

Family, Child and the Sistemic Psycopedagogical View

Maria Cecília Castro Gasparian*

Professor of the Specialization Course in Psychopedagogy at Pontifícia Universidade Católica and Universidade São Camilo, São Paulo, Brazil

***Corresponding Author:** Maria Cecília Castro Gasparian, Professor of the Specialization Course in Psychopedagogy at Pontifícia Universidade Católica and Universidade São Camilo, São Paulo, Brazil.

Received: January 06, 2020; **Published:** February 26, 2020

Abstract

This article addresses the topic and issue of the family and its' implications throughout its member's learning processes. Within a historical vision it is shown how families have been organized historically up to contemporary times. It shows the functional role of each element in the family organization and its' importance in the development and formation of children and teenagers as it suggests one more option for the observation and listening of the psychopedagogist to the elements with learning difficulties and their family relationships.

Keywords: Family; Organization; Learning

Introduction

Parents unconsciously leave their child the burden of redoing his story but redoing it in such a way that nothing should change, after all. The paradox in which the child is trapped soon produces violent effects; indeed, there is rarely an opportunity for the child to perform in his own name [1].

I begin this article on the Family with a look at learning difficulties, with the words of Mannoni, as they represent very well how families, in most cases, are organized. Some children go through these demands very well, others not so well. And perhaps these are the children who may have some kind of symptom that often appears in various forms of school learning. We know that symptoms are a kind of denunciation, and it is for this matter that our eyes must be focused, but the family as a group has a great influence on all its members.

As a professional who has worked with human suffering for over 30 years to learn and to learn at various levels of understanding about learning (whether school, or any other kind of lifelong learning), I have a systemic view of the family phenomenon, which is basically seen as a set of relationships that interact with each other influencing each other. The family is not just a set of introjected objects, but is a matrix where dramas, plots, traumas, secrets and lies, beliefs and values emerge, not to mention the conscious and unconscious exclusions that influence all the people involved and that often imply generational issues that its members carry for years and often losing their original meaning. All of these factors can influence the child's learning, hindering their normal development.

My intention with this article is also to show the importance of affection that circulates within the family and to include it in a more careful assessment of the family and the numerous affective implications, noting as one of the fundamental elements of the learning difficulties of both children and adolescents. of the family itself involved in this difficulty.

I think that the family also has a learning modality, has a specific way of seeing and grasping the world, relating to people, has their beliefs and their personalized values, among other factors. This is why the need for further study on this institution is important, so that the psychopedagogue has one more instrument to evaluate and help the child or adolescent to learn and to find the pleasure and joy of discovery and learning.

It is worth remembering that this article is not intended to exhaust the subject, even because it is complex and diverse, but serves only as a reminder about the family: it is much more than a simplistic assessment. It goes beyond just answering a questionnaire that the psycho-pedagogue can often misinterpret because of the lack of more appropriate material and a closer look at this family. We have to put aside the “achism” and prejudice we often have unconsciously, and as professionals, research and mine the “pearls and diamonds” hidden in feelings such as shame, fear, want, abandonment, anger, hurt and revolt, covered by the individual and collective not knowing of the family.

But my focus right now is not on the formation of family psychopedagogues. I leave just a few reflection questions for those who are interested in the subject, for example: which family am I talking about when I think and talk about it? From my or my client’s family? What are my beliefs about family? What values do I believe in? Do I not want to “standardize” my client’s family on my own beliefs and values, or within the beliefs and values of a society?

Within a vast family literature, we note that this is a concept that appears and disappears from social and human theories according to the historical moment. Now she is praised, now she is severely criticized. It is often accused as the beginning of all the evils of mankind, especially pointed to as repressive (and often too lax or permissive about its offspring) or exalted as the provider and promoter of the body and soul protection of all its members family.

In our work, to understand the family, we need to go beyond examining one of its elements alone, or just as a product of society. It is very common to refer the person who is experiencing some kind of difficulty and ignore the rest of the family as if the individual who is experiencing the symptom lived in isolation from the rest of the family and the community in general. We need to analyze the whole family, social and school system (where I call each of these groupings the ecological system) in which it is inserted to understand not only this set of people, but especially the symptomatic element with its function and role within this family, school and community.

One facet of current thinking directs the eye on environmental effects on the individual. Until recently most family research with children and/or adolescents with learning disabilities often focused only on the mother, sometimes playmates and some stimulation with toys, parents and their extended families were ignored and even despised. And if we looked at the larger family context, it was usually in terms of the family’s socioeconomic status, where grandparents, uncles, cousins were ignored. I do not rule out this hanging of the mother’s relationship with her child, especially the contributions of Winnicott and all theorists who talk about this mother-baby theme, I just broaden my gaze beyond the mother-baby relationship. in passing is very important) to understand more broadly the function of not learning this child. I warn you that this is only one side of our observation and we should not rule out any of the theoretical and observational possibilities of a phenomenon.

Wallon and Vigotski: Affectivity and culture as a form of family organization

Vigotski’s contributions are of great importance, as are Piaget and others. However, I selected only these two researchers because they talk about the affection and culture so studied in our country and how their contributions are very enlightening when dealing with family and social issues. Why am I putting these two authors in this text? First, because Wallon [3] has studied affectivity and it has everything to do with our inter-family relationships, and Vigotski [2] because it addresses cultural issues and language and thereby the quality of our communications within the family and with the world. In fact, I will not dwell on explaining them, because I assume that most psychopedagogues have already studied them, as have Piaget and other theorists. My proposal is just to bridge our knowledge, Psy-

chopedagogy and the family. That is, how can we use the knowledge already acquired about human development, language and affection when we come across families. There are several questions to ask such as: What is the role of this child in learning and not learning in this family? What role does she play within the family? These are very familiar questions among us, but what do we do with them? What are the answers we get? And what is fundamental how can we work with what the child reveals?

All of us psychopedagogists know that Vigotski has sought to build a new theoretical approach, based on a cognitive/cultural theory where he emphasizes the importance of language as the main invention of culture, and how historical and cultural aspects are appropriated by individuals in learning processes. This is already a good “tip” to start observing our patient’s family. How is the communication between them?

Thus, several concepts are widely studied in our training and contribute to the understanding and application in practice. It is noteworthy that for Vigotski [2] the development of the individual is a process built on and by the interactions that the individual establishes in the historical and cultural context in which he is inserted. That is, in this article, refers to the family. The construction of knowledge occurs from an intense process of social interaction, and therefore, it is from the insertion in the family culture that the child develops, since social interactions are responsible for the acquisition of knowledge built along of the story. And it is from the social relations, the inclusion of the child in the culture, that she appropriates new learning and thus developing. It is crucial that the psychopedagogue be able to relate some Vygotskyian concepts to the psychopedagogical practice, and with their contribution we will be able to observe in more depth the relationships that are established between people in general and between family members in particular.

Wallon’s choice [3] to illuminate the issue of family relationship is affectivity and its educational implications. This is due to several reasons: Wallon’s notion of the person, for example, points to a synthesis of the functional (affective, motor, and cognitive) sets and to the dynamic integration between the organic and the social. His theoretical position was contrary to human understanding in a fragmented way and is how the systemic approach also views people and how they establish their relationships.

His dialectical psychogenetic conception of development makes a major contribution to understanding human development as an integral person, helping to overcome the classic mind/body division present in Western culture and its multiple developments; encompasses in a dialectical movement, affectivity, cognition and biological and sociocultural levels. It also brings contributions to the teaching-learning process. Thus, the Wallonian theory makes great contributions to the understanding of the relations between the members of the same family and the family and school, besides placing them as a fundamental means in the development of these subjects. This is another tip.

In a very simple way we can define affectivity as the functional domain, which has different manifestations, which will become increasingly complex as people develop, and emerge from an eminently organic basis until they reach dynamic relationships with cognition, as can be seen in the feelings.

The family, historical and social course

We also know that affectivity is a way of penetrating what is most unique in people’s lives, because it constitutes a universe of subjective configuration of social relations that begins within the family. This is why it is a private phenomenon and has its resonances and consequences in the social universe, constituting a bridge where the social and the psychological, the mind and the body, and especially the reason and the emotion, move. Many authors agree that we should not deny or despise affectivity, as it would be to deny or despise man himself, his humanity and with it his life. However, it was not always so. Anyone who looks to examine people’s daily lives and history over the centuries to the sixteenth century will find that there was no such intimacy and family affection as we see it today. According to Ariès [4], life in the past until the seventeenth century was lived in public, there was no privacy between the couple and all intimacy was exposed. People lived mixed up, masters and servants, children and adults, in houses permanently open to visitors’ indiscretions. The family did not exist as a feeling or as a value.

The modern family no longer has the same reality of past centuries, it extended as sociability withdrew. From the eighteenth century, people began to defend themselves against a society whose constant living up until then had been the source of education, reputation and fortune, and thereafter began a change in relations between people, whether between boss and servant, friends and customers, etc.

This movement expanded where it reinforced the intimacy of private life with the old neighborhood relationship, friendships. The house has lost the character of public place in favor of the club or cafe. Professional life and family life drowned out the activities that previously belonged to the activity of social relations. Therefore, family feeling and sociability were no longer compatible [4].

The care given to the child began to inspire new feelings, a new affection arose. Parents were no longer content to place their children in the world, and the morals of this age required them to provide all their children, not just the elders with an education that was now shared with the school and by the end of the seventeenth century girls received a preparation for life through school.

Traditional learning has been replaced by the transformed school, the instrument of severe discipline and protected by justice and politics. The extraordinary development of the school in the seventeenth century was a consequence of this concern for children. The family and school together removed the child from adult society. The school confined the once free childhood to an increasingly stringent disciplinary regime, which would result in the total enclosure of boarding school. As the family began to organize around the child, she herself erected a wall between society and private life [4].

Thus the modern family has taken out of ordinary life not only children but also a large part of the time and concern of adults. She responded to a need for intimacy as well as identity: family members are united by feeling, custom, and lifestyle [4].

However, in recent years, with studies on science, human development, neuroscience, neuropsychology, we have seen a strong impulse to broaden our gaze to the suffering person to learn and to learn. This new perspective uses the term “developmental ecology and context” to describe behaviors observed within the socio-cultural environment in which the family lives.

This approach [5,6] (systemic approach) points out that each child grows up in a complex social environment (a social ecology) with a distinct cast of characters: siblings, sisters, one parent or both, grandparents, cousins, uncles, employees, pets, teachers, friends, etc. These characters are also embedded in a larger social system: parents have jobs they may or may not like, may have close and welcoming friends, or may be very isolated; may live in a safe or perilous neighborhood; the local school can be excellent or bad; and parents may have good or bad relationships with the school.

It also prioritizes understanding of the ways in which all components of this complex system interact with each other.

Within the family microsystem [5-7], several dimensions of parents' behavior toward their children appear to be particularly significant including the family's emotional tone, method of maintaining control and communication patterns.

Families that provide higher levels of affection and affection, compared to those that are colder or rejecting, have safer children and better relationships with peers.

Families with clear rules and standards, and a relatively high level of maturity expectations or demands, and who consistently insist on these rules and expectations, have children who exhibit greater self-esteem and competence in a wide variety of situations.

Frequently spoken children with complex sentences who are also heard not only develop language faster, but also have more positive and less conflicting relationships with their parents.

These elements of parenting behavior occur in combination or parenting styles of children. Theorists suggest four types of these styles: competent, authoritarian, permissive, and negligent.

Competent style includes great care, control, communication, and maturity requirements; the authoritarian includes too much control and demand for maturity and little affection and little communication; the permissive style includes a lot of affection and little communication, control, and requirement for maturity; negligent style has very low levels of these four dimensions. Which of these categories do we identify with in reality? Which of these categories is our client in?

The family system is also affected by the child's characteristics such as temperament, age, gender and position in the family, ie whether it is the first child, second or third child, for example. Siblings raised in the "same" family turn out to be quite different because parents often behave differently toward each child because of the affinity, time, and family historical moment at which each child was born [6].

Parental characteristics that negatively affect the family system include depression and its functional mode of bonding and attachment. Family structure also has an impact on family functioning, which in turn affects child and adolescent behavior. We note that there is currently an increasing tendency for children who will spend at least a portion of their childhood in a single parent family, ie, separated parents, or one of the two strangers.

Changes in family structure tend to produce brief disruption (often including an increase in authoritarian or negligent parenting style) before the system adapts to the new form.

Families with stepparents, especially those including teenagers, are slower in this adaptation, and often continue to exhibit an unqualified parenting style for long periods.

The mother's work can also affect the family system by modifying her self-image, increasing her power and changing the distribution of tasks. The effects on children are usually positive, especially for girls.

The loss of a father's job also disturbs the family system by diminishing competent parenting style and marital satisfaction. Children often have behavioral disturbances. The character of man's work also has an important effect on his family interactions.

We therefore have to be aware as parents, teachers and/or psycho-educators about our personal and interpersonal relationships so that knowing this we can establish a frank and open dialogue with our children so that they can interact and build a more humane world. and fairer because we know that behavior influences and is influenced by others and that we all have a commitment to building a more responsible and happy society.

The family and the child in contemporary times

The child instinctively knows what to do or not to do in order to belong to the family group. This is not a purely human attribute (...). Wherever there are links there is automatically a spontaneous perception: 'What is necessary here for me to be part of this group and what should I do or not do so as not to lose the right to membership'. The organ of perception in this case is consciousness. (...) I call this awareness of binding consciousness [7].

This finding by Hellinger coincides with Manonni's statement at the beginning of this article. The child unconsciously knows exactly what to do to please the parent, he knows that each has different patterns of relationship, but it always revolves around the same thing: belonging to the family, because the worst thing that can happen to a child is to be excluded from the family. This we find quite often in everyday family life, but this exclusion is so subtle, so unconscious, and often so perverse that only a more experienced look can notice the subtlety of this act. It may be camouflaged in shame, distrust, disqualification, humiliation of the child and various other situations. The child does everything to belong to this family, wants to share its destiny, whatever it may be, and that is what the child does everything for, and she would be willing to "die" if she thought it could help in any way. the other members. Thus, suffering and the problem are easier to bear than the solution itself, because the child alone cannot solve it and thus creates symptoms (which in some ways are a

request for help) and thus denounces the family. This has to do with the fact that suffering or maintaining the problem is deeply linked to a sense of family loyalty. With this the child hopes that his own suffering can save another person from the family.

This situation, so often found in our care proves our hypotheses of some of the difficulties of learning, because for me, every child, to develop, somehow needs to transgress prohibitions. Parents forbid something because they think it is necessary, but at the same time secretly cherish the hope that the child will break the ban: after all, they were once children too, and now that they are parents, they know very well what a child will or will not do. So if a child does not transgress this is harmful to both the parents and the child. As mentioned above, all-allowing parents also hinder their child's development because they cannot develop their inner strength [7].

My question: what are we if not transgressors?

One of our difficulties in working with the child is that we do not realize the various levels of her role in the family, that is, her role and function within the family dynamics, because all behavior is extremely complex and her reactions are very varied. What a child says is one thing, but what he really wants is another. She may seem rebellious on one level, but on another deeper level we realize that she is extremely loyal. If we do not look at the situation from a distance, we will only see one side.

The family performs three functions that can in fact be dissociated: the procreation function, the care function (food, education), the lineage function (adoption). In reality these three family functions are more or less joint or separate in reality. Its distinction implies particular problems and requires the recognition of multiple kinship homes [7].

The contemporary family is defined more by its internal relations at the heart of the family and less by its institution. The family institution is in this beginning of the century changing rapidly, where the family is no longer seen as father, mother and children since there are innumerable ways of conceiving a family and the traditional view is being questioned. The common ground that could exist between the old family and the contemporary family could be to contribute to the function of biological and social reproduction, the role of caregiver of their children and the function of "continuation" of their values and beliefs. However, nowadays the idea of "independent production" is already widespread, and artificial insemination, a fact that is still under discussion about the lineage of this child (and there enter the ethical questions about the biological origin of this human being), since in many cases it is not allowed to know who is the donor of semen or egg. However, both traditional and contemporary families seek to maintain and improve their position in social space from one generation to the next, not taking much into account the issue of heredity but the continuation of their ethical and moral values. In this context also come the families organized by homosexual bonds, the children adopted within the most varied parental organizations.

It is clear that although families today tend to no longer have such a rigid hierarchy as in the early twentieth century until the 1960s, it is much more discreet among both couples and between them and their children, but we note that This attitude does not diminish intergenerational conflicts and they continue within the family context.

Singly [8] points out that contemporary family history can be divided into two periods. In the first period (modern family 1 or early modernity) beginning in the years 1918 until 1968 (approximately 50 years), the fact that men work abroad to earn family money and women stay at home is noteworthy. to take care of the children as well as possible. This type of family is group-centered, and adults are at the service of the family, and especially the children.

The second period (modern family 2) beginning in the 1960s, when a great advance of new technologies and new trends in philosophy, psychology and science is noted, the family begins to turn its interest in individuation, behavior this one that continues today. It is, therefore, an unfinished development process in which the male and female identity is questioned, lacking the identification of roles of each partner, where there is still an inequality of domestic work due to the professional work of women outside the home. Women, in this sense, no longer depend financially (at least in part) on men and began to question their role and the role of men in the marital rela-

tionship. This movement of individuation is still in the process of being built, and Singly [8] and Souza [9] signal that Western societies still have difficulty managing so many changes that are emerging in today's society. Thus Singly [8] suggests that, like modernity, the family has an uncertain future, but despite this and with some social constraints (why not prejudice) such as LGBT movements, same-sex marriages, and other types of relationships, individuals build their history as they have done for over 5,000 years.

Final Considerations

"Children are the living messages we send at a time we won't see" [10].

The reader may be wondering about families with adopted children or with children with some kind of learning disorder, disorder, difficulty or problem that involve organic issues, or severe mental illnesses, which I have not mentioned at any point. This will be for an upcoming article if readers are interested. Much remains to be said, however, space is little for a complex, fascinating, intriguing, thought-provoking subject to which we all belong in a very particular way. To talk about family is to talk about ourselves. As this Talita poetry says: Family is all the same: each one is special.

Bibliography

1. Fernandez A. "The Imprisoned Intelligence". 2nd edition. Porto Alegre: Artmed (1999).
2. Vigotski LS. "Pedagogical psychology". São Paulo: Martins Fontes (2001).
3. Wallon H. "The psychological evolution of the child". São Paulo: Martins Fontes (2007).
4. Ariès P. "Social History of Children and Families". 2nd edition. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: LTC - Technical and Scientific Books Publisher (1981).
5. Miermont J. "Dictionary of Family Therapies: theory and practice". Porto Alegre, RS: Medical Arts (1994).
6. Bronfenbrenner U. "The Ecology of Human Development: Natural and Planned Experiments". Porto Alegre, RS: Medical Arts (1996).
7. Hellinger B and Hover TG. "Family Constellations: the recognition of the orders of love". Sao Paulo, SP: Cultrix (2007).
8. Singly F. "Contemporary Family Sociology". Rio de Janeiro: Publisher FGV (2007).
9. Souza CMB. "Review: Family in contemporary times: changes and permanences". Notebook CRH 21.54 (2008).
10. Postman N. "The Disappearance of Childhood". Rio de Janeiro: Graphia (2012): 11.

Volume 12 Issue 3 March 2020

©All rights reserved by Maria Cecília Castro Gasparian.