THE INFLUENCE OF PRIMARY SOCIALIZATION IN GENERATING SCHOOL DEVIANCE. A LITERATURE OVERVIEW

Alina DASCĂLU

Ph.D. Student, Doctoral School of Social Sciences and Humanities,
University of Craiova (Romania)
E-mail: dascalu_doina_alina@yahoo.com

Abstract: *Apparently contradictory, the theories that explain the genesis of school deviance focus their attention on dimensions and levels of analysis, which result from the multifactorial nature of deviant behavior. In this article, we will present the main factors that contribute to the appearance and perpetuation of school deviance in the first years of life, during primary socialization, using both theoretical perspectives in sociology, psychosychology and pedagogy and the conclusions of field research on the causality phenomena, respectively to the methods and strategies for ameliorating these phenomena depending on the etiological factors. Primary socialization, the first stage of the process of becoming the individual as a social actor, takes place in the first years of life and results in the formation of a set of values and attitudes that will guide the individual in subsequent actions. In this article, we started from the hypothesis that the family and the school, as the main agents of socialization in the first 7 years of life, play a decisive role in the child's subsequent decision to violate school rules and leave school. We analyzed the literature to find out if and to what extent the stated hypothesis is confirmed by theoretical models and field research conducted so far.*

Key words: school deviance; school dropout; school absenteeism; primary socialization; school; family.

1. Introduction

The specialized literature offers for analysis an impressive volume of research meant to elucidate the mechanisms by which school dropouts are reached and, especially, to the situations in which it becomes a serious social problem, passing, through its share, from the category of normal social facts in the category of pathological ones. In general, studies that analyze the determinants of absenteeism and dropout propose several types of approaches, depending on the theoretical perspective assumed. First, school deviance is attributed to social, psychological, and demographic variables. This approach starts from the empirical finding that certain characteristics of the student correlate with his predisposition to leave / drop out of school early or, at least, to more subtle evasionist behaviors, such as absenteeism (Barro and Kolstad, 1987). The research question from which most studies operating in such a paradigm start is: "Are there characteristics that differentiate potential graduates from those who will not finish high school and, if so, are these characteristics measurable, using data available in school records? " (Barrington and Bryan, 1989: 310) This approach, dominant in the years 1980-1990, takes into account explanatory variables such as: sex, age, marital status, occupational status, IQ, temperamental type, higher personality factors, political orientation, religious orientation, etc.

Since the 1990s, the emphasis has shifted from the statistical correlations between school dropout / absenteeism and individual psycho-socio-demographic predictors to the analysis and understanding of the behavior of the individual in that life context. The approach remains predominantly individualistic, the only methodological and gnoseological transition being the one from individualistic neopositivism to phenomenological and interpretive

approaches, par excellence also individualistic. In the knowledge of the etiology of absenteeism and dropout, the analysis of school documents and statistical correlations no longer play a decisive role, their place being taken by methods and, implicitly, the analysis of qualitative data, obtained mainly on the basis of in-depth interviews. We mention here the study of Jeremy Finn (1989), quoted no less than 4182 times. It presents the two dominant ways of analyzing school dropout used by researchers in the field until the end of the ninth decade of the last century:

   a)   statistical approach, focused on identifying statistical correlations and regularities;
   b)   the interventionist approach, which consists of measures to prevent and combat the phenomenon (what today we would call "social policy studies").

The two approaches, Finn argues, although based on "good ideas, not to mention good intentions" (Finn, 1989: 118), have major limitations in elucidating the triggers of absenteeism and abandonment. To fight the effect, says Finn, we must know the real cause of the problem, and for this we need a new vision on the issue, a holistic and profound vision, lost sight of the efforts made by the scientific community until then: "Few, however, are based on a systematic understanding of developmental processes that lead a person to drop out of school altogether." (Finn, 1989: 118).

The third category of theories subsumed to the understanding of the determining factors in the appearance of the phenomena of absenteeism and school dropout are the collectivist ones, which include multiple currents of thought: ecological theories, institutionalist and neoinstitutionalist theories, critical theories, etc. In general, these theories start from the premise that certain variables in the way society is structured and functions - therefore extraindividual variables - largely determine not attending or dropping out of school. For example, we mention the research undertaken by Lee and Burkam (2001). They emphasize the role of school organization in generating deviant behavior, a role neglected or treated as secondary to previously published studies: "Although the major focus of research on school dropout focuses on students' social and academic risk factors, there is a growing in which schools influence these behaviors. Specifically, the way schools are organized in terms of social relations between school members has been shown to influence the involvement of students in school and also the final act of disengagement: dropout." (Lee and Burkam, 2001: 12)

The analysis of the school curriculum to explain the inequalities and the predisposition to disengage among certain categories of students, an approach taken by Bourdieu and Bernstein several decades before, is not enough, say Lee and Burkman, to understand how the school as a social institution is directly involved in the generation of absenteeism and dropout: "Although an increasing number of researches demonstrate the importance of how schools structure their curriculum, all this research investigates the effects of curriculum structure on student performance. There is only a small but growing body of research that focuses on how schools influence students' decision to drop out of school, and how school structure - urbanity, positioning and size - can influence this important decision." (Lee and Burkam, 2001: 12).

Four years later, Rumberger and Palardy (2005) publish another article, also in a neo-institutionalist key, in which they analyze the relationship between absenteeism / dropout and the characteristics of school institutions. Several conclusions are worth noting: "schools that are effective in promoting learning (increasing school performance) are not necessarily effective in reducing dropout rates" (Rumberger and Palardy, 2005: 3) and "the characteristics of schools that have contributed to performance in one field often did not contribute to performance in another field "(Rumberger and Palardy, 2005: 3). The two major agents of primary socialization, school and family (Otovescu, 2009: 230), have been the subject of extensive analyzes on how they may or may not predispose to the onset of school deviance.

2. Family environment

In general, studies bring to the fore significant correlations between parenting style in the family of origin and school dropout. The concept of "parenting style" was established by D.

Baumrind (1973) to designate a specific orientation of the system of values-attitudes and behaviors that parents manifest in relation to the child. Depending on the degree of reporting, Baumrind identified 5 parental styles: subjective authoritarian, objective authoritarian, careless, permissive and overprotective. In general, a lax, overly permissive parenting style is associated with high rates of school failure and dropout (Alexander, Entwisle and Horsey, 1997). In contrast, a rather authoritarian parenting style seems to discourage early school leaving and encourage performance (Glasgow, et al, 1997).

The family is the main agent of socialization in the first 7 years of life, and the way in which it performs its functions that justify its status as a fundamental social institution depends largely on the educational and professional future of children. It is certain that "the development and socio-professional integration of the child depends on the way in which the primary socialization process in the family takes place" (Nistor, 2018: 44) and "dysfunctions within the family have consequences on spouses, children, family relations with the outside, these becoming evident in the conditions of partner separation (separation in fact or divorce), family abandonment, domestic violence or in the conditions of juvenile delinquency" (Mihăilescu, 2003: 165). Certain structural or functional deficiencies in the family can affect children's socialization. The loss of a parent, through death or divorce, will strongly influence the child's choice to leave school (Lee and Croninger, 2001). Children who grow up and live with both parents are more likely to apply and be admitted to college, while the divorce or death of one parent can significantly affect the school and career path, against a depressive and anxious background, dominated by uncertainty. and axio-normative instability.

Another interesting finding, observed following successive research, is that the risk of dropping out of school is higher the lower the share capital of parents (Lee and Croninger, 2001). For this reason, the family-community relationship indirectly affects the child-school relationship. Families withdrawn from community life, characterized by weak neighborhood relationships and superficial relationships with relatives and extended family, show major deficiencies in children's socialization in accordance with the educational ideal and, statistically, more often encounter difficulties in their socio-professional integration, and regularity is maintained regardless of the socio-economic and educational status of the parents, geographical positioning or other parasitic variables. One of the explanations brings into question the child's takeover of precarious relational patterns, which can go hand in hand with the development of psychological disorders (school phobia, social anxiety, avoidant personality disorder, etc.). It is also plausible to socialize a culture contrary to the dominant one. This happens especially in the case of families from the extreme classes of society: the subclass or upper class, which socialize cultural elements different from the statistically majority. The studies are at the beginning, and the mentioned explanations only partially elucidate the mechanisms by which the low social capital of the family becomes a predictor of school dropout.

What is certain is that in the parent-child interaction the linguistic, cognitive and relational skills are developed, but also the will, the affectivity and the motivation, which are decisive in the development and optimization of the child's relationship with himself and the extra-family environment. With these premises, created through socialization, the child, at the age of 7, has the "baggage" necessary to assimilate the school culture. In the classroom, children need to interact and adapt to an environment that differs more or less from the family environment. The smaller the discrepancy between family culture and school culture, the faster school success occurs. Obviously, we are not talking here about determinism or fatalism, but about social patterns, which differ from case to case. The role of the child, of biological, genetic, ascriptive and temperamental factors, which can outweigh to a lesser or lesser extent the influence of socialized cultural elements in the family, must not be denied. Then, the child is not a passive "receiver" of external influences, but an active participant in the socialization process, which, in a constructivist sense, manifests itself in a double sense: from society to the individual, but also from the individual to society. The child is not only a product of the environment, but a

distinct individuality, an active participant in his own formation: "he is able not only to receive, but also to produce, process and communicate meanings, and on this basis to selectively internalize and in personalized forms the social structure" (Stănciulescu, 1996: 205-206).

The constant emotional and moral support from parents influences the child's ability to cope with failure and pressure, helping him to adapt to the rules of the school environment. Therefore, children with receptive and involved parents are likely to achieve better results at school, which is why the school-family partnership is indispensable in preventing dropouts. If the child's education stops in the classroom and there are no learning opportunities at home, it is hard to believe that the student will end up with outstanding educational performance. Learning at home and building a generally positive attitude towards school are issues related to family culture and are learned in the first 7 years of life, during primary socialization. The first games with letters and numbers facilitate the development of cognitive processes and role-playing games, part of anticipatory socialization, fulfill well-defined functions in school integration in the following years. Obviously, the ideal situation requires the convergence of the school-family value system. If parents show a hostile attitude towards school, then, statistically, the road to school failure is almost certain. At the same time, letting the student do "what he wants" means, in fact, orienting him towards failure. Regardless of good intentions and his ability to set goals, the child will not have the behavioral self-control and self-regulatory mechanisms necessary to achieve these goals, these skills being specific to the next stages of psycho-emotional development. For this reason, a certain degree of pressure and parental control are beneficial in directing the training process, while conducting them in school, through regular evaluations.

A major problem arises when the family is no longer able to perform these roles properly. We mentioned the loss of a parent, through death or divorce, this being the cause that has the richest scientific literature. In Romania, but not only, another phenomenon seems to affect the right and access to education of children, namely the temporary emigration of one or both parents to work abroad. A qualitative research conducted by "Salvați Copiii" among this category of students draws attention to the many particularly worrying facets of the problem. First, "among adolescents, especially among boys, who have both parents working abroad, there is a tendency to drop out of school" (Salvați Copiii, 2007: 51). Secondly, unlike abandonment, which is more common among boys, as confirmed by statistics and theoretical models, absenteeism does not seem to take into account gender. Girls and boys with departed parents are absent as often, being, not infrequently, in danger of expulsion (Salvați Copiii, 2007: 51).

The study also highlights the fact that "both children and adults have a decrease in interest in school and homework, amid a lack of control by an adult with authority over them" (Salvați Copiii, 2007: 51) and "children and sometimes adolescents have difficulty completing homework and understanding the subject taught at school, feeling the need for help from an adult who can get involved in this activity / to provide assistance in the absence of parents" (Salvați Copiii, 2007: 52). Although there are no specific school policies and programs for this category, the research highlighted that their involvement in extracurricular activities had "a positive impact on children in terms of motivation to come to school" (Salvați Copiii, 2007: 52), which confirms the applicability and effectiveness of the participation-identification model, developed by Finn (1989). A doctoral research on the same topic reaches similar findings, some conclusions being worth mentioning: "Lack of physical presence of parents and implicitly low affectivity due to mobility, lack of a counselor, lead to conditions such as feeling abandoned, sadness, confusion , imbalance." (Cătărău, 2018: 23). Therefore, "children are affected by the lack of parents, they associate their physical departure with fear, with feelings of loneliness, aspects that lead them to seek support in people who have the same situation as theirs." (Cătărău, 2018: 23)

The proportions of the phenomenon in Romania are worrying. According to the data provided by the National Agency for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities/ Agenția Națională

pentru Drepturile Persoanelor cu Dizabilități (2020), in March 2020 in Romania lived 81274 children whose parents went to work abroad. Of these, 14519 children come from families where both parents have gone abroad, and 56458 from families where one parent has left. Official statistics also indicate that 1,0297 children come from single-parent families, in which the only parent is working abroad. The data provided by the Agency should be viewed with great caution, taking into account that they are based on secondary information processing of the registers of the Directorates-General for Social Assistance and Child Protection/ Direcțiilor Generale de Asistență Socială şi Protecția Copilului, which do not have the exhaustive situation of children left at home. Their number is expected to be much higher than the data presented above suggest, with important effects on absenteeism and dropout rates.

Another family problem specific to Romanian society more than others refers to the culture socialized in the family, which involves a certain attitude towards school. The attitude of the parents towards the school can be "the propellant towards the success and performance of the children or the main obstacle in the way of reaching them. It is a matter of choice, value orientation and, ultimately, the philosophy of life that parents assume and that they will pass on to future generations" (Velciu and Niculiță, 2012: 46). In Romania, although it is not wrong to talk about an unprecedented expansion of education in the second half of the last century, the school-family partnership is a recent principle, emerged simultaneously with the implementation of new pedagogical models and school policies. In the totalitarian regime, the school, as an institution of social control, was meant to ensure the training of the student in relation to the requirements of the "new man", independent and sometimes in dissonance with the education offered in the family. For this reason, the complementarity of the two institutions, the delimitation of the social functions performed by each and the development of collaboration mechanisms for school success were notable post-December challenges, also specific to other former socialist states (Buden, 2010).

In addition to the factors related to the family of origin, absenteeism and school dropout are also based on factors that refer to the establishment of a new family, the most important being pregnancy and early marriage. Depending on the social affiliation, there are three subgroups within which these phenomena register an increased incidence, especially in Romania (UNICEF and SAMAS, 2019: 66). First, the situation is particularly common in traditional ethnic communities, such as some Roma communities, where the age of socially acceptable marriage is 10-16 years, which correlates with a generally hostile attitude towards school, which is not perceived. as a significant agent of social success. The second category includes people from disadvantaged families, with a low level of education, who face absolute poverty or are on the verge of poverty, regardless of ethnicity. Finally, the third category considers marriages and "stochastic" tasks in the statistical distribution, few in number, which occur accidentally and do not take into account ethnicity, environment or level of education or income from the family of origin. Worryingly, "most minor mothers dropped out or drop out of school when they become mothers" (UNICEF and SAMAS, 2019: 4), despite school counseling and support programs for them. At the level of educational policy, Romania does not yet offer credible solutions for solving this social problem: "No educational measures are implemented for socially disadvantaged groups of adolescents and for those who dropped out of school, they are largely excluded from information activities. and education, which increases the risk of inappropriate sexual behavior and unwanted pregnancies." (UNICEF and SAMAS, 2019: 4). According to the National Institute of Statistics, no less than 19480 adolescents became mothers in 2018. The proportions of the phenomenon amplify the problem and make stringent the implementation of appropriate measures for these categories of students, for whom the risk of leaving school is higher, if not imminent.

3. School environment

School factors complement the explanatory table, giving more importance to the relationship between the student and the school environment. Specifically, psycho-pedagogical models focus on the ways in which performance and learning are achieved, the emphasis being placed not so much on the dynamics of the individual psyche, but on the student-teacher and student-community dyads. For this reason, pedagogical or, more precisely, psycho-pedagogical factors are assimilated to collective, "environmental" factors, which represent external predictors of school success or failure.

The debates about how the teacher should relate to the student and what should be the nature of this relationship are inexhaustible, bringing together a continuum of positions, from traditionalist to postmodernist. In the perspective of constructivist postmodern pedagogy, training is not the center of gravity of the teaching process, but the interaction between teacher and student, interaction focused on cognitive and applied purposes (Windschitl, 2002). Lately, the problem of the relationship between the constructivist principle of differentiated learning and the need for comparability of the performances obtained by students and the teaching units from which they come is becoming more and more frequent. The boundary between setting common standards and facilitating a space for the manifestation of creativity, interests and particular needs seems to be a difficult border to draw. The student is forced to comply with the requirements of the education cycle in which he is, and the "general competencies", as well as the "specific" ones, are often formulated in terms of general compulsory requirements. This hierarchical-functionalist organization of education, opposed to the vision of constructivists, encourages, according to the latter, absenteeism and school dropout: "The alternative of the student in a situation of school failure is his orientation towards special education or school dropout. Practices more recently validated in pedagogy, such as inclusive education, which supports the idea that students have equal opportunities in education and that it is necessary to make full use of the possibilities of all students, cannot be easily integrated into hierarchical educational systems." (Chiş, 2005: 43).

Poor skills of the teacher and the school environment in general to meet the specific needs of each student are an important factor in school failure. Intellectual psychological factors are poor predictors of school performance, indicating that for a large number of students, poor performance is mainly determined by non-intellectual factors, such as emotional insecurity, poor motivation, negative attitude towards school, poor self-control. or other unfavorable psycho-social circumstances (family or school). This means that the failure of the students in question can be avoided by practicing active and individualized pedagogical methods, through what Finn (1989) called participation-identification, in relation to the psychological profile that characterizes each student.

The personality of the actors in the educational environment (student and teacher) has a considerable importance in facilitating the participation and identification processes. In the learning activity, the student uses not only memory, thinking and attention, but also another psychic structure that integrates them, but not limited by them - personality. The emotional tone, activism and sociability specific to each temperamental type are of overwhelming importance in learning and in managing the teacher-student relationship. The balance of the sanguine and the phlegmatic predisposes to maintain a constant rhythm of the didactic activity, while the choleric student becomes very motivated at the beginning, but gives up very quickly. The phlegmatic seems to postpone everything, the melancholic seems distracted. The early manifestations of temperament change with the psycho-emotional maturation of the student, they begin to be controlled voluntarily, but the type of temperament does not change.

The extraversion-introversion dichotomy influences, in turn, the way in which students communicate both with each other, within the school group, and with their parents and teachers, respectively. Orientation to the outside (extraversion) or to the inner world

(introversion), anxiety (against the background of increased neuroticism) or predisposition to aggression or addiction and isolation are dimensions of personality that belong to temperament and have been studied by psychopedagogy. For example, the fact that extroverts work better than introverts in primary school and introverts better than extroverts at university level has been explained by the existence of specific factors that differentiate the primary school environment from the university one (Fontana, 1981). Constructivist pedagogical models favor extroverts, while individual work, specific to the university level and traditional education, favors introverts with priority.

Also, the study of the relationship between school performance and anxiety (or the dimension related to neuroticism) revealed that anxious students perform better in a calm and relaxed environment, while students with a low level of neuroticism are highly motivated. a more tense and competitive environment (Fontana, 1981). Anxious students must be supported by the teacher to face exaggerated and sometimes unjustified fears about school activities (irrational cognitions), and excessively "balanced" students must, in turn, be motivated, even by inducing a certain degree of anxiety. The non-adaptation of the school environment and the teacher to these requirements explains, to a certain extent, the source of school failure, with its ultimate form, respectively dropout, whose cause is often mentioned "disinterest", without being operationalized.

Another cause of school dropout, also of a school nature, refers to the perpetuation of inequalities in the school environment. The critical vision on education gained ground in the middle of the previous century, against the background of the social movements of ascension of some disadvantaged social categories until then. The central point of the conflictualist theories is the modification of the functioning regime of the school institutions. They no longer have the role of reproducing, but of producing values, they no longer preserve the relations of domination, but actively participate in social reform (Aliakbari and Faraji, 2011). Thus, through emancipatory education, students learn to "think critically and develop a critical consciousness, which helps them to improve their living conditions and take the necessary measures to build a fairer and more equitable society" (Aliakbari and Faraji, 2011: 1). Theorists of this current propose reorienting the school towards "teaching students to take risks, to teach them to challenge those in power, to honor critical traditions and to reflect on how authority is used in the classroom." (Giroux, 1997: 265)

4. Conclusions

The study of the determinants of school deviance followed the transition from neopositivist individualism to interpretive-phenomenological and, more recently, collectivist-institutionalist approaches. All these perspectives are not limited to theoretical speculations or assertions with nomological value. Depending on the theoretical position it adopts, the researcher analyzes differently the "responsible" factors for the deviant phenomena that appear in the school space. The first two perspectives, subsumed by the classical sociological and psychological approach, see in the individual and in the group experience the causal mechanisms related to these problems.

The third perspective, more recent and dominant at present, which continues the neoconflictualist criticism, emphasizes the social organization and, especially, the way the school space is structured and functions, respectively what elements of the social and educational macrostructure are based on the student's decision to leave school. Obviously, these elements may or may not be aware of the student, which is why the sociological survey based on a questionnaire, although useful, is not sufficient to elucidate family and school factors during primary socialization that encourage absenteeism and dropout. Although not yet imposed by its own methodological apparatus, this approach offers both impressive empirical research from the perspective of the data corpus used and the innovative nature of the conclusions (Lee and Burkam, 2001), as well as theoretical analyzes designed to order and

explain how the family, in the first years of life, but also the school, through curriculum, structure, regulation and psychosocial climate, can influence school deviance (Riehl, 1999).

References:

1. Agenția Națională pentru Drepturile Persoanelor cu Dizabilități (2020). *Situație copii cu părinți plecați la muncă în străinătate.* [online] available at: http://andpdca.gov.ro/w/situatie-copii-cu-parinti-plecati-la-munca-31-03-2020/.
2. Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R., and Horsey, C. S. (1997). From first grade forward: Early foundations of high school dropout. *Sociology of education*: 87-107.
3. Aliakbari, M., and Faraji, E. (2011, October). Basic principles of critical pedagogy. In *2nd International Conference on Humanities, Historical and Social Sciences IPEDR* (Vol. 17, pp. 78-85).
4. Baker, C. E., Cameron, C. E., Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., and Grissmer, D. (2012). Family and sociodemographic predictors of school readiness among African American boys in kindergarten. *Early Education & Development*, *23*(6): 833-854.
5. Barro, S. M., and Kolstad, A. J. (1987). *Who drops out of high school?: Findings from high school and beyond*. Washington, DC: Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, US Department of Education.
6. Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, *4*.
7. Bilige, S., and Gan, Y. (2020). Hidden School Dropout Among Adolescents in Rural China: Individual, Parental, Peer, and School Correlates. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *29*(3): 213-225.
8. Buden, B. (2010). Children of postcommunism. *Radical philosophy*, *159*: 18-25.
9. Barrington, B. L., and Hendricks, B. (1989). Differentiating characteristics of high school graduates, dropouts, and nongraduates. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *82*(6): 309-319.
10. Cătărău, L. F. (2018). Evaluarea impactului migrației părinților asupra comportamentului infracțional al copiilor rămași acasă. Iași: Doctoral School of Philosophy and Social-Political Sciences, A. I. Cuza University.
11. Chiș, V. (2005). *Pedagogia contemporană. Pedagogia pentru competențe*. Bucharest: Casa Cărții de Știință.
12. Dumfart, B., & Neubauer, A. C. (2016). Conscientiousness is the most powerful noncognitive predictor of school achievement in adolescents. *Journal of individual Differences*.
13. Finn, J. D. (1989). Withdrawing from school. Review of Educational Research. *Chemistry of Heterocyclic Compounds*, *25*(3): 319-325.
14. Fontana, D. (1995). *Psychology for teachers*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
15. Giroux, H. (2018). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling: A critical reader*. Routledge.
16. Glasgow, K. L., Dornbusch, S. M., Troyer, L., Steinberg, L., and Ritter, P. L. (1997). Parenting styles, adolescents' attributions, and educational outcomes in nine heterogeneous high schools. *Child development*, *68*(3): 507-529.
17. Lee, V. E., and Burkam, D. T. (2003). Dropping out of high school: The role of school organization and structure. *American educational research journal*, *40*(2): 353-393.
18. Lee, V. E., and Croninger, R. G (1999). Elements of social capital in the context of six high schools 1998 April Paper presented at Social Capital: An International Conference Bridging Disciplines. *Policies, and Communities East Lansing, Michigan State University*.
19. Mihăilescu, I. (2003). *Sociologie generală. Concepte fundamentale și studii de caz*. Iași: Polirom.

20. Nistor, G. (2018). *Familia românească, între conservatorism şi modernitate.* In. Nistor, G.; Neacşu, I.; Simion, E. (2018). Familia în societatea românească. Pregătirea copiilor şi tinerilor pentru viaţa de familie. Bucharest: Universitară.
21. Mike, I. O., Nakajjo, A., and Isoke, D. (2016). Socioeconomic determinants of primary school drop out: the logistic model analysis. *African Journal of Economic Review*, *4*(1): 217-241.
22. Otovescu, D. (2009). *Sociologie generală.* 5th Edition. Craiova: Beladi.
23. Otovescu, D. and Spînu, C.I. (2017). *Monografia Universităţii din Craiova. Şapte decenii de învăţământ superior (1947-2017).* Bucharest: Academiei Române; Craiova: Universitaria.
24. Riehl, C. (1999). Labeling and letting go: An organizational analysis of how high school students are discharged as dropouts. *Research in sociology of education and socialization*, *12*: 231-268.
25. Rumberger, R. W., and Palardy, G. J. (2005). Test scores, dropout rates, and transfer rates as alternative indicators of high school performance. *American educational research journal*, *42*(1): 3-42.
26. Salvaţi Copiii (2007)*. Impactul migraţiei părinţilor asupra copiilor rămaşi acasă. Raport de cercetare, Bucureşti, 2007*. [online] available at: https://copiisinguriacasa.ro/wp-content/themes/csa/doc/Impactul%20migratiei%20parintilor%20asupra%20copiilor%20ramasi%20acasa_Salvati%20Copiii.pdf
27. Stănciulescu, E. (1996) *Teorii sociologice ale educaţiei. Producerea eului şi construcţia sociologiei*. Polirom: Iaşi.
28. Tansel, A. (2002). Determinants of school attainment of boys and girls in Turkey: individual, household and community factors. *Economics of education review*, *21*(5): 455-470.
29. Traag, T., and Van der Velden, R. K. (2006). Early School-leaving in Lower Secondary Education. The role of student-, family-and school factors. *ROA, University of Maastricht, mimeo*.
30. Ţiulescu, L.N. (2013). Abandonul şcolar în România. Bucharest: ProUniversitaria
31. UNICEF and SAMAS (2019). *Raport. Sarcina la adolescente în România,* [online] available at: https://www.unicef.org/romania/media/4086/file/Raport%20Sarcina%20la%20Adolescente%20in%20Romania.pdf
32. Velciu, A., and Niculiţă, Z. (2012). Educaţia ca valoare şi atitudinile educative ale părinţilor. *Psihologie, revista ştiinţifico-practică*, (2): 35-46.
33. Wanless, S. B., McClelland, M. M., Lan, X., Son, S. H., Cameron, C. E., Morrison, F. J., ... and Sung, M. (2013). Gender differences in behavioral regulation in four societies: The United States, Taiwan, South Korea, and China. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *28*(3): 621-633.
34. Windschitl, M. (2002). Framing constructivism in practice as the negotiation of dilemmas: An analysis of the conceptual, pedagogical, cultural, and political challenges facing teachers. *Review of educational research*, *72*(2): 131-175.