In search of a common language: teacher and student in educational space

Paweł Sporek, Pedagogical University of Cracow, Poland
psporek@interia.pl

Abstract

In my paper I would like to present the student and the teacher in educational space. I'd like to say about difficulties in communication between them and the search for a common language for dialogue. The context for this discussion will be the current socio-cultural space and the expectations of both the teacher and the student. The purpose of the text is to show the conditions through which the agreement between the student and the teacher is possible and identify a cultural experience of a common language. Considerations will be conducted from the perspective of the anthropological concept of education and subjective view of the student and the teacher.

Key words: education, teacher, student, language of education

Introduction

Dialogue is the foundation for education understood as subjective. It is the only thing which makes it possible to share thoughts, experiences and the possibility to create the common ground to seek answers to the most important questions about a man and the world surrounding him, which define thought regarding existence. At the same time, it limits indoctrination, instrumentalisation of education process and behavior influence. It unleashes creativity of both the student and the teacher, decides about their emotional and intellectual growth and, at the same time, it is the element which shapes the relationship between them. The dialogue builds the understanding for seeking knowledge together and then shaping relationships which go beyond classes and school walls. If it is authentic, based on the fundamental value of truth, supported by pursuit of particular good (teacher's, student's or common one), it can become the guarantor of communication, common understanding of both the teacher and the student and the space for building mutual respect. The dialogue can create specific language between education subjects i.e. a code, sign system which facilitates the emergence of mental and spiritual closeness, can unleash the student's need to strive for knowledge and development of skills. Due to the

dialogue, the teacher can feel the need to be a wise and responsible guide, humble and conscious and the same time, aware of his limitations and to be the master devoting himself and his time to ensure his student's growth using his own knowledge and competence. The effect that takes place simultaneously is the development of the teacher himself who improves his skills, becomes a more accomplished person for himself and others and builds his personality for himself and others, especially students he looks after, and is responsible for.

The aforementioned intention of school communication based on dialogue between subjects – teacher's and student's, demands explanation of few key definitions for such a vision of education and elaboration of notions mentioned above.

Teacher and student – transformed images?

We need to begin from apparent obviousness i.e. the thought about the most important subjects for education – the teacher and the student. Contemporary concept of the student, seen by people who are brought up in the time of postfigurative culture (Mead, 2000), can be totally different from reality. The student today is not the man of Gutenberg period, who was brought up among words and by them, but the child of new media, especially internet, and educated in the world of screens and interactive reality. His relationship with knowledge (available at all times due to internet in iPhone or tablet) and his way of perceiving the world - conditioned by hypertextuality (Janusiewicz, 2009, Branny, 2009) are different, and the perception similar to web navigation. At the same time, these reception conditions determine his personality – the level of concentration, the way to find information and its organization, selection and verification. Those conditions influence student's attitude towards the culture represented by the generation of adults (parents and teachers) as well as everyday life formed in their eyes and by them through being active in cyberspace, which is the new way of shaping human relationships (Bauman, 2000, p. 24-27). Those "new students" do not develop anymore in relation to traditional narration, key cultural signs which, in the past, ensured the transfer of values and cross-generational communication, bonding grandparents, parents and children into system of commonly-recognized meanings and strengthening maintained order of things. The substitute function is taken over by hybrid popular culture which makes the message and tastes homogeneous. It gets into spaces reserved for art through media and escalates consumption mechanisms organizes the sector of public functioning and determines the shape of policy and forms of ideological messages. The result of these influences shapes, especially for younger people, postmodern identity that takes different forms and

variations. The most essential and most common ones would be the identities defined as “transparent identities” and “supermarket” type (Melosik, Szkudlarek, 2009, p. 59-64). They both share severance from all forms of belonging, instability, decontextualization, superficiality of relationships and functioning in socio-cultural space, as well as the extreme consumptionism and hedonism leading not only to collecting things but experiencing and drinking in all the impressions and even momentary pleasures. The students developing in such a way, gently speaking, do not resemble the pupils who would be sitting in identical uniforms and whose area of experiencing the world would be limited to books passed on by older generation. They also are unwilling and passive receivers of universal content, which older generation i.e. parents and teachers would like to pass on to them. They are characterized by programmatic mistrust towards the knowledge of past generations, which is often considered by young people as unbefitting a different, technological world. What is more, its communicators when facing the new world seem to be lost and limited by being unable to use modern technology, which automatically makes them unreliable as mentors and guides for the maturing generation. Also, the recognition in the world which is done by the youth seem to deny the experience passed on by the elderly. It turns out that “solid knowledge” is becoming more and more useless and the narration of the role of education for the future of a growing man cannot stand against the reality where being feisty, recognized and possessing the ability to “sell” one’s own are better promises of success than information gained during different stages of education. At the same time, the students function in the culture of omnipresent narcissism i.e. the cult of body and youth which demands constant creation and formation of one’s image (Melosik, 2013, p. 239-254) and, while the value and meaning of old age is being discredited, old age is eliminated from the official media where the myth of happiness equals the myth of eternal youth (Brocki, 2003, p. 61-63). Those conditions, to a higher or lesser degree, influence the formation of contemporary students’ behavior. That is why, if we think about school, we have to demand totally different didactic solutions than the ones which were successfully used thirty or forty years ago.

Transformed image of the student requires the new image of the teacher. Meanwhile, this expectation clearly departs from reality. Above all, the vast majority of teachers working at schools mentally and perceptively belong to Gutenberg’s era. It does not necessarily mean that they deny the new, screen and interactive reception of reality (Książek-Szczepanikowa, 1996, Sporek, 2010) or that they stand against digitalization and multimedia but it influences the way of perceiving the world surrounding them. They are also defined by a different attitude towards knowledge (theoretical and unpractical) which was the

foundation for their own education. In a certain way, without apparent postmodern burdens, during the time of them becoming adults, the knowledge was the foundation of old age sense, as well as the form of cross-generational and multicultural continuity. They are often attached to "solid knowledge" which enabled them not only to become educated but also was enough to find themselves on clearly profiled job markets. Their story is the proof of that. The conviction that e.g. the book is superior to media and new media (Manovich, 2006), the feel of higher credibility towards printed word than less permanent electronic message emerges from that fact. They also have a different approach towards the process of gaining knowledge and skills. The people who are educated through knowledge transmission model and accustomed to being given the knowledge, often believe in the efficiency of such an educational process. They consider it to be less time consuming and supporting the authority of the people who know and pass on the wisdom to the next generation. That positivistic – enlightened message influences their vision of school and learning (Kłakówna, 2003, p. 29-32). Such understanding presents the school as the place where knowledge is given, passed on, introduced, made aware of and shaped, so many activities are done around the student and somewhat with him, obviously for his own good. That kind of language completely identifies the idea of thinking about the student not as a subject. In such reality, the student is the receiver (passive?), the person who undergoes many processes and manipulations and who is eager to absorb the things which teachers try to write and print into him. There is no place for independent knowledge gain, world exploration and understanding it in different meanings than before, as well as for negation and criticism of different messages. This solidification of passiveness not only causes denial from rebellious young people who consider such actions to be against their own nature, shaped in digital and postmodern reality, but also supports negative habits such as passiveness, stagnation, lack of criticism. The development of those habits causes only educational harm, it weakens students' defensive mechanisms against popular culture messages, advertising corporate actions which use media as means of making money and manipulating clients who are unaware of such mechanisms. Placing teachers around postfigurative culture strengthens the dissonance between their own expectations and expectations of their students. The key element strengthening the sense of strangeness between teachers and the new generation of students is also a different cultural experience understood here as the area forming personality and referring to symbolical signs emerging from the area of high culture. That is why, a conversation about common issues, which should be interesting to all people at all times and everywhere, can lead nowhere due to different

possibilities of contextual reference. It turns out that, together with breaking a traditional cultural model of transmission mechanism, the possibility of communication between teachers and their students has been destroyed. The cultural decontextualization, typical for the new identity of young people, becomes complemented with additional meanings emerging from cultural surrounding of a young person (Melosik, Szkudlarek, 2009, p. 58). The student who faces literary and cultural texts which represent elite culture receives them in a way which is typical for him – he refers them to his own experiences or looks for context to understand them in his cultural experience. He tries to explain them in relation to all that which is offered by the media and pop culture – computer games, advertising messages, new language typical for him and his peers formed in virtual reality, as well as the image of the world which is defined by the media product to be sold.

This long addition to the image of contemporary student seems to be essential here in order to highlight communicative dissonance which takes place on the grounds of cultural considerations initiated by the teacher. His understanding of culture, built on a different educational foundation and finally a different from the student's level of cultural competence, especially literary and language one, mentally limits him in the contact with student, very often closing him for dialogue. Of course, the ascertainment that the teacher, especially one formed in the frames of modern culture influence, is not affected by new reality is false and does not find the natural confirmation. Homogeneous message of popular culture, the spread of computer technology and its omnipresence in every area of life is also teachers' experience. Going further, it is probable that they too use the tools of progress and very often consider them superior to traditional forms of contact with the world of knowledge, entertainment and finally everyday practicality. This obviousness does not translate into school – bound by tradition, eternal beliefs and myths, unleashing the attachment to things of the past. Naturally, it is caused by the responsibility of the school – seen as an institution which guarantees the survival of tradition, cherishing the statues of national and world culture, the foundation of axiological order involved in various educational responsibilities (Janus-Sitarz, 2009, p. 63). This placing, true in many aspects, underpins the conservatism of thought and traditionalism of didactic solutions. At the same time, there is the mistrust towards the new, less known, threatening the met order, which is pragmatic against the premises. It shows that changes are possible and needed by school. The consequences can be curious. For example, the teacher who reads books using e-book reader could force his students to use paper version of books during his classes. Such way of thinking has its consequences in the way of perceiving teachers by their students. On the one

hand, such teachers can be considered hypocrites who solidify fictional order of things that denies common sense and everyday obviousness. On the other hand, they can be perceived as people detached from the real world who deny the actual image of the world together with its most characteristic and typical elements. Without a real answer of the school as an institution to the new reality, building authentic dialogue between the teacher and new students seem to be impossible to do.

New image of the teacher

The situation described above, as well as presented image of the student and teacher demands asking the question of the teacher's image, who could be a teacher of new, modern times. It also encourages to consider a number of competences which the teacher should possess in order to be somebody who is important for the students in their own development. The teacher should allow his students to accurately prepare themselves for life in its different areas, and he should be credible and efficient in his own actions. At the same time, it is the question of the teacher's personal qualities, his skills concerning his native subject, as well as the pedagogical and psychological knowledge and moral value which is fundamental due to the profession he has. It is worth beginning from substantive factor. The basis is the knowledge of the subject which is firm, extensive and, above all, constantly updated, completed, verified according to the development of the that subject and its growth. It verifies the foundations – thanks to it, the education process will have subjective characteristic and will find its outlet a concrete thing. Of course, the functionality of subject knowledge depends on different factors which go beyond the teacher's knowledge of e.g. literature and film. The lesson usefulness of the teacher's erudition depends on pedagogical – psychological awareness. It has to include being familiar with existing educational concepts, especially views on upbringing from the past, as well as the present ones, and it has to be ordered by critical thought and value various pedagogical attitudes. This has to be connected with the awareness of various socio-cultural conditions as well as historical, political and even economic ones as they influence the way of life, shape of society and due to that they are the element which conditions efficiency or the lack of efficient educational vision. Pedagogical knowledge together with the awareness of the conditions mentioned above has to be completed on the ground of subject recognitions connected with the student and the teacher (Kłakówna, 2003, p. 75-108). The teacher should possess the knowledge of psychology, especially developmental psychology which defines the human's maturity level throughout different stages of his life. The key element here would be the awareness of

shaping up the thinking of a child depending on his age, as well as the question of the child's emotions. The knowledge of memory mechanisms, different types of intelligence, as well as of different types of disorders which can occur in development of the human is fundamental. Another important type of knowledge is the one of cognitive ways which the teacher possesses while organizing the educational process – hence the necessity to recognize the cognitive characteristics of humans and awareness of their differences. We have to assume that the teacher gains such competences not only by acquiring available knowledge but also by practice. These resources of information concerning different disciplines of science have to be connected to one another and combine the awareness of socio-cultural reality in which the contemporary human exists.

The areas of knowledge and skills mentioned above have to be bound and unified by the area of attitudes which is a derivative of teacher's axiological formation. We can also take risk and claim that the teacher's disability in that area makes the competences mentioned above unimportant. The ethical level does not only influence the shape of and character of knowledge and skills which the student is confronted with, but also the meaning of role played by the teacher. Writing about his moral level, we have to include the area of axiological declarations i.e. the preferred and preached values and, above all, the scope of their practical implementations expressed by particular attitudes, actions and even the smallest types of behavior (Sporek, 2011). The notion itself is very difficult because it assumes that the teacher has a particular ethical form and can influence his students. Such case is ambiguous due to respect for different ways of life and differences in views on the world, as well as the differences emerging from religious assumptions. Hence, the difficulty occurs among such notions as **bringing up – indoctrination – autonomy of views and values** represented by the teacher and his students.

We can answer the question of indoctrination and claim that there is no place for it in education. Firstly, the historical experience still shows its limitations as means of shaping individuals through different doctrines and religions (Sienko, 2002). Secondly, it is a form of rape on human personality and the expression of enslaving the mind and emotionality. Furthermore, it completely depreciates the subjectivity of man – the student's and the teacher's as well. The first one is the subject of particular processes, devoid of possibility of independent and critical thinking, and the second one is enslaved by the doctrine itself – he plays the role of a disciple who undergoes the process of objectification in the same way as his pupil. Indoctrination often equates upbringing, although the synonym of it would be ideology or, using different terminology, training. Upbringing itself is something totally different. As an integral element of education, it has to be based

on respecting freedom, dignity and independence of the other person, especially young one, who is still building himself in the student's area of axiology and views on life (Gadacz, 2005, p. 144-159). It is based on bringing out what is best from the student (Łobocki, 2002). This can build his still forming axiological system. Different ways of upbringing are possible. The two most important ones are connected with affirmative and dramatic upbringing (Wojnar, 1995, p. 234-244). The first one is based on propaganda of readymade role models by showing unambiguous and honorable attitudes and deeds. It can be implemented in reading of written works which are unambiguous and which show polarization of characters' attitudes limiting the dilemmas to clearly formed categories of good and evil. The second one emerges from the conviction of complexity and ambiguity of the world. It assumes the existence of difficult choices, reveals the human drama placed between good and evil and who sometimes makes good and bad choices. The dramatic model is full of difficult questions which do not give unambiguous answers and surround various decisions with additional conditions which make the unambiguous moral choices more complex. From the educational view, both concepts can be utilized at school, the second one being more required there. It assumes that there are not only attitudes worth copying (as in affirmative upbringing) but also that a young person can critically consider various attitudes, make independent difficult choices and he can understand the complexity and ambiguity of the human and the world. The second model of upbringing also clearly highlights the subjectivity of the student – it confronts him with various constructs of attitudes, establishes their value and independent exploration of conscious choices and values. The question of independent views and values expressed by educational subjects occurs on the basis of those choices, so here we have the third question connected with demanded image of the teacher. The limitation of ideological actions, elimination of indoctrination does not mean axiological indifference and transparency of the teacher. The lack of clearly visible ethical rules disqualifies the teacher. Nobody apart from him functions in axiological void. How should the teacher behave taking into account the plurality of values, a large number of views and cross-culturalism taking place at school? What should he do when the students' views and their parents' clearly differ from the world of his values? Finally, what attitude should he take concerning the existence of value ambiguity understood in the spirit of objectivity, subjectivity and relativity when all the theories of values ontologically and epistemologically deny the two remaining ones? Also, how to talk and think about axiology in postmodern reality which denies all stability that hits the classical understanding of notions and that distrustfully asks about the definition of particular values? Obviously, accepting the perspective where the

teacher represents a particular axiological attitude and points it as the only true view on the world cannot stand. It hits the widely understood subjectivity of the pupil and is a form of intellectual limitation and denies the right to the student's freedom of thought. The choice of the right solution, especially its particular implementation in the education process is very difficult. It is also very difficult to measure because the scale of educational influence cannot be verified during various types of examinations, especially external ones organized by formal institutions in education system. Also, it does not find the reflection on the school certificate. This case is also complicated because of the assumption that axiological consistence in the system of values of the teacher himself can also be a matter of contractual issue. As all the people, even the teacher looks for his own way and is, at the same time, forced to be lost in the world of values (Tischner, 2001, p. 115-193). What in this case can be offered school or the teacher as a person who takes responsibility for a particular form or student? It seems that no solution is free from flaws and will always be criticized. Nevertheless, while searching for the golden mean, it makes sense to base axiological education on basic moral laws which function in all religions, are respected by law systems and regulate life of major and minor communities and guarantee understanding within families. Respect for life, ownership right, freedom of speech and beliefs, honesty and social justice, as well as respect for otherness could constitute a foundation for demanded values regardless of different religious beliefs and life views. They could be complemented with values important to different individuals. Obviously, such a way of thinking about values is a thing to be demanded and relatively common and should not be limited to propagating knowledge of those axiological qualities. The key here would be the evidence of their realization. Hence, the upbringing would concentrate around these values and would be required from students and from the teacher, whose personal testimony should constitute the most important lesson about upbringing to realize such values. The question of the role of the teacher brings up the last element required in the demanded image of the teacher. It is about his personality which integrates his knowledge, skills, and declared attitudes and values. We have to think about his personality as a consistent structure or, at least not contradictory, which harmonizes intellectual and emotional element with world view area. This is not a new issue in pedagogy and has been described in various psychological works. For the use of this text which is directed to practical knowledge, it is worth mentioning a few features which are the key to teacher's personality and which in contemporary socio-cultural reality are essential to work effectively and have a chance to build authentic dialogue with students representing new formations. What kind of personal features should be

expected from the teacher who meets the requirements of new times? Naturally, the list of such features would be long. However, from my perspective, my academic experience supported by longstanding reflection and observation of socio-cultural reality, we should include such features as:

- authenticity in relationship with children and teenagers which emerges from the richness of experiences; the credibility which is the result of being involved in the native area of knowledge as well as students' everyday life – their problems, joys, interests and passions;
- independence of thought and autonomy concerning world views and choices made; its foundation would be the belief in one's powers, the stability of characterological dispositions which would result in courage to express and defend particular views;
- creativity and originality in taken actions connected with openness to new solutions as well as new ideas and inspirations, which also come from students;
- faith in students' potential connected with the conviction that the essence of teaching job is not the implementation of tiny guidelines found in ministry documents but supporting versatile student development, creative response to their intellectual and emotional needs, as well as the attachment to the value of existential dilemmas;
- care of students' ethical development which is the most essential element of education and which is treated as imperative in the development of competences and cognitive area understood in relation to knowledge of a particular area; it is connected with an unambiguous relation to good and evil being fundamental axiological qualities;
- criticism of existing social and political views, own relation to national matters and issues connected with widely-understood culture which is connected with current knowledge of civilizational context;
- openness to "the new world" of technology and civilizational changes; creative use of benefits of technology and its functionality to ensure more efficient communication with students brought up in the reality of new media domination (Manovich, 2006) which represent, in terms of perception, screen and interactive reception of surrounded reality, as well as works of culture and popular culture;
- finally, the distance towards oneself (awareness of one's own flaws and imperfection) and the world connected and understanding definitions such as teacher and student in categories of social roles where the foundations are the authentic relationships between human (teacher) – human (student), which

are definitely more important than having a particular function resulting from roles played by the teacher and the student.

The set of features presented above, resulting from various additions, maybe too large and devoid of terminological clarity, seems to have the key meaning for building proper relationships between the teacher and the student. Regardless of knowledge, which in the functional and practical way, has to be distributed by the teacher, the key factors seem to be his personal qualities and his moral attitude.

Dialogue – terminological ambiguities, the richness of meanings

An important and fashionable notion with relation to school is dialogue. Overusing it and using it in the context of various philosophical, social and political arrangements, as well as using it commonly can lead to imprecision which causes ambiguity. For the purpose of this text, the subject to think about will be the educational dialogue emerging from Socratic dialogue (Myrdzik, 2006, p. 212) as well as personal philosophy, especially the philosophy of dialogue (Mikoś, 2001, p. 16, Myrdzik, 2006, p. 213). Such theoretical support of educational dialogue goes beyond understanding it only as conversation. From the humanistic perspective, it is “the category that merges the meeting of two subjects – the teacher and the student: “me” and “you” (Myrdzik, 2006, p. 18). Elżbieta Mikoś in the work about the notion suggests that the dialogue on the ground of educational activity should be understood as:

- the essence of educational process and upbringing;
- method of interpersonal communication (its aim being mutual understanding, approach and cooperation which conditions educational success);
- the way of being in the situation of meeting “me” and “you” (the teacher – master and the student who are partners in the educational process);
- a particular attitude which means being constantly ready to seek understanding and emotional closeness with the other person by using conversation;
- the aim, the method and the condition of achieving success in education;
- form of learning;
- the way which conditions efficient achievement of aims of subject education;
- the way of preparing students to live in freedom and democracy (Mikoś, 2001, p. 18).

It seems that the extensive meaning of educational dialogue properly defines the field of mutual reactions in the space of communication of both subjects, the teacher and the student. It is not only the way of achieving aims resulting from subjective responsibilities, but also the way to shorten the distance between the

people and, at the same time, spiritual growth of the teacher and the student. We can add that education built on educational dialogue can extend beyond the world of school walls. It can be the form of communicating with people in different circumstances, can become the way of life, shape the relationships within the family, places of work and rest, long-term, short-term and temporary contacts.

At school, the teacher is the subject responsible for dialogue. He, due to his maturity, competences, life experience and his place in the educational process, should inspire students to dialogue, encourage them to it, limit all the actions that suppress independent thought and student emotionality. Barbara Myrdzik writes about it in such a way: "The quality of educational dialogue depends on, above all, the teacher's attitude who monitors the direction of the conversation taking place and, at the same time, suspends his right to omniscience and the exclusiveness to ask questions. The class dialogue should form such skills as: listening to other people, expressing opinion on a particular issue, presenting arguments and defending them, consideration towards arguments of other people, expressing oneself in a responsible way" (Myrdzik, 2006, p. 212).

The opinion presented above ennobles the value of conversation – the foundation of dialogue, which allows to update remaining situational meanings found in the meaningful area of educational dialogue. It also doubts the traditionally conducted education process – based on knowledge transmission, its reproduction which is closed in the form of answers easy to predict and limited by factual material. That is why, the positive offer could be open conversation where the student finds out the problems, names them, questions his own ideas and concepts, confronts with the ideas of both his peers and the teacher and considers himself a competent dialogue participant. In the dialogue designed in such a way, pupil's independence, his intellectual and emotional involvement, as well as the conviction that the authentic conversation about important matters, up-to-date in terms of their universality, becomes the key element. The same can be said about the conviction that this kind of conversation has its own value, facilitates his development as a person building their own personality, forming themselves and their individual system of values. The development of cultural competence resulting from the characteristics of learnt subject happens in the same way.

The space of school communication

The dialogue, the basic category for school communication, is found in specific spatial reality. That space is the key category for contemporary scientific thought. This definition, eagerly used in various sciences and humanities, clearly, in the

modern meaning reflects in itself the shape of postmodern reality. It becomes detached from the place, physical limitations and opens itself to semantics, which allows to describe itself using various metaphors and causing symbolical thinking (Myrdzik 2009, p.11-12). Due to the shape of considerations present in this paper, it is worth noticing that the widely-understood cultural space consists of this educational value, integrating material, mental and spiritual things and being heritage of the past, the image of present and the project of some kind of future. It combines institutionalism, the apparatus of extensive bureaucracy and the human which goes beyond its physicality, forms the area of experience, assumes the development and maturity designed in the centrally planned educational policy. At the same time, it integrates the richness of meanings emerging from subjectivity of participants of educational process – it reveals the communal perspective built through the prism of development of particular collectivities (society, nation), as well as the individual perspective which concerns personal development of the students and the teachers.

School dialogue, taken into account around educational area, is placed near school communication (being also its form) which is determined by human and institutional factor. The first one can be found, above all, in record area despite being encumbered by the system of meanings found in educational tradition. The school itself is a semantical structure. It somewhat opens the first level of meanings essential for school communication. By being the place that educates people, it is on the one hand, at least in assumption, the medium of tradition, and on the other hand, an institution which prepares to live in changeable geopolitical and socio-cultural conditions. Also, the figures of the teacher and student are important. I tried to explain and comment on it in previous subchapters. The forms connected with school such as knowledge, skills, education and upbringing are also semantically encumbered. I mentioned that above as well. The element which determines the image of school the most and which influences educational practice are the documents describing and pointing the areas of organization of functioning of educational institutions (Walker, Soltis, 2000). The most important thing in the Polish system for its substantive shape is the core curriculum. This document designs aims and tasks of school, aims and tasks for teachers of particular subjects and describes teaching material and content, as well as the conditions and ways of implementation into the lesson. It governs particular syllabuses. Together with independent documents such as school statute, preventive and educational programs they describe the space of meanings governed by law - by the state and the schools as well with relation to ministerial directives. The documents mentioned above describe the second level of meanings that are the part of school communication. The whole

thing is closed by the most important factor – the human factor. It constitutes the third level of meanings, which, apart from its own semantical quality, integrates in itself two levels mentioned before. From the teacher's perspective, the key here would be his personality and moral attitude he represents and the system of values resulting from it, as well as widely-understood competences. This has been described earlier. From the student's point of view, we should include various conditions influencing his personal development and contemporary image of the pupil, which is the derivative of changes that took place in the world, especially in terms of technological development. The communication or its lack takes place between educational subjects taking into account complex and complicated contexts. It can be genuine – in this way it could be found in the meaningful areas of the dialogue described above or it can be ingenuine, then it becomes a pseudo-dialogue, limits the possibility of relationship building, authenticity changes into lies, which from the axiological perspective causes the feeling of rejection, erects the space of denial and closes to the other person (Tischner, 2001, p. 9 and 234-239).

The ingenuine and genuine communication – in the direction of educational projects of the classes

Ingenuine and genuine communication, pseudo-dialogue and dialogue constitute the educational concrete. They condition the shape and character of the whole education process, they influence the architecture of particular classes. For the purpose of this text, these phenomena have to be related to the examples of solutions which illustrate the negative and positive tendencies during Polish lessons (integrating literary-cultural material and language notions). They will be taken under consideration in relation to such notions as: 1) choice and character of lesson materials; 2) choice of educational strategies, teaching methods and organizational forms; 3) the style of conducting classes; 4) the way of asking questions; 5) possible teacher's reactions to students' actions; 6) lesson contact – interactions between the teacher and the students; 7) forming the topics of written works and homework; 8) correction of longer written works and homework. The examples will be order according to categories of "good and bad practices":

1. Choice and character of materials:

Bad practice – the materials irrelevant to students' experience, not understood by them in terms of language and used to illustrate historical development of literature and culture, they represent particular periods and styles, shown as texts illustrating specific tendencies, devoid of masterpiece qualities as well as difficult to read and lacking universality, bringing contexts

which students are unable to understand, without any relation to cultural timelessness; the choice of works is unambiguous in its meaning, they lack the discursive element, present simplified axiology; they are ordered according to historical-literary or genealogical criteria, as well as according to order typical of disciplines found in scientific works of academic order; attachment to traditional texts, no modern works included.

Good practice: the choice of various materials, masterpieces and forms directly referring to students' cultural experience; texts with language easy to understand, related to psychological stage of development they student is on; the works updating universal perspective which could be understood in different contexts, as well as when detached from the native one, arranged in problem blocks around which the texts "talk" with one another allowing to extract new meanings which update themselves from the "here and now" perspective.

2. The choice of educational strategies, teaching methods and organizational forms:

Bad practice: using association strategy (Okoń, 1998, p. 320, Chrzastowska, 1979, p. 117-118), expository methods (e.g. lecture, storytelling, work with a book) and their modern modifications (e.g. multimedia presentations functioning in the same way as a lecture); traditional organizational forms which make students sit at the desk, eliminating or using vestigial student cooperation and their mutual learning from one another.

Good practice: using emotional, operational and problem strategy (Okoń, 1998, p. 321-324, Chrzastowska, 1979, p. 117-122); using active methods to solve problems and causing students to act; using not only scientific benefits of general teaching but also methods typical of particular subject e.g. language developing methods (Dyduch, 2004, 2005) or literary education (Uryga, 1996) or, more extensive, literary-cultural; using various organizational forms – individual or group work, pair work, organizing work outside the classroom, not at the desks, using various theatrical stagings etc.

3. The style of conducting classes:

Bad practice: authoritarianism, excessive teacher's activity and limiting students' creativity, lack of trust towards the skills and abilities of the students, excessive control during the classes, limiting spontaneity and students' behavior, no possibility to ask questions, no consent to criticism, comments and additions from the students.

Good practice: actions towards democratic form control – inspiring to independent and critical thinking, making students face particular problems and, at the same time, consent to creative search of possible solutions of the problems; discursiveness in both student and teacher approach; opening areas of free

speech for the students, discussing proposed solution ideas, substantive and friendly criticism based on reality, the atmosphere of common work not to investigate made-up dilemmas but to solve real problems found in the drama of the human world, which allow to investigate understanding of self and surrounding world.

4. The way of asking questions:

Bad practice: numerous questions containing suggested answers, closed questions – conclusive, which start with the word “if”, assuming in their structure the answer “yes” or “no” without additional justification; excessive number of detailed questions which do not need general thought and limit students’ creative search; too many questions requiring justification of ready-made statements usually emerging from solidified possibilities of interpreting given works, those questions are not the answer to independent thinking; too many questions about details, trivia (e.g. unimportant details in the book) at the expense of open questions that support the process of interpretation.

Good practice: making students ask their own questions about the problem or a particular work; general questions which are later complemented with details (question gradation) in order to give the possibility to form interpretational hypotheses; the possibility to ask the teacher problem questions; questions about students’ opinions their thoughts; creating such conditions that the students who ask questions and answer them could feel safe and have the possibility to ask questions to one another; the questions concerning summary of the lesson which enables students to order their thoughts and require deepening of the problem, as well as can open the new perspective to see the analyzed material.

5. Possible teacher’s reaction to the students’ actions:

Bad practice: rigor; criticism of statements which are not consistent with the way the teacher takes to understand the works of art and literature (sometimes connected with criticism of the person); limiting longer statements which go beyond the accepted thought outline; fixed shape of classes without allowing longer digressions, student updates not fitting the context area designed by the teacher; limitation or exclusion of pop cultural associations made by the students; attachment to the pre-designed course of the lesson without the possibility of adjusting it to the situation resulting from the students’ attitude; elimination of the devices such as laptops, tablets, iPhones as well as electronic versions of literature and culture.

Good practice: respect for students’ statements, even ones that do not fit the interpretational outline of the lesson; pliability and flexibility – adjusting the course of the lesson to changeable situation resulting from the students’ activity,

their way of thinking; verification of students' statements – their factual and language correction but with the respect for student subjectivity who express their own statements and provides arguments; contrasting students' opinions with teacher's and experts' thoughts; forming methodology of reaching to and understanding the meanings hidden in the analyzed works; highlighting the attitudes of students who distinguish themselves by being non-stereotypical, exceptionally creative, insightful, using those attitudes in substantive discussion in the classroom; motivating students to emotional involvement, revealing own feelings, experiences, sharing own experiences with students whose experiences are treated at the same level as teacher's; allowing students to use information technology to improve the classes.

6. Lesson contact – interactions between the teacher and the students:

Bad practice: criticism of the students' worldview which results from being different from the statement of others or teacher's opinions; highlighting the inequality of roles of the teacher and the student; taking advantage of his own position in the disputes based on argument exchange, discrediting the student due to his age, lack of experience, deprecating relationship to student's intellectual abilities; fierceness of statements and opinions expressed by the teacher; lack of respect for student's thought and worldview independence, eliminating student's personal experience and feelings from the discussion; deciding possible disputes from the perspective of own position without substantive justification; negative body language which influences distance building.

Good practice: respect for student's worldview by his peers and the teacher; partnership of thought and the right to take part in discussion, expressing own opinions by all the participants of education process; kindness, openness to students' opinions, substantive discussion about different attitudes towards the problem or a particular work; gentle assessing comments; addition of students' experiences in the thinking process, using their emotional involvement in the matter; positive body language; finally, building friendly relationships based on trust and mutual sympathy.

7. Forming the topics of written works and homework:

Bad practice: forming topics that require uncreative knowledge, which are detached from experiences and needs of the pupil; giving topics which are irrelevant to modern socio-cultural reality and which formalize student's way of thinking; giving trite topics which are described in detail in internet and function in the form of ready-made papers; giving tasks which are devoid of internal logic – contradictory to common sense and not consistent with factual reality, rules of

probability (such tasks, contradictory to the world depicted can be found in relation to e.g. fantasy genres).

Good practice: giving topics which motivate to work, fire up creativity and independence of students, encouraging to seek knowledge, eliminating the search for ready-made knowledge which can be used without processing; topics which involve students emotionally, requiring the expression of their own opinions and justifications, which allow to exhibit originality; tasks requiring different perspectives of reception and transmission so the ones that assume taking the attitude of distance, playing the role, thinking about the meaning of attitudes and motivations of literary characters.

8. Correction of longer written works and homework:

Bad practice: giving only marks for written works; lack of written and oral comments; lack of feedback for the student regarding things he did correct and incorrect, possibly substituted by listing the flaws of the work; giving low marks for homework which has been done incorrectly in terms of the way of thinking, ignoring some students while marking; not checking shorter and longer homework; lack of reaction to works copied from internet sources.

Good practice: making more extensive comments for longer written works which point out advantages and disadvantages and which help the student to eliminate mistakes; taking into account personal relationship with the student in the comment (the name, current knowledge about the student, previous works, possible progress); group and individual discussion about longer written works; matching written works with students' individual needs and taking into account students who have problems with writing or ones who excel at it; striving toward systematic correctness of all homework, limiting it so that their correctness is possible for the teacher.

Conclusion

The school in the postmodern reality does not feel well at all. Common education cannot catch up with the world and is not the result of a conscious choice but it is the anachronism of structure and entanglements where it has to function somewhat against the modern world. Its institutionalism, reforms and changes that cannot catch up with changes in socio-cultural context and civilizational changes that condition the development of next generations of students, do not facilitate the search for understanding between the most important subjects at school – the teacher and the student. Especially, the first one is entangled in institutional constraint, responsibilities emerging from curriculum, form of examinations, and is torn between the past that forms him and present where his students exist. The student is a part of a powerful

mechanism whose function is not clear and it stands against students' everyday life. Hence the generation of children approaches the school with a greater distance – they see it as detached from real life, think of it as the place that offers impractical and non-functional knowledge. Communication problems taking place between the teacher and the students are largely the derivative of conditions described in this paper. This negative image, which seems to be general, does not exclude the possibility of understanding between the school and the student and, more precisely, a particular teacher and student. Nevertheless, the key here seems to be, above all, the attitude of the teacher himself, his professional competences and personal qualities described above. The teacher equipped with those qualities will be conscious of the fact that in order to find the understanding, he has to use student's own language, update contexts a young person is familiar with, open to things which are new and difficult to understand for him. The entrance in the "student world" is the only way to break the communicational impasse, the chance of "grassroots change" which can transform the image of school in the way which is not institutional. Getting to know the ways of communication used by young people, understanding the mechanisms behind those processes gives teacher the chance to exchange opinions and discuss different worldviews. At the same time, it can help the teacher to get the student closer to the matters that are valuable and important, which are not accessible to the student because they are placed in the area of meanings functioning in the world he is not familiar with, difficult, forming fundamental obstacles of reception, severing him from the semantic area. Maybe such a task could be summarized in the following formula defining the space of relationship of communication between the teacher – Me and the student – You: *I will get to know you and your language, I will understand the way you think, I will get to know what is important to you. Maybe then you would like to listen to my story, the things I want to show and tell you so that you could discover the value, the meaning of it to yourself. In order for that to happen, I will try to talk about it using your own language...*

References

- BAUMAN, Z. (2000). *Globalizacja. I co z tego wynika*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- BRANNY, E. (2009). Powieść a powieść hipertekstowa. In Żurek, S. J. & Dziak, A. (Eds.), *e – polonistyka*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- BROCKI, M. (2003). W cieniu ciała. *Charaktery* 5, 61 – 63.
- CHYZAŃSTOWSKA, B. (1979). *Teoria literatury w szkole*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

- DYDUCH, A. (2005). Metody kształcenia sprawności językowej (1). *Nowa Poliszczyzna*. 5, 31 – 43.
- DYDUCH, A. (2006). Metody kształcenia sprawności językowej (2). *Nowa Poliszczyzna*. 1, 13 - 25.
- GADACZ, T. (2005). *O umiejętności życia*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
- JANUS-SITARZ, A. (2009). *Przyjemność i odpowiedzialność w lekturze. O praktykach czytania literatury w szkole. Konstatacje. Oceny. Propozycje*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Universitas.
- JANUSIEWCZ, M. (2009). Literatura hipertekstowa – ewolucja tradycji czy tradycji zaprzeczenie. In Żurek, S. J. & Dziak, A., (Eds.) *e – polonistyka*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- KŁAKÓWNA, Z. A. (2003). *Przymus i wolność*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Edukacyjne.
- KSIĄŻEK- SZCZEPANIKOWA, A. (1996). *Ekranowy czytelnik*. Szczecin: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego.
- ŁOBOCKI, M. (2002). *Wychowanie moralne w zarysie*. Kraków: Impuls.
- MANOVICH, L. (2006). *Język nowych mediów*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- MEAD, M. (2000). *Kultura i tożsamość. Studium dystansu międzypokoleniowego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- MELOSIK, Z. (2013). *Kultura popularna i tożsamość młodzieży*. Kraków: Impuls.
- MELOSIK, Z. & SZKUDLAREK, T. (2009). *Kultura, tożsamość i edukacja. Migotanie znaczeń*. Kraków: Impuls.
- MIKOŚ, E. (2001). O dialogu edukacyjnym. In Uryga, Z. & Budrewicz Z., (Eds.) *Drogi i ścieżki polonistyki gimnazjalnej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej, 16 – 30.
- MYRDZIK, B. (2009). Dialog z Innym w przestrzeni kultury w wybranych koncepcjach. In Myrdzik, B. & Karwatowska, B. (Eds.) *Dialog kultur w edukacji*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie Skłodowskiej.
- MYRDZIK, B. (2006). *Zrozumieć siebie i świat*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie Skłodowskiej.
- OKOŃ, W. (1998). *Wprowadzenie do dydaktyki ogólnej*. Warszawa: Żak.
- SIENKO, M. (2002). *Polonistyka szkolna w gorszej ideologii. Dyskusje wokół wychowania literackiego w latach 1944 – 1989*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej.
- SPOREK, P. (2010). Koniec ekranowego czytelnika? *Polonistyka* 11, 38 – 42.
- SPOREK, P. (2011). *Problemy z autorytetem nauczyciela we współczesnej szkole*. In Żurek, S. J. & Bajan, M., (Eds.) *Etyka nauczyciela*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- TISCHNER, J. (2001). *Filozofia dramatu*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.

-
- URYGA, Z. (1996), *Godziny polskiego*. Warszawa-Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- WALKER, D. F. & SOLTIS, J. F. (2000). *Program i cele kształcenia*. Warszawa: WSiP.
- WOJNAR, I. (1995). *Teoria wychowania estetycznego*. Warszawa: Żak.

Contact

Paweł Sporek, Ph. D.

Pedagogiczny im. Komisji Edukacji Narodowej w Krakowie

ul. Podchorążych 2

30-084 Kraków

psporek@interia.pl