



## Educational Abuse of The Child

Mesut Demirbilek

Ministry of Education, Istanbul, Turkey

### ABSTRACT

Child abuse is usually only prominent with its physical, sexual, or mental dimensions, and the educational dimension, which is based on the educational neglect and exploitation of children, is ignored. In this context, deliberate directing and shaping of the child's interests, needs and expectations, and the attempts of various stakeholders (such as parents, laws, culture, power authorities, capital groups, private enterprises, and interest groups) open the door to the educational abuse of the child. In this sense, the facts that the dominant classes use education systems to adapt their economic, social, political system and orientation, parents' authority and interventions for their children's educational and professional futures thus creating anxiety and pressure on the child, the expectation of the investment groups to raise individuals suitable for market dynamics from education by justifying the labor market and employment and the pressure for this, the educational activities of private enterprises to gain commercial earning by using the privatization ground in education, and the suppression of the child by the norms of the current culture through education and the expectation of adaptation or the provision of a curriculum for this can create an intervention in the child's self or attitude of being himself/herself by destroying the individual expectations and originality of the child. For this reason, not seeing education as an element that liberates the individual spirit and a medium that gives the individual a chance to choose, and structuring individual preferences in a way that rumples the mind or directs individuals to various goals may cause the child to be abused in an educational sense.

**Keywords:** *Educational institutions; child; educational abuse; child abuse* **Subject classification code:** 97B.

**Citation:** Mesut Demirbilek (2021). Educational Abuse of The Child. *International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Studies*, 3(6), 60-69.

### INTRODUCTION

Abuse is defined as having authority over other individuals, using force, pressure, violence against these people, forcing these people to act in various ways, intimidating them, causing them pain and suffering, as well as controlling and exploiting the behavior, thoughts, and ideas of individuals for various purposes [1]. Child abuse, on the other hand, includes mental, physical, and sexual maltreatment, exploitation and neglect of the child and includes potentially harmful behaviors that affect the child's physical and emotional health and development [2]. In particular, mental and emotional abuse is considered as the ignoring and rejecting children's basic emotional needs and expectations [3]. In this direction, education has important duties in satisfying these needs of children and revealing their existence and subjectivity.

This optimistic approach to education can be abused from time to time by various stakeholders (family, laws, private schools, capital owners, etc.) and can become a means of realizing the goals of other individuals or institutions by exceeding the child's self-actualization and subjectivity. This approach can also show itself in the definitions of education. Thus, as valid definitions in Turkey, Sönmez [4] defines education as "a means of changing human behaviors in the desired direction or the process of creating desired biochemical changes in the brain", Ertürk [5] defines it as "a process of creating a deliberate and desired behavioral change in an individual's behavior through one's own experience", Demirel [6] defines it as "deliberate enculturation", and Fidan [7] defines it as "the process of educating people for certain purposes". All these definitions are based on a deliberate and purposeful teaching, they impose a process structured as a goal and point out the concepts that ignore the individual's needs, abilities, skills and emotions, and the individual's existence characteristics. This situation opens the door to abuse in the educational sense, as it contains risks that will enable the child's characteristics, behaviors, goals, and life expectations to be directed and imprisoned within a certain framework.

At this point, human factors that require the purpose of education to be reconsidered are affecting more and more children's lives and development today. Educational arrangements and guidance made by various factors (family, labor market, state, laws, employment-education relationship etc.) can cause harm that will lead to the abuse of the child in an educational sense or that will damage their professional development and affect the success of their job. Hence, a study of job satisfaction conducted by Keser [8] using a sample in Turkey revealed that 33% of individuals were not satisfied with their jobs. In particular, the job satisfaction of individuals who have graduated from primary and high school is

lower than those with other education levels. Thus, at these education levels, the expectation of finding a job is more dominant than the individual's desire and expectations, and the failures in the education processes prevent being selective in choosing a profession and taking their wishes into account. At the same time, the research of Keser [8] concluded that white-collar workers feel more professional unhappiness than blue-collar workers and academicians. In particular, the dissatisfaction of the group, which is called white collar and has a higher education level and makes vocational choices, can be evaluated as a result of education and professional choices that are abused due to the pressure of the labor market. In this context, in this study, abuse of the child's education has been discussed within the framework of the state and laws, family and parents, labor force, market expectations and employment pressure, private schools and privatization in education, and culture and norms.

## **Conceptual framework**

### ***The state and laws***

The education laws of states may have characteristics that may undermine the child's right to receive an education appropriate to their needs and restrict the child within the framework of certain general objectives. For example, while the Education Law of the People's Republic of China aims to build an education based on socialism and to convey Marxism, Leninism, and Mao Zedong thought [9], with the Federal Law on Education adopted in 2012 in Russia, the needs of an innovative economy and international requirements of education have been adapted to student learning [10]. Again, while the USA maintains a capitalist public education curriculum linked to democracy [11], Australia, on the contrary, can support young people to overcome the difficulties of life and become productive citizens by creating a Youth Policy Framework [12]. All these practices constitute the legal framework of the interventions of countries and states towards children and youth and shape the individual's future.

According to Akin and Arslan [13], the ideologies of the states focus on maintaining the economic, social, and political system and orientations of the dominant class and countries use their education systems to adopt these ideologies. According to Akin and Arslan [13], the human profile that is desired to be structured within the framework of this ideology is mostly shaped through education systems and education becomes a means of educating citizens in the desired direction. On the other hand, according to Billington [14], the framework of the achievements transferred in line with a school curriculum is usually determined according to the economic or social needs of the states. Akin and Arslan [13] state that compulsory education and lifelong learning practices constitute the irresistible framework of this upbringing and orientation process and political powers use education to provide ideological legitimation. Akin and Arslan [13] also argue that educational activities such as excessive course load and diversity, useless information and curriculum for the child, scarcity of artistic and sportive course activities and their devaluation support these inferences and therefore they claim that under these circumstances, children's expectations and needs are secondary.

According to Friedman [15], the main role given to the political powers is to adhere to the principles generally accepted for the organization of the society, and then to ensure the freedom of the individual and to implement the existing contract by organizing the economic activities, to prevent coercion and to follow the correct application of the free market rules. However, Rout and Dixit [16] point out that education is mostly used today as a tool to maneuver towards political goals and to guide future generations towards "majoritarian" ideologies through pedagogical processes and curricula. In this framework, according to Akin and Arslan [13], teachers are mostly used in the transfer of these ideologies to individuals in educational processes, and especially in underdeveloped societies, the role of immunity and power (authority) is defined for the teacher, thus by forming a model framework of which the main source of information and authority on the student are never lost, and therefore, the transfer and shaping of the child takes place. Thus, according to Billington [14], teachers, especially in traditional societies due to their professional role, have seen authority respect, but also sometimes can be a charismatic authority in the classroom, sometimes can be defined and assigned as a representative authority, and sometimes can be an academic authority or moral authority who is seen as an omniscient and expert. At this point, this orientation, which targets the child within the framework of the teacher's deliberate authority and is structured in an ideological framework, opens the door to risks that may cause the child's existing nature and preferences to be limited and his/her self-actualization ability to atrophy.

### ***Family and parents***

Family and parent expectations in children's life also significantly affect the educational life and direction of the child. Thus, according to Nartgün and Kaya [17], student parents pay attention to the image of the school when enrolling their children in schools. In this context, parents generally choose a school on behalf of the student, taking into account factors such as teacher quality, physical spaces, school environment, school success, student profile, and the effect of school on employment rather than student needs and expectations [18,19]. Ceylan [20] states that the parents of preschool students consider factors based on their expectations such as the school being close to their workplaces, fees, and friend advice when choosing a school for their children. However, even how the concept of "parent" is defined can draw a profile that puts the parent in the foreground, not the student. Thus, the Turkish Language Association defines the student's guardian as "*the person who protects a child, takes care of his/her affairs and is responsible for all his/her*

*behaviors*”, takes the authority to have a voice and responsibility on behalf of the child from the student and gives it to the parent (<https://sozluk.gov.tr/>).

Family expectations for the child can suppress or exploit the child’s educational expectations. As stated by various researchers [21,22,23], student parents generally prefer schools with good academic achievement and teacher quality. However, parental pressure and expectations on children cause children to experience test anxiety, and students experience more test anxiety in families that are authoritarian and protective compared to families with a democratic family structure [24]. At the same time, according to Peker and Kağızmanlı [25], parental attitudes significantly affect children’s academic motivation, while according to Öztürk, Kutlu and Atlı [26], parental attitudes also affect adolescent children’s decision-making strategies.

According to Omurtak [27], families with low- and middle-income levels strive to reach the standards of upper capital groups and try to reach the upper economic and cultural class that they cannot reach for themselves, through the education of their children or by investing in their children’s education. On the other hand, according to Omurtak [27], upper-class families in terms of economy and culture arrange their children’s education processes according to the requirements and expectations of their social class, while families living in middle-class areas invest more in their children’s education to reach this upper culture. Families who are at a low level in terms of education, economy, and culture see only the education that will enable their children to find a job in the future. According to Omurtak [27], this situation enables individuals to reproduce and protect their class structures. In this respect, it is possible to indicate that educational institutions have become an effective tool of family pressure on children caused by the anxiety of maintaining the existence of class family groups in the society or the expectation of being promoted to the upper class.

Omurtak [27] also mentioned the effect of families on children’s career choice and stated that families directly or indirectly play a role in choosing a profession. According to Omurtak [27], children remain passive especially in decision-making processes due to the traditional family structure, and the family becomes more dominant in professional decisions. Omurtak [27] states that this situation is due to the habits and cultural capital of families that exist in their background, and that families combine this situation with their current economic capital and make decisions for students and education. Therefore, in children’s professional future visions, the abuse of families towards education should be handled within the framework of the connection of families with their cultural and economic capital.

One of the studies to support this result is of Huang, Guo, Zhang and Shen [28]. The study concluded that especially family income had the main effect on the education choices of middle-class students, however, this study also revealed that the views of low-income families had an implicit effect on the educational and vocational field selections of children. Another study conducted by Ma [29] exhibited that the socio-economic status of the families was effective in choosing the department and profession of the students, and Ma found that especially the students with a lower socio-economic family profile preferred vocational fields where they could provide more job opportunities and earn higher incomes. As can be seen in these results, the family factor has a decisive effect on the educational life of the child with all its dimensions, and the current situation and future expectations of the family are the driving forces in the choice of vocational field of children.

### ***Labor force and market expectations***

One of the main factors limiting the educational needs of children is labor and market expectations. Thus, raising individuals especially in areas that the economy needs and planning education in this direction bring along risks that will exploit the educational needs of children. According to Billington [14], the economic and labor needs that emerged with the industrial revolution ensured the structuring of education in line with the required skills and occupations. Billington [14] called this condition “educare” and claimed that trainees were “trained” for a particular skill. Various exemplary views can be put forward to support this situation in Turkey from time to time, for example, according to Özkan, Atalı, and Sarıbiyik [30], regarding vocational education, qualified workforce should be trained to ensure the development of the country and in line with the necessary knowledge and skills, the workforce structure that is needed by the business world should be revealed. Işık [31], on the other hand, recommends giving vocational education suitable for low and high job skills, taking into account the skill needs of the job market, to ensure the balance between education and employment, and thus, a framework that exceeds individual needs is presented to children in terms of education, by taking the labor market to the fore.

In this respect, the views of Bourdieu and Passeron [32] on education provide a clearer understanding of the expectations of investors regarding education. Thus, according to Bourdieu and Passeron (2014), existing education systems are shaped and legitimized by the dominant classes or capital owners, and this causes class stratification in education. At the same time, according to Bourdieu and Passeron [32], since the children of capital owners have a more efficient background and their cultural investments are high, they are more successful in education than the children of the working class, and the culture of the ruling class is imposed on the students by creating inequality. At the same time,

Bourdieu and Passeron [32] state that this cultural capital power also determines the way of raising children in societies, and this cultural pressure constantly creates itself by secretly creating an effect on individuals. Bourdieu and Passeron [32] also indicate that educational organizations teach a culture drawn and framed by the dominant capital owners because the dominant classes want to legitimize the cultural structures they target through education and spread them to the general public. In this process, the children of the dominant capital owners are in an educationally advantageous position and they are more successful because they grow up with the culture that is determined and desired to be transferred. However, Althusser [33] states that the latent function of education offered to children is actually to meet the labor force needs of the representatives of capital. In summary, as Bourdieu and Passeron [32] and also Althusser [33] stated, education for children can be a tool of exploitation of capital groups, as dominant power groups structure education in line with their interests.

### ***Employment pressure***

One of the factors that suppress the expectations of children and individuals is the pressure of employment. Thus, today, the problem of unemployment has become a global problem [31], and the expectation of finding a job has changed the occupational preferences of individuals. The occupational field that children dream of from an early age can change over time with the effect of employment pressure, and the fear of finding a job can force individuals to choose certain professions or receive certain educational processes by exceeding their individual, vocational, and educational needs. For example, the 2021 YKS (the University Admission Exam in Turkey) placement results reveal that the most preferred departments are Law, Medicine, Psychological Counselling and Guidance, Dentistry, Architecture, Engineering which are the departments with less employment problems [34]. The 2020 LGS (the High-School Entrance Exam in Turkey) placement results reveal that Science High Schools (46.7%) and Anatolian High Schools (28.5%) are the most preferred secondary education institutions, which have a greater effect on university admission rates [35], in terms of being selected as the first preference by students. Billington [14] drew attention to this situation and stated that more weight was attached to the professions and departments needed in working life and that fields such as fine arts, sociology, social sciences, and human sciences were at the bottom of the list of priorities, individuals were raised under the designed economic system, and by being approved by documents such as certificates and diplomas, individuals gain roles under the predetermined mold. This emerging picture obliges students and parents to make certain educational choices and creates anxiety and pressure in children's life.

However, the demand for qualified labor force suitable for the needs of the economy and the characteristics expected from individuals may differ. To reveal the individual type suitable for this differentiation, employment practices create pressure on education processes and necessitate the harmony between qualified manpower and education. Thus, the fact that the skills, knowledge, and abilities of the individuals who graduated from educational organizations are not in the extent and level desired by the labor market and capital organizations is considered as a disconnection in terms of education-employment relationship [36]. This situation causes indirect educational guidance and process configurations that exceed the preferences of the child and the individual.

Employment pressure on education can manifest itself with consequences that will make the child unemployed as he/she progresses to adulthood. Thus, according to Durkaya and Hüsnuoğlu [37], depending on the changes in labor supply and demand, educational processes are concentrated in certain occupational areas, and this situation draws the route and changes the scope of the education demand. Durkaya and Hüsnuoğlu [37] also state that the professions preferred by everyone change the direction of the demand for education due to the change in demand or agglomeration in the labor market and can direct people and families to different occupational fields and educational decisions that create employment. One of the basic questions to be considered in this context is about "why education exists". While education is trying to be adopted as a phenomenon that includes the education of the individual within the framework of his/her traits, abilities, skills, needs, and interests, employment pressure or other reasons will eliminate this optimistic thought, will affect individuals, and can become a human dead end that forces people to choose certain occupations and educational processes.

### ***Private education institutions (private school) and privatization of education***

According to the regulation of Private Education Institutions of the Ministry of National Education in Turkey, educational institutions that provide education and training in return for a fee at various levels such as pre-school, primary school, secondary school, secondary education, special education, special education courses, social activity centers, vocational education and development courses, special education and rehabilitation centers are defined as "Private Education Institutions" [38]. Private education institutions contain an understanding that aims to gain commercial earning in general in terms of existence and they try to provide education services in this direction. In this context, private education institutions carry out various image and brand studies in the competitive environment of the education sector and also carry out activities that will attract parents and children. At this point, the main purpose is important, and thus, state-owned schools do not have commercial concerns and educational concerns are more prominent, but commercial concerns in private education institutions are generally more appropriate to prevent

educational concerns, except for traditional schools. In this context, while the target of the abuse of the “educational needs of the child” constitutes a point that should be considered by all stakeholders, at the same time, the question of whether “child” or “commercial concerns” is at the center of special education is a subject that requires re-evaluation for all countries.

According to the statistics of the Ministry of National Education, while the number of Private Education Institutions was 14,477 and the number of students was 3,137,452 in the 2007-2008 academic year [39], the number of private education institutions decreased to 13,501 and the number of students decreased to 1,310,605 in the 2020-2021 academic year due to the pandemic. The share of private education institutions in all educational institutions is 20.1% and it is 7.9% in terms of student ratio. The student ratio is higher especially in pre-school (15.1%) and secondary education (11%) compared to other levels [40]. Although these rates are low compared to other countries and with the effect of the pandemic, they still show that privatizations in education in Turkey increase as they gain a foothold.

Thus, the basic situation that creates this ground is the exam scores that are effective in the placement of the child in secondary or higher education. For example, the research conducted by Karaşahin [41] concluded that “the success of the school in a central examination” came to the forefront in the order of importance that enables the provincial and district administrators, inspectors, school administrators, teachers and parents to evaluate a school successfully, and yet it was the most important factor. The research also reveals that the elements with the lowest importance in the ranking in terms of these stakeholders are: “supporting the personality development of the student and observing and supervising the students” from the point of view of provincial and district administrators and inspectors, “being a researcher (creating interest, desire, and curiosity) and planning the activities and the education in the school” from the point of view of school administrators and teachers, and “course and seminar support given to students, the working environment provided by the school to the students, the school informing parents and students, the monitoring of the students, the consideration of the views of the teachers, parents, and students, and the qualifications of the classroom teacher” from the point of view of parents. The main element that draws attention in the research of Karaşahin [41] is the difference in the perception of students to evaluate a school as successful compared to other stakeholders. Thus, in the research, students ranked “the success of the school in a central examination” in the sixth place in importance compared to other stakeholders. The situations that the students placed in the first two places in the order of importance were the “proficiency of the teachers and the social activities at the school”. These results exhibit that there is a difference between the interests and needs of students and the expectations of other stakeholders, and in this context, the expectations of parents and other stakeholders suppress student expectations, and the success in exams is considered more important by the stakeholders in choosing a school or private education institution, contrary to student wishes.

The facts that the central examination scores of the schools are considered more by the parents of students and the competitiveness of private schools (in terms of resources, textbooks, teacher selection, facilities, etc.) is higher than public schools cause private education institutions (private schools) to be preferred more. Thus, student performances of the Transition to High Schools (LGS) system in 2018 reveal that the average score of the students who graduated from public secondary schools was 339.94, while it was 380.55 for private schools [42]. Although the statistics of this data have not been published by the Ministry of National Education in Turkey since 2018, these figures for 2018 reveal the inequality of opportunity between public and private schools and are a reason for students’ parents to prefer private schools. This situation provides private education institutions with high commercial expectations the opportunity to instrumentalize student success and opens the door to abuse.

The concept of privatization includes the transfer or reduction of various economic activities of the state or the practices that impose an economic burden on the state [43], and the reflection of privatization in the field of education is observed in the form of reducing the educational burden of the state by expanding private schools or private education institutions [44]. However, private schools may also contain risks that may cause social stratification in society [45]. Hence, the socio-economic levels of the students who go to private schools are higher than the students who go to public schools and they benefit from educational opportunities at a higher level [46]. At the same time, according to Weiß [47], parents from higher socioeconomic status feel the need to send their children to private schools to legitimize and protect this status and also maintain high standards. Although there are partial financial incentives for private schools for low- and middle-income groups in some countries (like Turkey), as Witte [48] states, students from low socio-economic backgrounds studying in private schools have lower success expectations than students from upper socio-economic backgrounds. In this context, the fact that states pave the way for or encourage privatization of education, which is one of the fundamental rights of the child, brings along risks that will legitimize public-sourced educational abuse, which accelerates social stratification and causes inequalities in society.

However, in most countries, education privatization policies are supported by local interest groups, international organizations, and private organizations, and similar supportive views on privatization of education can be shared even by ethnic groups or conservative groups in countries [49]. This situation may harbor the danger of instrumentalizing the

public education field by different interest groups in countries compatible with their own interests and shaping the educational and pedagogical achievements within the framework of the understanding of reaching the desired results. For example, in Turkey, the Fetullah Terrorist Organization's ideological gain by giving scholarships to children with socio-economically limited opportunities or raising them in private schools [50] is one of the best examples of the transformation of privatization in education into educational exploitation. At the same time, as Atabay [51] points out, the facts that private teaching institutions, which have become a "shadow education system" in recent years due to the pressure of central examinations, have become educational institutions parallel to public education and the parents of students have to send their children to private teaching institutions due to the competition created by central examinations are among the past examples of educational abuse.

### ***Culture and norms***

Cultural codes of societies are one of the factors that force the child to adopt traditions and habits based on various norms through education, apart from his/her self and decision-making instinct, and use education as an intermediary in terms of gaining these norms. Culture offers various patterns to societies and individuals and these patterns consist of behaviors, norms, and traditions [52]. Culture has great effects on education and societies impose duties on education, especially in transferring cultural and social heritage to individuals. This assignment is generally justified as informing the individual about the culture and ensuring their integration into society [52]. Despite these justifications, the suppression of the child by the norms of the current culture and the expectation of adaptation or the provision of a curriculum for this may create an intervention to the individual's self or ego.

The basic elements that culture aims were specified by Brooks [53] as folklore, greetings, politeness patterns, music, hobbies, oral taboos, and by Chastain [54] as family, religion, dress, etiquette, by CEF [55] as daily life practices, interpersonal relationships, beliefs, values, and attitudes, body language and social traditions, and ritual behaviors. In all these targeted areas, education is generally considered as an intermediary or transformative institution and adapted to individual learning. However, considering the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, for example, article 18 states that "everyone has the right of freedom of thought, conscience, and religion", article 19 states that "everyone has the right of freedom of opinion and expression", article 26/2 states that "education should be for the full development of the human personality and empowerment of the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms", and article 27 states that "everyone has the right to participate freely in the cultural life of the community" [56]. At this point, obliging cultural elements through the curriculum in various countries without the consent of the individual and the evaluation of education as an intermediary element in this obligation may lead to human rights violations in a pedagogical framework. At the same time, the facts that languages such as English dominate societies through globalization or standardization of various elements of societies, global consumption posing a threat to local elements and some cultures being vulnerable to this global pressure (for example, the thought that learning global languages will provide an advantage for the student), and this being mostly realized with elements such as education, media, etc. constitute the global dimension of the abuse of the child's self [57].

Moreover, one of the factors that should be considered and that affects the individual consciousness and self is the concept of "culturation". The concept known as culturation is the conscious transfer of cultural elements and techniques through education or social experiences within the framework of the life process [58]. The main reason for this framework, which is known as culturation and imposed on the individual, is to ensure the continuity of the society, which is defined as the reason for being of the school, as Ergün [58] states, and to adapt the individuals to the society and socialize them. In this socialization, education and child play an implicit role as a tool for the continuity and continuation of the upper culture or the super consciousness shaped in the founding philosophy of states and societies. In this culturation process, the facts that the disadvantaged groups and cultural diversity are not taken into account and cultural coding based on education for standardization cause the disappearance of the local and individual natural elements of culture and consciousness of individuals and the loss of cultural memory that causes abuse. Hence, according to Johnson, Chambers, Raghuram, and Tincknell [59], the dominant culture in societies is usually established and managed by the communities that have the most power, it is an element of pressure to affect the beliefs and actions of the rest of the society, and dominant cultures spread their domination ideologies by using or instrumentalizing institutions such as religion, media, education, politics, etc [60].

### **CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION**

Every individual under the age of eighteen is considered a child in the Convention on the Rights of the Children, and every child has innate rights, regardless of the language they speak, the place they live, their beliefs, opinions, or their gender, disability, financial situation, who their parents are or what they believe, and the convention clearly states that they should not be exposed to injustice for any reason. At the same time, according to this convention, when making decisions about their children, parents should consider how their children will be affected within the framework of these decisions and should consider the best for their children [61].

The child has a structure that includes a mental and spiritual period that is open to external intervention in the human development process. In this period, when consciousness and character can be abused and shaped in any way, any achievement offered to the child constitutes deliberate behavioral changes that cannot be evaluated by the child at the level of consciousness. For this reason, the existence of an individual, who opens his/her eyes to the world without knowing the elements of innate identity, is exposed to external interventions towards identity, culture, and deliberate goals from the first day. The consciousness of the child, which is shaped in the framework of parental wishes and identity in the first period, then grows up with the state and rules, social dynamics and traditions, educational goals, economic expectations, global patterns, and cultural templates and becomes vulnerable to the stimuli of these elements. Especially in countries where strict and disciplined education, law, and cultural elements are imposed, this desperation leaves its place to surrender to “shaping”. In this context, it is important that the child has the power of questioning and critical thinking, and it is also important that a culture of the mind, which can say “no” especially to the confinement of the sense of self into ordinary patterns and make decisions about being oneself, is created through education.

Educational elements in the world are mostly shaped outside the child or within the framework of a totality that prioritizes other elements by instrumentalizing the child. For example, according to NCERT [62], while the purpose of education is considered to be the transfer of various skills (agriculture, hunting, fishing, etc.) related to the economic life of the society in traditional societies, Idris et al. [63], on the other hand, indicated the aim of education as ensuring the development of the country’s economy, national identity and society, and Rice [64] evaluated it as building, maintaining, and strengthening society. In these evaluations, the existence, self, the idea of self-actualization of the child, and the power to make their own decisions were pushed into the background and the existence and continuity of the society, as well as the development of the economy and national identity, were prioritized.

For this reason, not seeing education as an element that liberates the individual spirit and a medium that gives the individual a chance to choose, and structuring individual preferences in a way that rasps the mind or directs individuals to various goals may cause the child to be abused in an educational sense. Thus, processes like parents imposing certain professions and educational processes on their children within the framework of their own expectations and family image, educational processes structured to train the economic workforce within the framework required and drawn by the market, norms and rules placed in the curriculum for the continuity of society and culture, education systems structured with ideological expectations, interest groups seeing education as a target area, and private persons and institutions turning the privatization of education into an opportunity to realize their commercial expectations lead to the abuse of education through the child and indirectly to the abuse of the child.

In this direction, parents who want their children to be a “doctor” and make efforts in this direction, market actors who direct education and strive to make more profit by raising the type of individual desired by the sector with the concept of “qualified labor” and “employment” pressure, social laws and ideologies that penetrate culture and norms into the individual’s mind with the expectation of “reasonable citizen”, interest groups waiting to achieve their goals through “directed minds”, and private education and training initiatives that want to gain economic power by creating “educational competition” ignore children and their innocent needs, wishes, desires, and expectations and they abuse children in an educational sense by rasping the child’s expectations. In this context, looking at education and educational processes from a different perspective, rethinking as a parent, centering the expectations and needs of the child, creating education as an area of freedom for the child, and giving him/her the right to choose at every stage of the education process are considered beneficial in the imagination of a happy future for the child.

Hence, as Billington [14] states, educational processes should not be handled in a pragmatic structure, which he refers to as “educare” and which enables states, societies, and power groups to model individuals within the framework of their economic expectations and needs, on the contrary, they should be handled in such a way that he expresses as “educare” and allows individuals to discover the world and themselves, value ideas, knowledge, and skills as “immanent” and valuable, and enable them to acquire skills, not through extrinsic motivation, but through the intrinsic rewarding and fulfillment of discovering something. In this direction, the role of the teacher is also changing and this process will prevent the child from thinking with the judgments of others and will accelerate the child’s process of being himself/herself by transitioning to the role of a source or an “encourager” who helps to discover rather than an being an authority and making the student say rather than telling [14].

Although the dominant market expects from education to train experts in designated areas and to teach certain skills, the main purpose of education should be to activate the dynamics that will support individual autonomy. Thus, the individual who learns in this way will begin to look at the issues around him/her from a wider perspective, increase his/her creative powers, gain empathy for different views, and gain the ability to stand on his/her own by overcoming his/her prejudices. At this point, the imposition of skills by dominant groups through education can implicitly prevent creativity and intellectual accumulation that can be achieved by the autonomy of the individual, although it provides individuals with competent and impressive qualifications in fields of work [14]. For this reason, structuring and

presenting autonomous education processes in the child's educational life, supporting their preferences in the subjects and areas they need, and not limiting their originality and imagination are vital for the child.

## REFERENCES

1. Fayaz, I. (2019). Child Abuse: Effects and Preventive Measures. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 7(2), 871-884.
2. The UN Refugee Agency [UNHCR] (2021). *Abuse and Exploitation*. Action for the Rights of Children (ARC) Report. Revision Version 04/01. <https://www.unhcr.org/3bb81aea4.pdf>
3. National Center for Victims of Crime [OVC] (2021). *What You Should Know About Child Abuse (For Teenagers Ages 12–16)*. [https://www.ncjrs.gov/ovc\\_archives/reports/help\\_series/pdftxt/whatyoushouldknow12\\_16.pdf](https://www.ncjrs.gov/ovc_archives/reports/help_series/pdftxt/whatyoushouldknow12_16.pdf)
4. Sönmez, V. (1994). *Program geliştirmede öğretmen el kitabı*. Ankara: Anı Yayınları.
5. Ertürk, S. (2013). *Eğitimde program geliştirme*. Edge Akademi.
6. Demirel, Ö. (2017). Eğitimde program geliştirme: Kuramdan uygulamaya. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
7. Fidan, N. (1986). Okulda Öğrenme ve Öğretme Ankara: Kadioğlu matbaası.
8. Keser, A. (2018). İşte Mutluluk Araştırması. *Paradoks Ekonomi Sosyoloji ve Politika Dergisi*, 14(1), 43-57.
9. Education Law of the People's Republic of China (March 18, 1995). Promulgated by Order No. 45 of the President of the People's Republic of China [http://www.npc.gov.cn/zgrdw/englishnpc/Law/2007-12/12/content\\_1383710.html](http://www.npc.gov.cn/zgrdw/englishnpc/Law/2007-12/12/content_1383710.html)
10. Russia Federal Centre for Educational Legislation. (December 29, 2012). *The Law on Education*. <http://fcoz.ru/en/education-law-in-russia/the-law-on-education/>
11. Carroll, D. O. (2011). The Curriculum of Capitalism: Schooled to Profit or Schooled to Educate. Electronic Theses and Dissertations. 528. <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/528>
12. Australian Government (2021). Australia's Youth Policy Framework. <https://www.dese.gov.au/australias-youth-policy-framework/resources/australias-youth-policy-framework>.
13. Akın, U., & Arslan, G. (2014). İdeoloji ve eğitim: devlet-eğitim ilişkisine farklı bir bakış. *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(1), 81-90.
14. Billington, R. (1997). Felsefeyi Yaşamak (Çev. A. Yılmaz). *İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları*.
15. Friedman, M. (1955). The role of government in education. <https://la.utexas.edu/users/hcleaver/330T/350kPEEFriedmanRoleOfGovtable.pdf>
16. Rout, B. C., & Dixit, S. (2017). State and the Education in Contemporary Times. Forthcoming in: *The New Leam Magazine*.
17. Nartgün, Ş., & Kaya, A. (2016). Özel Okul Velilerinin Beklentileri Doğrultusunda Okul İmajı Oluşturma. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(2), 153-167.
18. Tai, D. W vd. (2007). The Correlation Between School Marketing Strategy and The School Image of Vocational High Schools. *The Business Review Cambridge*, 8(2), 191-197.
19. Kurşun, A. T. (2011). *Okulların Kurumsal İmajının Okul Yöneticilerinin Etik Liderlik Özellikleri ve Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Selçuk Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.
20. Ceylan, R. (2019). Ebeveynlerin Okul Öncesi Kurumu Hakkındaki Görüşleri: Tercih Sebepleri, Beklentileri Ve Memnuniyetleri. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 18 (70), 497-517. Doi: 10.17755/esosder.414788
21. Armor, D. J., & Peiser, B. M. (1998). Interdistrict choice in Massachusetts. P. E. Peterson and B C. Hassel (Eds.), *Learning from school choice*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
22. Kleitz, B., Weiher, G. R., Tedin, K., & M. Richard. (2000). Choice, charter schools, and household preferences. *Social Science Quarterly*, 81(3), 846-854.
23. Schneider, M., Marschall, M., Teske, P., & Roch, R. (1998). School choice and culture wars in the classroom: What different parents seek from education. *Social Science Quarterly*, 79(3), 489-501.
24. Boztepe, D. (2016). *Ebeveyn Beklentilerinin Sınav Kaygısı Üzerindeki Etkisi: Lise Son Sınıf Öğrencilerine Yönelik Bir Değerlendirme* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
25. Peker, A., & Kağızmanlı, N. (2018). Ebeveyn tutumlarının ergenlerin akademik güdülenme düzeyleri üzerindeki yordayıcı etkisi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14(1), 210-224.
26. Öztürk, N., Kutlu, M., & Atli, A. (2011). The Effect of Parents' Attitudes on Adolescents' Decision-Making Strategies. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education (INUJFE)*, 12(2), 45-64.
27. Omurtak, G. (2019). *Eğitim-öğretim sistemine Bourdieu'cu bakış: Lise öğrencilerinin sınav hazırlık sürecinde ailelerin meslek seçimlerindeki rolü, İstanbul örneği* (Master's thesis), Maltepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
28. Huang, B., Guo, C., Zhang, J., & Shen, S. (t.y.). The Effect of Parental and Personal Influence on Students' Choice of College Major. Columbia University. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/561bf748e4b0f7b2b488f369/t/5980ad5d893fc04f39f072ba/1501605216830/Team+Old+Driver+Final+Proposal.pdf>
29. Ma, Y. (2009). Family Socioeconomic Status, Parental Involvement, and College Major Choices—Gender, Race/Ethnic, and Nativity Patterns. *Sociological Perspectives* 52(2), 211-234.

30. Atalı, G., Özkan, S. S., & Sarıbiyık, M. (2016). *Nitelikli İşgücü Yetiştirmek için Ön Lisans Programlarında Uygulamalı Eğitim Modeli*. 5th International Vocational Schools Symposium. Prizren, 18-20 May 2016.
31. Işık, V. (2019). *Mesleki Eğitimin İş Piyasası İle Uyumlaştırılmasında İhtiyaç Analizi ve Öz Değerlendirme Modeli*. İstanbul: SETA Yayınları.
32. Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (2014). *Varisler, Öğrenciler ve Kültür* (Çev. Levent Ünsaldı). Ankara: Heretik Yayınları.
33. Althusser, L. (2002). *İdeoloji ve Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları*. (Çev. Y. Alp ve M. Özışık). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
34. www.ensonhaber.com (Eylül 28, 2021). “YKS 2021 adaylarının merceğinde: En fazla tercih edilen üniversite bölümleri”. <https://www.ensonhaber.com/gundem/yks-2021-adaylarinin-merceginde-en-fazla-tercih-edilen-universite-bolumleri>
35. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [Ministry of National Education-MEB] (2020). *2020 Liselere Geçiş Sistemi (LGS) Kapsamında İlk Yerleştirme Sonuçları*. MEB Eğitim Analiz ve Değerlendirme Raporları Serisi (No 14), Ağustos 2020. [https://www.meb.gov.tr/meb\\_iys\\_dosyalar/2020\\_08/10084549\\_No15\\_LGS\\_2020\\_Ilk\\_Yerlestirme\\_Sonuclari.pdf](https://www.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2020_08/10084549_No15_LGS_2020_Ilk_Yerlestirme_Sonuclari.pdf) obtained from.
36. Yağmur, A. (2009). *İstihdam Edilebilirlik Açısından Eğitim-İstihdam İlişkisi: Konya Bölgesi İmalat Sanayii Örneği* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.
37. Durkaya, M., & Hüsnuoğlu, N. (2018). İstihdamda Eğitimin Rolü. *Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 19(41), 51-70.
38. Resmi Gazete [OfficialNewspaper] (2012). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Özel Öğretim Kurumları Yönetmeliğinde Değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Yönetmelik. *Yayınlandığı Tarih*, 21(2012), 28360.
39. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [Ministry of National Education-MEB] (2008). Millî Eğitim İstatistikleri Örgün Eğitim 2007-2008. [https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb\\_iys\\_dosyalar/2012\\_12/06020810\\_meb\\_istatistikleri\\_organ\\_egitim\\_2007\\_2008.pdf](https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2012_12/06020810_meb_istatistikleri_organ_egitim_2007_2008.pdf)
40. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [Ministry Of National Education-MEB] (2021). Millî Eğitim İstatistikleri Örgün Eğitim 2020-2021. [https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb\\_iys\\_dosyalar/2021\\_09/10141326\\_meb\\_istatistikleri\\_organ\\_egitim\\_2020\\_2021.pdf](https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2021_09/10141326_meb_istatistikleri_organ_egitim_2020_2021.pdf)
41. Kardeşahin, M. (2010). *İlköğretim Okulları Başarı Göstergeleri*. Ankara: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Eğitimi Araştırma ve Geliştirme Dairesi Başkanlığı (Earged)
42. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [Ministry Of National Education-MEB] (2018). *2018 Liselere Geçiş Sistemi (LGS) Merkezi Sınavla Yerleşen Öğrencilerin Performansı*. Ankara: MEB Eğitim Analiz ve Değerlendirme Raporları Serisi (No:3). [https://www.meb.gov.tr/meb\\_iys\\_dosyalar/2018\\_12/17094056\\_2018\\_lgs\\_rapor.pdf](https://www.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2018_12/17094056_2018_lgs_rapor.pdf)
43. Demirbaş, M., & Türkoğlu, M. (2002). Kamu İktisadi Teşebbüslerinin Özelleştirilmesi, *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(1), 241-264.
44. Yirci, R., & Kocabaş, İ. (2013). Eğitimde Özelleştirme Tartışmaları: Kavramsal Bir Analiz. *Turkish Studies*, 8(8), 1523-1539.
45. Ambler, J. S. (1994). Who Benefits From Educational Choice - Some Evidence From Europe. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 13(3), 454-476.
46. Pedró, F., Leroux, G., & Watanabe, M. (2015). *The Privatization Of Education In Developing Countries. Evidence And Policy Implications*. UNESCO Working Papers on Education Policy N0:2.
47. Weiß, M. (1986). The financing of private schools in the Federal Republic of Germany. *Journal of Comparative Education*, 16(2), 149-165.
48. Witte, J. F. (1992). Private school versus public school achievement: Are there findings that should affect the educational choice debate? *Economics of Education Review*, 11(4), 371-394.
49. Apple, M. W., & Pedroni, T. C. (2005). Conservative alliance building and African American support of vouchers: The end of Brown’s promise or a new beginning? *Teachers College Record*, 107(9), 2068–2105. Doi:10.1111/j.1467-9620.2005.00585.x
50. Kadın ve Demokrasi Derneği [Women and Democracy Association-KADEM] (2021). *Fettullahçı Terör Örgütü (FETÖ)*. İstanbul: Kadem Yayınları.
51. Atabay, S. (2014). Dershanelerin Eğitim Sistemindeki Yeri, İşlevi ve Dönüştürülme Süreci. *TÜSİAD Görüş Dergisi*, (82). <https://tusiad.org/tr/yayinlar/gorus-dergisi/item/7450-tusiad-gorus-dergisi-no-82>.
52. Roy, P. (2019). Education and Culture. N. Bhagabat & P. Saikia (Ed.). *Sociological Foundation of Education* (pp. 229-242). Krishna Kanta Handiqui State Open University.
53. Brooks, N. (1994). *Language and language learning*. (2nd edition). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
54. Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second language skills: theory and practice*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jonovich
55. CEF (2001). *Common European Framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, and assessment*. Cambridge University Press.
56. United Nations (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>

57. United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization [UNESCO] (2009). *Investing in Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue*. UNESCO World Report. [https://www.un.org/en/events/culturaldiversityday/pdf/Investing\\_in\\_cultural\\_diversity.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/events/culturaldiversityday/pdf/Investing_in_cultural_diversity.pdf) obtained from.
58. Ergün, M. (1994). *Eğitim Sosyolojisine Giriş*. İstanbul: Ocak Yayınları.
59. Johnson, R., Chambers, D., Raghuram, P., & Tincknell, E. (2004). *The Practice of Cultural Studies*. SAGE
60. Lears, T., & Jackson, J. (1985). The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities. *The American Historical Review*, 90 (3), 567–593. Doi:10.2307/1860957
61. United Nations (1989). Convention on the Rights of the Child. United Nations General Assembly 20 November 1989. <https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/ProfessionalInterest/crc.pdf> obtained from.
62. National Council of Educational Research and Training [NCERT] (2006). *Position Paper National Focus Group on Aims Of Education*. New Delhi: Ncert Offices Of The Publication Department.
63. Idris, F., Hassan, Z., Ya'acob, A., Gill, S. A., & Awal, N. A. M. (2012). The role of education in shaping youth's national identity. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, (59), 443-450. Doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.299
64. Rice, J. K. (2015). *Investing in Equal Opportunity: What Would it Take to Build the Balance Wheel?* Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/balance-wheel>