

## The Realisation of Educational Dialogue as the Key to the Education of Children and Youth. Inspiration of the Pedagogy of Fr. Janusz Tarnowski

Realizacja dialogu edukacyjnego jako klucz do wychowania dzieci i młodzieży.  
Inspiracja pedagogiką ks. Janusza Tarnowskiego

Ewa Wiśniewska

Mazovian University in  
Płock, Poland

e.wisniewska@mazowiecka.edu.pl

ORCID 0000-0003-1894-  
1768

Received: 30 Nov 2025

Revised: 12 Dec 2025

Accepted: 19 Dec 2025

Online First: 31 Dec 2025

**Abstract:** This text addresses the issue of education in the spirit of educational dialogue. The aim of the study was to recall and introduce the richness of dialogue according to the concept of Fr. Janusz Tarnowski, which is an expansion of his concept of Christian personal-existential pedagogy, and to demonstrate that such a dialogue can be an inspiration for contemporary educators. Educational dialogue, understood by Fr. Janusz Tarnowski as a method, process, and attitude, supports other pedagogical methods, as long as they focus on the pupil, without overly emphasising his individualism, where the common good disappears, and personal life is threatened. The study contains an analysis of selected factors influencing the implementation of dialogue by the educator, such as: the educator's attitude towards education, the educator's approach to dialogue, the educator's communicative culture/communicative competences, and the emotional climate preferred by the educator. This analysis was conducted against the backdrop of the concept of Fr. Tarnowski, because his views on education and the educator are appropriate to the chosen factors. Based on this, it was concluded that despite the passage of time and the changes that have taken place in the Polish school in recent years, the pedagogy of dialogue of Fr. Janusz Tarnowski's work can still be a valuable source of inspiration for contemporary teachers and educators in implementing dialogue in the school environment. Currently, with the end of pedagogy that uncritically emphasises the leading role of the educator, fulfilling the principle that education is primarily about the human-to-human relationship becomes the meaning of "human-face" pedagogy, rooted in Christian foundations and expressed in authentic dialogue.

**Keywords:** peace, upbringing for peace, dialogue, pedagogy, educational dialogue, educator, pupil

**Abstrakt:** W niniejszym tekście podjęto problem wychowania w duchu dialogu wychowawczego. Celem opracowania było przypomnienie i przybliżenie bogactwa dialogu według koncepcji ks. Janusza Tarnowskiego, będącej rozwinięciem jego koncepcji chrześcijańskiej pedagogiki personalno-egzystencjalnej oraz wykazanie, że taki dialog może być inspiracją dla współczesnych wychowawców. Dialog wychowawczy rozumiany przez ks. Janusza Tarnowskiego jako metoda, proces i postawa wspiera inne metody pedagogiczne, o ile te skupiają się na wychowanku, bez nadmiernego eksponowania jego indywidualizmu, gdzie zanika dobro wspólne i zagrożone jest życie osobowe. Opracowanie zawiera analizę wybranych czynników wpływających na realizację dialogu przez wychowawcę, takich jak: postawa wychowawcy wobec wychowania, podejście wychowawcy do dialogu, kultura komunikacyjna/kompetencje komunikacyjne wychowawcy oraz klimat emocjonalny preferowany przez wychowawcę. Analizy tej dokonano na tle koncepcji ks. Tarnowskiego, gdyż jego poglądy na wychowanie i wychowawcę są adekwatne do wybranych czynników. Na tej podstawie sformułowano wniosek, że pomimo upływu czasu oraz zmian, jakie w ostatnich latach dokonały się w polskiej szkole, pedagogika dialogu ks. Janusza Tarnowskiego nadal może stanowić cenne źródło inspiracji dla współczesnych nauczycieli i wychowawców w urzeczywistnianiu dialogu w szkolnym środowisku wychowawczym. Obecnie, kiedy mamy do czynienia z końcem pedagogiki bezkrytycznie eksponującej przywódczą rolę wychowawcy, spełnienie zasady, że wychowanie polega przede wszystkim na relacji człowiek – człowiek, staje



This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)

się sensem pedagogiki „o ludzkim obliczu”, zakorzenionej w chrześcijańskich podstawach i wyrażającej się w autentycznym dialogu.

**Słowa kluczowe:** pokój, wychowanie do pokoju, dialog, pedagogika dialogu, dialog wychowawczy, wychowawca, wychowanek

## INTRODUCTION

Around the twenty-ninth minute of the 1999 film, directed by Lana and Lilly Wachowski, *The Matrix*, a scene takes place that has become a staple of pop culture: Neo meets Morpheus (Wachowski & Wachowski 1999):

Modern pedagogy defines the role of the educator as supporting the child in his independent explorations and choices. In the relationship between the educator and the pupil, the basis of interaction is mutual respect and trust, providing a climate of security (without fear, pressure), open communication, refraining from expressing judgments, providing feedback, stimulating creativity, independence, and sovereignty. The educator, being a man of dialogue, takes into account that the educator and his “I” is the centre of educational interactions. As a person, he has his own value, which means that he cannot be treated as an object. Such an educator is an active partner, seeking genuine contact and open communication. He cares about the freedom of the individual, facilitates the creation of individuality, and the use of one’s own developmental potential. Educational interactions become “encounters” – deep personality relationships. The educator should accept himself, not be afraid of novelty, recognise different personalities, have imagination, help through communication and dialogue, inspire trust, respect his own and others’ needs, be sincere, and creative.

Dialogue in education, however, is hindered by a number of phenomena, such as the demanding attitude of one of the parties to the meeting, or the disregard for the dialogue partner evident in the inability to listen to his reasons and in undermining his motivations. One of the most common pitfalls of dialogue is its conversion into a duet of monologues, as well as the educator’s excessive adaptation to the level and expectations of the young person. Dialogue at all costs leads to the destruction of the educator’s identity of conviction and results in the annihilation of his authority at his own request.

Undoubtedly, these obstacles can be an expression of the differences between the educator – parent, teacher and the educator – child, student. They result from both

developmental conditions and discrepancies related to specific cultural experiences or rapid civilisation changes that alter an individual's attitude to knowledge and the training of various skills.

And so the educator is perceived by the educator as the Other. Perhaps even as an enemy, but certainly as an expression or exotic representative of another world order and values. The educator is a representative of the world of symbolic culture, unknown to the educator and different from his previous experience. He is a representative of a generation, still raised in the era of the printed word, often oriented in opposition to the image, especially that which has its origins in pop culture. He is also an exponent of a particular axiological order, an ideal that is difficult to realise for himself as well. He is someone using a distinct language that has reference to contexts foreign to the educator.

The alumni, on the other hand, are primarily representatives of a new mentality, a different way of perceiving and categorising reality. First of all, his primary cultural experience is immersion in visual messages in the broader pop culture. It carries with it the baggage of disparate experiences and is a vivid example of the increasing dominance of so-called prefigurative culture or co-figurative<sup>1</sup>.

He emerges as a subject from an axiologically unsettled reality, derived from the clash of different concepts of values, propagated in the mass media of various *modus vivendi* (way of life) that document pluralism of worldview and liberalism of attitudes. Thus, it is a representative of qualities rejected from the perspective of high culture, most often negated by

---

<sup>1</sup> According to anthropologist Margaret Mead: prefigurative culture, the so-called culture of *puzzled children* - is a type of culture in which younger generations transmit technical knowledge to older generations, the direction of transmission of values changes, adults do not keep up with changes, the world is understandable only to children; co-figurative culture, the so-called culture of "*found peers*" - is a type of culture in which the cultural patterns of younger and older generations coexist. In this model, younger and older generations coexist, but are unable to introduce children to the changing conditions of reality on their own. The significant persons are peers. This type of culture is transitional between post-figurative and pre-figurative culture and characteristic of the developmental stages of modern, industrial society; post-figurative culture, the culture of *unappreciated ancestors* - is a type of culture in which younger generations assimilate cultural patterns from older generations, adolescence entails taking on adult roles. This type of culture is dominant and characteristic of traditional societies in which, due to high illiteracy rates and the confinement of individuals to small communities, horizontal transmission of information, that is, within culturally distinct groups, is negligible.

adults. It is also a user of an already foreign language, a code, simplifying communication to forms of Internet communication.

In conclusion, the existence of educator-educator relations is an expression of all sorts of differences. They result both from developmental conditions and discrepancies related to cultural experiences or are conditioned by civilisation changes. Nevertheless, the distinctiveness of the two subjects does not have to be exclusively differentiating. The value of each subject can be realised precisely in the possibilities of opening to dialogue, and these differences can be an element that builds it, but only if, in the space of interpersonal relations, both the educator and the educated try to follow a common path. Then it may turn out that dissimilarity (otherness) can be an asset on the path of discovering oneself and the world together. It can also provide an opportunity to exchange experiences and allow for multi-faceted cognition.

This text aims to recall and introduce the richness of dialogue according to the concept of Fr. Janusz Tarnowski. Despite the passage of time and the changes that have taken place in Polish schools in recent years, Fr. Janusz Tarnowski's pedagogy of dialogue, which is a development of his concept of Christian personal-existential pedagogy, should still be a valuable source of inspiration for contemporary teachers in making dialogue a reality in the school environment. For, as Fr. Tarnowski emphasises, education is primarily about the human-to-human relationship; it is an interaction "with a human face." Thus, education in the spirit of educational dialogue aims to help develop the humanity of the pupil. Therefore, the modern teacher, being a teacher of dialogue, takes into account that the pupil and his "I" is the centre of educational interactions. As a person, he has his own value, which means that he cannot be treated as an object for a purpose. Upbringing, therefore, is to be a support and help in the formation of the "being myself" of the pupil.

This paper contains an attempt to analyse the factors influencing the realisation of dialogue by the educator in contemporary educational reality. This analysis is made against the background of the concept of Fr. Janusz Tarnowski, as his views on upbringing and the educator are relevant to such aspects of educational work as:

- the attitude of the educator toward upbringing,
- the educator's approach to dialogue,

- the communication culture (communicative competence) of the educator,
- the emotional climate preferred by the educator.

## 1. EDUCATIONAL DIALOGUE IN CHRISTIAN PERSONAL-EXISTENTIAL PEDAGOGY

The word *dialogue* for most people has an obvious meaning. In the colloquial sense, it means a conversation aimed at agreeing on positions, views, and it is a way of bringing one's points of view closer together and working out a common understanding of them. Dialogue, however, is not just talk. The UN and the Norwegian think-tank Nansen Centre for Peace and Dialogue, which has been nominated several times for the Nobel Peace Prize, see dialogue as a process of "real interaction, during which people listen carefully enough to each other to change under the influence of what they learn. Each participant in the dialogue makes an effort to consider the other person's point of view, even when contradictions persist. No participant in the dialogue abandons his or her own identity, but each recognises the other person's position enough to change his or her way of dealing with it" (Ciesiołkiewicz 2022).

The problematic of dialogue was introduced into pedagogy and contributed to its consolidation by the Jewish philosopher, theologian and pedagogue Martin Buber. It was in connection with his person that the issue of dialogue deepened in the early 20th century. The ethical necessity of approaching, opening to the other person was also postulated by Emmanuel Levinas, Jozef Tischner. The idea of dialogue, which has its origins in the philosophy of these thinkers, captures human existence in the category of encounter – "Man becomes Self in contact with You" (Buber 1992, 56). The encounter in this view reveals the metaphysical dimension of human existence, the realm of the "in-between," is the starting point for understanding man, the diversity of the world and oneself, and causes man to experience the very other (the Other). On the Polish ground, the issue of dialogue is noted in the concept, related to the philosophical personal-existential thinking, of the pedagogy of dialogue by Father Janusz Tarnowski.

The essence of Fr. Tarnowski's concept of Christian personal-existential pedagogy is contained in the following formula:

1. Pedagogical priority: person to person interaction, person to person. The role of the educator and the educator on the secondary plane.

2. Upbringing: to become more and more human, arriving again and again at its existential depth, and moving toward the same existence of the educated person.

3. The pupil is not an object, but is the subject of pedagogical radiation on the educator.

4. Master: Jesus Christ living in the Church, the Son of Man, God Incarnate.

5. Through authentic dialogue, education becomes an aid to the existential encounter with God and people, which should result in the full involvement of the educator and the pupil” (Tarnowski 1993,180).

According to this concept, pedagogical action is not built on the principle: subject – object, but has a two-subject character. The peculiarity of this pedagogy lies in the tendency, without in any way infringing on the freedom of the pupil, to reach his deepest self, preparing him to meet Christ living in the Church. Thus, whenever we talk about the pedagogical process and its Christian character, the basis, goal and way is Jesus Christ. The concept of personal-existential pedagogy refers to the person as the central value, both of the educator and the educated, taken concretely, and rooted in a dual reality: sacred and earthly (Tarnowski 2000b, 85).

From the personalistic view of man in the process of his socialization and upbringing comes the affirmation of him as a fundamental and autotelic value, the primacy of spiritual life, the irreducibility of the person to things, the body, the senses and biological needs, the inalienability of the rights inherent in human nature, the awareness of duty to others based on the principles of justice, and the rejection of the anarchic concept of the freedom of the human person. However, it should be emphasised that Fr. Prof. Tarnowski, standing firmly on the ground of Christian personalism, also uses elements of existentialism, because he believes that only then does the human being become more concrete, situationally conditioned, “multidimensional.” For this very purpose, the contents of existentialism are helpful: relying on the “core” of the human being, that is, on his deepest self, and on the application of pedagogical goals of categories of the existential type: authenticity, dialogue, encounter, commitment” (Tarnowski 1993, 89-90).

J. Tarnowski defines upbringing as “the totality of ways and processes that help a human being, especially through interaction, to realize and develop his or her humanity” (Tarnowski 1991, 71-73) and emphasizes that on both sides of this process stand first and foremost not so

much the educator and the pupil, but rather the human being in relation to the human being. There is no room for domination by either the educator or the pupil. The most important pedagogical moment is the two-way human contact. Thanks to this approach, the process of upbringing is not one-sided, but multifaceted – the educator and the pupil educate each other.

Thus, upbringing is primarily about the human-to-human relationship. It is an interaction “with a human face.” Each person carries the unique mystery of his own destiny. What should particularly characterise the educator is an attitude of respect towards the specific “mystery” (secret) of the person of the educator. Thus, every educational activity should focus on the “protection” of the young person, seen as a “peculiar value” with a specific developmental potential, which should be brought out and developed for both individual and social use.

Thus understood, education is characterised by: humanity, permanence, inter- and intra-activity, indeterminacy and transgressiveness. Humanity is the basis of all upbringing, eliminating the asymmetrical nature of mutual interaction. Permanence is that upbringing is not limited to a specific phase of a person’s life, but continues throughout his life; the need for it never disappears. Inter- and intra-activity is the reciprocal interaction of subjects – the educator with the educator and the educator with the educator, but also entering into action with oneself, i.e. self-education; mutual opening to one another’s values. Another property is the indeterminacy of situations, events, and consequences that occur in educational situations, requiring constant openness to novelty, while knowing things and being aware of one’s own value system or aspirations. Transgressiveness, in turn, is the constant ability to transcend oneself and overcome the paradox between the superficial self and the deep self (Śliwerski 2005, 68-69).

Fr. Tarnowski warns, however: “For if the pedagogue desires to ‘humanise’ the pupil with the conviction that he himself has already achieved proper humanity, the situation becomes dangerous. For education is about discovering and developing humanity on both sides of the pedagogical process. Of course, the responsibility is disproportionately greater and the demands are on the person of the educator. However, the awareness that he is not yet a perfect human being should constantly accompany him. Then and only then, if (...) he is aware of his imperfection, he can also help imperfect students” (Tarnowski 2007, 78).



K. Chałas noted that when we accept the definition of upbringing understood as a personal meeting and dialogue between the educator (master) and the student, supporting the pupil in the realisation of a wide spectrum of values leading to the fullness of humanity, the question of the identity of the educator becomes important. The level of educational competence of the teacher, how he perceives the complex problems of upbringing, how he intends to solve them, determines to a large extent the course of the educational process and educational achievements (Chałas 2006).

Christian personal-existential pedagogy puts forward, as a condition of the educator's influence, the cognition, understanding and approach to the educator in his concrete situation. In this way, the basic condition of the attitude of dialogue in personal-existential pedagogy is fulfilled: to listen to the alumni in order to understand them, to get closer to them and to interact with them.

Rev. Janusz Tarnowski claimed that the call for a master is one of the characteristic needs of modern times, and therefore he repeatedly presented examples of masters of dialogue. One of the champions of dialogue cited by Fr. Tarnowski – Fr. Bernard Kryszkiewicz<sup>2</sup> understood these conditions as follows:

- Dialogical understanding is “To show the maximum possible appreciation of the beliefs, views of the pupil, to reckon with him as much as possible;” “To try to put myself in the place of the pupil. What would I think, how would I feel, how would I react to it.”

- Emotional rapprochement is “Radiate warmth, love, service, joy as much as possible. Let the alumni feel, clearly feel, that you love them, that you have their best interests at heart. With words say as little as possible – with deeds as much as possible.” “Paying attention is the greatest stone of offense; what tact is needed here. Handle the pupil as gently as with the pupil of the eye. Try to imbue attention as much as possible with kindness, sweetness, gentleness and – as privately as possible – emphasise the positives.”

- Dialogic interaction is “To undertake work on others first of all like work on one's own grooming. In educating others, to bear in mind first and foremost my own education.” “To

---

<sup>2</sup> Fr. Bernard Kryszkiewicz (1915-1945), a member of the Passionist order; served as spiritual father of seminarians for 5 years. From this time comes his “Pedagogikum” contained in a notebook found after the author's death. It consists of 44 notes written during his educational work (Tarnowski 2000a, 92).



regard sorrows, which will never be in short supply, as treasures for my character and to repay them in the spirit of the Gospel. Those who cause them – they are my greatest friends” (Tarnowski 2000a, 93).

Rev. Janusz Tarnowski, on a personal-existential level, sees dialogue as: a method, a process, an attitude. “Thus, the method of dialogue is a way of communication, the subjects of which strive to understand each other, come closer and cooperate (as much as possible). The dialogue process, on the other hand, occurs when at least one of the elements contained in the method has been realised. (...) Thus, the dialogue process can begin with any of the elements: cognitive, emotional or praxeological, and gradually aim (or not) to achieve the zones of the others. On the other hand, the attitude of dialogue is a readiness to open up to understanding, approaching and interacting (as much as possible) with the environment” (Tarnowski 1992, 149).

Dialogue can take the form of factual, personal and existential dialogue. Substantive dialogue is the pursuit of the value of truth by the subjects of dialogue and occurs in a situation of learning about reality. Personal dialogue is based on the value of freedom and goodness, and is the disclosure of one’s spirituality, experiences, emotions, and the opening of the subjects to their inner self. Existential dialogue, on the other hand, is based on the value of love. “It is expressed not only with words, but with the whole person, putting one’s self at the disposal of the partner, up to the point of sacrificing one’s own life” (Tarnowski 1992, 149).

In an authentic dialogue, a person gets rid of his or her own selfishness, thus recognising another person with whom he or she wants to meet and engage in conversation. People who produce a dialogic relationship treat each other subjectively, because “Dialogue is meant to acquaint people with each other. On the one hand, we have the right to be ourselves, just as the dialogue partner has the right to be himself, but on the other hand, in dialogue, one person wants to be for the other, opens up to him (...). In dialogue, we not only try to understand the other person, but we also want to communicate with him about what we have in common, what we have in common, what is important” (Grün 2016, 160-161).

According to Father John Tarnowski, there are three basic conditions for its occurrence and success, namely: two-sided authenticity, meeting in a personal sense, and commitment (Tarnowski 2000b, 86-88).

The first condition, namely two-sided authenticity, is to free oneself from the mask, to act in accordance with one's own self, to be sincere and true to oneself. Such authenticity is conditioned by the individual's inner depth, intensive spiritual training and life consistency (Tarnowski 1993, 79-80). An encounter in the personal sense is an event of contact with a concrete or transcendent person, during which the core of existence, the deepest self, is touched and a profound inner transformation takes place. Commitment, on the other hand, which should come from a free choice to devote oneself to a certain cause or person, is a process in which the individual, without ceasing to be himself, develops a higher emotionality and selfless benevolence. Dialogue conditioned by authenticity leads to an encounter, resulting in commitment. The existential authenticity of which Fr. Tarnowski speaks is an authenticity untainted by infantilism and subjectivism. It consists of inner depth, intensive training and life consistency. Inner depth is rooted in a person's inner self, which contains the image of God Himself. It develops in a person when he frees himself from externally influencing information and sensations and begins to search for his deep Self, remains true to himself, quiets himself, and opens his heart to God's grace. However, the search for one's deep Self, which is the centre of one's physical, mental and spiritual life, does not take place only under the influence of our firm decision. It is a journey to one's inner self, the author says, which lasts throughout a person's life, and should be reinforced by intensive prayerful training. An educator must not be afraid to be himself. He should grant himself the right to make mistakes, since a mistake is information for him about what to avoid in the future. He should also think positively, as it promotes well-being – sympathy for his own person and affection for his students. Thus, such a teacher, according to the principle of reciprocity, has a chance to be liked by those around him. It is also necessary to respect others regardless of age group. It manifests itself in honesty and fairness, keeping commitments, granting the right to be wrong, tolerance and openness to different points of view. A positive attitude toward people also involves reducing distance, which should be seen as a potential threat to the authority of the educator.

The second condition for dialogue is an encounter in the personal sense. This is an event of contact with a concrete or transcendent person, during which the core of existence, the deepest self, is touched and a profound inner transformation takes place (Tarnowski 2000b, 87). Every person is a person endowed with autonomy. Relationships established by individuals

should protect this autonomy. If this happens, we are dealing with personal relations. A personal relationship is at the same time a dialogical relationship, a relationship of the type: I speak to you, you listen to me, and vice versa – you speak to me, I listen to you. The establishment and continuance of a personal dialogical relationship is served primarily by trust: You to Me and loyalty of Me to You. The effect of misappropriating these values is the disintegration of the personal relationship or its transformation into an object relationship. In such an object relationship, at least one member of the relationship becomes bewitched and becomes an instrument for the Self.

The third condition, in turn, is commitment, which should come from a free choice to devote oneself to a certain cause or person. It is a process in which the individual, without ceasing to be himself, develops a higher emotionality and selfless benevolence. For this to happen, an educator should also be courageous. A courageous educator knows how to defend the right of the aggrieved or wrongly accused, knows how to admit a mistake or weakness himself, show emotion, take up difficult topics in conversation, and does not avoid confrontation. The educator must work on the ability to express his opinions and views directly and clearly. He can persuade, but must not impose his opinion, should intervene decisively when the situation requires, but must not use his position to dominate or intimidate alumni.

Essential to the engagement is mutual trust, without which dialogue is impossible. It presupposes respect for the dignity of the educator and objective truth. Adults do not always know how to communicate with children or adolescents, because they fail to listen to them and enter their world. Listening is necessary to encourage them to confide and get closer to the reality in which he lives. The ability to listen demonstrates acceptance of the educator and genuine interest in him. It expresses a sincere desire to learn about him and his existence. For dialogue to be effective, goodwill must also be demonstrated. It should come from the educator, who must reckon with the fact that the alumnus may also have his reasons. These rationales should be justified by the congruence of the proclaimed words or ideas with his own actions.

The realization of dialogue as an idea that fills the entire educational space is based on the conviction that in the educator-educator relationship they are identical in their humanity, thus it is expressed in the mutual pursuit of mutual knowledge, in the pursuit of mutual understanding, in showing the educator help in discovering his potential, in the willingness to

recognize that you are always a little right. The dialogue educator sees his pupils not only as recipients, but also as givers, and not only of knowledge, but also of feelings, emotions, beliefs, ideas, values. He is for him, but also vice versa – the educator is for his educator precisely that Other whom he meets on his way and is ready to be at his disposal.

The responsibility for this process falls on both subjects of the dialogue, with the burden not being equal. The archetypal master-disciple arrangement makes the former bear the burden of responsibility for the other as an educator, but also as a human being. This responsibility is limited only by the category of freedom ascribed to everyone, which opens perspectives you may or may not have. Even, if the educator has greater knowledge and richer experience than the educator, he also bears a greater responsibility (Tarnowski 2003a). Responsibility is a characteristic directly inherent in the profession of master teacher. The educator is responsible for education and upbringing in the spirit of socially defined values. An indispensable condition for the existence of responsibility is wisdom, which unquestionably sets the direction towards justice and freedom (Cieśleńska 2020,132-133).

T. A. Gadacz argues that for education to become a full reality, it must be realised in dialogue (Gadacz 1993). This is because education demands a living testimony of humanity, because it will only achieve lasting results if it results in a real commitment to the values shown by the educator.

## 2. CIRCUMSTANCES AND CONDITIONS FOR THE REALISATION OF EDUCATIONAL DIALOGUE IN THE LIGHT OF FR. TARNOWSKI'S PEDAGOGY OF DIALOGUE

In such educational environments as the family and school, is there room for dialogue and cohabitation in dialogue between educators and educators? Certainly yes. Undoubtedly, however, educators play a key role in this process, because they are the ones who enter into a relationship with another person (child, student) and consciously influence his attitude, views, thinking, and world of values.

There are several elements in the functioning of educators that are important for the occurrence and success of dialogue in the family and school environment. These include:

- beliefs about the nature of the educational process,

- preferred parenting strategy and related approaches to parenting dialogue,
- communication culture,
- the created climate of upbringing.

There is no doubt that every educator adopts a certain strategy for communicating and cooperating with his pupils in the educational process. We can distinguish two models of this cooperation: in the first, the educator places exceptional emphasis on the importance of dialogue with the alumni; in the second, the educator is the clearly dominant party, has power and authority. The educator who prefers the first model treats the alumni as partners in conversation, during which everyone can ask questions, have doubts and express their own point of view. Importantly, he adopts a non-judgmental attitude, listens carefully to what they say, refrains from making remarks and watches for similar behaviour from the alumni. The manifestation of concern for the alumni is an expression on his part of an attitude of kindness, acceptance, openness to the problems of the student, which, as a consequence, in educational work can be very effective. The dialogue between the two evokes a kind of participation, presence and involvement of the educator in the alumni's affairs. The educator does not aim to capture, confuse and defeat the alumni. He allows him to feel that he does not leave him alone both in moments of doubt and difficulty and in his successes. He does not hide that he can rely on him. Such an educator accompanies the mentee and supports him, helps him, but does not bail him out and does not take the responsibility off the mentee. He does not limit his independence. At the opposite pole is the second attitude of the educator, which is certainly not conducive to dialogue with the pupil. The educator who prefers it is the clearly dominant party, has power and authority. He is usually convinced of the rightness of his position. Submission to discussion of the information he provides is very limited or impossible. Consequently, this leads to a decrease in the creativity and aspirations of alumni.

Another factor in the realisation of dialogue in upbringing is the course of communication processes in the practice of upbringing, which is mainly a reflection of the educator's beliefs about the essence of the process of upbringing. And in this case we can speak of two opposing attitudes of the educator. He can adopt a dialogical or transmissive attitude (Barnes 1988, 174-199). The dialogic educator creates communicative situations and two-subject educator-educator interactions. He uses a cooperative communication pattern, i.e., as a

sender, he does not present precise requirements to the educator in a directive manner, or his own judgments hidden under arguments. The communication is two-way – the sender agrees to let the recipient's behaviour run its course independently of his expectations. Thus, he supports the alumnus in his development, creates him to meet contemporary existential needs and his creative abilities, respecting his rights. The “transmission” educator represents an attitude towards communication that is absolutely opposite and therefore unacceptable in the spirit of dialogue. Most often he uses an authoritarian pattern of one-sided communication of a directive nature. The dialogue with the pupil is mostly disharmonious (destructive) in character, for it is accompanied by criticism, a commanding tone or moralising. Intolerance and lack of kindness also seem to be characteristic. In descriptions of behaviour indicative of mistreatment of the pupil, we find: harshness and ruthlessness, deprivation of the opportunity to express one's own opinion, lurking for stumbling blocks, threats, and blackmail.

Undoubtedly, the educator's communicative competence, also known as communicative culture, plays an important role in creating dialogue with the educator (Koć-Seniuch 2000, 137). Nowadays, the educator rather loses the role of a manager in favour of an intermediary in the process of cultural communication, or simply a participant, a partner in the educational dialogue. He loses his position as a preacher, and is needed as a conversation partner, as a participant in inter- and intra-generational exchange. As a participant and organiser of dialogues, he has no chance in them as an arbiter; however, he can have a significant place as one who listens, co-creates, puts forward arguments, and speaks from himself.

An important component of educators' communication culture is the ability to listen. However, human beings are dialogical beings, and they are not always able to realise this also by listening to each other's speech. He can't because in a dialogue where there is always I AM and YOU the leading one is usually I AM. Half of the success of a dialogue depends on how well we can listen. When we listen to an educator, we communicate with him not only verbally, but also non-verbally. However, one cannot be a pretend listener, who only pretends to follow the statements of the alumni, or a passive listener, focused only on reception, but an active listener. The value of dialogue is therefore also measured by the quality of the attitude of silence. To be silent does not mean to stop talking, but to forget for the time of listening one's own judgments, not to impose one's own image of the world on the student, to get rid of all

prejudices and premature judgments in order to give the interlocutor a chance to hear himself as well. True dialogue can only be very fruitful where the subjects of the dialogue support and respect each other. Without this climate, dialogue will become a monologue, or so-called dialogue among the deaf. Such a term recognises a discussion in which everyone remains encamped in their own position, incapable of any understanding of others. This very deafness, in that modern man is unwilling to listen and is not curious about the thinking of others, is one of the basic sins of modern man.

Considering the form of contemporary dialogue, especially in the school environment, it can be seen that a dialogue of low linguistic value prevails. Many linguists say that in modern times we are dealing with the vulgarisation and commodification of language. Unfortunately, it also affects adults – parents and teachers. However, the word is a powerful weapon, but this weapon must be able to use. In the process of upbringing, the word has creative power. For with the help of the word the formation of the person of the educated person takes place, the formation of his spiritual shape and the realization of the person in all dimensions, with all abilities. “Through language we speak to and about other people. And in the way we formulate speech, it reveals whether we like people or despise them, whether we want to give them good or bad words. To speak good words means to bless (*benedicere* in Latin). To speak bad words means to curse (in Latin *maledicere*)” (Grün 2016, 26).

An appropriate educational climate also plays a key role in building a space for dialogue. This term refers to the climate that educators create through their methods and forms of work. Relationships between educators and their students can be friendly or hostile. Educators who cause irritation must be aware that they will be treated with hidden hostility. On the other hand, those who constantly help children in their efforts, encourage them every day in the face of various difficulties, and rejoice in their successes together will be liked and may even be loved. True dialogue requires mutual respect and trust, a friendly and comprehensively stimulating environment. A friendly emotional climate makes dialogue meet the requirements placed on it from a pedagogical point of view, and makes it possible: sincere exchange of thoughts and feelings of the educator and the student, mutual sharing of experiences and life experiences, mutual cognition and understanding, providing support in moments of doubt and difficulties, helping to solve problems (Lobocki 2007, 148). The key in creating an appropriate and friendly



educational climate is the subjective treatment of the alumni. Then the educator in dealing with alumni does not use his own advantage, but remembers that each alumni:

- is a free, but also a unique person;
- has an inalienable right to harmonious and comprehensive development;
- has the right to make mistakes;
- carries within himself a lot of good;
- is a thinking but also a feeling being;
- has the right to dignity and intimacy;
- has the right to speak freely (Sniezynski 2005, 132).

Respect for the subjectivity of the educator by the educator is a necessary condition for optimal development. Without respecting the subjectivity of the other, one cannot be a good educator. Z. Włodarski emphasises: “to see in the other person not only the object of actual or possible interactions, but an individual with certain needs and aspirations, who is entitled (like all people) to autonomy, the right to self-determination” (Włodarski 1992, 128-129).

There is still too little awareness of this truth, that the disappearance or insufficiency of dialogue can lead to severe mental disorders, is the cause of emotional immaturity. In extreme cases, helplessness develops into reactive depression. The thesis that unspoken feelings and thoughts harm and that they are the cause of the inability to make decisions, plan new tasks, a source of constant emotional tension and inadequate perception of threats is confirmed. Lack of understanding in people close to and key to an individual can cause passivity, helplessness, lack of a sense of agency and avoidance of responsibility for self-induced behaviour. Overcoming the above is undoubtedly helped by conversation, which is, on the whole, one of the most important tools for people to communicate, for which the very expression “dialogue” is used.

However, it is not easy to possess the art of dialogue, as many conditions must be met. Is it even possible? Of course it is, but it is only feasible if society is brought up from an early age to an attitude – the virtue of dialogue. Key in this is the role of educators and leaning into the pedagogical credo of Fr. Janusz Tarnowski, in which the author gives five principles to be applied in education:

1. Starting point. In the first contact with an educator or a group, as the author states, the most important thing is to enter his (their) world, with not feigned, but genuine interest. The point is to make them feel our respect and understanding, and to ensure that we do not take the wrong first step.

2. The educator. He is not someone inferior or less valuable than the educator, but on the contrary, he can tower over him in many respects. We are not his judges. We must recognise possible flaws, but we must not identify the educator with them. One must always find in him the image of God, who loves and forgives him.

3. The educator-alumni relationship. Move steadfastly toward friendship, expecting neither gratitude nor attachment. To let the educator feel love, but without obscuring the one who loves him far more: Christ. The bonding link is to be prayer.

4. The process of upbringing. Listening to the pupil. Mutual learning and education. Not imposing or coercing, but gently helping to awaken interest in values and to seek them until encountering God in Christ through the grace of the Holy Spirit. Not so much expecting immediate results, but rather hoping for the distant future. Constant patience and an atmosphere of joy.

5. Goal. To help the pupil “find his place in life and personal vocation in a gradual approach to human and Christian maturity. At the same time, along with the process of educating others, to strive for self-education; to live Christ” (Tarnowski 2003b, 84).

The educational potential inherent in personal-existential upbringing gives the modern educator and the educated the opportunity to achieve human maturity and Christian maturity on an individual and social level. Upbringing becomes a special form of encounter and dialogue between the educator and the one being educated, a process that supports his development and shapes his personality, and the personal relationship should be at the same time a dialogical relationship (Wisniewska 2020, 149). Such upbringing captures the person realistically and integrally, the fruit of which is authentic upbringing through self-education and permanent formation. It is important that the relationships that occur between the educator and the educated have the character of a symmetrical interaction with a “human face.” This condition is fulfilled by educational dialogue, which involves a human-to-human relationship. In this relationship, differences related to age and roles are blurred, while sympathy and interest, mutual

communication and willingness to take into account the words and perspective of the other into account, up to the ability to see things from the other's position. This dialogue of a spiritual nature, related to contact and mutual understanding, seems to be fundamental to the didactic and educational process. It also has the surprising effect of bringing both the subject – in relation to the educator – and that subject – which is the educator – to a new understanding of himself and the surrounding world.

## CONCLUSION

The pedagogy of the future must be a pedagogy of being near the other person, rather than maintaining a distance from him. Meeting this principle becomes the nerve of the life of another pedagogy “a pedagogy with a human face, rooted on Christian grounds and expressed in authentic dialogue” (Tarnowski 1993, 38). Therefore, it is necessary to seek and discover the truth about man, promote his dignity as a person and help him develop his humanity, threatened today by various theories, moral relativism or the negation of all values. Educational dialogue, understood by Fr. Janusz Tarnowski as a method, process, and attitude, supports other pedagogical methods insofar as these focus on the pupil without overemphasising his individualism, where the common good disappears and personal life is threatened. Therefore, every educator should remember that being interested in how to talk and reach agreement with alumni who have a different opinion – not to attack, not to criticise, and not to force the interlocutor to change his views. Only then can one find meaning and value in the concept of Fr. Janusz Tarnowski.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Not applicable.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The author declares no conflict of interest.

## REFERENCES:

- Barnes, Douglas. 1998. *Teacher and students. From communicating to educating*. Warsaw: WSiP.
- Buber, Martin. 1992. *I and you. A selection of philosophical writings*. Warsaw: PAX Publishing House.
- Chalas, Krystyna. 2006. “Opportunities for creating the identity of the teacher in the reforming school.” In *Pedagogical Thought and Continuing Education for Teachers*, edited by Agnieszka Jaworska and Sabina Zalewska, 59–64. Warsaw: Publishing House of the Higher School of the Przymierza Rodzin.
- Ciesiołkiewicz, Konrad. 2022. *Pedagogy of peace urgently needed*. Accessed 6.09.2024. <https://fundacja.orange.pl/strefa-wiedzy/post/pedagogika-pokoju-pilnie-potrzebna>.

- Cieśleńska, Beata. 2020. "Responsibility of the teacher in working with educationally difficult students." In *Student with special educational needs in school theory and practice*, edited by Beata Cieśleńska and Ewa Wiśniewska, 123–134. Plock: Scientific Publishing House of the Mazovian Public University in Plock.
- Gadacz, Tadeusz. 1993. "Education as a meeting of persons." In *Man – upbringing – culture. A selection of texts*, edited by Franciszek Adamski, 107–113. Cracow: Publishing WAM.
- Grün, Anselm. 2016. *The weight of words – the power of silence or a new culture of conversation*. Poznan: On the way Publishing House.
- Koć-Seniuch, Genowefa. 2000. "On the formation of the communicative culture of the modern teacher." In *Contemporary Times and Teacher Training*, edited by Henryka Kwiatkowska, Tadeusz Lewowicki and Stanisław Dylak, 137–144. Warsaw: WSP ZNP Publishing House.
- Lobocki, Mieczysław. 2007. *In care of upbringing at school*. Cracow: Impuls.
- Śliwerski, Bogusław. 2005. *Contemporary theories and currents of upbringing*. Cracow: Impuls.
- Snieżyński, Marian. 2005. *The art of dialogue. Theoretical assumptions and school reality*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej.
- Tarnowski, Janusz. 1991. "Man – dialogue – upbringing. Outline of Christian personal-existential pedagogy." *Znak* 9(436): 69–78.
- Tarnowski, Janusz. 1992. "Pedagogy of dialogue." In *Alternative education – dilemmas of theory and practice*, edited by Bogusław Śliwerski, 141–151. Cracow: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.
- Tarnowski, Janusz. 1993. *How to educate?* Warsaw: Publishers of the Academy of Catholic Theology.
- Tarnowski, Janusz. 2000a. *Three masters of dialogue*. In *Author of Alternative Education. New theories, models of research and reform*, edited by Jacek Piekarski and Bogusław Sliwinski, 92–99. Cracow: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.
- Tarnowski, Janusz. 2000b. "Dialogue attitude in personal-existential pedagogy." In *Alternative pedagogy. Dilemmas of theory*, edited by Bogusław Śliwerski, 84–91. Cracow: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.
- Tarnowski, Janusz. 2003a. "Existential pedagogy." In *Pedagogy. An academic handbook*, edited by Zbigniew Kwiecinski and Bogusław Śliwerski, Vol. 1, 248–260. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Tarnowski, Janusz. 2003b. "An allurements to existentialist pedagogy?" In *Ideas of Philosophical Pedagogy*, edited by Sławomir Sztobryn and Bogusław Śliwerski, 82–92. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Tarnowski, Janusz. 2007. "The paradox of Christian pedagogy." In *Christian upbringing. Between tradition and modernity*, edited by Alina Rynio, 70–78. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Wiśniewska, Ewa. 2020. *Teacher's educational work. Selected areas and problems*. Plock: Scientific Publishing House of the Mazovian Public University in Plock.
- Włodarski, Ziemowit. 1992. *Man as an educator and teacher*. Warsaw: WSiP.