

Bessie Dendrinos

THE NATIONAL DREAMS OF THE U.S. AND THE U.S.S.R. VS. THE GREEK DILEMMA

Introduction

In the first and main part of this paper an attempt shall be made to investigate the social values and patterns reflected by the socialization processes followed in the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Concern with these two systems stems out of a personal assumption that, though they are very diverse from one another, both systems have influential power on the Greek goals for citizenship. This assumption will be investigated in the last part of this paper. Here, in an effort to understand Greek ideals, the values and patterns seemingly prevalent in Greece will be reviewed under the light of the insights acquired by our comparison of socialization processes in the two world powers.

The effort to look into the Greek values and patterns is an aim I set forth as a Greek educator. The more clearly national ideals are defined, the more effective an instrument of national policy education may become. More particularly, understanding Greek goals for citizenship is a very concrete goal I set forth as a foreign language pedagogue. And this because in dealing with a language, one is basically dealing with social values and patterns. The foreign language coursebook designer and the teacher are responsible to teach, in a language other than the learner's own, about people in modern society, about their behavior, beliefs, feelings, about how people relate to one another and to institutions. As such, foreign language teaching, more than other subjects perhaps, could be regarded as a cardinal socialization agent.

Efforts to understand the Greek national dream or Greek ideals for citizenship will immediately run against a basic problem: the confusion which characterizes social values. The fact that there is a confusion of values has in fact been documented in a small scale investigation into the relational value orientation of the Greek (Dendrinos, 1980). This investigation indicated that there are two sets of standards as regards «right» and «wrong» social behavior. It was discovered that there is a diversity between what members of the Greek society believe that it is desirable to believe as right and what they actually believe is right.

The causes for this confusion could be traced historically through to the present and seen to depend on a variety of factors. A most essential one is assumed to be that the Greek society still holds on to its traditional values while also trying to adopt beliefs and ways of living which are foreign to it. This process is difficult in itself. However there is even greater difficulty

involved if the input comes from diverse sources as is assumed to be the case of Greece. In fact, this paper is based on these very assumptions. And it is at this point that an investigation of the type undertaken here becomes significant. By investigating the values and patterns reflected by the socialization processes in the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. we shall presumably be highlighting the diversities which constitute the basic influences in the Greek values and practices. This might become evident in the last part of the paper when the comparisons and contrasts will hopefully support the assumptions above.

1. — Comparative socialization in the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

In considering child-rearing and socialization processes in different cultures around the world, we may begin with the basic anthropological assumption that «all people everywhere are the same; everywhere all people are different.» What accounts for human nature and unique differences in individuals around the globe? Basically, the differences arise from the sociocultural values of each society.

The U.S. and the U.S.S.R. are in many ways similar: Citizens of both nations share industrialized, technologically based life-styles; each society provides relatively equal support services to its members; both countries consider that they have a world commitment to persuade other nations to be influenced by their national values; each of the two nations has been highly influenced by the historical fact of its respective revolution.

The American revolution set the tone for the delineation of the ideal Americans. Some elements that characterize them are that they are independent, self-driving, motivated to material success, comfort-loving, competitive, status-seeking; they are responsive to law, unless it impedes individual rights; they are guilt-ridden, and therefore morally judgemental, and maintain relatively loose ties to family and groups of choice. Americans value ownership, privacy, education, newness and autonomy. They identify with their job, have hopes for progress and change, and believe in cooperation when it serves their enlightened interest.

The Soviets have been profoundly influenced by the series of revolutions that created the Communist state. As in Koutaisoff (1980:74), according to Marxist theory, the economic basis determines the superstructure of human institutions and psychological attitudes. So, the efforts in the Soviet Union have been geared toward providing the material and technical basis which should automatically give rise to new production and social relations — hence to a new society and, eventually, to a «New Communist Man.» Ideal citizens in the U.S.S.R. are directed by philosophicopolitical views; are typically scientific, and behavioristically cooperative; some of their characteristics include that they are sacrificing, disciplined, obedient, competitive for

group goals, respectful to law, dependent upon the experts and leaders, and loyal to the dreams of their children; they seek honor more than status, are motivated more by shame than by guilt, and are thus prone to control others and be controlled by outer-directed forces. They value education as the key to mobility and honor, and are immersed in the immediacy and joy of work which will bring increasing social recognition. Finally, they have relatively strong ties to their family, from which they move away with much less ease than do the Americans.

1.1. The Socialization Process

Books (1971:131) defines socialization as the process of psychologically growing up in a society so as to become part of it. Socialization requires that the individual behave in culturally approved ways and respond to the dominant ideals, values and motivations. As Elkin and Handel (1972:6), social order is possible because people are taught, as they grow up in a society, to regulate their actions in accord with various standards of appropriateness. The teaching is implicit. Individuals have no choice but be shaped by their physical, cultural and familial environment. Providing the biological requisites, a person is molded by interacting with people that have a certain frame of reference, by the social institutions and by using the language which is shaped by the culture it expresses. In fact, the function of socialization is to transmit to new members the culture, i.e. the values which are dictated by a particular world view and determine people's behavior. These values serve as criteria for norms which are realized in the economic practices of a society, its educational methods, the relations between people and their sex-role definitions, the childrearing techniques and all other areas of life.

The commonalities of social mechanisms¹ operate in all children, in all cultures since they are based on universal human needs.² However, how these are realized, and what the end product of socialization is, differs across cultures. For example, the results of the mother-infant interaction is affected by differing parental styles³ which, even though characterized by

1. According to Books (1971:132), there are four basic mechanisms of socialization: 1) desire to obtain affection, regard, acceptance and recognition from others and its corollary; 2) wish to avoid unpleasant feelings that occur when one is rejected or punished by others; 3) desire to identify; 4) expressed tendency to imitate.

2. Cultural Anthropology and related fields have been concerned with universal patterns, values and behaviors. See, for example, Brown and Levinson, ed. by Goody (1978).

3. Thomas (1973) indicates that differences in infantile reactivity include approach-withdrawal behavior, threshold of responsiveness, quality of mood, and their match with parental attitudes. Furthermore, the predispositions and potentialities of the child are matched or conflicted with the mother's behavior.

idiosyncratic differences, are nonetheless confined within the boundaries of the cultural values system. Thus, in the American setting the degree of emotional involvement is determined by values of individualization (Dendrinos 1980): a positive relationship is evaluated in terms of how well the parent can discern in the infant unique traits, and the degree to which s/he can accept the child as it is (Erikson 1968). On the other hand, in the Soviet setting, values concerning group identity determine the degree of parental involvement and behavior. The individual child in the U.S.S.R. is not an end in itself, as is true in the U.S., but a means in social construction. So, everything that is done with the child, according to Alt and Alt (1974:135), for it and through it, is directed toward that end. The primary concern thus lies with how the child behaves rather than with what it thinks and feels.

Generally speaking, the respective values of individualism and collaterality in the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. determine how people identify with and how they function in the group setting. In the U.S. groups have a fairly great latitude as to choice of interest and activities whereas in the U.S.S.R. they do not spring from free choice but from a mandate which has been explicitly defined and to which members of the society are expected to learn to conform. In the activities of groups sponsored and maintained by the Soviets there is no emphasis on the individual and individual self-expression as is true in the U.S., where the group is seen as sustaining and supporting the individual, as an instrument of release; for, as according to Alt and Alt (1974:154), one basic difference in the two societies is the extent to which the Soviets rely on the group as an instrument of character development.

1.2. Socialization in the family

Socialization in each society begins with the personal attachment of the newborn to the mothering person. What form this attachment takes depends on a large number of factors among which is how each society evaluates the family as an agent of socialization. Where the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. are concerned, there is a basic difference in that the former are eager to find ways to conserve the contribution of the family to the development of the personality and character of the child (Coons and Sugarman 1978). The latter have aspired to move in the opposite direction so as to make an essential connection between rearing within a group situation and preparation for life in a collectivist society. Alt and Alt (1974:160) maintain that the family remains the cradle of individualism and the collective dream cannot easily be realized unless the state gains possession of the mind and the spirit of the child.

As above, the Russian child is more likely to be cared for in a group setting. Alt and Alt (1974:156) assert that in Soviet methods of child rearing there is value placed on the utilization of the authority implicit in the

hierarchical structure of the group and the power that it exerts, as well as its potential as a medium of indoctrination. However, it is also more likely that the Russian baby will be nursed and fed at greater frequency by the employed mother, for whom provisions are made. Also, it is generally true that this baby will receive more physical handling not only by the parents but by all adults that come in contact with it, everyone of whom is responsible for doing what they can to protect and guide children. This handling is both affectionate and restricting. Not in the sense that it restrains the infant's movements in any rigid fashion —something that care-manuals caution against— but in that it does not foster feelings of individuality and independence, neither of which are aspired by the Soviets.

In contrast to the U.S., in the U.S.S.R., the state sees itself as the primary «parent» and defines in considerable detail the profile of the future citizen, and the kind of child-rearing that it will produce, the type of character and personality that is embodied in the national goal. The guidelines for child rearing practices in care-manuals, psychology and pedagogy literature are much more clear cut, non-conflicting, and they are based on scientific principles of collective responsibility. Many of these collective principles are derived on those prescribed by Makarenko (1967) in 1954. He stressed the importance of submission to the will of the collective as the final authority. The child must learn to subordinate its own selfish interests to those of the group, for joy must come from participating in collective strivings that involve the expenditure of work effort on behalf of common aims rather than from the gratification of personal desires (Lilge 1968:3).

The Soviet Union is not content with the *laissez-faire* policy about parental responsibilities that exists in the U.S. The parents' obligations are carefully spelled out and include careful daily scheduling, systematic organization of the child's activities and time (Levshin 1982:70). Parents are persuaded to love their children in a rational and demanding or conditional way, and are endowed with the responsibility of rearing their off-spring in the image of the «Soviet Man» that is carefully constructed in the pedagogical literature. Generally, child rearing in the U.S.S.R. is scientific, rational, self-conscious. Questions of control and discipline are discussed and solved deliberately. Parents tend to be conscientious and often demand high standards of behavior of themselves because setting a good example is one of their important roles.

The child is of extreme importance in the Soviet Union⁴ and the official line

4. As is Alt and Alt (1974:136), «... there are virtually no gaps in the arrangements for the care, education and protection of children of children in the Soviet Union. The universality and completeness of the various programs designed to conserve child-life merit sincere tribute: the far-flung health system, the growing educational establishment with its many and varied resources. In truth, the variety of measures designed to help parents discharge their

is «youth-centered humanism». According to Geiger (1978) the welfare of children is a serious, a sacred matter even,⁵ in an ideology that portrays a better future, such as that of the Soviets. Children are seen to bring new hope to their parents' lives, but there are also high demands made upon them as they are growing up, while ultimately they are expected to care for their parents in their old age.

The above are elements which characterize ideals about child rearing in the U.S.S.R. Naturally, as in all societies, here too one may distinguish different patterns. In fact, it is possible to make a distinction in three general categories of family lines: i.e., the authoritarian, the permissive and the authoritative. On a very superficial level these might seem to fit the U.S. family types studied by Baumrind (1967). However, in considering the cultural diversion, one can detect the great distance keeping them apart. The permissiveness, for example, is directly related to interdependency patterns in the U.S.S.R.⁶ whereas in the U.S. it is contingent to the national goals of permissiveness — the U.S. generally being a permissive society, where children are to be brought up «free to be you and me.»⁷

The ideals of the American society, stemming from the values of individualization, come in direct contrast with Marxist theory and Soviet values. Consistent with the Americans' world view, interest is centered on the existential person, since his/her being is not determined by the environment and since it is believed that «existence precedes essence.»⁸ Hence, the ultimate aims are self-knowledge and self-actualization by having each individual explore and experience by him/herself (Combs and Snygg 1979:412) so as s/he may arrive at new and adequate relationships between him/herself and the world in which each operates. Children thus are not to be disciplined and taught; they are not to be seen as «objects to be treated» (Morris and Pai 1976:357) for this is thought to dehumanize them by denying them their purpose and freedom. A child is to understand by self-discovery so that, according to Rogers (1969), it may acquire «significant learning,» so that it will not be led into dependency on others.

responsibility for the caring and rearing of the child are probably more complete than most nations have developed».

5. An excerpt from the official line in *The Family* of the U.S.S.R. on why Soviet parents should love and care for their children explains: "Children are our future, our joy and happiness. Our first thoughts are about them. Theirs must be a life of smiles. For their sake we are fighting and working". (*Time, Events and People*. Tract printed in Moscow in 1979).

6. In a nonpermissive society, permission granted to the child to indulge in an activity means that someone else takes the responsibility for the act. Thus, it is not the child who is accountable for the deed, but the person on whom the responsibility is transposed. Thus, a dependency pattern is established.

7. Words from a song by Marlo Thomas, popular in the '60s.

8. See Rogers (1969:68-72).

By incorporating the American values of individualization, the parent aims at the cultivation of self-discipline discriminately, the allowance of spontaneity, the development of creativity, and the guidance toward self-knowledge and introspection. And this because, as maintained by Maslow (1971), people who know themselves are passionately and infinitely interested in their own existence and hence walk in the paths of self-actualization which will lead them into becoming fully functioning persons.

Like parents all over the world, American parents are interested in their children's welfare, and have certain obligations towards them. However, they are first of all responsible to themselves as individuals and to their own personal lives. The same is true of children who are brought up to face no real obligations toward parents but first of all to themselves. In fact, what constitutes freedom, in the American concept, which is ideally the ultimate goal, is that «I can live here and now by my own choice.»⁹ Despite the diversity of social values and goals in the U.S., inspite of the lack of a general line to achieve this ideal, the above are the basic principles that underly socialization patterns which take on different forms and shapes.

1.3. Socialization in Education

In all countries, education is an instrument of national policy. It is structured and organized so as to pass out values and ideals.¹⁰ This fact however is rarely admitted as bluntly as in the U.S.S.R. primarily because the whole Soviet thought is predominated by principles derived from environmental (cultural) determinism. The basis of this philosophy is non teleological, and can be characterized as scientific realism. Society is «logical» and the human being is to serve the whole in order to sustain that logic. Thus, the official Soviet position is that there can be no conflict between individual and society. Personal fulfilment, as Alt and Alt (1974:151) explain, cannot be attained through experience opposed to the proclaimed aims of society. It can only be achieved through the realization of social goals, for the individual does not exist outside of a social matrix.

Consistent with Soviet thought and social ideals, the educational system in the U.S.S.R. has relied heavily on instruction, imitation and shaping. The school is thought to be, in Broefenbrenner's (1974) words, a «children's collective» where group responsibility, support and interpersonal cooperation is advocated for the welfare of society. The teaching serves to foster acceptance of the established but also for development of a critical mind. In the 1970s efforts were made to get youngsters to assimilate more

9. See Rogers (1969:296).

10. This, in fact, is the reason that Carnoy (1977) supports that education schemes set up in deprived countries by the economically developed ones have acted as imperialist dominators.

knowledge, handle information more rationally, reason and generalize at an earlier age, and think in abstract terms (Koutaisoff 1981).

Consistent with American thought, where one's essence is not predetermined but free and hence enabled to be shaped, and directly relevant to the core values of American culture based on individualism (Spindler 1983:136-9), the American school has been founded upon the concepts of individual development and democracy of education propounded by Dewey (1961) and exerting influence today still. The school intends to provide equal opportunity for all, and to develop self-reliance, creativity, self-esteem and personal dignity. The aim has been for knowledge to be self-discovered, and for learning to be self-initiated, the ultimate goal being personal control and responsibility.

In both societies schooling starts in infancy but attendance is optional. However, in the U.S. preschooling is more or less a solution to the problem of the increasing in number working mothers. It is also an answer to more and more women's demand to find time and seek themselves as persons, to raise their consciousness and acquire self-esteem though discovering their interests and skills. In the U.S.S.R., preschooling is not only a solution for the working mother whose contribution to the labor force has been necessary, but it is also in accord with the national ideals that have from the beginning advocated rearing and character development in a collective setting. In fact, this is the very reason that the Sakhola Internants were established in 1958 but failing to succeed in replacing the family now board disadvantaged children.

Thus, in the U.S.S.R. preschooling is a state matter and a republican concern; as such, child care is represented at each of the levels of republican government (Drake 1980). Even though the function of child care for physically healthy children is delegated to the Education Department, administration may also be represented by the organizations responsible for organizing social workers. Every enterprise provides, administers and finances nurseries and kindergartens for women who work. In these institutions, there is an one party line and they function under an integrated program and guidelines for instruction lesson by lesson from birth to kindergarten.¹¹ Generally speaking, emphasis is placed on obedience, attention and response, on physical training and intellectual development. Cooperation and collective play is of prime importance in the early years.¹²

11. Chancey (1969) edited two volumes for the Educational Testing Service in the U.S. translating into English the intricate components of children's scheduling and program of instruction in the U.S.S.R.

12. For this reason, for example, when infants are as young as three months the Soviets group them into collectives of six to eight children in playpens raised to provide face - to - face interaction with the staff.

To ensure that the methods for training preschoolers are sustained in the home, there is much parent education and home visits.

Early childhood education is still primarily a matter of each individual family unit in the U.S. Day-care centers are often private institutions, as are kindergartens, though college and university set ups are common, frequently becoming experimental centers for new approaches and techniques to learning. There is no integrated program for preschool education which is not centrally controlled as in the Soviet Union. Hence, even though one may detect here too an overall pattern of enculturation and acculturation,¹³ training is based on different philosophies of child upbringing, giving thus way to varieties of methodologies. The closest to an integrate preschool program in the U.S. came in operation on a nationwide basis in 1965 with the Project Head Start. This was a comprehensive program that aimed at disrupting the cycle of poverty experienced by many Americans and was thus concerned with the welfare, health and education problems faced by the poor (Austin 1976:3). Its objectives were set according to the predominant American values and do not differ much from the overall objectives in preschool centers throughout the States. Among others outlined by Austin (1976:4), these include: fostering self-confidence, spontaneity, curiosity and self-discipline increasing the sense of dignity and self-worth within the child and its family (Bissell 1982).

The objectives verbalized for preschool education in the U.S. are to finally be achieved with a continuous child-centered education. So, elementary schooling too has been aiming at a socialization away from repression and externally imposed discipline, towards greater freedom and faith in the capitalist system stemming from Dewey's philosophy. Thus, the various reforms in the educational system were designed to meet the needs of the individual in a capitalistic industrialized society based on a particular hierarchical economic philosophy (Carnoy 1977:255).

Evincing the American concept of individualism in a capitalist society, and contributing, in curriculum building, to the experimentalism that characterizes the decentralized American educational system in the Individually Guided Educational reform. According to Chase (1977), this is one of the more widely adopted and better implemented of the innovations that started taking shape in the 1960s to be realized in the 1970s. In giving an overview of the IGE, Klausmeier (1977) explains that a model of instructional programming for IGE takes into account each student's individual characteristics and it is

13. Both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. have had to educate for enculturation and acculturation due to the large variety of ethnic groups which comprise their societies. In the U.S., however, there has been a trend in the recent years to move towards a more pluralistic society (see "Education and Cultural Pluralism" in Morris and Pai 1976).

used with explicitly stated instructional and all curricula areas objectives. Students achieve these objectives to a level judged to be appropriate for the particular individual student. Objective - based instruction implies that not all students engage in the same number or kinds of activities, or reach an identical level of achievement, interest or motivation. Continuous progress is thought to be ensured by adapting instruction to the rate of learning and other characteristics of the individual who is seen as a person. This personalized instruction aims at encouraging or increasing self-direction and a positive self-regard along with self-control and personal responsibility.

Other movements for implementing educational reform in the U.S. have been consistent with individualistic values. These include efforts for "deschooling" based on the ideas expressed by Holt (1972) who is concerned with children's innate capacity for learning and with the individual's unrestrained freedom that leads to meaningful learning; they also entail efforts for a more "humanistic education" based on the ideas expressed by the pioneers of humanistic psychology, Maslow (1968) and Rogers (1964) as well as others who consider education as a process of "self-actualization" and the only "significant learning" as "self-discovered" learning. Finally, they include movements toward a "free" school and the "open classroom". Supporters of the "free" school (see Graubard 1972, Kozol 1972) believe that children ought to be removed from the regimentation of the public schools so that learning can become self-initiated, creative and rewarding. Advocates of the "open classroom" believe that this is a means of making the classroom less authoritarian and a way of seeing students as individuals of worth and respect (Kohl 1969). More generally, in all educational movements the individual's choice has been considered as the primary factor, and the role of the family in each is seen to play an essential role (Coons and Sugarman 1978).

The philosophical concepts of the Marxist doctrine concerning equality of dialectical materialism and environmental realism come in sharp contrast with American concepts. These give rise to distrust in individual differences and all efforts to deal with them in Soviet education have long been discarded. The educator sees the child as much more malleable, and failure and backwardness are attributed to congenital defects rather than to lack of intelligence and ability. Thus, research by psychologists and pedagogists has been centered on the learning process: what helps a child to remember, attend, concentrate, draw conclusions or relate factors.

To ensure consistency in carrying out a unified program from elementary education onwards, a program through which specified goals will be achieved, there is a centralized curriculum in the centrally controlled Soviet education system which nonetheless gives power to local authorities (Koutaisoff 1971). In this «democratic centralism» there are very strong

informal links between units in the educational hierarchy and the chains are maintained through various organisms (Drake 1980). This curriculum is worked out with a definite syllabus for each subject, and differential coursework on a selective basis is permitted only to older youth after they have been exposed to a school schedule that exemplifies the philosophical concept of rationalism, where science and technology are part of all children's education; exceptions are made to the artistically gifted only, whom there are special schools.

Throughout his/her school life, the Soviet youngster is to respond to demands of discipline and standards of morality. In fact, character education is a matter of course in Soviet schools. Education for citizenship in a communist society, and all that this society entails is the basis of the school structure, curriculum and teaching methodology. It is furthermore affected through the collaboration of all members of society, particularly the youth organizations, such as Pioneer and Komsomol, under the overall direction of the central committee of the party,¹⁴ and the parents committees that bring the family and school into continuity and support the youth movements.

2. — The Greek dilemma in perspective

In the first part of this paper we have seen American socialization agents pushing the developing member of society towards independence and self-reliance, toward becoming conscious as an individual of worth and responsibility. The Soviets on the other hand have been seen helping youth towards acquiring greater group awareness and cohesiveness —the collective responsibility being the ultimate goal. Both at home and at school the Soviet youth's activities are structured and there are strong official models, a united pedagogical literature, the party line in education and child-upbringing. In the U.S. such structure and organization clashes with national ideals and education has moved towards individualization and less structure. Americans' individualistic values make them feel uncomfortable with high levels of obedience and deference, and these are not qualities which the parents and the school strive for. On the other hand, collateral values in the U.S.S.R. do not allow the nurturing of the individual ego for the

14. Youth organizations in the U.S.S.R. are organized in a way so as to provide structured extra - scholastic activities which are in line with desired goals for character development. These organizations include: Palaces and Houses of Pioneers; young technicians stations; children's parks; stadiums. There are also children's houses of artistic training; sections attached to workers' and kolkhoz clubs; houses of culture; home - management circles. In the U.S. extra - curricular activities, directly connected with school life, are a variety of clubs for drama and oratory, journalism and other professions, technical drawing, art, music and a variety of sports.

society's primary concern is to tighten the reins of social responsibility and group identity.

It has become very clear throughout the first part of this paper that each of the two nations examined has its own national dream and all the values and ideals of each society are thereby consistent. If we turn our attention to Greece what will strike one immediately is that there seems to be no unified vision concerning the sort of society that we Greeks want to live in and what types of behavior standards we wish to set. To support this first impression we could use our personal observations, knowledge, experience and intuition and to mention a few examples randomly chosen.

In our country we seem to want to develop autonomous, independent, self-reliant individuals that can support a free economy. We also value imagination and creativity as stepping stones to self-actualization, or simply as ends in themselves. At the same time we want people to be behavioristically cooperative, disciplined, submissive, obedient, respectful to law regardless of the individual rights it violates, dependent upon the nuclear and extended family, upon the elders, the authorities, the experts and generally all those that "know"-especially if this knowledge is scientific and rational, if it is knowledge of objective facts.

Another set of conflicting values that readily comes to mind when thinking of our society is that which on the one pole carries love of comfort, of material possessions and of ownership. These are generally accepted desires, desires which are maintained by the mass media, even nationally controlled radio and television. On its other pole this set of values has a definite admiration for the spiritually enlightened, the artistically talented, the intellectually gifted, the culturally enriched. Furthermore persons who put deep feeling and emotion over ownership and give up all material possession for the "gearnings of their soul" are appraised and valued.

A keen observer and member of the society could go on with endless sets of conflicting values: the desire of status vs. the love of honor; the quest for individual status and personal happiness vs. ingroup status and happiness; the obligations to self vs. obligations to the ingroup vs. obligations to the collective; the wish for self-drive and internal motivation vs. valuing control by outer directed forces; the desire to learn to be competitive on both individual and group level, so as to maintain free enterprise, vs. depreciation of any form of competitiveness and self-assertion; the love of freedom as an ultimate goal vs. the desire for interdependencies and strong attachments.

Having examined the American and the Soviet Societies comparatively and then turned to the conflicting values of the Greek society, one has the feeling that, whereas the national goals of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. derive from hope in the future, Greek goals derive from disillusionment, from despair about what has gone wrong rather than from optimism about what can turn out right. It seems that there is no national dream to attain.

Traditional values may still serve personal and familial relationships but they do not serve the socioeconomic needs of the nation which has no choice but to follow along the paths of more technologically advanced countries. Hence, Greece is obliged to adopt new values and ideals. For the input it looks to both world powers for reasons which are political, economic, social and geographic. The input is thus conflicting. The base on which the conflicting input comes to be absorbed is not similar to either side and this because the view of the self in the Greek culture is different than the view of the self in the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. (Lee, 1959). The basic perspective has traditionally been lineally oriented rather than individualistically or collaterally oriented (Dendrinos, 1980).

The end result of what is discussed immediately above is the confusion that prevails over Greek goals evinced in conflicting values but also in the clash between what is desired and what is practiced. Furthermore it is evinced in conflicting practices. We could probably think of endless examples taken from socialization processes at home; however, we shall trace through socialization processes in education where, if there were a definite vision of the sort of society we want to develop, it would have definitely been expressed through the educational system and teaching practice since education is acknowledged by the government to be the basis of all social change.¹⁵

Though in the Greek society individual differences are not disregarded, in fact they are recognized in each person who is considered to be a unique being as well as a member of a unique family, few efforts have been made towards individualization and learning autonomy. On the contrary, in order to ensure uniformity, the centrally controlled Greek education system—similar in structure to that in the U.S.S.R.—provides a centralized curriculum which is worked out with a definite syllabus for each subject. Differential course work, on a selective basis, has been permitted to older youth, like in the U.S.S.R., with a recent education act — strangely enough by a socialist government that has also introduced the idea of comprehensive schooling, basically an American conception. Unlike what one would have expected, right wing government in the past, aiming towards a capitalist system, had not allowed room for any differential coursework whatsoever.

Teaching in Greek schools, much like in the U.S.S.R., has relied heavily on instruction, imitation and shaping. To “teach” almost always means to transmit one’s knowledge, rather than to develop learners’ abilities and skills so that they can learn on their own. Learning is more often than not equated with acquisition of information available rather than with discovery and

15. See: «Ο νόμος 1268/82 για τη δομή και λειτουργία τών Α.Ε.Ι.» ΟΕΔΒ, σελ. 7 («Γι' αυτό η παιδεία αντικειμενικά αποτελεί θεμέλιο της κοινωνικής αλλαγής»).

experience. The learning process generally focuses on getting pupils to attend, remember, recite and less often to relate factors and draw their own conclusions.

The principles of the type of education that has briefly been described above are obviously consistent with environmental determinism and scientific realism. Such educational structure and practice serves a society in which it is believed that personal fulfilment "cannot be attained through experience opposed to the proclaimed aims of society" but that, on the contrary, "it can only be achieved through the realization of social goals, for the individual does not exist outside of a social matrix."¹⁶ However, it is not at all clear that these are convictions of the Greek society. And, even if they were, it is again through educational policies that such beliefs come to be contradicted. The steps taken toward educational innovation are in themselves contradictory and do not respond to a distinct vision of a society with coherent values. For example, while the worked out definite syllabus for each subject allows no room for individualized instruction, and centrally determined evaluation criteria do not provide opportunities for individualized assessment, general educational policy, pedagogy manual and teacher-education coursebooks talk about the development of learner-autonomy and learner-centered teaching. There are also very definite concerns expressed by the state and teacher-trainers towards developing in the pupil self-esteem and personal dignity. There is also a verbalized interest that pupils do not be seen as "objects to be treated", and that a humanistic approach to education be taken so that pupils become self-reliant, so that they develop their imagination and creativity.¹⁷

The concerns described immediately above are consistent with non-deterministic views and with phenomenological rather than ontological percepts of reality both of which underlie capitalism. And, in order for objectives such as these above to be realized, it seems logical that they should have to be placed within the boundaries of an individualistic value system — a system in which "each individual exists in a private world of experience of which s/he - the I, me or myself — is the center"¹⁸ Obviously in such a system the individual, as a separate entity, has obligations first of all to him/herself rather than to "country, religion, family". And it is believed that one is determined neither by the immediate nor the extended environment. On the contrary, within this framework, the human being's unique quality for self-awareness is recognized and there is an appreciation of the individual's

16. These are beliefs associated with the values in the U.S.S.R. already mentioned earlier in this paper.

17. These are values associated with the U.S. already mentioned earlier in this paper.

18. These values are consistent with the humanistic psychosocial model. See Rogers, 1961.

ability to reflect, reinterpret, and re-organize his/her past experience; to be critical and evaluative of his / her own behavior; to integrate experiences and make plans in terms of past, present and future. The individual is hereby recognized as an active participant in shaping his/her own destiny — both of individual and group levels.

Any trained observer of the Greek reality who participates in everyday life in Greece and stops to reflect on the beliefs and goals verbalized would not reject the above values as unfamiliar. At the same time this same person will readily recognize how these very values come to clash with more traditional ideology as well as with the other set of input values discussed earlier in this last section of the paper.

Conclusion and implications

In this paper we have investigated the basic features which characterize socialization processes in the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. — two societies with distinct values and ideals which determine the standards of appropriate social behavior. The insights we have developed from this investigation highlight the schizophrenic confusion that prevails over Greek social values and practices. Hence, we are permitted to make a number of assumptions about the nature of this confusion documenting these assumptions with personal observations. These assumptions could serve as the basis of a series of hypotheses concerning socialization processes in the Greek family and education. Systematic investigation might then yield data which could prove useful in defining our national ideals and into making our education an effective instrument of national policy.

Further to the above, it could be asserted that, even before any systematic investigation is undertaken, recognizing the problem is a step toward resolving the confusion. And, as educators of teachers, pupils or both it is our duty to begin focusing our attention on what it is that the society expects from us, what we expect from our society and from our students. We can begin then to foster the sorts of values and advocate the patterns desired for the ideal citizen in Greece.

References

1. Alt, H. and E. Alt (1974). *The New Soviet Man: His Upbringing and Character Development*. N.Y.: Bookman Associates Inc.
2. Austin, G.R. (1976). *Early Childhood Education: An International Perspective* N.Y.: Academic Press.
3. Baumrind, D. and A.E. Black (1967). "Socialization Practices Associated with Dimensions of Competence in Preschool Boys and Girls". *Child Development*, 38, 291-328.
4. Bissell, J. (1982). *Planned Variation in Head Start and Follow Through*. Mimeo graphed. U.S. Dept of Education and Welfare, January.
5. Books, C. (1971). *Developmental Psychology Today*. Dal Mar: CRM Publications.
6. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1974). *Two Worlds of Childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R.* Harmonds - worth.
7. Carnoy, M. (1977). *Education as Cultural Imperialism*. N.Y.: Longman.
8. Chancey, H. (1969). Program Prepared by the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and the Academy of Medical Sciences. 2 Vols. *Educational Testing Service*. N.Y.
9. Chase, F.S. (1977). "Introduction, IGE and Educational Reform". In H. J. Klausmeier, R. A. Rossmiller and M. Saily (eds.) *Individually Guided Edementary Education*. N.Y.: Academic Press.
10. Coons, J.E. and S.D. Sugarman (1978). *Education by Coice: The Case for Family Control*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
11. Combs, A.W. and D. Snygg (1979). *Individual Behavior*. N.Y.: Harper and Row.
12. Dendrinos, B. (1980). *The Relational Value Orientation of the Greek as a Determinant for Reform in Secondary Education*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Claremont Graduate School, Claremont California.
13. Dewey, J. (1961). *Democracy and Education*. N.Y.: Macmillan.
14. Drake, M. (1980). "Soviet Child Care: Its Organization at Local Level". In J. Brine, M. Perrie and A. Stutton (eds.) *Home, School and Leisure in the Soviet Union*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
15. Elkin, F. and G. Handel (1972). *The Child and Society: The Process of Socialization*. N.Y.: Random House.
16. Erikson, E. (1968). *Childhood and Society*. N.Y.: Norton.
17. Geiger, K. (1973). *The Family in Soviet Russia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
18. Goody, E. (1978). *Questions of Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Graubard, A. (1972). "The Free School Movement". *Harvard Educational Review*, 42, No. 3., August.
20. Holt, J. (1972). *Freedom and Beyond*. N.Y.: Dell.
21. Klausmeier, H.J. (1977). "Origin and Overview of IGE". In Klausmeier, Rossmiller and Saily op. cit.
22. Kohl, H. (1969). *The Open Classroom*. N. Y.: New York Review.
23. Koutaisoff, E. (1981). "Education" *The Soviet Union*. London: Ernest Benn Ltd.
24. Kozol, J. (1972). *Free Schools*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
25. Lee, D. (1959) "The View of the Self in the Greek Culture" In *Freedom and Culture*. N.Y.: Prentice - Hall.
26. Levshin, A. (1982). *A Family and School in the U.S.S.R.* Moscow.
27. Lilge, F. (1963). *Anton Semyonovich Makarenko - An Analysis of his Educational Ideas in the Context of Soviet Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
28. Makarenko, A.S. (1967). *The Collective Family: A Handbook for Russian Parents*. N.Y.: Doublesday and Co. Inc.
29. Maslow, A.H. (1968). *Towards a Psychology of Being*. Princeton: Van Nostrand.

30. (1971). *The Father Reaches of Human Nature*. N.Y.: Viking Press.
31. Morris, V.C. and Y. Pai (1976) *Philosophy and the American School*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
32. Rogers, C.R. (1964). "Towards a Science of the Person". In T.W. Wann (ed.) *Behaviorism and Phenomenology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
33. Rogers, C.R. (1961) *On Becoming a Person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
34. (1969). *Freedom to Learn*. Columbus: merrill.
35. Sindler, G. (1983). "Education in a Transforming American Culture". In G. Spindler (ed). *Education and Culture*. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
36. Thomas, A., S. Chesse, R.G. Birch, M.E. Hertzig and S. Korn (1978). *Behavioral Individuality in Early Childhood*. N.Y.: New York University Press.

General Reading

1. Armstrong, J.A. (1978). *Ideology Politics and Goverment in the Soviet Union*. N.Y.: Preager.
2. Barth, R.S. (1982). *Open Education and the American School*. N.Y.: Agathon.
3. Bowen, J. (1962). *Soviet Education: Anton Makarenko and the Years of Experiment* Wiscinsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
4. Breznev , L.I. (1980). *Socialism, Democracy and Human Rights*. Oxford: Rergamon.
5. Brown, G.I. (1981). *Human Teaching for Human Learning*. N.Y.: Viking.
6. Dunstan, N.J. (1978). *Paths to Excellence in the Soviet Union*. Windsor, Berks.: NFER.
7. Fitzpatrick, S. (1978). *Cultural Revolution in Russia 1928-1931*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
8. Grant, N. (1972). *Soviet Education*. London: Penguin Books.
9. Grayson, L. (ed.). (1978). *The American Image of Russia 1917-1977*. N.Y.: Ungan.
10. Harasymiv, B. (1976). *Education and the Mass Media in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe*. N.Y.: Praeger.
11. Hunt, M.P. (1976). *Foundations of Education: Social and Cultural Perspectives*. N. Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
12. Kierkegaard, S. (1944). *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
13. Lane, D. (1978). *Politics and Society in the U.S.S.R.* London: Martin Robertson.
14. Lapenna, I. (1979). *Marxism and the Soviet Constitutions*. London: Institute for the Study of Conflict.
15. Lynch, J. (1979). *Education for Community: A Cross-Cultural Study for Education*. London: Macmillan.
16. Makarenko, A.S. (1976). *Anton Makarenko: His Life and his Work*. Moscow: Progress Publishers
17. Meyer, J. W. and M.T. Hannn (1979). *National Development and the World System: Educational, Economic and Political Change 1950-70*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
18. O'Hear, A. (1984). *Education, Society and Human Nature*. London: Routledge.
19. Raven, J. (1982). *Education, Values and Society*. London: H. K. Lewis.
20. Reshetov, P. and V. Skurlatov (1977). *Soviet Youth: A Sociopolitical Outline*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
21. Tolimage, H. (ed.). (1985). *Systems of Individualized Education*. Berkeley Cal.: McCutchan.
22. Tomiak, J.J. (1972). *The Soviet Union*. Newton Abbot, England: David and Charles.
23. Troost, C.J. (1983). *Radical School Reform*. Boston: Little, Brown.
24. Ushinsky, K.D. (1975). *Selected Works*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
25. White, S. (1979). *Political Culture and Soviet Politics*. London: Macmillan.

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Βασιλική Δενδρινού, *To Εθνικό όραμα των δύο υπερδυνάμεων και το ελληνικό δίλημμα*

Στο πρώτο μέρος της μελέτης αυτής εξετάζουμε τις βασικές κοινωνικές αξίες επάνω στις οποίες στηρίζεται η διαπαιδαγώγηση του Αμερικανού και του Σοβιετικού πολίτη. Έτσι, από τη μια πλευρά βλέπουμε το όραμα της Αμερικανικής κοινωνίας που στοχεύει στην ανεξαρτησία, την αυτοδυναμία, την αυτογνωσία και τη συνειδητοποίηση της ατομικής αξίας και ευθύνης. Το όραμα αυτό απορρέει από μια ατομικιστική κοσμοθεωρία και μια φαινομενολογική αντίληψη της πραγματικότητας. Συνεπώς, έρχεται σε πλήρη αντίθεση με το όραμα της Σοβιετικής κοινωνίας, το οποίο είναι αποτέλεσμα μιας κοσμοθεωρίας περιβαλλοντολογικού ντετερμινισμού και οντολογικού ρεαλισμού. Σύμφωνα δε με τις απόψεις που συνεπάγεται η θεώρηση αυτή του κόσμου και της πραγματικότητας, το ανθρώπινο όν ολοκληρώνεται μέσα από τις εμπειρίες εκείνες που είναι εναρμονισμένες με τις πολιτικές επιδιώξεις της κοινωνίας, εφόσον το άτομο δεν έχει υπόσταση έξω από το κοινωνικό σύνολο. Για το λόγο αυτό, ο πολίτης της Σοβιετικής Ένωσης αθείται προς την απόκτηση μιας ολοκληρωμένης ομαδικής συνείδησης με απότερο σκοπό την ανάπτυξη ισχυρού αισθήματος ευθύνης απέναντι στην κοινωνία. Η επίτευξη του σκοπού αυτού επιδιώκεται με σαφώς διαγεγραμμένη παιδαγωγική καθοδήγηση από την πολιτεία, η οποία δίνει την κατευθυντήρια γραμμή για τον τρόπο ανατροφής στο σπίτι και εκπαίδευσης στο σχολείο. Στις Η.Π.Α., αντίθετα, φαίνεται να υπάρχει μικρότερη επέμβαση από την πολιτεία και μεγαλύτερη ευελιξία όσον αφορά τη διαπαιδαγώγηση του νεαρού Αμερικανού. όμως, η συνέπεια που χαρακτηρίζει τις αξίες και αυτής της κοινωνίας θέτει τα στενά πλαίσια, μέσα στα οποία η βασική επιδιώξη είναι η ανάπτυξη του ατόμου που έχει την ευθύνη των πράξεών του και βαδίζει προς την ανακάλυψη της προσωπικής του αλήθειας.

Η πληροφόρηση που αποκτούμε με τη σύγκριση του τρόπου διαπαιδαγώγησης στις δύο υπερδυνάμεις μας χρησιμεύει για να διαμορφώσουμε μια οπτική γωνία σύμφωνα με την οποία βλέπουμε, στο δεύτερο μέρος της μελέτης, τη σύγχυση που επικρατεί στα ελληνικά εθνικά ιδανικά και, κατά συνέπεια, στους επιδιωκόμενους στόχους μέσω της εκπαίδευσης. Τα στοιχεία που παρουσιάζονται στο σημείο αυτό της μελέτης προκύπτουν από προσωπική εμπειρία και παρατήρηση και ενισχύουν την προσπάθεια να διερευνήσουμε τις συγκρουόμενες αξίες που συνεπάγονται σύγχυση στους επιδιωκόμε-

νους στόχους της κοινωνίας μας και να οδηγηθούμε στην κατανόηση του προβλήματος.

Η προσπάθεια διερεύνησης των ελληνικών αξιών και κοινωνικών στόχων που γίνεται στη μελέτη αυτή δηλώνει γενικά το προσωπικό μου ενδιαφέρον ως εκπαιδευτικού που προσδοκά τα σαφώς διαγεγραμμένα εθνικά ιδανικά να θέτουν τους στόχους της εκπαιδευτικής πολιτικής, τη βάση επάνω στην οποία στηρίζεται το περιεχόμενο και η διδακτική προσέγγιση τών σχολικών εγχειριδίων, αλλά και οι μέθοδοι διδασκαλίας. Το ειδικότερο ενδιαφέρον μου προκύπτει από την ενασχόληση μου με την ξενόγλωσση εκπαίδευση, και αυτό διότι η διδασκαλία της ξένης γλώσσας συνεπάγεται τη μετάδοση κάποιων κοινωνικών αξιών και τους τρόπους έκφρασης των αξιών αυτών. Ο συγγραφέας του ξενόγλωσσου βιβλίου και ο δάσκαλος της ξένης γλώσσας γίνονται ουσιαστικά υπεύθυνοι για να διδάξουν, σε μια γλώσσα άλλη από τη μητρική γλώσσα του μαθητή, σχετικά με τη θέση του ατόμου στη σύγχρονη κοινωνία, για την κοινωνική του συμπεριφορά, για το πώς αντιλαμβάνονται τα καθημερινά γεγονότα γύρω του, πώς αισθάνεται και αντιδρά σε σχέση με αυτά, για τις σχέσεις του ατόμου με άλλους ανθρώπους και με τους κοινωνικούς θεσμούς. Κατά συνέπεια, η ξένη γλώσσα, συγκρινόμενη με άλλα σχολικά μαθήματα, αποτελεί έναν πολύ σημαντικό παράγοντα κοινωνικοποίησης του ατόμου.