

## SOCIALIZATION MODELS IN FAMILIES AS THE RESULT OF MULTICULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Alicja Szerłaż

University of Wrocław, Institute of Pedagogy, Dawida 1, 50-527 Wrocław, Poland  
E-mail: [alicja.szerlag@gmail.com](mailto:alicja.szerlag@gmail.com)

Multiculturalism became an everyday reality for a contemporary man. It generated a number of official and unofficial spheres in reference to which we create our identities. Families, accomplishing one of its functions, play an important part in such process as they introduce young generation to the diverse cultural world. Various types of families are determined by the ways of inter-generation transmission of tradition and cultural values in the living conditions of multiethnic societies, as well as by the ways of coping with cultural differences occurring within families and local environment.

**Keywords:** postmodernism, multiculturalism, multicultural communication, cultural function of the family, socialization, cultural types of migrant families.

doi:10.3846/cpc.2012.14

### Cultural diversification of the postmodern world in its communicative context

The word of a contemporary man – the world of postmodern age – is dynamised by cultural differences, that are manifested in relation of such a man with the external surrounding – the social, political and economical one, but foremost with the cultural one in given geopolitical spheres. In places usually significant for a man, i.e. where his/her existences take shape in subjective, objective and common aspect at the same time. These are generated by the number of global processes, among which particular attention should be drawn to (Grzybowski 2009: 132–133):

1) migration of those travelling (often with the families) for various purposes, as well as refugees (especially from the Third World),

2) internalisation, i.e. social and political changes taking place in all European countries, initiated by elimination of the bipolar system of the Cold War with its repercussions,

3) Europeanisation, with its consequences of political and economical integration of the EU in the social sphere of each membership country,

4) fragmentarisation as reaction to globalisation, manifested in aspirations for autonomy as the result of rise in awareness of possessing different than global patterns of cultural identity.

In turn, these processes altogether initiate two basic tendencies – one towards coherent unity (in particular structural, economical, social and cultural unification) where cultural differences cease to play a diversifying role and the other – sanctioning and exposing cultural differences as the developmental factor in all spheres of life for the contemporary man, where all these differences are located. In consequence, the man of a postmodern age has been rooted in new orders determining his/her everyday reality, where existence involves answering many questions of primal nature, both existential and those denoting

the identity (personal, social and cultural ones), in new points of references, where the cultural difference is on one hand subject to intentional unification, and on the other creates new orders, shaping his/her everyday multicultural reality. Nevertheless, the latter should be considered as attributive for the postmodern world.

Contemporary multiculturalism is manifested according to J. Nikitorowicz as “multifactor and multi-range and may be perceived (...) territorially in context of prescription, procedurally in context of emerging differences, reviving ethnic and national movements, shaping new, independent states, but also seen in the context of migration and democratization processes that initiated sense of differences and shaping own “Me”, resulting in establishment of duplex, disperse or split identity” (Nikitorowicz 2002: 268). Multiculturalism perceived in such way may, in consequence, be attributed with two dimensions – an official and an unofficial one (Mozejko 2004: 147–160). In the first case it implies acknowledgment of equality of all cultures regardless of its geographical, racial or religious origin. Hence, it involves understanding and tolerating other cultures, attributing to them equality in all spheres they generate, where contemporary men function, with perceiving oneself from the angle of own culture, but also involving the Other and the Strange one, which in consequence should result in possessing the skill to enter cultural borderlines and allow others to become familiar with the Otherness. As a result, it becomes possible to create over-subjective common axiological spheres that provide with basis for common existence (understanding and cooperating) both for the individuals and entire communities among the cultural diversity. Therefore, multiculturalism in its official meaning manifests few levels of influence as it (Mozejko 2004: 148):

- 1) refers to a society characterized by advanced ethnic and cultural heterogeneity;
- 2) manifests the idea of equality and respect towards ethnic minorities and cultural groups;
- 3) serves as a notion to determine principles of the internal policy of a given country, joining

the rule of fully equal rights of all the citizens regardless of their origin, race, gender or religion;

- 4) requires to revise the curricula of school education at all levels, generating in consequence demand for “culturally sensitizing” curricula, enabling getting to know and understanding cultural differences by reference to, e.g., cultural heritage of a given ethnic group.

Therefore, in its official understanding, multiculturalism guarantees recognition of the cultural diversity within given country, still retaining unity and commitments for its sake as a macro-system, both in case of the entire minority communities and individual members. Nevertheless, taking into consideration the issue of locating such minority communities within a state, unofficial aspect of multiculturalism may be indicated, as cultural diversity (particularly the one emerged on the basis of national, ethnic, religious or racial diversity) – which becomes often a source of many tensions, revolts or antagonisms manifested in official multiculturalism – shall be a movement for the sake of a change, hence “(...) preventing repression towards multitude of social groups, ignoring their identity, devaluating the values of ethnic and minorities groups, and finally – acknowledging heterogeneous cultural structure” (Mozejko 2004: 158). Nevertheless, such understanding exposes domination of the majority group that legitimates (by appropriate jurisdiction) the law of coexistence of the culturally diverse minority groups, whereas the characteristic feature of nowadays migration flows shaping multicultural mosaic, is the fact that they take place not gradually with domination of a given ethnic group, but are specified by diversity, that stimulates the groups to find a common language, get to know, and understand each other (Mozejko 2004: 158). Therefore, considering multiculturalism in its unofficial understanding, it is worth to recall the notion of *creolisation* that denotes aware usage and mixture of cultural practices and material manifestations of a culture, symptomatic both for dominating, and for the local cultures (Melosik 2007: 15), approached on the neutral ground.

In such perception, this notion, as noticed by T. Turner, falls outside the control of official multiculturalism (Możejko 2004: 158). In consequence, it may be assumed after Z. Bauman, that the community of life (coexistence with the principle of inalienable affiliation) becomes replaced with the community of fate where “many rules and ideas appear, among which one can choose from, compare, make choice, and in other cases change them, verifying own previous choices, trying to reconcile in such a way demands contradictory and often impossible to combine” (Bauman 2007: 13–14).

Therefore, it is difficult to analyze homogenous minority groups or those explicitly defined, which easily single out their relations with dominating group. Hence, exploring multiculturalism in its unofficial aspect, it seems crucial to move towards the idea of interculturalism that “better expresses and emphasizes trans-cultural nature of the mutual learning, including cultural values of other groups within own standards and cultural values, in a way distant from imposing and assimilating, as it implies that (Korporowicz 1997: 69):

- no culture exists in closed and homogenous form,
- each culture constitutes a way of transmitting own values and patterns subject to advanced transformations, hence it is of procedural nature to a certain degree,
- no one is a typical member of a group,
- no one is a member of a solely one isolated group, as the identity is defined with reference to members of various groups,
- no one is granted own identity in ready-to-use and unchangeable form (Korporowicz 1997: 70–71).

Acknowledging the above assumptions puts accents on the cultural borderlines generated by interculturalism itself, which is perceived as “a process resulting from the modernity, globalization, transformation and integration. Influencing all spheres of human life, it releases and shapes mutual exchange and interactions beyond the centre, causing specific interpersonal communication connected

with the need to move beyond own culture, (...) shapes the ability to be and function on cultural, intellectual, mental, social, political and other borderlines. In consequence, the borderline understood as sphere of diversity, otherness and diversification out of the centre, where one may »compare«, »discover«, »express amazement«, »negotiate«, »conduct a dialogue«, becomes a natural environment of a contemporary man (Nikitorowicz 2005: 39). As a result, the word of such a man, being on one hand multidimensional and changeable, places the individuals among diversity, making them constantly redefine own self-identification (self-understanding, self-defining), but on the other creating spheres where it becomes possible for individuals and communities to exist, despite differences, among Others and together with Others, while integrating activities for own sake. The new intercultural quality, generated in such a way, sanctioning cultural diversity, implies breaking through the cultural closure in a favour of activity towards the change and openness towards all kinds of cultural diversity thanks to “constant negotiations, reculturation, transculturation, common borrowings, recognition of a duplex identity, that all lead to the third culture” (Nikitorowicz 2002: 265). The above shall be considered as a specific challenge stratifying all processes that should take place in their essential living conditions, oriented at shaping multidimensional identity of a contemporary man, particularly among the youth. Therefore crucial role within these processes is played by the multicultural education, as thanks to such it is possible, on one side, to notice and phenomenologically experience cultural differences of various provenience, and on the other side to create dialogic intercultural spaces, which accustom such cultural differences, making them part of social/communal or individual cultural orders. As a result, we deal with specific communicative continuum which can be subject to stratification by social relations of various character – from an open antagonism, through the passive antagonism, segregation, isolation, sham coexistence coming down to the mutual

accommodation, assimilation, finishing with intercultural coexistence as such (Golka 1997: 5).

In the above context, particular importance shall be drawn to acquiring communication competences, especially those of dialogic nature. Hence, according to F. Casmir, they should meet few basic criteria, i.e. (Korporowicz 1997: 68).

- Formulating the goals of interaction and openness towards defining tools. It results from the fact, that in many cases there is a need for redefining previously assumed premises of communication in consequence of the changes occurred in the surrounding of an individual or organization, but also as the result of internal transformations.
- Becoming basis for establishment of the abilities to expand contextual borders of communication, as in such way reconfiguration of meanings linked between each other, and inclusion of narratives (i.e. results of individual, group and organizational mediations) take place.
- Ability of positive response to intentional actions undertaken by other people or experiences as the consequence of encountering with another set of values. It should be accompanied with readiness to change own self-image.
- Future-orientation, i.e. search for that, what initiates and begins, rather than for what terminates or finalizes given interaction.

The above-presented model of communication competences exposes cognitive flexibility, cultural sensitivity, awareness of the relativity of values and cultural approaches, that all do not lead to disintegration of the identity, but become the basis for critical self-identification and distance towards own cultural “subjectivity”, readiness to understand emphatically values of other cultures, and innovativeness in perceiving goals and forms of communication (Korporowicz 1997: 68).

### **Family home and cultural experiencing**

Individuals belonging to various cultures, as noticed by J. Nikitorowicz, functioning in given

circumstances and conditions, experiencing given reactions and participating in such interactions, learn a unique perception and interpretation of the reality, hence, building up identity of a man understanding the Other occurs as a result of social interactions (Nikitorowicz 2010: 36–37). Therefore, in the process of acquiring intercultural competences, particular accent should be put on socialization – a widespread and coherent process of introducing individuals to the social world (Berger, Luckman 2001: 193) but also on upbringing is perceived as intentional educational processes (Schulz 2001: 253), taking place altogether in a family home. It is therefore the place where “systematic instilling given, characteristic patterns of thinking takes place from the very beginning, what in turn may lead to emergence of significant cultural differences between people” (Nisbet 2009: 12–13). Family home, apart from many other functions, also plays cultural role, as “through own culture, set of values and attitudes, protects the individual and small social group from global systems, but at the same time it also opens the members for these systems – the external worlds, national, and the general culture. Besides, the family home, apart from functioning as a bridge or connection with the homeland, efficiently serves as a shelter, protecting values in a critical situation” (Theiss 2008: 80).

Therefore, family home is significant as for unique “family – house homeland” – a family nest, a cradle, a patrimony with domination of such values as sense of being “at own place”, unity and belonging to the family, acceptance, love and happiness that are established by the family community, i.e., the mother, the father, ancestors, children, and grandchildren all functioning within given cultural sphere both of symbolic and material nature (Theiss 2008: 87). Hence, its cultural ethos is the beginning and the place of shaping cultural identity of the young generation, starting from the inherited identity, through open, dispersed one, integrated cultural identity to even a virtual one (Nikitorowicz 2005: 85–93). Each is saturated with own axiological standards of culture quality, situated in the continuum determined on

one hand by closure towards cultural diversity, through glorification of the culture of own community, and on the other – through multiculturalism, i.e. sanctioning cultural differences and establishing cultural borderlines. Still, it may be also determined by commercialization of the identity with cultural community, basic values and identity serving instrumental functions. The specificity of family socialization and upbringing, equipping young generation with given capital and cultural competences, determines coping with own, and others' cultural diversity. As a result, there may be various types of families, distinguished on the basis of attitude towards tradition and transmission of cultural values in multiethnic living conditions (Nikitorowicz 2001: 58–60).

I. *Type a family socializing and bringing up in ethnic centrism*, that isolates and separates the child within own religious and ethnic circle by:

- providing the sense of relation with religious and ethnic culture, protecting from the negative influences of prejudices and stereotypes;
- socializing and upbringing on the positivity of own group, i.e. systematic provision of sense of belonging, strong identification with the ancestors' culture by positive historical assessments;
- socialization and upbringing engaging religious practices and aware as well as active religious functioning, active participation in ethnic and religious organizations,
- socialization and upbringing influences directed at preserving possibly widest range of elements of religious and ethnic diversity, protection manifested in preserving and protecting cultural values.

II. *Type of a family socializing and upbringing dualistically* by:

- providing positive examples of mutual recognition of diversity and religious tolerance, mutual compromises and respect towards culturally diverse values;
- socialization and upbringing making individuals and groups closer, unifying in the context of mutual advantages of the interactions, indicating common traits,

positivities and negativities of both, leading to identification with two cultures in consequence;

- socialization and upbringing simultaneously engaging in making use of values represented by various groups preserving and cultivating own cultural diversity;
- socialization and upbringing influences directed at preserving and cultivation of selected elements of "own" group with simultaneous introduction of experiencing the culture of the majority group.

III. *Unstructured type of a family*, i.e. confused, dispersed in upbringing and socialization influences shaping cultural identity. In such family the following may take place:

- parents' helplessness in defining this, what is good and required for a child in the future, lack of explicit cultural orientation in the process of socialization and upbringing;
- imprecise and undetermined socialization and upbringing, taking place out of cultural values, resulting in the lack of identification with culture of some of the groups, at the same time lacking specific religious or ethnic behavior, as well as positive engagement in the culture of the majority culture with simultaneous neutral or negative approach towards it;
- lack of specifically determined relations between the awareness of a cultural and ethnic diversity and the culture of the majority group, manifested in independence of the elements of religious and ethnic identities between each other and other cultures, e.g. expressing positive attitudes towards "the own ones", with simultaneous lack of identification with them, or identifying with the majority culture at the same time cultivating some elements of the minority group;
- experiencing contradiction between the individual values and aspirations and the values and standards of the minority group, as well as with the values and expectations of the majority group, what results in changeability of socialization and upbringing influences.

IV. *Type of a family that withdraws through socialization and upbringing from the minority ethnic group for the sake of integration with the culture of the majority group*, therefore in such families takes place the following:

- resignation and systematic disappearance of elements assigned to ethnic culture, surrendering to the unifying influences of the culture of the majority group;
- socialization and upbringing takes place on the basis of dominating culture, not revealing own roots and cultural origin, in order to avoid “attribution” to the minority group and negative images or assessment of own group of origin resulting from it;
- socialization and upbringing is distant from negative stereotypes and prejudices in order to retain high self-esteem, accepting new, more effective values and pattern of behaviour in aspect of recent conditions and social situations;
- socialization and upbringing influences are oriented at identification with dominating culture with simultaneous elimination and liberation from the influences of the culture of the minority group.

With reference to the above-mentioned types of families, it may be concluded that the intergeneration transmission, manifested in socialization and upbringing in families, significantly influences the sense of belonging and cultural identification of the young generation, i.e. the process of conceptualizing own identity – integrated multidimensional identity, individual identity shaped in a time and space, inherited with the awareness of the past, expressed with the awareness of the present time and the identity constantly being acquired with the awareness of the future (Nikitorowicz 2005: 85).

### **Dilemmas of multiculturalism in culturally diverse families**

Multiculturalism, as shown in the above reflections, is manifested in the everyday reality of

a family both within its internal borders, as in external space of cultural functioning. Hence, the closer the families are in cultural aspects, the more noticeable is the similarity in accomplishing its basic tasks (Plopa 2005: 82). It is particularly noticeable when such cultural similarity refers to the social environment where such a family exists. But, it becomes a bit more complicated among those families, who are culturally diverse in multicultural connotation of the surrounding. Migrant families, especially those that decided to settle in the country of one of the spouse's origin or neutral for both, are experiencing such situation. Therefore, it is worth to ponder over the problem of coping with cultural diversity within the borders of own family, while simultaneously experiencing cultural diversity in the living environment. Research oriented in such way were conducted in the years 2009–2011 in the Institute of Pedagogy at University of Wrocław. They particularly focused on culture merging in the environment of culturally diverse families (particularly in national, ethnic and religious aspect) in the context of the quality of family socialization. The research results (**research team A. Nassim, M. Szuszfalak, M. Brzuchania under supervision of prof. A. Szerląg**) may constitute the grounds for analysis of the ways of coping with cultural diversity of the family itself, as well as the local environment in the context of a child's socialization, determining at the same time dominating types of the researched families. The research embraced 24 families, where one of the members represented cultural diversity of national nature (13 families, among such families were cases with one of the spouses of Turkish, Chinese and Moroccan origin), ethnic nature (2 families – with a mother, or a father of Roma origin), and religious nature (9 families with one of the spouses belonging to the Jehovah's witness, Buddhist or Muslims). In overwhelming majority of the researched cases the attractiveness of the culturally diverse partner and country of his/her origin were the basic premise to enter the marriage, what in turn constituted significantly the ways function-



ning of the researched families, particularly in socialization context – the status and range of parents' roles, socialization contents, as well as eliminating cultural barriers, particularly tackling the cultural compromise, also with regards to dominating culture related to the place of living. In most cases, the mother/wife was in inferior situation to the man – a husband/ father (especially in Muslim, Turkish, Moroccan and Chinese families), since from cultural perspective it was the father who was the leader, deciding in most important cases in the life of the family. Besides, in the situation of living in the father's country of origin, his family played crucial role in defining the range of the wife's or mother's commitments. Such situation was often surprising for the Polish women that decided to settle in the husband's country of origin. It is reflected in the following comments of the researched:

*It was only after the wedding that the wife began to pay attention to the customs in our house. She was surprised that, for example, in China women may sit at the table only after the men have finished their meal (...). As late as one week later, only because she liked her mother-in-law, she agreed to eat together with her, when all the men would finish their meal. Only then did she experience what privileges are women deprived of in China.*

*A woman in Turkey is a human being created by Allah. Comparing women's and men's position, the latter is still the stronger one, as the woman is not capable of living without the man. In my country, the woman has to listen to her husband. In case of opposition, he may use physical force against her. Besides, it is unacceptable for a woman to reveal her face. In such case she may be severely punished by her husband, as in such way she shows lack of belonging and expresses her freedom. Only a man may marry woman of other faith, because the Quran claims that he possesses within more faith. The woman does not inherit anything after her husband's death. Additionally, she must be sexually obedient.*

*The marriage with a Polish women was a disgrace for the family, as there was no shortage of gypsies. Nevertheless, Szero Roma eventually*

*agreed for us to marry. My grandfather came to the wedding, granting us with mangaripen, traditionally binding our hands together. There was no wedding reception as everyone was upset that I introduced a white one to the family.*

*In our family everyone, except from me, is a Muslim. My husband does not accept catholic faith, saying it is hypocritical and mendacious. Few months after the marriage he began to convince me to change my faith, but I did not agree, so he forbade me to go to church. He got rid of all crosses and sacral souvenirs. He still holds grudge against me for being catholic. When he goes to work or leaves the place where we live, I feel free. I go to church every day, I pray. I even have a small, hidden rosary.*

The above-mentioned comments, symptomatic for the researched, indicate that women, entering a marriage with a culturally diverse man, automatically with no right to make a choice, become inferior to their spouses. Such situation should be perceived as crucial source of conflicts in the researched families, as in the cited cases the family was whether disintegrated because of not dealing with the cultural diversity of the spouse, or closure within own culture took place, providing the sense of mental security with simultaneous accomplishment of everyday life reality resulting from the diverse culture. Nevertheless, in such situations it is difficult to point out any positive outlook for the future of such families.

Nevertheless, in case of those researched where both spouses were open towards cultural compromise (particularly on the ground of the faith) the situation was completely different, as it may be noticed in one of such orientated comments:

*In our family, we celebrate both catholic as well as Muslim feasts. I'm a tolerant person, therefore I know that for each believer, it is important to preserve own custom and tradition connected with the religion in order to save from disappearance the values transmitted from generation to generation.*

Therefore, on the basis of the research results, it may be stated that in majority, the

researched women, deciding to marry culturally diverse man, were not fully aware of the limitations of the role of a wife and a mother, resulting from the husband's cultural diversity. In the very few cases among the researched, there were women aware enough to work out with their husbands axiological grounds of family functioning and children socialization in situation of experiencing cultural diversity in the everyday reality, tackling the issue of cultivating cultural traditions of each and every spouse and working out common strategy of upbringing their children. The specific feature of such socialization resolutions was the cultural compromise and in consequence – shaping intercultural identity, i.e. subjective cultural process of becoming oneself by "(...) identification with the family culture (homogeneity of Me and the culture), reached by settling in and transmission of the heritage, bivalence and multiculturalism (heterogeneity of Me and the culture), assimilation of extorted and voluntary character, integration, with high self-assessment of family culture, being a result of a dialogue and negotiation" (Nikitorowicz, 2005: 93). In consequence, in the researched families over-cultural values are predominantly exposed, where cultural relations are of open character, i.e. accepting all kinds of cultural differences, spheres of cultural self-identification and communications as effects of negotiations, with the transmitted cultural contents of family origin, as the cultural worlds of culturally diverse parents are manifested in the everyday life reality of their children. In consequence, cultural orders specific for given family are established, enabling shaping intercultural qualities, as the researched families not only sustain diverse cultural traditions of both partners, but also work out new spheres of cultural manifestations of their own self and their children. In such context, it is worth to recall the following statements of the researched:

*Sometimes I am asked whether I'm not missing .... (almost everything can go here), what suggests cultural deterioration. But my experiences are different – I don't find my home culture deteriorated, quite the contrary. Within the culture*

*merging we create our own, unique traditions, that homogenous relations lack.*

*(....) It was mainly a battle who's stronger in the resolution to be tough and show the other half where his/her place is. Luckily, we realized with the time that such a struggle makes no sense, as each of us know the value of the other one, and we respect each other with no need to show own superiority.*

*It is a tradition in Muslim culture for the children to inherit faith after their father, so in our family me and my daughter are Muslims, whereas my wife is a Christian. Still, we celebrate religious feasts together – we decorate the Christmas tree during Christmas, buy presents, prepare Christmas Eve dinner. But it's only my wife who attends the midnight mass and we don't share the holly wafer. During the Easter it is also only my wife who goes to the church with the basket to bless the food, but we do not consume this food the next day. We normally eat a rich breakfast consisting of traditionally Polish products. We do not fast during the fasting period for the Catholics, and as far as Ramadan is concerned, I'm the only one who fasts as my daughter is too small. My wife also fasts but not every day, but she tries to celebrate the meals after dark as in Morocco. At the end of Ramadan we prepare together a great feast when we make wishes and give presents to each other. During the Sacrifice Day we buy a ram and give out the meat to the poor families living close to us.*

Analyses of the situation of culturally diverse families and socialization taking place in such circles, carried out during the research, make it possible to distinguish dominating types of such families, with the ways of coping with cultural diversity within own family and beyond as the main criteria.

1. *Type of a family positioning vertically with its simultaneous deconstruction.* In families of such a type intense confrontation of cultural influences takes place between the spouses, resulting in cultural domination of one of them, what in consequence affects the range and quality of children socialization. It is usually primacy of the majority culture over the minority one, ac-



accompanied by devaluation of the attractiveness of the latter. In turn, the family becomes disintegrated as the spouses are not capable to deal with cultural differences, crucial in all spheres of family life. External intervention experienced from the majority community is also of certain importance - particularly experienced from the extended family, that strengthens such cultural primacy.

2. *Type of family appropriating culture.* A process of both spontaneous and imposed advanced assimilation is typical for such types of families. Culturally diverse spouse, belonging to the minority community, appropriates entirely attributes of the dominating cultures of the spouse. Such situation is directly referring to the country, where such a family live. As a result, family socialization is monocultural, i.e. constituted only by these values, approaches, and attitudes typical for the dominating culture recognized within the family. At the same time, it becomes the only cultural space, with reference to which and in which, all self-identification cultural processes of the family members take place.

3. *Type of a seemingly coexisting family.* Such a type of a family mainly relates to such families, where pressure of dominating culture of a spouse, with simultaneous strong internal bonds, imposes working out a strategy protecting own (minority) cultural points of references of the other spouse. As the research proved, it comes down to hiding own cultural practices (particularly the religious ones) that provide sense of mental security, which is the basis for creation of the own cultural Me. Such cultural camouflage may refer to only one, culturally diverse spouse, but may be also transmitted onto the children. In consequence, socialization will be of façade character:

- oriented, on one hand, at mainly externalization of the attributes of dominating culture "to show off", providing sense of accomplishing cultural tasks, guarantying conflict-free functioning both within family and in local circles;
- nevertheless, on the other hand it will constitute internalized, individual experiencing of own (minority) culture with

simultaneous camouflage of behavior manifesting cultural belonging.

As a result, such socialization may lead to shaping in children incoherent, internally bipolar self-concept, the one expected by Others, and the private one - that challenges them with a difficult task of creating own identity.

4. *Type of a family of a diverse, open, home culture.* Mutual recognition of cultural diversity (particularly the religious one) of its members is reflected not only in respecting culturally different values, but also with regards to common (non-dual) axiological spheres of cultural self-identification, that become crucial point of reference for socialization. Such cultural diversity is considered as a unique quality of a culture, thanks to which is it possible to preserve and cultivate each and every culture, introducing to the culture the dominating group of the place of living at the same time. The attributes of communication relations refer to negotiations, cultural dialogue, cooperation and collaboration, hence the experienced cultural differences serve as an important stimuli of the development of the entire family community, both collectively and individually. Hence, they prepare to coexist with *the Other*, being for him/her *the Other* as well. Therefore, it may be assumed that creating *the Other* in family circles in relation to *the Other* becomes the basis for the sense of *Own-self*. Establishing such a type of a family is enhanced by living in the country where the spouses do not origin from, i.e. a place neutral for both of the spouses.

Taking into consideration the range of distinguished types of the family it may be concluded, that the recognized way of coping with cultural diversity of the spouse determines the cultural self-identification of the children, taking place during the process of family socialization. Still, the place where the family dwell is of significant importance, as if it is the country of one of the spouses' origin, the dominating culture becomes the living culture for the family, whereas living in a country neutral for both of the spouses enables openness towards cultural differences, orienting at interculturalism as a value with axiological standards it implies.

## Conclusion

Taking into consideration that „(...) in the context of the fate of the contemporary world, with ethnic absolutism as withdrawing feature of the late modernity, cultural diversity is becoming more and more significant, with threats of the new and old patterns of national and cultural identity that try to retain own identity, overtaking closed versions of cultures or communities, refusing to become involved (...) in difficult issues resulting from life with such differences (Bauman 2007: 92). Hence, in the process of creating own identity in the context of cultural self-identification, particularly within socialization taking place in culturally diverse family, it is worth to move towards diverse, open home culture, where cultural differences, becoming an attribute of the everyday reality of the family, stimulate towards new cultural quality – interculturalism. Therefore, education is becoming crucial (also in institutionalized way) as it sensitizes culturally and equips individuals with intercultural competences, including particularly communicative ones.

## References

- Bauman, Z. 2007. *Tożsamość. Rozmowy z Benedetto Vecchim*. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, 13–14, 92.
- Berger, P. L.; Luckman, T. 2001. Internalizacja rzeczywistości, in *Wprowadzenie do pedagogiki. Wybór tekstów*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls. 193.
- Golka, M. 1997. Oblicza wielokulturowości, in *U progu wielokulturowości. Nowe oblicza społeczeństwa polskiego*, Eds. Kempny, M.; Kapciak, A.; Łodziński, S. Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa. 5.
- Grzybowski, P. P. 2009. *Edukacja europejska – od wielokulturowości ku międzykulturowości: koncepcje edukacji wielokulturowej i międzykulturowej w kontekście europejskim ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem środowiska frankońskiego*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls, 132–133.
- Korporowicz, L. 1997. Wielokulturowość a międzykulturowość: od reakcji do interakcji, in *U progu wielokulturowości. Nowe oblicza społeczeństwa polskiego*. Eds. Kempny, M.; Kapciak, A.; Łodziński, S. Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa, 68–71.
- Melosik, Z. 2007. *Teoria i praktyka edukacji wielokulturowej*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls. 15.
- Możejko, E. 2004. Wielka szansa czy iluzja: wielokulturowość w dobie ponowoczesności, in *Dylematy wielokulturowości*. Ed. Kalaga, W. Kraków: TAIWPN Universitas, 147–160.
- Nikitorowicz, J. 2001. *Pogranicze. Tożsamość. Edukacja międzykulturowa*. Białystok: Trans Humana, 58–60.
- Nikitorowicz, J. 2002. Edukacja międzykulturowa wobec dylematów kształtowania tożsamości w społeczeństwach wielokulturowych, in *Pedagogika i edukacja wobec nowych wspólnot i różnic w jednoczącej się Europie*. Eds. Malewska, E.; Śliwerski, B. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls, 268, 265.
- Nikitorowicz, J. 2005. *Kreowanie tożsamości dziecka. Wyzwania edukacji międzykulturowej*. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 39, 85–93.
- Nikitorowicz, J. 2010. Reakcje i interakcje w komunikacji społecznej z perspektywy edukacji międzykulturowej, in *Edukacja równość czy jakość?*. Eds. Łukasik, J.; Nowosad, I.; Szymański, M. J. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 36–37.
- Nisbet, R. E. 2009. *Geografia myślenia*. Translation Wojtych, E. Sopot: Wydawnictwo Smak Słowa, 12–13.
- Płopa, M. 2005. *Psychologia rodziny. Teoria i badania*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls, 82.
- Schulz, R. 2001. Elementy pedagogicznego obrazu wychowania, in *Wprowadzenie do pedagogiki. Wybór tekstów*. Eds. Jaworska, T.; Lepert, R. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls. 253.
- Theiss, W. 2008. Dom i ojczyzna – miejsca w świecie bez miejsc. Trzy perspektywy, in *Dom i ojczyzna. Dylematy wielokulturowości*. Ed. La-lak, D. Warszawa: Universitas Varsoviensis, 80, 87.

## ŠEIMOS SOCIALIZACIJOS MODELIAI KAIP KOMUNIKACINIO DAUGIAKULTŪRIŠKUMO PASEKMĖS

Alicja Szerłaż

Šiuolaikiniam žmogui daugiakultūriškumas tapo kasdienybe. Jis skverbiasi į daugelį erdvių (oficialių ir neoficialių) ir ten įsitvirtina. Svarbus vaidmuo šiame procese atitenka šeimai, kuri, įgyvendindama vieną esminių savo pareigų, atveria naujai kartai daugialypį kultūros pasaulį. Kultūrinių vertybių ir tradicijų perteikimas daugiatautėje visuomenėje, pačioje šeimoje ir jos aplinkoje atsirandančių kultūrinių skirtumų įveikimo būdas nulemia įvairius šio kultūros pasaulio modelius. Jų savitumas lemia lankstumą prisitaikant prie kultūrinių paribių.

**Reikšminiai žodžiai:** postmodernizmas, daugiakultūriškumas, tarpkultūriškumas, daugiakultūrė komunikacija, šeimos kultūrinė funkcija, migrantų šeimų kultūriniai modeliai.

*Įteikta 2012-06-14; priimta 2012-09-03*