



Marek Jeziorański* 

Reason or Relationship: About an Example of the Significance of Model Solutions for Educational Practice

Abstract

This article explores the importance of theoretical assumptions for educational practice by analyzing a selected problem, the dilemma expressed in the phrase: reason or relationship. "Reason" here indicates the anthropological necessity of undertaking educational activities for the sake of the student's own well-being, while "relationship" primarily speaks to an anthropological image that demands the educator's unconditional acceptance of the student. Both theoretical models guide and justify different educational practices, which are presented in the article. Furthermore, the article addresses the problem of seeking a solution to the dilemma both on theoretical and consistently practical grounds.

Keywords: educational anthropology, purpose of education, well-being of the student, educational reason, educational relationship.

Racja czy relacja – o przykładzie znaczenia rozwiązań modelowych dla praktyki wychowawczej

Abstrakt

Artykuł wskazuje na zagadnienie ważności założeń teoretycznych dla praktyki pedagogicznej poprzez analizę wybranego problemu, którym jest dylemat wyrażony w sformułowaniu: racja czy relacja. „Racja” wskazuje tutaj na antropologiczną konieczność podejmowania działań wychowawczych dla dobra samego wychowanka. Natomiast „relacja” mówi przede wszystkim o takim obrazie antropologicznym, który domaga się od wychowawcy bezwzględnej akceptacji wychowanka. Oba modele teoretyczne

Article received: 9.10.2025; accepted: 30.01.2026.

* The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland.

prowadzą i uzasadniają odmienną praktykę wychowawczą, która jest ukazana w artykule. Poza tym, artykuł podejmuje problem poszukiwania rozwiązania – tak na gruncie teoretycznym, jak i konsekwentnie praktycznym – przedstawionego dylematu.

Słowa kluczowe: antropologia pedagogiczna, cel wychowania, dobro wychowanka, racja wychowawcza, relacja wychowawcza.

Introduction

The search for optimal educational practices is a fundamental issue and concern in the field of education. The opposition between reason and relationship, mentioned in the title of this paper, points to the problem of taking appropriate educational decisions, which lie between what the educator accepts for the sake of the learner's developmental well-being and what they aim at (reason), and building a good, mutually trusting educational relationship with the learner. It is generally accepted that achieving these two goals of educational activity is essential for the activity itself, and so ultimately for the learner. Nevertheless, educational practice shows that maintaining these two goals often becomes problematic, and sometimes even impossible because they stem from two (paradigmatically) different anthropological and teleological approaches.

If this is the case, and if, one might even say, this is one of the most significant dilemmas, it is certainly difficult to resolve it in a single article. It will remain an unresolved dilemma, which, however, certainly does not let researchers give up seeking and presenting possible solutions. Hence, the approach presented in this paper is regarded primarily as an inspiration for further research and exploration, rather than as a ready-made, definitive solution. The present author's view is that the very awareness of this problem helps resolve it in specific educational situations.

The paper consists of the following sections: arguments stemming from educational theory supporting both 'reason' and 'relationship' in education; a presentation of the principles governing educational practice derived from these theoretical premises; and, in the final section, the present author presents one of possible solutions – applicable to both educational practice and theory.

Theoretical justification for the approaches presented

Reflection on the search for appropriate solutions between a pedagogical approach focused on achieving specific, predetermined educational goals and an approach that defines the aim of education as building a relationship between the educator and the learner is a good opportunity, above all, to present the significant connection between theoretical principles and practice. This issue is important because this connection exists also in situations when the educator is not fully aware of it. Jörg Zirfas notes that whoever raises or teaches a child, advises an adult or supports an elderly

person, possesses a specific (practical, non-scientific) 'image' of the recipient of their educational activities (cf. Zirfas 2021: 12). Next the German educator observes that anthropological issues are intertwined with educational work whether individual educators consciously reflect on them or not. He says that people "live anthropologically", that is, always have a certain conception of who a human being is, who they can become and who they ought to become (Zirfas 2021), and act towards other people (consciously or unconsciously) in accordance with this conception. He names this approach "anthropological anthropology" and adds that it involves intertwining of anthropological description with normativity.

Amedeo Cencini adopts a similar approach clearly insisting that every educator must take a conscious decision to follow a selected theoretical educational model. He says that it is not uncommon for an educator to adopt a particular formative model without first acknowledging their own choice to themselves, that is, with little awareness of what they are doing and why they are doing it in this way, nor giving it much thought and applying the method in a rigid manner (Cencini 2006: 12).

On the basis of the above examples, a conclusion may be drawn that practising educators should be warned against hasty rejection of theoretical issues and focusing only on methodology or technology, since thus the very technology of education becomes meaningless and may end up unsuitable for the learner. The present author believes it is possible to say that the less consciously an educator engages in reflection inspired by pedagogical theories, the more rigidly they implement educational methodology, which ultimately is not suitable for the learner. In other words, those who reject reflection on general, theoretical issues often (excessively) focus on methodological matters, which sometimes manifests itself in an expectation that the learner will adhere to them rigorously. It may be assumed that such behaviour on the part of the educator is, often unconsciously, a way of hiding their own unawareness or uncertainty regarding the learner's genuine developmental well-being. To sum up, the educator expects their actions to be effective, but is unable to assess them in terms of their appropriateness.

In light of the above, it seems even more essential to reflect on the theoretical assumptions in order to improve and optimise educational practice and, perhaps above all, to make it an increasingly conscious and consistent choice, in the context of who the learner not only can, but should become as a result of educational interventions.

Approaches reinforcing the concept of 'reason' in education

The concept of 'reason' is linked to the belief that education aims at achieving a specific goal. This goal, understood as the desirable and expected changes that, under the influence of appropriate methods, means and conditions, take shape in the learner's personality in the form of views, attitudes, habits and other personality traits (Okoń 2007: 58) is always assumed a priori and constitutes the criterion organising the entire educational process (cf. Nowak 2008: 365–366). This approach, here referred

to simply as 'reason', has its roots in the thought of Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776–1841), the father of scientific pedagogy, who, speaking of the aim of education, said that what educators should care about must spread out before their eyes like a geographical map or like the plan of a well-built city (Herbart 2007: 23). This idea stems from the Platonic concept of education/upbringing, which is possible only if the educator has previously experienced what is authentically true and good – the world of ideas to which they should then lead their learners (cf. Platon 2003: VII, 514a–519e.; Böhm et al. 2019: 33–34).

Today, this theoretical position is noticeable in the following examples. The Austrian educational theorist Konrad Paul Liessmann maintains that education (*die Bildung*) is inconceivable without an image (*das Bild*) of a good and successful life to which one should aspire (Liessmann 2019: 69). On the other hand, Bogdan Suchodolski (1903–1992), Polish educator, put it as follows: “for the educator, a person is not what they are, but always what they become under the influence of education; indeed, they are not even who they are, but who they could be if the conditions for their growth and transformation were fulfilled” (Suchodolski 1993).

The above examples represent the teleological school of thought. They convey the firm conviction that defining an educational goal clearly and then pursuing it is the *sine qua non* of educational activity. Certainly, there are many more such approaches today (Kiereś 2017; Woroniecki 2008; Zalewski 2013). They offer a specific diagnosis of the current social situation in the field of education and, on this basis, suggest specific solutions. This is particularly noticeable in Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster's (1869–1966) works. Among other things, he wrote that the great weakness of modern education lies in a lack of educational certainty. He also emphasized that we take pride in the current 'century of the child', as we give more thought to the methods of education than has been the case in all past centuries, yet we forget that we are far poorer in educational strength (Foerster 1934: 11).

At this point one might ask what, in the German educationalist's opinion, is capable of ensuring this 'educational strength'. One might also ask what is the reason for this “lack of educational certainty”. Posing these two different questions, one seeks one and the same reason for these two phenomena, since Foerster explicitly links “lack of educational certainty” with “poverty of educational power”. We find the answer to both questions elsewhere in Foerster's major work on education and self-education, where he explains that the educator must possess an unambiguous, unwavering and general aim, i.e., he must be fully aware of where he is to lead the pupil and how to educate him (Foerster 1934: 8). Thus, awareness of the goal or, as Foerster emphatically puts it, belief in the infallibility of the goal (Foerster 1934: 10) is what constitutes the source of educational strength and confidence.

To sum up, according to this theoretical approach, educational activity starts with defining an educational objective, which the entire educational process is subsequently subordinated to. It is worth noticing that such a strong assertion as the “infallibility of the goal” does not occur anywhere else in the pedagogical literature, and certainly not among contemporary researchers.

In the context of translating theoretical assumptions into educational practice, it can be observed that the discussion presented so far leads to the formulation of the principle of guidance (for further details, see Jeziorański 2022: 194–196) in education. This principle indicates that the educator not only can, but should, intend to exert an educational influence focused on achieving clearly defined goals. Here, the concept of ‘reason’ is connected with the adopted educational aim, the recognised truth, the ultimate goal, while the educator is the one who takes the initiative. It is the educator who is aware of the goal, and the core of the educational process lies in bringing about an optimal developmental situation, a better state than the one that currently exists. Depending on the specific educational relationship, the goals will be defined differently, as their selection is connected with the educator’s axiological assumptions, the learner’s own expectations of themselves, the social vision of the future, and many other factors.

The principle of guidance also indicates that the educator acquires their pedagogical qualifications primarily due to proactive and ongoing work on their own development. Such an attitude is a fundamental characteristic of a responsible leader. Indeed, thus achieved qualifications are subsequently supplemented by exploring a broad range of pedagogical knowledge and gaining educational experience; nevertheless, self-improvement is a key dimension of the principle of guidance. In this way, the educator is not neutral in terms of their worldview, but clearly reveals their system of values and norms which they consider important. Sergiusz Hessen calls for such an attitude on the part of the educator. He notes that true education cannot therefore be achieved by renouncing all worldviews, nor by the hegemony of a single worldview, ossified into ideology. The proper attitude of a teacher towards young people consists in boldly expressing one’s own view of the world, yet without any attempt to impose it (Hessen 1997: 51).

Approaches reinforcing the concept of ‘relationship’ in education

A different approach to the essence of education is represented by the term ‘relationship’. This perspective emphasises the paramount importance and value of the educational encounter itself, of establishing a bond, and of creating a situation of mutual trust and openness (Jeziorański 2022: 122). It can be said that the very establishment of a meaningful bond with the learner is the primary aim of education. Therefore, the educator does not exert intentional educational influence, nor do they suggest any change, because if change happens, it will do so due to the power of the very educational relationship itself. Here, what occurs is a shift from traditionally perceived education towards building a relationship with the learner. Jesper Juul conveyed this with the following phrase: *Aus Erziehung wird Beziehung* (“education becomes relationship”) (Juul 2016). Above all, it must be emphasised that this is not merely a shift in educational practice, but, first of all, in the anthropological conception of the learner.

The inspiration for this approach is found mainly in contemporary educational thought, though it is also present in historical sources. For example, Herman Nohl (1879-1960) wrote that the foundation of all pedagogy is the personal relationship between the educator and the pupil, which we call the pedagogical relationship. Where true pedagogy has developed, it has grown out of this relationship (Nohl 1949: 282). He defines the pedagogical relationship itself as a living and profound relationship between a mature person and another person in the process of their becoming, undertaken for the latter's benefit, so that they may understand their life and give it their own form (Nohl 1935 cited in: Kron 2012: 183). Carl Rogers (1902-1987), on the other hand, wrote that if I can create a certain type of relationship with another person, they will discover within themselves the ability to use that relationship for their own growth, and they will undergo personal change and development (Rogers 1961), and if such a relationship is to be established at all – Rogers continues – the educator's attitude must be characterised by unconditional positive regard, i.e. a positive, emotional openness without prejudice or judgement (Rogers 1961).

Joachim Bauer reinforces this view from a neurobiological perspective, claiming that interpersonal relationships are just as crucial to the biological development of children and young people as proper nutrition is to physical well-being and intellectual stimulation (Bauer 2019). On this basis, he adds that the essence of all pedagogy is the pedagogical relationship (Bauer 2019: 25).

Among historical sources, it is worth citing, for example Michel de Montaigne (1533-1592), who wrote the following about one of the most important virtues of an educator: "It is a virtue of a great and very strong soul to be able to lower oneself to these childish concepts and guide them" (Wołoszyn 1995: 234). On the other hand, Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835), spoke of the educator who, as a capturer, must always, in a certain way, resemble that which he wishes to capture (Humboldt 2002).

Based on the above sources, it can be concluded that as far as the relationship-based approach is concerned, the emphasis is placed on the unconditional acceptance of the learner's current situation; acknowledging it, embracing it and 'meeting them where they are'. The goal here is for the educator to meet the learner, putting aside their own position for the sake of the encounter, of establishing contact and of building a relationship. The relationship is a bond thanks to which educational influence is exerted. For this reason, it is the educator who undergoes a certain inner shift in order to enable the encounter with the learner. The educator reaches out to the learner, not only physically, but also materially, emotionally, intellectually, socially, etc., all in order to – as Humboldt wrote – 'become like' the learner and, thus, to meet them on the same level.

This kind of pedagogical approach leads to the adoption of the principle of closeness in educational practice. This principle emphasises the educator's willingness and ability to draw closer to the learner. Andrzej Murzyn draws attention to this attitude, saying that in order to awaken in the learner the inherent need to draw closer to oneself and to another person, the educator should reject the urge to explain the

learner's behaviour in purely empirical terms (Murzyn 2015: 135). The principle of closeness does not force the educator to abandon their own system of values and principles, but emphasises the significance of the moment of encounter with the learner, which, if it is to be authentic, must be free from the educator's axiological and normative expectations or demands. The moment of drawing closer should be persistently and often repeatedly sought by the educator, until a genuine relationship is established. It also entails risk-taking on the part of the educator. They must be prepared to engage with the pupil as if they were a partner on the same journey. In other words, they 'take a risk' with the pupil through their own way of being, their own convictions, their own faith, and their own pedagogical motivation, presented in its human form for the spiritual good of the pupil (Fontana 2002: 134). This risk also entails accepting that one functions within a relationship that is not entirely predictable. This is a relationship where one must be open-hearted, taking into consideration the possibility of being hurt, rejected, or disagreeing, etc. However, only then is it possible to establish the right space for closeness (Stawnicka-Zwiahel 2014: 100)

Seeking solutions

It is evident that the two pedagogical approaches described above are radically different. One of them, i.e. 'reason', emphasises the need to change the learner; the other, i.e. 'relationship', focuses on the need to accept the learner unconditionally. It might seem that the only possible way to reconcile these differing positions is to present arguments that reinforce (adopt) one position and simultaneously allow to reject the other. In accordance with logical reasoning, as both approaches are mutually exclusive at the level of their premises, the result should be their separation in educational practice as well, following the pattern: if 'a' is the opposite of 'b' and 'a' is correct, then 'b' is incorrect. It is worth considering, however, whether this way of thinking is effective from an educational perspective.

If we accept the point of view sketched above, we can speak of two possible outcomes: reason without relationship and relationship without reason. In the former case, the aim of education and the educator's pedagogical awareness are clearly defined. However, the educator believes that the learner must follow the path of their own development outlined for them by the educator. The educator does not even attempt to 'meet' the learner at their level, but, speaking figuratively, waits at the top of the mountain to announce the attainment of the goal to the learner once the learner reaches the summit. Such an approach leads to a breakdown in the bond with the learner, if there ever was one. This image clearly shows that here the educator is not a *pais ago* ('one who guides the boy'), that is, he is not an educator (cf. Śliwerski 2012: 25). Although anthropologically fundamentally different, the other position, relationship without reason, is consistent with the former one regarding the absence of guidance (also here, the educator is not a *pais ago*). This time, however, the educator, following the climbing metaphor, does not wait at the summit, but has descended

to the learner and remains with them wherever they met. Under no circumstances, nor having any right to do so, does the educator suggest that the learner undertake specific self-improvement work or change something about themselves, as this would undermine the educator's unconditional acceptance of the learner. It is also worth noting that while the first approach may lead to authoritarianism and a complete breakdown in the bond with the learner, the other one may lead to the learner's developmental stagnation.

The above conclusions lead to an impasse. On the one hand, it is emphasised that both approaches under discussion are based on radically different premises; on the other hand, the arguments presented above show that following either of these positions does not solve the problem. Therefore, in the further search for a solution, it is no longer sufficient to focus solely on devising new (stronger) arguments that would reinforce one of the positions; instead, a different approach must be adopted.

Until now, the 'between' used in the title has been perceived as an alternative – and indeed an exclusive alternative. Another approach is to understand 'between' as something distinct from 'reason' and 'relationship', as a new quality, a third way. At this point, Aristotle's method of the 'golden mean' seems to come to the fore. It is worth noting that this method was proposed by the Stagirite to define what 'moral virtue' is. This means that this principle does not apply to the cognitive sphere (the search for truth: truth does not lie in the middle), but to the sphere of action – the search for appropriate conduct. The second condition for applying this method is a situation where two opposing solutions can be identified along a continuum. The philosopher stated that "excess and deficiency are errors, while the mean amount is praised, and constitutes success" (Aristotle 1956: 95 [II, 6, 1106b]). Both conditions for applying the 'golden mean' principle align well with the dilemma between reason and relationship. Here, too, the objective is to find an appropriate educational approach between, on the one hand, an extreme attitude emphasising the need to change the learner and, on the other, full acceptance of their current stage of development. At this point, however, the question arises as to how the golden mean is to be determined. Should it be a proportional approach: for example, 50% reason and 50% relationship? Even if this were the case, how would it be measured? Moreover, it seems that even if it were possible, it would still not be a satisfactory solution, because the phenomenon of education is processual and dynamic. Hence, the 'golden mean' could take various forms depending on the learner's stage of development. Furthermore, such an approach always leads to the conclusion that 'reason' is (must be!) diminished at the expense of 'relationship' and *vice versa*, 'relationship' at the expense of 'reason'.

Yet another approach is the concept of 'opposing poles' (*Der Gegensatz*) proposed by Romano Guardini (1885–1968), which he himself applied to the study of the educational process (cf. Nowak 2023: 48). Guardini observed that life is, however, neither a synthesis of opposites nor a mixture of them, nor is it their identity, but rather a specific unity, being a union of the duality of elements. Pairs of opposi-

tes are a unity, yet not a mechanical unity, but a living one. In what is alive, there are external and internal processes that create unity. Such a relationship does not exist in a machine, where all parts are beside, behind and above one another. An opposition is a kind of pre-phenomenon in which one pole necessarily presupposes the other, and without the other it not only cannot exist, but cannot even be conceived (Guardini 1925: 41).

As Marian Nowak (1955–2025) notes, Guardini's proposal differs fundamentally from the dialectical method, in which the juxtaposition of two opposing elements – thesis and antithesis – leads to the emergence of a third: synthesis, because in Guardini's approach the objective is to maintain between them (i.e. the opposites) a kind of state of suspension, generating a specific tension between the individual elements of the relationship of such an opposition (Nowak 2023: 49). Thus, a system of opposing poles arises, which occurs not through a struggle against some enemy, but through the synthesis of both, which is maintained in a state of highly fruitful tension, i.e. it leads to fruitfulness by rebuilding a concrete unity (Guardini 1985: 45–46). Lech Witkowski proposes a similar approach to thinking about educational phenomena. He uses the category of 'duality', which, according to this researcher, is so key a category that pedagogy, by revealing the usually unnamed dual dimension or duality as the fundamental characteristic of all its references and objects of analysis (including concepts), has attained the capacity to be a mature discipline (Witkowski 2013: 64).

If one adopts Guardini's approach, the question also arises as to how it should be implemented – how to apply in practice the system of opposing poles to the problem: between reason and relationship. While undertaking this task, it is worth noting that the two opposing fields indicated in this methodological approach are not mutually exclusive, but complementary in that only by maintaining both positions is there certainty (a guarantee) that they will be authentic. Thus, 'reason' will be truly oriented towards the learner's developmental good only when it remains in constant tension with the task of forming a relationship with them, whereas 'relationship' will be oriented towards the educator establishing an appropriate educational relationship with the learner only in connection with a specific developmental good. In other words, Guardini's premise amounts to the fact that the combined view of 'reason' and 'relationship' not only protects both perspectives from devolving into extreme attitudes that are dangerous for education, as mentioned above, but above all, such a situation ensures that 'reason' is an authentic reason, and 'relationship' is an authentic relationship.

Nevertheless, the problem of reconciling these two approaches still remains. Karol Wojtyła (1920–2005) presents some inspiring research in this regard. Albeit in the field of ethics, he suggested an innovative solution that aligns with what Guardini named external and internal life processes. Wojtyła's approach is described in the relevant literature as the 'normative power of truth' (Wojtyła 2021) and amounts to the fact that as soon as a person (the learner) discovers the truth about themselves, this discovery is not merely a moment of intellectual enlightenment (the acquisition

of certain knowledge), but is also a moment that obliges the learner to implement the discovered truth in their life. This is, however, an internal obligation which the learner experiences as an immanent, personal imperative arising from the reality they have come to know about themselves. This discovery – as Wojtyła emphasises – takes place in the realm of conscience, that is, in the place where that particular coupling of truth with duty takes place (Wojtyła 2021), or – to use the terminology introduced here – the union of unconditional acceptance with the expectation of change, or: a relationship combined with reason.

Based on the above, it can be concluded that building an authentic, deep relationship with a learner is to enable them to discover the truth about themselves (cf. Rogers 1961), and this discovery, in turn, reinforces their process of change towards the developmental good, towards the implementation of the truth they have come to know about themselves. In other words, the educator's primary role is to help the learner discover their authentic 'self', rather than imposing a truth about them upon them. Wojciech Chudy compares this to the discovery of personal dignity and explains that it is a moment that is binding, but not coercive. A person may live in a manner contrary to their own dignity; they may not live with dignity; yet this value remains intact within the metaphysical structure of their person. Dignity, however, 'calls' a person to live up to their personal vocation, to live in accordance with this value (Chudy 2009: 55).

The present author believes that this approach offers a concrete proposal pointing towards a solution (but is not the solution itself!) to the problem outlined at the beginning of this paper. It reconciles the reason-based approach, focused on the learner's developmental good, with the relationship-based approach, which aims to form a non-judgemental and open bond between the educator and the learner. Furthermore, this solution safeguards the educational process against the two threats described above, which may arise as soon as the educator sides with one of the poles of the described opposites with no reference to the other.

It is also worth noting here that a certain analogy to the above approach can already be found in the works of Johann Friedrich Herbart. Discussing the aims of education and, consequently, the educator's duties towards the learner, he wrote that the educator stands in for the boy's future self; he must therefore, in his endeavours, strive towards those goals which the pupil himself will set in the future as an adult; for these, he must now prepare favourable conditions in the pupil's soul (Herbart 2007: 46).

It is worth emphasising that Herbart requires the educator to acknowledge a third party in their relationship with the learner, namely 'the learner of the future as an adult'. One might question the feasibility of such an observation; nevertheless, what is of profound significance here is that the father of scientific pedagogy obliges the educator to seek the aims of education within the learner themselves. It seems that this insight of Herbart's has been forgotten.

A practical application of this theoretical approach can be the principle of 'embracing' or, in other words, assuming the learner's perspective. It involves the educa-

tor making an internal effort to adopt the learner's standpoint, not only to experience their own actions from the other side, but above all to place themselves as fully as possible in the learner's position within a specific educational situation (cf. Buber 1968: 454–555), in their way of thinking and valuing. Martin Buber (1878–1965) calls this 'embrace' (*Umfassung*) and explains that in order to be able to guide, one needs the strength that allows one to embrace the situation of the person being guided (Buber 1968: 455). In practice, this will often amount to the educator asking the learner questions such as: "Why do you think that?", "What led you to that conclusion?". What is essential in such questions – however they may be phrased – is that the educator does not judge the outcome of the learner's actions nor suggest desired solutions, but rather, through their questioning, prompts the learner to reveal – or perhaps even to become aware of – their own reasoning. A very clear example of applying the principle of adopting the learner's perspective is the question: "Why do you think that?" when the learner says that $3 + 8 = 12$. While this is, of course, a highly trivial situation, it is worth noting that the teacher neither reprimands the learner nor provides the correct answer for them. This way of engaging in a conversation with the learner, however, prompts them to reveal their train of thought, and this in turn enables the teacher to increasingly adopt the learner's standpoint – to fulfil Buber's call to embrace.

This kind of educator's presence – as Walter Herzog (2001) observes – is often more important than methodically structured patterns of conversations, meetings and appropriate actions. Such an educator silently inspires and shapes without words, through their very existence, with a marvellous power. This may be an exaggeration, but it recalls a moment of pedagogical effectiveness that is methodologically elusive. When a teacher works unwillingly or is unable to do so, it is not a question of their pedagogical competence, but of their attitude towards themselves (Herzog 2001: 539).

It is precisely this that makes the educator a genuine guide for the learner, as one is a role model only when one does not wish to be one (Herzog 2001: 538) or – as Ludwig Liegle claims – if someone is important to me, they influence me, regardless of whether they or I want this; whether they or I are aware of it or not; they influence my personal development, the shaping of my character; they "educate" me (Liegle 2017: 60–61).

Conclusion

This paper compares two contrasting pedagogical positions stemming from anthropological premises. One, referred to as 'reason', indicates a form of education that is primarily focused on achieving the learner's developmental goals. The educator bears primary responsibility for defining these objectives. The other position – 'relationship' – asserts that the very act of establishing an open and trusting bond with the learner, based on unconditional acceptance of the learner as they are, is the pri-

mary aim of education. Both positions are supported by source material from the relevant educational literature.

This paper aims to explore theoretical approaches that may help answer the question of whether the outlined positions are mutually exclusive, or whether it is possible to construct an integrative framework. Furthermore, practical applications are highlighted at each stage of the theoretical analysis. Apart from the specific proposals for practical, educational solutions presented above, it seems that the fundamental prerequisite for resolving the dilemma between reason and relationship is the educator's awareness that such a dilemma exists at all.

Bibliography

- Aristotle (1956) *The Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. H. Rackham, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Bauer J. (2019) *Die pädagogische Beziehung. Neurowissenschaften und Pädagogik im Dialog* in: *Pädagogische Beziehungen: Grundlagen – Praxisformen – Wirkungen*, Ulrich Herrmann (ed.), 1. Auflage, Weinheim Basel, Beltz Juventa, pp. 23–34.
- Böhm W., Schiefelbein E., Seichter S. (2019) *Projekt Erziehung. Eine Einführung in pädagogische Grundprobleme*, 6th revised edition, Grundstudium Erziehungswissenschaft 5243, Paderborn, Ferdinand Schöningh, <https://doi.org/10.36198/9783838552439>.
- Buber M. (1968) *Wychowanie*, trans. S. Grygiel, „Znak”, no. 166(4), pp. 442–461.
- Cencini A. (2006) *Drzewo życia. Ku modelowi formacji początkowej i permanentnej*, trans. K. Stopa, Kraków, Formacja Kapłańska i Zakonna, Wydawnictwo Salvator.
- Chudy W. (2009) *Pedagogia godności. Elementy etyki pedagogicznej*, ed. A. Szudra, Prace Wydziału Nauk Społecznych, Lublin, Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego Jana Pawła II.
- Foerster F. W. (1934) *Wychowanie i samowychowanie. Zasadnicze wytyczne dla rodziców, nauczycieli, księży i opiekunów młodzieży*, trans. B. Koprocki, Księgarnia Wydawnicza L. Igel.
- Fontana U. (2002) *Relacja, sekretem wszelkiego wychowania*, trans. J. Krykowski, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Salezjańskie.
- Guardini R. (1925) *Der Gegensatz. Versuche zu einer Philosophie des Lebendig-Konkreten*, Mainz, Der Werkkreis im Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag.
- Guardini R. (1985) *Der Gegensatz. Versuche zu einer Philosophie des Lebendig-Konkreten*, Mainz, Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag.
- Herbart J. F. (2007) *Pedagogika ogólna wywiedziona z celu wychowania*, trans. T. Stera, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”.
- Herzog W. (2001) *In Beziehung zu sich selbst. Relationales Denken in der Pädagogik*, „Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Bildungswissenschaften”, no. 3, pp. 529–545, <https://doi.org/10.24452/sjer.23.3.4618>.
- Hessen S. (1997) *O sprzecznościach i jedności wychowania. Zagadnienia pedagogiki personalizacyjnej*, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”.
- Humboldt W. von (2002) *O myśli i mowie: wybór pism z teorii poznania, filozofii dziejów i filozofii języka*, E. M. Kowalska (ed.), trans. E. M. Kowalska, M. J. Siemek, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

- Jeziorański M. (2022) *Relacja wychowawcza. Rozumienie, modele, propozycja*, Lublin, Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Juul J. (2016) *Zamiast wychowania: o sile relacji z dzieckiem*, trans. D. Syska, Podkowa Leśna, Wydawnictwo MiND.
- Kiereś B. (2017) *Człowiek i wychowanie: od osoby do osobowości*, Scripta Paedagogicae Classicae, Lublin, Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Kron F. W. (2012) *Pedagogika. Kluczowe zagadnienia. Podręcznik akademicki*, trans. E. Cieślik, Sopot, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Liegle L. (2017) *Beziehungspädagogik: Erziehung, Lehren und Lernen als Beziehungspraxis*, Stuttgart, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, <https://doi.org/10.17433/978-3-17-029383-0>.
- Liessmann K. P. (2019) *Bildung als Provokation*, Piper Verlag, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvddzx0m.10>.
- Murzyn A. (2015) *Współczesna filozofia edukacji. Kluczowe kwestie*, Kraków, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Nohl H. (1935) *Die pädagogische Bewegung in Deutschland und ihre Theorie*, 2. Aufl., Frankfurt am Main, Verlag von Friedrich Schulte-Bulmke.
- Nohl H. (1949) *Pädagogik aus dreißig Jahren*, Frankfurt am Main, Schulte-Bulmke.
- Nowak M. (2008) *Teorie i koncepcje wychowania*, Warszawa, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Nowak M. (2023) *Antropologiczne, ontologiczne i aksjologiczne podstawy oraz uwarunkowania decyzji w kwestii kontynuowania i zmiany w metodologii badań pedagogicznych*, „Edukacja”, no. 2(165), pp. 43–57, <https://doi.org/10.24131/3724.230204>.
- Okoń W. (2007) *Nowy słownik pedagogiczny*, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”.
- Platon (2003) *Państwo*, trans. W. Witwicki, Kęty, Wydawnictwo ANTYK Marcin Dybowski.
- Rogers C. R. (1961) *On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Stawnicka-Zwiahel E. (2014) *Stworzeni do relacji. Dialogiczne inspiracje Martina Bubera*, Toruń, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Suchodolski B. (1993) *Pedagogika w: Encyklopedia pedagogiczna*, (ed.) W. Pomykało, Warszawa, Fundacja Innowacja.
- Śliwerski B. (2012) *Pedagogika ogólna. Podstawowe prawidłowości*, Kraków, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Witkowski L. (2013) *Przełom dwoistości w pedagogice polskiej. Historia, teoria, krytyka*, Kraków, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Wojtyła K. (2021) *Person and Act and Related Essays*, trans. G. Ignatik, Washington D.C., The Catholic University of America Press, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1khdqkj>.
- Wołoszyn S. (ed.) (1995) *Źródła do dziejów wychowania i myśli pedagogicznej*, vol. 1, *Od wychowania pierwotnego do końca XVIII stulecia*, Kielce, Dom Wydawniczy Strzelec.
- Woroniecki J. (2008) *W szkole wychowania. Teksty wybrane*, Lublin, Fundacja Servire Veritati Instytut Edukacji Narodowej.
- Zalewski D. (2013) *Wychować człowieka szlachetnego*, Lublin, Firma EK Dariusz Zalewski, Fundacja Servire Veritati Instytut Edukacji Narodowej.
- Zirfas J. (2021) *Pädagogische Anthropologie*, Paderborn, Ferdinand Schöningh, <https://doi.org/10.36198/9783838555683>.

About the Author

Marek Jeziorański – Ph.D. Habil. Associate Professor at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland. He works in the Department of General Pedagogy, Institute of Pedagogy. His research interests are concerned with the area of general pedagogy, theory of education, philosophy of education and educational anthropology. His research focuses on the issue of the educational relationship, its nature, anthropological, social and cultural conditions and its importance in the process of education.
Contact: marek.jezioranski@kul.pl

O Autorze

Marek Jeziorański – dr hab., profesor uczelni Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego Jana Pawła II. Pracuje w Katedrze Pedagogiki Ogólnej Instytutu Pedagogiki. Zainteresowania naukowe koncentrują się w obszarze pedagogiki ogólnej, teorii wychowania, filozofii wychowania oraz antropologii pedagogicznej. W szczególności zajmuje się problematyką relacji wychowawczej, jej specyfiką, uwarunkowaniami antropologicznymi, społecznymi i kulturowymi oraz jej znaczeniem w procesie wychowania.
Kontakt: marek.jezioranski@kul.pl