nor to reduce them to the lowest common axiological denominator, but allows to change the profile of a given culture towards pluralism and interculturalism. Thus the need to work out values that would constitute in the borderland a foundation for the contact, and then, a lasting understanding and permanent, ethically rooted relations. Hence, the difference between universality, pluralisms and particularization is crucial as the cooperation between representatives of various axiological backgrounds cannot be brought down to some cosmopolitan clichés or universal platitudes. Therefore particularism is the opposite of the community, and consequently the efforts for the sake of common axiological borderland shall focus on pluralism that enables dialogue, mutual respect, justice and tolerance.

Types of values in cultural borderlands – towards axiological diversification

Taking the above into consideration, it must be remembered that the moral horizon is established by certain combinations of values constituting ethical sphere of each in-

dividual and community. Thus, it is crucial to define the structure of values establishing the axiology of a cultural borderland. B. Wojciszke, applying American social psychology paradigm, consolidated the model of the structure of culturally universal types of values and they interrelations (Wojciszke, 2002), as presented in the table below.

Table 1. **Universal types of values and their representatives**

Moving Beyond own interest	Conservatism	Concentration on own interest	Openness to Change
Universality	Security	Power	Self-management
Kindliness	Tradition	Achievements	Stimulation
Responsibility	Conformism	Hedonism	Life joy

Source: own study based on: Wojciszke, B. (2002). *Człowiek wśród ludzi. Zarys psychologii społecznej* (p. 179). Warszawa: Scholar.

From the above it is clear that values such as the one of "moving beyond own interest" origin, as well as values related to the "openness to change" appear most desirable and suitable in terms of a cultural borderland. Nonetheless, the above chart does not fulfil the interpretative frameworks of structures of values, but indicates axial dimension specifying the community on the basis of preferable values rooted in the two polar opposites, i.e. "conservatism versus openness to change" as well as "concentration on own interest versus moving beyond own interest". Such polar opposites imply another key aspect of socialization in borderlands, i.e. the intercultural communication that is tightly linked to the process of dynamising openness, or quite the contrary – insularity of the culture.

Therefore, the reflection on values in culturally diverse environment shall take into account given basic properties of values, i.e. the assumptions that from practical perspective and in the context of willingness and activity they constitute a dynamic element of cultural identity nonetheless, still retaining its objective nature, i.e. statically reflecting the social, traditional and common for all people nature of values such as honesty or loyalty (Didier, 2002).

Analyzing axiology of a cultural borderland it must be remembered that values are most often derived from developmental tendencies of a culture and society, philosophical or religious concepts of a human, various forms of social ideology, social policy of a state and etc (Schulz, 2003) and all these factors should be taken into consideration while focusing on the borderland axiology, as in such context the foundation for common moral sphere may be found. Moreover, it must be remembered that values are experienced and realized in the process of upbringing and socialisation, hence their key importance for intercultural education. Moreover, in the intercultural societies there are processes occurring for which axiological diversification is crucial according to A. Szerląg (Szerląg, 2001), who claims that such process leads to reflexiveness, providing individuals with the

ability to experience values actively, supporting them in taking active approach towards self-growth as well as experiencing the cultural contents of various, complex provenance. Therefore, axiological diversification, occurring in the course of socialisation in the borderland, refers to phenomena that may be characterized in the following chronology:

1. Imitation of attitudes, opinions and assessments (also stereotypes) shaped by values establishing symbolic universe of a given group. It takes place in the course of socialisation and education, including the mechanisms of identification with the traditions of own group. At this stage, according to the author, "such position of values plays the part of a codifier, sanctioning activities expressed by the subject, with all anticipation acts referring to the reality of multicultural reality that are also rooted in such values (Szerląg, 2001). It means that "if values in favour of the diversity became objective, then - while undergoing process of self-identification - individuals or groups assign meaning to such values and as a consequence such individuals acknowledge the cultural personality pattern, actively adopting to the conditions of a multicultural society" (Szerląg, 2001).

2. Relations with the surrounding become stratified on the basis of gained experiences. i.e. the perception of multicultural diversity is subjectively defined by individual set of values, attitudes, feelings or intellectual competences.

3. Diversity of the expressed social roles, resulting from multilevel cultural reality, makes the subjects permanently redefine their ontological positions, hence the axiological awareness of own self allows them to exist in a multicultural diversity.

As a consequence, the members and active participants of a cultural borderland (intercultural society) may select the types of values they adopt in the process of upbringing and socialization, including the following categories:

- prosocial values reflecting the attitudes and activities moving beyond own interests determined by empathy or kindness, favouring dialogue, understanding and constructive relations in the cultural borderland;
- egoistic values interpreting and perceiving the world individualistically and in that way disturbing and interfering the borderland communication with power and hedonism;
- values determining openness towards change, including self-management and stimulation, supporting mutual intercultural contacts, enriching them and catalysing positive direction of the interaction;
- conservative values such as tradition, conformism and security that disable the process of opening towards the Other, as well as multitude and abundance of the cultures and this, what axiological borderlands have to offer (Wojciszke, 2001).

From the above set of values those oriented toward society and openness to change manifest significant educational value stimulating interculturalism and dynamising axiological borderland. Therefore, in relation to such perspective it is worth to take into consideration the selection of values proposed by R. Jedliński, who underlines the

following as crucial in the process of socialisation and upbringing in the cultural borderlands (Jedliński, 2000):

- altruism, which according to M. Łobocki "refers to the set of attitudes and behaviour reflecting acceptance and friendliness towards others, involving understanding and aware activities for the sake of others and widely perceived community" (Łobocki, 2002);
- the value of a human, which is defined by M. Łobocki as "intrinsic spiritual existence remaining in inseparable connection with the spiritual and mental existence of a human" (Łobocki, 2002), whereas other authors refer to this notion as collective manifestations of own self in a community, with inextricably assigned right to health, respect and life, subsequently making all the members of such society responsible for such prerogatives (Babić, 2002). Respectively, internalization of such a value results not only in awareness that a human constitutes an independent and complete creation, but acknowledges that such an individual functions as a personalistic existence for others;
- responsibility, which defines not only the sense of self-responsibility, but also involves the responsibility for the partner of a dialogue in the intercultural contact, which in turn shapes mature, in-depth intercultural relations;
- freedom, which is understood as a value linked to the responsibility and sense of democratic community that provides a framework for liberty and consideration for the Other hence facilitating altruistic, pro-social responsible activities for the sake of a community, providing foundations for the process of fulfilling sense of dignity and personal liberty;
- tolerance, which role in the context of socialisation in borderlands is defined by J. Nikitorowicz as "a process allowing individuals to establish positive bonds despite differences between, carry out intercultural dialogue with the guarantee to sustain integral autonomy and to ensure multiculturalism" (Nikitorowicz, 1995). Therefore this value appears crucial for intercultural relations on borderlands, as it practically recognizes and confirms co-existence in such areas. On the other hand, M. Starnawski points at tolerance and intercultural dialogue as "individual experience determined in the context of their social and economic location as well as cultural educational and political competences established in such circumstances (Starnawski, 2008), and it seems that such determinants as the author recalls truly expose the meaning of the borderland axiology reflected in various areas of social and cultural functioning in the borderlands;
- justice, which is – due to its nature - perceived as a foundation for the sensitivity towards diversity, granting the individuals the right to equal, just treatment regardless of the lifestyle manifested and values behind such code of conduct. It additionally becomes a ground for the dynamics of social and political changes occurring in multicultural societies and countries.

In the context of the above examples of a borderland axiology, it is worth to focus on some given example of such society.

Axiology in the borderland – Bosnian example

Bosnia-Herzegovina sets a very interesting example of a contemporary borderland society that constitutes a meeting point for representatives of ottoman, Muslim culture (a reminiscence of almost five hundred-year long Turkish rule), Balkan traditions, orthodox church influences and western-European lifestyle that was established during the Austro-Hungarian occupation, therefore, in the course of the history, this intercultural society has created a crossroad for the West and the East, the Orient and the Occident. Despite the dramatic war accompanying the fall of Yugoslavia, contemporary Bosnian society is still capable of combining different customs, traditions and code of conducts while experiencing the heterogeneity of the culture in the prose of everyday life. While analyzing the issue of socialisation and upbringing in Bosnia-Herzegovina, F. Hrustić, a Bosnian sociologist, claims that apart from common set of values there must be number of cognitive processes involved, which according to the author involve understanding of human nature and needs, as well as readiness to learn and will of getting to know the unknown (Hrustić, 2010). In the context of axiology, the process of learning is understood as learning in order to broaden moral horizons, to modify own behaviour (creative conduct in accordance with moral principles), to live together and to exist consciously, which makes up the sum of previous steps. Referring to his country also as a place of research, Hrustić indicates the following principles and values which constitute the axiological sphere of contemporary Bosnia-Herzegovina, emphasizing: sense of community and similarity in the context of cardinal values (the good, the evil, life and death), legal, political, social and economic equality, equality in terms of inalienable dignity, equal cultural, political, confessional and economic rights, shared common values such as justice, honesty, decency, honour, creative activity, solidarity, devotion, love, hope, responsibility, respect and last but not least - cognitive curiosity (Hrustić, 2010).

The above values, in the context of socialisation in borderlands become a part of symbolic culture of given social groups and significantly influence the nature of interactions. Furthermore, they become a point of reference and a specific "code" according to which given social, cultural and political phenomena are read, interpreted and assessed. Nonetheless, it must be remembered that in multi- and intercultural societies some tensions will always occur regarding the dominance of socially and morally desirable values, as not all processes taking place within inter- or multicultural society favour the accomplishment of borderland values, internalised whether in the course of upbringing. However, it must be remembered that intercultural education accompanying the process of socialization in borderlands should facilitate conditions for tolerance and other above-mentioned

values to meet appropriate ground in order to become internalised, as one of the Croat Bosnian educationalists claim (Babić, 2002). Hence, contacts with the representatives of other nations, religions, ethnic groups or languages should assist the members of society in overcoming the unambiguous paradigm of a monoculture. This, in turn, supports the idea of experiencing acceptance, understanding and respect for others.

The intercultural world of the borderlands may be defined with tools, categories of values and their relations with interactions (intercultural communication). On the basis of own qualitative research focusing on the Bosnian identity, the selection of the key values (tools of axiological socialisation) in the context of Bosnian borderland includes the following:

- cognitive values allowing to gain and process the knowledge and information regarding the other culture and its representatives (code of conduct, preferable set of values, traditions regarding various religious holidays);
- pro-social values enabling members of the Bosnian borderland to participate actively in various enterprises for the sake of the community such as common cultural events, festivals, participation in culturally diverse forms of entertainment;
- moral values perceived not only as internalized dimension of core concepts setting a hierarchy and structuring internal and external world of the individuals (concerning their motivation, direction of activity, emotional attitudes and pattern on interpersonal communication) (Cichoń, 2006). The empirical material proved that human dignity, respect for the values of life and non-violent approach to conflict constitute the core of such categories of values.

Therefore, relations between the world of values, intercultural communication and borderland identity constitute a co-depended structure, with the most primary feature of the multicultural world, i.e. borderland axiology structuring and dynamising intercultural communication, which is a foundation for conceptualisation of intercultural, borderland identity, as researched in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and presented in works of Bosnian researcher (Hrustić, 2010). This correlation reflects direct and mutual connection between entering the world of values in the course of primary and secondary socialisation, empowered by intercultural communication, rooted in the cultural surrounding and leading to the establishment of multidimensional, multicultural identity enriched with aforementioned values, distinguished for a cultural borderland.

In the context of socialisation in borderland the axiology ipso facto creates and f accomplishes the priorities of intercultural education leading towards the borderland identity. Hence, the axiological influences in the course of socialisation stimulate experiencing relations with the cultural surrounding that may become inspiration of axiological meaning (Szerląg, 2005).

Conclusions

According to K. Ferenz, "the contents and structure of the world which is subject to experiencing and recognition of humans constitutes their personal interpretation, hence individuals act according to it, as this everyday world of experience becomes their world. In turn, rules and values significant and binding in such world become internalised and constitute a crucial element of shaped individual personality" (Ferenz, 2004). The features of the culture of an everyday life in fact reveal to what extend the axiological orientation is accepted and expressed in the recognition of the representatives of other axiological horizons, living in such borderland. It is consequently reflected in the willingness to co-operate with the Others, readiness to establish dialogue with them or to negotiate. Thus, everyday experiencing of the Other in cultural borderland requires not only a constant cognitive activity, but also the moral one, as the flexibility of thinking and interpretation is required and possible only in such circumstances. Moreover, everyday intercultural communication results from the axiological perspective, as increased participation in a given culture rises awareness regarding the principles and rules derived from given values. The dynamics of defining, negotiating, entering relation and active participation enables the individual axiology to become a set of dynamic variables, subject to universal rights of human dignity, due to the recognition of a certain category of common, shared values which "in individual and common perception do not generate tensions, hence are not of dual nature, but are related to the existence of equal system both for the individual and the group <…> and those are values of stable character, guaranteeing relative homeostasis in the relations of individuals or group with culturally diverse surrounding (Szerląg, 2005). It seems that such approach summaries the key issue of the borderland axiology that is shaped in the course of socialisation in an intercultural society sharing their everyday lives in a cultural borderland.

Drawing conclusions from the above reflections it is worth to recall the idea of B. Suchodolski, who promoted the construction of intercultural education based on values that should be internalised in the process of borderland socialisation, emphasising the following:

- socialisation on borderlands should result in establishment of such a community that would stressed common understating and empathy;
- the internalised values should cherish "to be" rather "to have" as acondiciosine qua non of a valuable human;
- non-instrumental values such as love, friendship and wisdom should be predominant in the process of upbringing and socialization in borderlands;
- values should be recognised as superior over personal benefits due to the conviction that the deepest and most fundamental reality of human existence is constituted by culture and world of values it involves;

- seeking common values as a sphere of borderland cooperation shall become a priority for the young generation entering "mature" social and cultural life.

Therefore, this appeal explicitly situates upbringing and socialisation within the scope of the borderland axiology, as the values of borderland constitute the tools of accomplishing tasks of intercultural education leading towards intercultural, borderland identity. Hence, since the identity defines the moral horizons (Taylor, 1995), axiology of a borderland constitutes the essence of intercultural identity.

Socialisation taking place in the cultural borderlands is shaped by different factors than those dynamising this process in homogenous societies. Multitude of cultural patterns, customs, traditions and different lifestyles may cause confusion for these members of a cultural borderland that have not consolidated their identity accordingly to the principles of axiological education. Acknowledging values within the process of upbringing and socialisation are crucial for further cooperation and development of culturally heterogeneous societies, emphasising their openness, flexibility and wide margin of tolerance towards this, what is unknown and unfamiliar. Thus, acknowledging and socialising towards such values is of paramount importance in contemporary cultural borderlands. Summing up it is worth to recall the reflections of A. Szerląg, who claims that "while the ontic structure of a human subjectively locates and determines the dynamisms assigned to a human nature, the world of values activates them objectively, as otherwise it is rather difficult to explain the urge of individuals to move beyond current situation of their internal efforts and transformation towards not only this, what's good, but also what is better. Thus, accepting objective values independent from individuals that activate and engage them, concurrently leads to an understanding insight into immanent dynamism of a human existence (Szerląg, 2001).

References

Anderson, A. (1997). Istota uniwersalizmu. In J. M. Dołęga, & J. Kuczyński (Eds.). *Szkoła przeżycia cywilizacyjnego* (pp. 86–96). Warszawa: Dialog.

Babić, M. (2002). *Milost slobode* (pp. 17, 26–29). Sarajevo: Svjetlo Riječi.

Cichoń, W. (1996). *Wartości, człowiek, wychowanie. Zarys problematyki aksjologiczno-wychowawczej* (p. 83). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Didier, J. (2002). *Słownik filozofii* (p. 415). Katowice: Książnica.

Ferenz, K. (2010). Kody komunikacji w kulturze codzienności. In M. Baryluk, & M. Wawrzak-Chodaczek (Eds.). *Wartości w komunikacji rożnych grup społecznych* (p. 19). Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.

Ferenz, K. (2004). Wartośc i uniwersalne w kulturze codzienności. In A. Szerląg (Ed.). *Edukacja kuwartościom* (pp. 36–37). Kraków: Impuls.

Hrustić, F. (2010). *Odgoj za univerzalne vrijednosti* (pp. 21, 67–148). Tuzla: Bosanskariječ.

Jedliński, R. (2005). *Językowy obraz* świata *wartości w wypowiedziach uczniów kończących szkołę podstawową* (p. 25). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe AP.

Łobocki, M. (2002). *Wychowanie moralne w zarysie* (p. 80). Kraków: Impuls.

Michalik, M. (2004). Uniwersalizm i pluralizm – moralne standardy współczesności. In Z. Krzysztoszek, & W. Rabczuk (Eds.). *Aksjologiczne problemy współczesnej pedagogiki* (pp. 25, 31). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo WSP TWP.

Nikitorowicz, J. (1995). *Pogranicze–Tożsamość–Edukacja Międzykulturowa* (p. 25). Białystok: Trans Humana.

Ossowska, M. (1963). *Socjologia moralności. Zary szagadnień* (p. 115). Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Schulz, R. (2003). O statusie i zadaniach aksjologii pedagogicznej. In Z. Kwieciński, & B. Śliwerski (Eds.). *Pedagogika: podręcznik akademicki* (p. 26). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Starnawski, M. (2008). Poza tożsamśćiró żnicę. O społeczno-politycznych warunkach dialogu. In M. Patalon (Ed.). *Tolerancja a edukacja* (p. 321). Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo UG.

Suchodolski, B. (1986). Wprowadzenie w problematykę konferencji. In B. Suchodolski (Ed.). *Edukacja kulturalna a egzystencjac złowieka, zbiór studiów* (p. 14). Wrocław: Zakład Narodowyim. Ossolińskich.

Szerląg, A. (2001). *Ku wielokulturowości. Aksjologiczny sens wychowania w rodzinie na litewskim pograniczu kulturowym* (pp. 59–60, 61, 69). Kraków: Impuls.

Szerląg, A. (2006). Fenomenologia obcego i jej reperkusje dla edukacji między kulturowej. In A. Szerląg (Ed.). *Wielokulturowość – między kulturowość obszara mi edukacyjnych odniesień* (p. 150). Kraków: Impuls.

Taylor, Ch. (1995). *Tożsamość w czasachzmiany. Rozmowy w Castel Gandolfo* (pp. 9–21). Kraków: Znak.

Wojciszke, B. (2002). *Człowiek wśród ludzi. Zarys psychologii społecznej* (p. 179). Warszawa: Scholar.

Pedagogika

Paribių aksiologija tarpkultūrinio ugdymo ir socializacijos kontekste

Justyna Pilarska

Vroclavo universitetas, Istorijos ir pedagogikos katedra, Pedagogikos institutas,
J. W. Dawida g. 1, 50-527 Vroclavas, Lenkija, justine_p@op.pl

Santrauka

Kultūros paribiuose vykstantiems socializacijos procesams būdingas išskirtinis dinamiškumas, kitoks nei tas, kuris pastebimas monokultūros visuomenėje vykstančiuose panašiuose procesuose. Ugdymo ir socializacijos procesų metu patiriamą įtaką daugiakultūrėje visuomenėje lemia aksiologinis pliuralizmas, apimantis etinę ir moralinę įvairovę, o tai esmingai atsiliepia vykstantiems procesams ir daugiakultūrės visuomenės narių nuostatoms bei elgesio modeliui. Todėl ypač svarbu atpažinti tas vertybes, kurios yra svarbiausios tapatybės formavimosi procesams, tarpkultūriniam ugdymui ir kasdieniam gyvenimui tokiomis aplinkybėmis. Tos vertybės lemia sugyvenimo būdą besiribojančių valstybių teritorijose, ir jis gali būti arba harmoningas (nors ir dinamiškas), arba smurtinis ir prieštaringas. Galima teigti, kad svarbiausių vertybių, kurios konsoliduotų dinamišką ir harmoningą skirtingų kultūrų paribių sugyvenimą, nustatymas yra lemiamas veiksnys tarpkultūrinio ugdymo kontekste.