ORYGINALNE
ARTYKUŁY
BADAWCZE

Edyta Zawadzka

The Maria Grzegorzewska University, Warsaw, Poland

e-mail: ezawadzka@aps.edu.pl

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6100-6607

Parental Teleological Awareness Based on Research Conducted in Central Poland*

Abstract:

The research problem discussed in this text concerns the specificity of parental teleological awareness, the components of which, in accordance with a constructed theoretical framework, are parental attitudes towards the child-rearing goals, types of their teleological awareness and the content of the child-rearing goals. The considerations are based on the results of the surveys that were conducted in central Poland. The research sample consisted of 212 parents who have filled the survey questionnaire that consisted of both open-ended and closed-ended questions. The results show that within the study group of parents, the child-rearing activity is usually deliberate, and that one can identify 4 types of parental teleological awareness (passive and active, as well as primary and secondary), with active and secondary being the dominant ones. Regardless of the fact that the content of the child-rearing goals within the said group is characterised by diversity, they usually form internally coherent system. In terms of preferred goals, one can observe the tendency among the parents to declare the intentions to pursue the objectives related to universal values, having a negotiable meaning, more often than not with individualistic rather than social qualities, and those assuming the

ORYGINALNE ARTYKUŁY BADAWCZE

child's subjectivity in the process of achieving them. The stated (verbalized) goals usually refer to postulated vision of a human being or his/her features.

Keywords: child-rearing goals, family child-rearing goals, teleological awareness, teleology of child-rearing, family child-rearing.

Introduction

Regardless of the pluralism of definitions and concepts regarding the upbringing (Kron, 2012, pp. 152–214; Śliwerski, 2012, pp. 144–300; Kubiak-Szymborska, 2013, pp. 12–13), that one could find within the field of Polish social sciences, it is perceived as a phenomenon the main feature of which is purposefulness (Sobczak, 2000, pp. 22, 31–38; Janke, 2002, pp. 78–80; Łobocki, 2006, p. 54). This thesis could be debatable, of course, for instance, with regard to the evolutionary definitions of upbringing, as well as to ways, in which it could be understood as raising, giving a permission to grow (Kron, 2012, pp. 153, 159––161), accompanying in development (Marynowicz-Hetka, 2005, pp. 341–343) or meeting (Gadacz, 2008, pp. 76–77; Walczak, 2011). However, assuming that upbringing that is implemented in such ways is completely deprived of goals seems to be a simplification. Regardless of the fact that each and every one of the said concepts excludes direct shaping according to a model or an ideal, none of them is without assumptions. There is a goal that accompanies the educator inscribed in all of them, even if it is "just" the development of a child according to his/her potential, the realization of humanity or subjectivity, or self-discovery of one's own identity.

When substantiating the importance of goals in upbringing, it is emphasized that they give meaning to the whole process and make it more detailed and concrete. They also help one to distinguish its stages. Moreover, they play the role of a starting point for reflection over situations and methods of raising children. Goals may also be seen as a criterion for assessing the effectiveness of undertaken activities. Furthermore, they have motivating qualities, they determine the behaviour of educators as well as the shape and the quality of communication between subjects of upbringing (Gurycka, 1979, pp. 164–167; Furmanek, 2003, p. 460; Schwarz et al., 2005, p. 207; Rowe & Casillas, 2011, pp. 476, 486–488).

Due to the importance of upbringing goals, the topic of teleology is discussed relatively often (Sośnicki, 1967; Muszyński, 1974; Miałkowska-Rejmer, 1981; Araszkiewicz, 1986; Sobczak, 2000; Bos et al., 2004; Achhpal et al.,

2007; Tulviste et al., 2007; Gara, 2009; Meng, 2012; Döge & Keller, 2014a; 2014b; Wesołowska, 2019). Polish publications in the aforementioned field tend to focus on the theoretical aspect of the matter and concern the general understanding of upbringing (the information regarding the space of establishing and achieving the goals is not specified). The authors usually write about the definition of upbringing goals, as well as the impact that objectives have on the quality of the process. One might also find information about views that were characteristic in various historical periods, disciplines and upbringing trends, as well as reflections on their sources and justifications. The publications prepared by Z. Miałkowska-Rejmer (1981) and P. Wesołowska (2019) are an exception to this rule. In these texts, along with theoretical assumptions, one may find the results of empirical research on the goals of family child-rearing. The theoretical reflections might also be found in the international periodicals. However, their main point of interest seems to be presenting the results of research on family child-rearing, focusing on the content of its goals understood both as an individual issue (Bos et al., 2004; Achhpal et al., 2007; Tulviste et al., 2007; Marshall & Van Der Wolf, 2013; Döge & Keller, 2014b; Chang & Lee, 2017), and in relation to other elements and conditions, for instance parenting styles (Li et al., 2010), the types of value systems that are preferred by the parents (Schwarz et al., 2005), communication with children (Rowe & Casillas, 2011) or the child's temperament (Meng, 2012).

The main aspect of considerations in this article is parental teleological awareness. While working on the said topic, the goal was to fit into the international empirical discourse regarding family child-rearing goals, but also to enrich Polish theoretical and empirical reflection on this matter.

Theoretical background of the subject field of analysis

According to F.W. Kron (2012, p. 46), the term "upbringing" is "ordinary and common", the implication of which is the need to understand it in the micro--social perspective and to define its specificity in relation to upbringing environments. Due to this fact, the creation of theoretical background for this matter had its beginnings within reflections regarding family child-rearing. The connection to everyday life gives it a double dimension. It consists of intentional, planned and well thought out actions, which one could identify with striving to achieve conscious child-rearing goals. Furthermore, there are developmental factors and circumstances (context of child-rearing), as well as impact (not necessarily realized by parents) in everyday family life the content of which

may be both contradictory and consistent with intentional acts of child-rearing (Kułaczkowski, 2011, p. 36).

It is rare for parents to possess scientific knowledge of child-rearing or its teleological aspects, which is reflected in the views of B. Suchodolski (1985, p. 70), who, when distinguishing between verbalized and non-verbalized goals, created a thesis that it is the second one that could be considered as characteristic for a family child-rearing reality. However, in the literature on the subject, it is emphasized that one of the most important factors that determines the shape of family child-rearing is the parents' pedagogical culture (Kawula, 2009), their individual knowledge of child-rearing (Opozda, 2012), child-rearing (Świdrak, 2013) or pedagogic (Wesołowska, 2019) awareness or subjective theories regarding child-rearing (Kornadt & Trommsdorff, 1990, cited in Schwarz et al., 2005). In the context of the dual dimension of family child-rearing, the term that is the most accurate seems to be "child-rearing awareness" perceived as a component of the family's pedagogical culture, and understood by H. Cudak (2007, p. 454) as "internally shaped pedagogical reactions between the adult – guardian, educator, parent – and the child, a reflection on methods, child-rearing goals, development, socialization, child-rearing and caring conditions, and the effects of such behaviours". This way of thinking reflects the component-relational approach, in which the teleological awareness, which is the subject of analysis in this text, functions in connection with other elements of child-rearing awareness. This thesis finds its confirmation in the views of K. Konarzewski (1987, pp. 7–9), who believes in the necessity to synthesize the teleological, axiological, and technological aspects in the process of reflection on the upbringing. A.W. Janke's (2002, pp. 80, 83–84) opinion on this matter seems to support this theory as well, as he points to the coexistence of the teleological component with those of an anthropological, axiological and praxeological nature.

Due to the topic that this paper focus on, the second aspect that is considered important for the creation of theoretical background is reflection on the upbringing goals. While analysing and interpreting ways, in which they could be understood, one is able to conclude that they relate to what educators would like to achieve in the upbringing process. However, if one wants to dive deeper into both Polish and international scientific discourse, it is necessary to point out two significant differences between them in this respect. While characterizing the first one, it is imperative to highlight the fact that Polish upbringing theorists (Sośnicki, 1967; Muszyński, 1974; Śliwerski, 2012; Leś, 2018) tend to focus on the conceptual precision, that is, they distinguish the process of the

upbringing from other social processes, as well as aspects that may influence the development of a human being or his/her realization of humanity. One could say that their considerations relate strictly to the goals of upbringing. The reflections of the international theorists are characterised by certain diversity – it is possible to find texts, in which the term "child-rearing goals" is used consonantly (Bos et al., 2004; Tulviste et al., 2007; Döge & Keller, 2014a; 2014b) as well as papers in which it is used interchangeably with the terms parental goals (Rowe & Cassilas, 2011; Meng, 2012; Chang & Lee, 2017) or assumptions/ goals of socialization (Danso et al., 1997; Achhpal et al., 2007; Li et al., 2010; Meng, 2012). The second difference concerns the object of upbringing goals. In Polish definitions, it is usually described as a desired condition (Muszyński, 1974, p. 23; Łobocki, 2006, p. 124; Śliwerski, 2012, p. 69) or specified by reference to the personality (Milerski & Śliwerski, 2000, p. 34; Janke, 2002, p. 79; Okoń, 2007, p. 466). In English-language publications, goals of upbringing describe the ideal model of human development (Schwarz et al., 2005, p. 207; Rowe & Casillas, 2011, pp. 477–478; Marshall & Van Der Wolf, 2013, p. 3; Döge & Keller, 2014a, p. 37; Bembich, 2016, p. 72). In these texts the development process is understood broadly because it takes into account personality traits as well as competences relating to various spheres of human functioning. Stating that Polish literature is completely deprived of references to development in the context of child-rearing, and its objectives would not be correct. However, they are less often reflected in the definitions of the child-rearing goals.

Teleological awareness is a very complex construct, which is why, while constructing the theoretical research model, I decided to highlight its 3 components. The first one is the parent's attitude towards child-rearing goals. When justifying its inclusion into the process of scientific analysis, the attention was brought to the views of A. Wróbel (2014, p. 12), as the researcher believes that a specific understanding of intentionality is the foundation of any upbringing activity. Moreover, due to the fact that avoiding normativism of pedagogy in relation to the family, which M. Nowak-Dziemianowicz (2012, pp. 15–19) points out to, is my desired objective, assuming that every parent thinks of the goals as an inherent element of the child-rearing process, and has an approving approach towards them is considered incorrect. The second component consists of the types of teleological awareness. A number of indicators were taken into account in the process of constructing them. The last component is the content of the child-rearing goals.

Methodological assumptions of the research

The basis of the considerations in the further part of the text is a fragment of the survey research. The goal of the research was to recognise teleological aspects of family child-rearing by referring to two issues – parental teleological awareness and justifications of the child-rearing goals. In this article, it is the first one that has become the major focus, which is why it is needed to reference the main problem that is related to it: "what is the specificity of parental teleological awareness?", as well as 3 detailed questions that arise from constructed theoretical frame:

1. What are the parents' attitudes towards child-rearing goals?
2. What is the type of teleological awareness that the parents possess? The presence of this detailed question is an implication of an assumption that teleological awareness is a multidimensional construct, which makes it a reasonable idea to distinguish its various types. I shall answer this question by creating 2 self-constructed typologies. Within each of them, 2 types of teleological awareness, the construction method of which is explained further in the text, are distinguished.
3. What is the content of child-rearing goals?

In order to find answers to the aforementioned questions, a survey was conducted along with constructing a questionnaire that consisted of both open-ended and closed-ended questions. The closed-ended questions allowed the researcher to obtain the information regarding the parents' attitudes towards the presence of goals in child-rearing, having child-rearing goals and the content of preferred goals. The open-ended question, on the other hand, provided the information regarding the content of verbalized goals. The answers to both types of questions provided indicators necessary in the process of constructing typologies of types of teleological awareness.

The population consisted of primary school students' parents from two voivodeships located in central Poland. Due to the pilot nature of the research, the high cost of random selection as the only way of obtaining a representative sample (Brzeziński, 2019, p. 118) as well as the lack of access to the full sampling frame, it was not assumed to select representative sample in conducted research. The implications of this decision are expressed in considering the conclusions formulated as fully valid only for the group under study. At the same time, not completely random sampling does not invalidate the cognitive value of the analyses or deprive them of their sense (Muszyński, 2018, p. 205), especially in the context of the small number of Polish empirical

studies on teleological topics. It should also be noted that the sample was not intentionally biased. The research procedure involved drawing from the created frame five towns in each of the two voivodeships, and then in each of them one primary school, the headmaster of which was contacted and asked to distribute the questionnaires to the parents of pupils. Thereby it was certain that the questionnaire would be filled in by a parent and not another person (which would be a risk in the case of Internet research). In addition, because of the intention to create the conditions for respondents to engage in in-depth reflection on teleological issues, each questionnaire came in an addressed envelope with a stamp so that completed questionnaires could be returned at no cost. A total of 700 questionnaires were provided to schools, of which slightly more than 30% (212), despite repeated requests to parents, were completed and returned. The research sample can be considered relatively heterogeneous (Table 1).

Table 1. Characteristics of the research sample

Variable	Variable value	N	%
gender	man	42	19.8
	woman	170	80.2
age	≤3 0 (due to the small proportion of under-25s in the survey sample (2), this category is presented together with the "25–30" category so that age could be included in the statistical analyses).	11	5.2
	31–35 years	24	11.3
	36–40 years	86	40.6
	41–45 years	68	32.1
	45 years	23	10.8
level of education	primary/lower secondary or vocational education (due to the small share of people with primary/lower secondary education in the research sample (2), this category was presented together with the category „vocational", which made it possible to include level education in the statistical analyses).	12	5.7
	secondary	50	23.6
	post-secondary non tertiary	14	6.6
	tertiary	136	64.2
place of residence	countryside	15	7.1
	city with up to 100,000 inhabitants	139	65.6
	city with more than 100,000 inhabitants	58	27.4

Table 1. Characteristics of the research sample (cont.)

Variable	Variable value	N	%
gender of children	female	68	32.1
	male	77	36.3
	male and female	67	31.6

Source: Author's research.

Statistical analysis of the collected research material was carried out using SPSS 25.0 software and was aimed at obtaining information on the distribution of respondents' answers and the relationship between variables using the chi-squared test of independence. The obtained results were then subjected to interpretation.

Research findings
Parents' attitudes towards the child-rearing goals

A component of teleological awareness that forms the background for the others is parents' attitudes towards the child-rearing goals. In order to obtain relevant data, the respondents were asked to choose from five statements the one closest to their opinion. The distribution of respondents' answers is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Parents' attitudes towards the child-rearing goals

Statement characterizing the attitude towards the child-rearing goals A parent acts appropriately when:	N	%
specifies comprehensively what he/she would like to achieve in the child-rearing process	36	17.0
specifies what he/she would like to achieve in the child-rearing process, but does not do so in detail	26	12.3
defines what he/she would like to achieve in the child-rearing process, but at the same time is ready to change his/her plans and act spontaneously	118	55.7
does not generally define what he/she would like to achieve in the child-rearing process, but sometimes sets certain goals to be achieved in the process	26	12.3
completely refrains from specifying what he/she would like to achieve in the child-rearing process	6	2.8

Source: Author's research.

As the above data show, the vast majority of respondents (85%) believed that family child-rearing should be a purposeful activity. However, their views were not completely homogeneous. Perceivable differences concerned both opinions

on the postulated degree of generality of goals and the demonstration of readiness to modify them. The significant percentage differences between the third statement and the two preceding ones, allow to draw an inference, that the dominant part of parents with an approving attitude towards goals understood the specificity of child-rearing as a process requiring the adaptation of its shape to e.g. the stage of development of the child, his/her needs or the range of experiences of the parents. Only slightly more than 15% denied the goal-oriented dimension of child-rearing, of which almost 3% definitely, and slightly more than 12% partly, believing that the formulation of goals is only sometimes justified. Factors differentiating parents' approach to child-rearing goals (with the adopted level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.05$) were their gender ($\chi^2(4) = 14.06$; $p = 0.007$; Cramer's V = 0.257) and level of education ($\chi^2(12) = 44.03$; $p < 0.001$; Cramer's V = 0.263). Women and parents with a higher level of education were statistically significantly more likely to have a positive attitude to the presence of goals in child-rearing, in particular to their definition with the possibility of modification, than men and persons with lower levels of education.

Types of parental teleological awareness

The analyses conducted in this section are based on the assumption that all respondents who chose to participate in the research had teleological awareness. At the same time, the answers to the questions concerning the possession of child-rearing goals and the content of stated (verbalized) and preferred goals allow the construction of two typologies of types of teleological awareness. Within the first, two mutually exclusive types were distinguished – active and passive. Table 3 presents indicators of the types indicated above.

Table 3. Indicators of active and passive teleological awareness

Indicators	Types of teleological awareness	
	active	passive
expressing views on the purposefulness of the child-rearing process	X	X
content of the answer to the question "do you have any child-rearing goals?"	yes	no
identification of a minimum of one stated or preferred child-rearing goal	X	–

Source: Author's elaboration.

Based on the above indicators, it is possible to conclude that 199 parents (94%) had active teleological awareness. The others had passive teleologi-

cal awareness. Gender ($\chi^2(1) = 15.18$; $p < 0.001$; Cramer's V = 0.268), age ($\chi^2(4) = 10.74$; p = 0.03; Cramer's V = 0.225), level of education ($\chi^2(3) = 23.48$; p < 0.001; Cramer's V = 0.333) of respondents and place of residence ($\chi^2(2) = 12.70$; p = 0.002; Cramer's V = 0.245) were found to be statistically significant differentiating factors between parents having passive or active teleological awareness. Females, parents aged between 31 and 35, with a university education and living in cities with less than 100,000 inhabitants were statistically significantly more likely to have active teleological awareness than the other groups of respondents.

The basis for the creation of the second typology are the answers to an open-ended and a closed-ended question regarding the content of the goals of child-rearing. Individuals (169) who were able to verbalize the goals of child-rearing (answered an open-ended question) were considered to have primary teleological awareness. Respondents formulated between 1 and 10 objectives, most often 3 or 4 (M = 4.95; SD = 2.36). The factors that differentiated the possession of primary teleological awareness were gender ($\chi^2(1) = 16.51$; p < 0.001; Cramer's V = 0.279), level of education ($\chi^2(3) = 35.31$; p < 0.001; Cramer's V = 0.408) of respondents and place of residence ($\chi^2(2) = 8.95$; p = 0.011; Cramer's V = 0.205). Women, people with higher education and those living in cities with less than 100,000 inhabitants had it statistically significantly more often than other groups.

The second type has been given the name of secondary teleological awareness. Its indicator was considered to be the ability to choose from among the goals proposed by the researcher those that are in line with the own child-rearing preferences. Its owners were all parents with active teleological awareness. The respondents chose from 4 to 30 goals, most often 24 or 26 (M = 20.60; SD = 5.39). It is important to emphasize the fact that primary and secondary teleological awareness were not mutually exclusive constructs. All parents who could verbalize the goals of child-rearing were also aware of their teleological preferences.

The constructed types of parental teleological awareness make it possible to understand this construct as a whole. In this context, it is crucial to emphasize the legitimacy of including passive teleological awareness in the analysis. In the presented research, 5 out of 6 respondents who completely denied purposefulness as a feature of child-rearing were the owners of this type of teleological awareness. The lack of goals therefore corresponded to their views and did not reflect a lack of competence to set them.

Content of the child-rearing goals

The third component of teleological awareness is the content of the child-rearing goals. Because of potential difficulties in verbalizing child-rearing objectives, it was decided to refer to two types of them while developing this issue. The first are preferred goals (Miałkowska-Rejmer, 1981), i.e. those that respondents considered to be in line with their preferences and chose from those proposed by the researcher. The survey questionnaire offered parents a choice of 30 diverse goals relating to specific spheres of a person's life as well as describing general vision of human being. Their content was based on the conclusions of the author's doctoral dissertation (2015), in which a qualitative research perspective was used. It contributed to the construction of a broad base of goals potentially corresponding to the parents' teleological preferences. In the research analysed in this article, respondents first chose all the objectives close to them from the proposed goals and then the 6 most important ones. Because of the belief that goals considered most important are a more accurate indicator of teleological preferences than all chosen objectives, analyses of preferred goals refer to them. The distribution of respondents' preferences is shown in Tables 4a and 4b, where the order of goals is determined by the frequency of their selection by respondents.

Table 4a. Content of goals preferred by a minimum of 20% of parents

Content of the child-rearing goals – I would like to	N	%
raise a happy person[*]	111	55.8
to raise a good person[*, *****]	103	51.8
my daughter/son to be able to distinguish between good and evil[**]	87	43.7
to raise a responsible person for himself/herself, his/her life, and development[*]	81	40.7
to raise a wise person	79	39.7
my daughter/son to be able to think critically and have independent views on any subject	66	33.2
my daughter/son to be able to take care of his/her safety[***]	57	28.6
my daughter/son to know that other people's needs and welfare are as important as her/his own	48	24.1
my daughter/son to be guided in life by certain values	47	23.6
my daughter/son to be able to live in a multicultural society[*]	46	23.1
my daughter/son to take care of her/his intellectual development	40	20.1

Note: the following designations were used for factors differentiating respondents' preferences for a given goal: [*] gender of the respondent, [**] age, [***] level of education, [****] place of residence, [*****] gender of the respondent's child/children.

Source: Author's research.

Table 4b. Content of goals preferred by less than 20% of parents

Content of the child-rearing goals – I would like	N	%
my daughter/son to be able to perfectly fulfil the duties related to social roles	39	19.6
to raise a cultured person	34	17.1
my daughter/son to be independent in everyday activities	33	16.6
my daughter/son to understand the importance of health in human life	30	15.1
my daughter/son to know the principles of a healthy lifestyle	28	14.1
my daughter/son to know the rules of society	28	14.1
my daughter/son to achieve a certain level of education	27	13.6
to raise a person who will be the best version of himself/herself	25	12.6
my daughter/son to make morally correct decisions	23	11.6
my daughter/son to be able to spend time in a cultural way*	20	10.1
my daughter/son to know Polish traditions and customs	18	9.0
my daughter/son to have certain character traits	15	7.5
to raise a physically well-developed person***	13	6.5
my daughter/son to put social goals above his/her personal goals and needs*, ****	10	5.0
my child to know the social expectations of women and men	10	5.0
my daughter/son to put Polish culture above others*	8	4.0
my daughter/son to have the same views as me*	8	4.0
to raise a person similar to myself	5	2.5
to raise a person from whom society will benefit*, ***	3	1.5

Note: the following designations were used for factors differentiating respondents' preferences for a given goal: * gender of the respondent, ** age, *** level of education, **** place of residence, ***** gender of the respondent's child/children.

Source: Author's research.

The analysis of the respondents' teleological preferences should begin with the finding that the content of the goals of child-rearing preferred by parents was characterized by high diversity. Only two goals – those concerning the child-rearing of a happy and good person – were chosen by at least 50% of the respondents with active teleological awareness. Due to the volume and purposes of the text, as well as the belief that the tables above clearly illustrate the distribution of parental teleological preferences, the analysis relating to the frequency of selecting each of the goals was abandoned. At the same time, I would like to emphasize that there was a noticeable inclination of parents to choose goals related to universal values, having a negotiable meaning and more often an individualistic than social dimension, as well as goals that assume the child's

subjectivity in the process of achieving them. Moreover, the respondents more often declared that they want their child to have the ability to think critically and to have independent views rather than those consistent with their own opinions, and they also expressed their intention to raise a person who would be the best version of himself/herself rather than one similar to them. For most goals (19), socio-demographic factors did not differentiate parents' preferences towards them.

The obtained data also allow for the conclusion that the goals assigned to individual spheres of child-rearing were not equally valued by parents. The most important goals preferred by the respondents belonged to the moral (308), then cognitive (220), biological (161), cultural (126) and social (90) spheres. Moreover, the respondents decided to select 237 child-rearing goals related to the general vision of a human being.

When constructing the theoretical frame of the research, apart from the preferred goals, stated objectives were distinguished, i.e. those that parents are able to verbalize in response to the question about their own child-rearing goals. Their content was also highly diversified, and it is also possible to indicate the goals declared by individual people. Moreover, most of them did not refer to a specific phase of human life, but rather were universal in nature, possible to be achieved regardless of age.

When formulating goals, parents most often referred to what kind of person they would like to raise. The following adjectives appeared in their reflections: good (25), responsible and consciously deciding about his/her own life and affairs (21), happy (15), empathetic (11), wise (10), honest (9), tolerant (8), educated (5), respecting other people (5), fair (4), self-accepting (3), loyal (3), open to knowledge coming from various sources (3), polite (3), ambitious (2), curious about the world (2), sincere (2), sensitive (1), truthful (1), forgiving (1), widely-read (1), helpful (1), not thinking only about himself/herself (1). Only in the answer of one respondent (male) there was a reference to gender expressed in the intention to raise a "real man", which allows for the conclusion that the human qualities that were important according to parents had a universal quality, essential for the realization of the humanity of people of both genders.

Another area of the goals of child-rearing is knowledge. There was no homogeneity in the study group, both in terms of its type and subject matter. In the child-rearing goals there were references to general (3) and specialized knowledge (1), regarding the country (1), Europe (1), one's own strengths and weaknesses (2), permissible and forbidden acts (1), and issues important from the point of view of social functioning (1).

The child-rearing goals relatively often referred to the desired skills. Parents declared that their children should be able to "cope with life" (2), distinguish between good and evil as well as truth and falsehood (4), take care of the family and fulfil its living needs (3), make decisions (3), deal with different situations (2), establish relationships (2), understand the consequences of their own actions (1) or deal with problems (1). Two people also mentioned a resistance to manipulation, and one – adaptation to the changing reality.

In the child-rearing goals formulated by several parents, there were also references to the sources of principles on which human behaviour should be based. Those were conscience (2), "self-formed moral backbone and the Bible" (1), social norms (1), values (good, honesty, truth; 1), law (1).

To conclude the part concerning the content child-rearing goals, it should be noted that even though the goals of family child-rearing were highly diversified, they formed an internally coherent system, the indicator of which was the lack of contradictory child-rearing objectives in relation to almost every (207) family.

Conclusions

Summing up the considerations, one should refer to the research question concerning the specificity of teleological awareness and conclude that the vast majority of the respondents had teleological awareness, the scope of which went beyond the views on the presence of goals in child-rearing. Understanding that child-rearing should be a deliberate activity, parents were usually also able to define the goals they would like to achieve in a child-rearing process. This conclusion corresponds with the results of the P. Wesołowska's (2019, p. 146) research, which showed that almost 94% of parents were aware of the child-rearing goals, which was equated with undertaking reflection on them before participating in the study. In the earlier cited studies which were carried out outside Poland, this issue was not a subject of interest – the researchers considered the presence of goals in the child-rearing activities obvious and did not verify the adopted assumption.

Despite understanding the purposeful nature of child-rearing, some parents had problems with verbalizing the goals of the process. It should be noted that there were fewer self-determined goals than those chosen by the parents in cafeteria question, and also not all parents with secondary teleological awareness had primary awareness. Moreover, the verbalized goals were characterized by a high level of generality, i.e. meanings included in them were not specified.

Therefore, these statements are partially consistent with the views of B. Su-chodolski (1985, p. 70) cited earlier. Due to the fact that the analyses presented in the empirical texts cited in the Introduction (Gurycka, 1979; Bos et al., 2004; Schwarz et al., 2005; Meng, 2012; Marshall & Van Der Wolf, 2013; Döge & Keller, 2014a) are usually based on questions requiring a choice from the pro-posed goals or to take an attitude towards the goals given by the researcher, it is illegitimate to formulate comparative conclusions regarding the verbalization of child-rearing goals and their level of concreteness. Moreover, in the studied group, the content of the goals of child-rearing was heterogeneous. On this ba-sis, it is possible to formulate a conclusion, which requires verification in repre-sentative studies, that today one socially approved teleological model of family child-rearing does not seem to exist.

In the process of constructing this text, as indicated earlier, the normative approach was abandoned, which resulted in the lack of valuation of the content of child-rearing goals. In justifying this decision, reference was made to the views of B. Śliwerski (2015, p. 61), who emphasizes the lack of unambigu-ous and commonly accepted criteria for assessing the value of the child-rearing goals. Therefore, it seems reasonable to consider the content of the goals as the implementation of the parents' right to express and implement their visions regarding (the support of) their child's development and not to evaluate them from the perspective of e.g. assumptions of various pedagogical trends or chal-lenges of the present day. Such a strategy does not exclude the implementation of educational activities towards parents aimed at developing their teleological awareness, e.g. by making them aware of the importance of goals in child-rear-ing, creating an opportunity to reflect on them or supporting them in the process of verbalizing and defining them.

As indicated earlier, due to the lack of representativeness of the research sample, the conclusions formulated in the text are of limited external validity. In this context, the cognitive value of the article is expressed:

– at the empirical level – in providing a number of hypotheses worth veri-fying in replication studies carried out on representative samples. Due to the socio-cultural determinants of the shape of child-rearing (Tromms-dorff & Kornadt, 2003, pp. 271–300; Schwarz et al., 2005, pp. 204–207; Bembich, 2016, p. 72), the indicated value applies mainly to Polish re-searchers. However, it seems that the text may also provide inspiration for foreign scientists wishing to conduct comparative research,
– at the theoretical level – primarily in complementing the teleological reflection with four types of teleological awareness.

References

Achhpal, B., Goldman, J.A., & Rohner, R.P. (2007). A Comparison of European American and Puerto Rican Parents' Goals and Expectations About the Socialization and Education of Pre-School Children. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 15(1), 1–13, doi: 10.1080/09669760601106620.

Araszkiewicz, F.W. (1986). *Teleologia wychowania w Polskiej Rzeczypospolitej Ludowej (1944–1980)* [Teleology of Upbringing in Polish People's Republic (1944–1980)]. Słupsk: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna w Słupsku.

Bembich, C. (2016). Parenting and Educational Aims in a Cross Cultural Perspective: How Culture Affects Early Interactions with the Child. *Rivista Italiana di Educazione Familiare*, 11(1), 71–85, doi: 10.13128/RIEF-18501.

Bos, H.M.W., van Balen, F., & van Den Boom, D.C. (2004). Experience of Parenthood, Couple Relationship, Social Support, and Child-Rearing Goals in Planned Lesbian Mother Families. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45(4), 755–764, doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00269.x.

Brzeziński, J. (2019). *Metodologia badań psychologicznych. Wydanie nowe* [Methodology of Psychological Research. A New Edition]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Chang, E.S., & Lee, B. (2017). Parenting Goals and Perceived Shared and Non-Shared Agency Among Kirogi Mothers of a Youth. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 22(4), 470–483, doi: 10.1080/02673843.2016.1245149.

Cudak, H. (2007). Świadomość wychowawcza rodziców [Parent Educational Awareness]. In: T. Pilch (Ed.), *Encyklopedia pedagogiczna XXI wieku* [Pedagogical Encyclopaedia of the XXI Century], Vol. 6 (pp. 454–456). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Żak.

Danso, H., Hunsberger, B., & Pratt, M. (1997). The Role of Parental Religious Fundamentalism and Right-Wing Authoritarianism in Child-Rearing Goals and Practices. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 36(4), 496–511, doi: 10.2307/1387686.

Döge, P., & Keller, H. (2014a). Child-Rearing Goals and Conceptions of Early Childcare from Young Adults' Perspective in East and West Germany. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 19(1), 37–49, doi: 10.1080/02673843.2012.692657.

Döge, P., & Keller, H. (2014b). Similarity of Mothers' and Preschool Teachers' Evaluations of Socialization Goals in a Cross-Cultural Perspective. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 28(3), 377–393, doi: 10.1080/02568543.2014.913279.

Furmanek, W. (2003). Cele pedagogiczne [Pedagogical Goals]. In: T. Pilch (Ed.), *Encyklopedia pedagogiczna XXI wieku* [Pedagogical Encyclopaedia of the XXI Century], Vol. 1 (pp. 459–468). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Żak.

Gadacz, T. (2008). Wychowanie jako spotkanie osób [Upbringing as a Meeting of Humans]. In: E. Kubiak-Szymborska, & D. Zając (Eds.), *O wychowaniu i jego antynomiach* [About Upbringing and Its Antinomies] (pp. 70–77). Bydgoszcz: Wers.

Gara, J. (2009). *Od filozoficznych podstaw wychowania do ejdetycznej filozofii wychowania* [From the Philosophical Fundaments of Education to Eidetic Philosophy of Education]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej.

Gurycka, A. (1979). *Struktura i dynamika procesu wychowawczego. Analiza psychologiczna* [Structure and Dynamics of Upbringing Process. Psychological Analysis]. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Janke, A. W. (2002). Perspektywa analizy wychowania w kategorii procesu [Perspective of Analysis of Education in Process Category]. In: A.M. de Tchorzewski (Ed.), *Współczesne konteksty wychowania. W kręgu pytań i dyskusji* [Contemporary Contexts of Education. In the Circle of Questions and Discussions] (pp. 64–92). Bydgoszcz: Wers.

Kawula, S. (2009). Kultura pedagogiczna rodziców jako czynnik stymulacji rozwoju I wychowania młodego pokolenia [Parents' Pedagogical Culture as a Factor in Stimulating the Development and Upbringing of the Young Generation]. In: S. Kawula, J. Brągiel, & A.W. Janke (Eds.), *Pedagogika rodziny. Obszary i panorama problematyki* [Family Pedagogy. The Area and General View of the Subject] (pp. 335–357). Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.

Konarzewski, K. (1987). *Podstawy teorii odziaływań wychowawczych* [The Basics of the Theory of Upbringing Actions]. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Kron, W.K. (2012). *Pedagogika. Kluczowe zagadnienia* [Pedagogy. Key Issues]. Sopot: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.

Kubiak-Szymborska, E. (2013). W czym wyraża się pluralizm teoretycznej wiedzy o wychowaniu [In Which Is Pluralism of Theoretical Knowledge About Upbringing Expressed]. In: E. Kubiak-Szymborska, & D. Zając (Eds.), Wychowanie w kręgu pytań [Upbringing in the Circle of Questions] (pp. 11–23). Bydgoszcz: Wydawnictwo Edukacyjne Wers.

Kułaczkowski, J. (2011). Cechy rodziny jako środowiska wychowawczego [Features of the Family as an Upbringing Environment]. In: J. Kułaczkowski (Ed.), *Leksykon pedagogiki rodziny* [Lexicon of Family Pedagogy] (pp. 35–39). Warszawa: Bonus Liber – Wydawnictwo i Drukarnia Diecezji Rzeszowskiej.

Leś, T. (2018). Mądrość jako cel wychowania. Wybrane teorie, implikacje praktyczne, podstawowe problemy [Wisdom as an Aim of Education. Theory, Practice, Main Problems]. *Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny*, 1(247), 48–68, doi: 10.5604/01.3001.0011.8224.

Li, Y., Constanzo, P.R., & Putallaz, M. (2010). Maternal Socialization Goals, Parenting Styles, and Social-Emotional Adjustment Among Chinese and European American Young

Adults: Testing a Mediation Model. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 171(4), 330–362, doi: 10.1080/00221325.2010.505969.

Łobocki, M. (2006). *Teoria wychowania w zarysie* [Outline of the Theory of Upbringing]. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.

Marshall, E., & Van Der Wolf, K. (2013). The Perception of Child-Rearing Goals Among Surinamese Teachers and Parents. *International Journal About* Parents *in Education*, 7(2), 1–7.

Marynowicz-Hetka, E. (2005). Towarzyszenie w rozwoju dziecku i jego rodzinie. Kilka uwag na rozpoczęcie debaty [Accompanying in Development to the Child and His Family. Few Remarks to Start the Debate]. In: H. Mazur (Ed.), *Wspólnie z dziećmi: o wspieraniu rozwoju małego dziecka – praktyka i teoria* [Together with Children: On Supporting the Development of a Small Child – Practice and Theory] (pp. 341–345). Łódź: Oficyna Wydawnicza Tercja.

Meng, Ch. (2012). Parenting Goals and Parenting Styles Among Taiwanese Parents: the Moderating Role of Child Temperament. *The New School Psychology Bulletin*, 9(2), 52–67.

Miałkowska-Rejmer, Z. (1981). *Preferencja celów wychowawczych. Przesłanki psychologiczne* [Preference in Child-Rearing Goals. Psychological Premises]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Milerski, B., & Śliwerski, B. (2000). *Pedagogika. Leksykon PWN* [Pedagogy. PWN Lexicon]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Muszyński, H. (1974). *Ideał i cele wychowania* [Ideal and Goals of Upbringing]. Warszawa: Państwowe Zakłady Wydawnictw Szkolnych.

Muszyński, H. (2018). *Metodologiczne vademecum badacza pedagoga* [Methodological Vademecum of a Pedagogical Researcher]. Poznań: Wydawnictwo UAM.

Nowak-Dziemianowicz, M. (2012). *Edukacja i wychowanie w dyskursie nauki i codzienności* [Education and Upbringing in the Discourse of Science and Everyday Life]. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.

Okoń, W. (2007). *Nowy słownik pedagogiczny* [New Pedagogical Dictionary]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Żak.

Opozda, D. (2012). *Struktura i treść jednostkowej wiedzy o wychowaniu. Studium pedagogiczne wiedzy rodziców i jej korelatów* [The Structure and Content of Individual Knowledge About Education. A Pedagogical Study of Parents' Knowledge and Its Correlates]. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.

Rowe, M.L., & Casillas, A. (2011). Parental Goals and Talk with Toddlers. *Infant and Child Development*, 20(5), 475–494, doi: 10.1002/icd.709.

Schwarz, B., Schäfermeier, E., & Trommsdorff, G. (2005). Relations Between Value Orientation, Child-Rearing Goals, and Parenting: A Comparison of German and South Korean Mothers. In: W. Friedlmeier, P. Chakkarath, & B. Schwarz (Eds.), *Culture and Human Development: The Importance of Cross-Cultural Research for the Social Sciences* (pp. 203–230). Hove: Psychology Press.

Sobczak, S. (2000). *Celowość wychowania. Tomistyczne podstawy teleologii wychowania* [Purposefulness of Upbringing. Thomistic Fundaments of Teleology of Upbringing]. Warszawa: Navo.

Sośnicki, K. (1967). *Istota i cele wychowania* [The Essence and Goals of Upbringing]. Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.

Suchodolski, B. (1985). Zagadnienia podstawowe [Basic Issues]. In: B. Suchodolski (Ed.), *Pedagogika. Podręcznik dla kandydatów na nauczycieli* [Pedagogy. Handbook for Teacher Candidates], Vol. 1 (pp. 9–190). Warszawa: PWN.

Śliwerski, B. (2012). *Pedagogika ogólna. Podstawowe prawidłowości* [General Pedagogy. Basic Regularities]. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.

Śliwerski, B. (2015). *Współczesne teorie i nurty wychowania* [Contemporary Theories and Currents of Upbringing]. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.

Świdrak, E. (2013). *Świadomość wychowawcza we współczesnej rodzinie* [Child-Rearing Awareness in the Contemporary Family]. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.

Trommsdorff, G, & Kornadt, H.-J. (2003). Parent-Child Relations in Cross-Cultural Perspective. In: L. Kuczynski (Ed.), *Handbook of Dynamics in Parent-Child Relations* (pp. 271–306). London: Sage Publications Inc.

Tulviste, T., Mizera, L., de Geer, B., & Tryggvason, M.-T. (2007). Child Rearing Goals of Estonian, Finnish, and Swedish Mothers. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 48(6), 487–497, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2007.00618.x.

Walczak, A. (2011). *Spotkanie z wychowankiem. Ku tożsamości ipse pedagoga* [Meeting with Pupil. Towards the *ipse* Educator's Identity]. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Wesołowska, P. (2019). *Świadomość pedagogiczna współczesnych rodziców oraz jej źródła* [Pedagogic Awareness of Contemporary Parents and Sources of the Awareness]. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Wróbel, A. (2014). *Problem intencjonalności działania wychowawczego. Studium teoretyczne* [The Problem of Intentionality of the Upbringing Activity. Theoretical Study]. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Zawadzka, E. (2015). Cele wychowania w rodzinach o zróżnicowanym poziomie wykształcenia rodziców [Goals of Child Rearing in Families with Different Formal Education Levels of Parents]. Niepublikowana rozprawa doktorska [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Warszawa: Akademia Pedagogiki Specjalnej im. Marii Grzegorzewskiej.