

WAYS OF JUSTIFYING THE PRESENCE OF ETHICAL STANDARDS IN PEDAGOGY

Marek JEZIORAŃSKI¹

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52846/afucv.v1i53.74>

Abstract: *The article addresses issues related to how ethical standards in pedagogy can be justified. This is an issue that lies in the area of theoretical research. The main problem of the article is as follows: How can the presence of ethical standards in pedagogy be justified? The answer to this question is based on two models of the relationship between pedagogy and ethics.*

In this context, one can speak of pedagogy that subjects educational activity to ethical evaluation (model 1) and one that excludes this evaluation, or at least excludes its extra-disciplinary conditions (model 2). The adoption of the former results in an approach where pedagogy merely 'translates' general ethical standards into its own environmental and development contexts. The adoption of the latter, however, will lead to the presence in pedagogy of a conventional way of introducing ethical standards, often expressed in the form of a code. Then the standards will also be produced in the area of pedagogy itself.

Keywords: *pedagogy, ethics, normative pedagogy, descriptive pedagogy, model, justification.*

Introduction

The combination of such two issues as ethics and pedagogy in one sentence immediately arouses a rich domain of associations, themes and problems. Being aware of this, I want to make it clear that with my article I only want to speak in the discussion and not attempt to systematize the ethical-pedagogical themes or problems present in the scientific debate.

This article will address issues related to the way ethical norms are justified in pedagogy. Thus, this is an issue that is located in the area of theoretical exploration. I understand justification itself as a process that legitimizes a certain state of affairs. This 'state of affairs' is the presence of ethical standards in pedagogy, which in turn demands justification. I adopt this as a starting hypothesis, the justification of which I will provide in the course of my research.

¹ Catholic University of Lublin, Poland.

The main question of the article should be formulated as follows: How can the presence of ethical standards in pedagogy be justified? To answer this question, first of all, it is necessary to consider models of the relationship between pedagogy and ethics. This will be shown on the definitional level of both sciences. These findings will make it possible to point out, I think, different types of forms of the presence of ethical norms in pedagogy and this will presuppose the identification of different ways of justifying them. On this basis, it will be possible to present the characteristics of ethical standards (and entire ethical systems) existing in the science of education dependent on the way of justifying their presence.

The definitional relationship between pedagogy and ethics

The first step in the search for the relationship and its specificity between pedagogy and ethics is to analyze the definitional approaches of each science. Ethics is defined as: "the theory of an act (that is, its material object) in terms of moral obligation (that is, its formal object)"². Pedagogy, on the other hand, is "the science of education, the subject of which is educational activity aimed at equipping society as a whole - and especially the younger generation - with knowledge, general and professional skills, interests, value systems, attitudes and beliefs, as well as preparing them to influence their own development"³. Seemingly, these two scientific disciplines have no definitional connection to each other. However, in order to see this connection, it is necessary to take a closer look at the understanding of 'act' in ethics. Traditionally, ethics has distinguished in the field of human activity between two types of it: *actus humanus* and *actus hominis*. The first term indicates such human activity of which a person is aware and fulfills it in freedom. The second term, on the other hand, speaks of activity to which man is passively subjected. Figuratively, the following statements apply to these two human activities: "I act" and "something happens in me." In addition, the first activity is called an act, and the second is called an activation⁴. At this point, it can be seen that the "theory of action" cited in

² A. Szostek, *Pogadanki z etyki*, Tygodnik Katolicki „Niedziela”, Częstochowa 2008, p. 33.

³ W. Okoń, *Nowy słownik pedagogiczny*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”, Warszawa 2007, p. 300.

⁴ Cf. A. Szostek, *Pogadanki...*, p. 35. K. Wojtyła sees the analysis of human activity in the triad: 'man acts'. - 'something happens in man' - 'something happens to man'. See K. Wojtyła, *Osoba i czyn*, Towarzystwo Naukowej KUL, Lublin, 2011, p. 112.

the definition of ethics refers only to conscious and free human activity. Part of this activity is educational activity, which, according to the above definition, is the subject of pedagogy. Thus, the definitional relationship between the two scientific disciplines is highlighted. It centers in the area of 'activity'. Pedagogy deals with educational activity and ethics is the moral evaluation of activity, in this case it will be the moral evaluation of educational activity. It can be tentatively assumed that this relationship grants ethics the right to make a moral evaluation of educational activities. In this way, ethics would make itself a discipline superior to pedagogy. At this point, the question arises whether pedagogy agrees with such an arrangement.

Addressing the presence of ethical norms in pedagogy, one can generally point to such a practice of pedagogy that allows the use of evaluative sentences and one that excludes them. In other words, in the former situation we are dealing with the consent of pedagogy to the evaluation of its activities by ethics, in the latter - with opposition. The first position can be called normative pedagogy⁵ (value-based) and the other descriptive (descriptive) pedagogy. Urszula Morszczyńska introduces a different nomenclature, but points to the same problem. She writes that "in modern pedagogy, two currents of consideration related to two intellectual perspectives have become quite prominent: modernist (Enlightenment, modern) and post-modernist (post-industrial, post-modern). [...] This change also applies to communication in the process of upbringing, and its most prominent manifestation is to be the abandonment of normativity going so far as to completely eliminate standards from educational interactions"⁶. The conclusion boils down to the same statement: it is possible to speak of a pedagogy that subjects educational activity to evaluation (model 1) and one that excludes this evaluation, or at least excludes its extradisciplinary determinants (model 2). One can also assume such a situation, in which pedagogy, on the basis of its own research, will claim to create ethical standards. It then becomes a discipline superior to ethics (model 3). Ethics then submits itself to the specific, individual, unique situations in which the individual finds himself. Such an

⁵ I do not refer to the name "normative pedagogy" in this article only as a pedagogical direction.

⁶ U. Morszczyńska, *Normy w pedagogice. Aksjologiczne i metodologiczne wyznaczniki statusu zdań o powinnościach*, Księgarnia Akademicka, Kraków 2009, p. 357.

understanding of ethics is called situational ethics or ethical situationism⁷. This issue is primarily concerned with ethics and its identity and goes beyond the scope of the matter addressed in this article, so it will not be developed further.

From the point of view of justifying the existence of ethical standards in pedagogy, we can talk about two models of the relationship between pedagogy and ethics. The first shows substantive cooperation between these disciplines. Nevertheless, with regard to the plane of moral norms, it should be noted that pedagogy is, in this view, a science subordinate to ethics. In extreme cases, when moral standards are given a dominant role in the entire process of education, pedagogy is denied the status of a science altogether. An example of this approach can be seen in the position of Jacek Woroniecki (1878-1949). In his introduction to Catholic Educational Ethics, he wrote: "Pedagogy as a separate science, endowed with its own internal unity, does not exist; it is - when it comes to upbringing - one of the main components of ethics, and at the same time its test and crowning..."⁸. On the other hand, a different model is present, which recognizes the separateness and independence of pedagogy from ethics. This approach is evident primarily in empirical pedagogy. H. H. Krüger uses the following names to describe it (to)-: experimental pedagogy or descriptive or critical-rationalist science of education⁹. At the same time, he explains that its basic principle "is founded on the given, the positive, the facts, and all issues going beyond this, such as normative problems, should be rejected as useless and speculative"¹⁰. M. Nowak recognizes this approach also in some positions of humanistic pedagogy¹¹.

To sum up, two ways of doing pedagogy are drawn today: normative and descriptive. In the area of normative pedagogy, there is a very clear connection between the science of education and ethics and its symptom is

⁷ T. Biesaga, *Sytuacjonizm etyczny*, in: *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, ed. A. Maryniarczyk, v. 9, Polskie Towarzystwo św. Tomasza z Akwinu, Lublin 2006, pp. 293-296.

⁸ J. Woroniecki, *Katolicka etyka wychowawcza*, v. 1, Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, Lublin 1986, v. 7.

⁹ Cf. H.H. Krüger, *Metody badań w pedagogice*, Pedagogika GWP, Gdańsk 2007, p. 31.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹¹ Cf. M. Nowak, *Teorie i koncepcje wychowania*, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa 2008, p. 239.

the presence of goals in the process of education, the formulation of which is fundamentally influenced by ethics. In the area of descriptive pedagogy, on the other hand, such a connection is not directly visible and can even be said to be intentionally rejected. Thus, it can be tentatively assumed that ethical norms are present in normative pedagogy and absent in descriptive pedagogy. Such a statement, although it seems to be a logical consequence, is nevertheless very superficial and thus untrue. Why? The following exploration will show that the difference between normative and descriptive pedagogy lies not in the (no)presence of moral norms in education, but in their specific justification¹².

Justifying the presence of ethical standards in normative pedagogy

Normative pedagogy is oriented towards the permanent evaluation of educational activities from the perspective of accepted norms.

This approach has been present in pedagogical thinking and work since the beginning of the emergence of pedagogy as a scientific discipline. With the emergence of philosophical thought, pedagogy found its place in the area of so-called practical philosophy¹³. When pedagogy increasingly became an independent discipline in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, it did not deny its connection with other disciplines, in particular with ethics. This was emphasized above all by the Father of scientific pedagogy, Jan Frederick Herbart (1776-1841). He pointed to two auxiliary disciplines for pedagogy. The first was psychology and the second was ethics. The first provided knowledge regarding the current state of development of the pupil and the second provided knowledge regarding the purpose of upbringing, from which the system of upbringing was then derived. Thus,

¹² I understand justification here as indicating "what justifies someone's conduct, some action or state of affairs." Cf. <https://sjp.pwn.pl/slowniki/usprawiedliwi%C4%87.html> [23.01.2020]

¹³ An illustration of this well-known thesis can be found in W. Jaeger's comment: "... the peculiarity of the place which the Greeks occupy in the universal history of education lies [...] in the drive, stronger than anything else, to seek a comprehensive form, and in the philosophical, penetrating thought for the laws underlying human nature and for the norms which flow from these laws in the field of personal conduct and in the organization of society." – W. Jaeger, *Paideia*, v.1, Instytut Wydawniczy PAX, Warszawa 1962, p. 25.

it is the area of teleology of upbringing that is the natural place where pedagogy and ethics meet. This positioning of ethics in relation to pedagogy is indicated by the very title of J. F. Herbart's main work, *General Pedagogy Derived from the Purpose of Education*.

Sergei Hessen (1887-1950), recognizing the necessary connection between pedagogy and philosophy¹⁴, wrote that "... where philosophy is aware of the sameness of its issues and the peculiarity of its method, pedagogical thought also lives and flourishes. On the other hand, if pedagogical thought is drowned out by technical and political matters, we have every reason to look for the causes of its degeneration in the negation of the intrinsic nature of philosophical cognition"¹⁵. Similarly, Bogdan Nawroczyński (1882-1974) argued that pedagogy is a normative science, since it "evaluates the means of upbringing in view of the purpose of this activity"¹⁶. Such pedagogues as K. Kotłowski and S. Kunowski also present a similar position in this area. Examples of the relationship between pedagogy and ethics in the area of normative pedagogy are numerous.

Based on the above, it can be said that the normativity of pedagogical actions is expressed primarily in the teleological and axiological aspects of the educational process. Following Mieczysław Łobocki (1929-2012), it should be stated that the goal is "a certain postulated state to be achieved as a result of educational actions"¹⁷. It is the formulation of the goals and (related) values of upbringing that at the same time becomes not only an element that organizes, but also evaluates the entire educational process. Hence, M. Łobocki explicitly calls them educational standards¹⁸. At the same time, he adds that views on the goals of upbringing depend largely on "the presented philosophical, worldview or religious orientation of those who deal with them professionally, but not only. These also include

¹⁴ Cf. S. Hessen, *Podstawy pedagogiki*, Wydawnictwo „Żak”, Warszawa 1997, p. 425: "In addition to those parts of general pedagogy - which are direct applications of the relevant philosophical branches..."

¹⁵ S. Hessen, *Podstawy...*, p. 428.

¹⁶ B. Nawroczyński, *Zasady nauczania*, Ossolineum, Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków 1961, p. 12.

¹⁷ M. Łobocki, *Teoria wychowania w zarysie*, Impuls, Kraków 2010, p. 120.

¹⁸ Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 120.

the orientations of parents, educators and teachers, and especially of educational theorists or educators in general...."¹⁹.

On the basis of his analysis, Józef Górniewicz distinguishes "five sources for the derivation of the goals of upbringing, first - human nature, second - timeless values, third - social values, fourth - the vision of the future world contained in ideology, and fifth - religious values"²⁰. It is worth noting that all the indicated sources of goals are not strictly within the field of pedagogy. This, in turn, means that pedagogy as a science does not create ethical standards but only 'translates' general norms to its own environmental and developmental contexts. Thus, the presence of standards in normative pedagogy is, if one may say so, 'borrowed' and not strictly belonging to the science of education itself. This observation indicates that the justification for the presence of standards in pedagogy should be sought - generally speaking - in its connection with philosophy and especially with ethics. Thus, the *a priori* anthropological and axiological assumptions of the various pedagogical currents will justify their decisions regarding the formulated goals of upbringing and the resulting standards.

Consistent with the above, the specific features of the system of ethical norms present in pedagogy are revealed. First, they build a certain coherent whole, and are not just separate and independent judgments. This whole is characterized by a certain structure, in which it is possible to identify the supreme norm and the subordinate sets of lower standards. A very interesting scheme of the relationship of individual educational norms with each other is shown by M. Nowak²¹. It shows that the standards used in pedagogy are closely related to social norms and these, in turn, derive from even more general philosophical assumptions²².

Secondly, the coherent totality of the normative system in pedagogy is also expressed in the fact that the same ethics, i.e. the same supreme norm, applies in the various areas of educational activity (in the various pedagogical subdisciplines), but described taking into account the problem situations of the subdisciplines concerned. In other words, by means of the deductive method, the content of the main goal of education is transferred

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 119.

²⁰ J. Górniewicz, *Teoria wychowania (wybrane problemy)*, Olsztyn 2008, p. 78.

²¹ M. Nowak, *Teorie...*, pp. 370–371.

²² Cf. M. Jeziorański, Indywidualne i społeczne cele wychowania religijno-moralnego, „Ateneum Kapłańskie” 171(2018), v. 2(657), pp. 259-260.

to specific goals, tailored to the specific circumstances of educational work. Thus, in this presuppositional context, there can be no question of different ethics or ethos in pedagogy, e.g., 'ethos of a teacher', 'ethos of an educator of the Prison Service', 'ethos of a vocational counselor', etc., but one ethic, which can be called 'pedagogical ethics'. It covers all areas of educational activity with the same ethical *corpus*, but expressed in the language peculiar to each pedagogical sub-discipline. Such a system is characterized by high cohesiveness, permanence (sometimes even rigidity) and low ability to 'see' exceptional situations.

Justifying the presence of ethical standards in descriptive pedagogy

The situation is fundamentally different in the second model of the relationship between pedagogy and ethics, that is, in such a view in which pedagogy does not allow into the area of its own activities and research value standards imposed on it by ethics²³. As shown above, such pedagogy has generally been called non-normative or descriptive pedagogy. It grows out of the positivist understanding of science in general.

In modernity, there has been a change in the science-making question from: "why" to: "how". And although the origins of this approach can be traced as far back as ancient Greek thought, in the 19th century it was strongly expressed primarily by August Comte (1798-1857). As P. Jaroszyński writes: "according to Comte, what matters in scientific cognition is the knowledge of laws, which we come to know starting from sense cognition, without resorting to hidden beings and causes"²⁴. This change is related to the change that took place at a deeper - ontological - level, and can be described as a shift from a teleological to a disteological conception of being²⁵.

It should be noted from the outset that it would be a futile effort to search for such an educational system in the area of descriptive pedagogy, which would not have any evaluative sentence in its assumptions. Here,

²³ For more on the reasons for this situation, see P. Magier, *O potrzebie etyki w pedagogice*, „Forum Pedagogiczne” 2016/2 p. 1, pp. 159-162.

²⁴ P. Jaroszyński, *Nauka*, w: *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, red. A. Maryniarczyk, v. 7, Polskie Towarzystwo św. Tomasza z Akwinu, Lublin 2006, p. 535.

²⁵ On the importance of this transition for values in pedagogy see: M. Jeziorański, *Od wartości do powinności w ujęciu aksjologii personalistycznej*, in: *Życie wartościowe w perspektywie aksjologii pedagogicznej*, ed. A. Cudowska, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Katedra, Gdańsk 2018, pp. 81-91.

ethical norms are also present, but they are justified in a fundamentally different way. They arrive at the educational process from two different sides. To get an idea of their importance, it is worth citing some examples.

One of the first pedagogues who confronted this problem consciously was Édouard Claparède (1873-1940). In the spirit of positivism, he postulated in a fundamental way that "the mind of the scholar should be completely free, liberated from all superstitions, from all philosophical apriorism"²⁶. On the other hand, however - referring to Karl Groos (1861-1946) - the Swiss pedagogue invokes the category of "teleological unity"²⁷, which is expressed in the fact that "knowledge is always only a means, and that it is therefore contrary to nature to administer it alone without linking to some end whose attainment it should make possible"²⁸. This goal is derived primarily from the biological conditions of child development and not from philosophical assumptions. A similar approach is presented by such pedagogues as Ellen Key (1849-1926), Maria Montessori (1870-1952), Janusz Korczak (1878-1942) and many others.

Today, it is believed that the anti-pedagogical current²⁹ is the most radical in its rejection of ethical norms in the process of upbringing. P. Magier notes that "the main thesis of anti-pedagogy expresses the conviction that there is no validity (need) for purposeful upbringing, and thus postulates the rejection of upbringing as such"³⁰. Therefore, it is worth taking a closer look at this issue. From the point of view of the issue at hand, an important category in the anti-pedagogical literature is responsibility. It where the legitimacy or lack thereof of the application of ethical norms in upbringing is focused in. Hubertus von Schoenebeck writes: "'Responsibly' - This is the crux of the problem. Who has the right to set the rules of responsibility in dealing with children?"³¹ and adds, "the

²⁶ E. Claparède, *Wychowanie funkcjonalne*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”, Warszawa 2006, p. 42.

²⁷ Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 32.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

²⁹ H. von Schoenebeck calls this current "apedagogy". See H. von Schoenebeck, *Wolność od wychowania*, Impuls, Kraków 2008, p. 24. Without addressing terminological issues at this point, I will use the term "anti-pedagogy".

³⁰ P. Magier, *Esej postantypedagogiczny*, Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, Lublin 2016, p. 73.

³¹ H. von Schoenebeck, *Wolność...*, p. 22.

fear of seeming irresponsible causes us to talk and act with children as if they are incapable of assessing for themselves the dangers of their actions. This fear makes adults relate to children as if they were beings who are not yet human. As if children are incapable of responsibility"³². In his view, on the other hand, the child knows what is good for him: he said: "he knows - according to the horizon of his experiences and evaluations, as any human being"³³. It is worth noting that the German pedagogue does not abolish the concept of responsibility, but admits it to each person in relation to his own decisions. Thus, the presence of ethical norms is possible (even necessary!) in upbringing, but it comes from the educator's own discernment of the good and responsibility for its implementation.

Similarly, the issue of responsibility is presented by Jesper Juul (1948-2019). He points out that the child is responsible for the sphere of his own senses, feelings and needs. As the child grows, responsibility in other areas of life comes in³⁴. The Danish pedagogue immediately warns against the naive conclusion that this approach results in children being able to "do everything their own way"³⁵. Instead, it is about recognizing the child's rights to their own needs, desires, experiences, feelings; looking at their needs from their point of view; responding to their actions with understanding without marginalizing your own position at the same time³⁶.

Based on the above examples, it can be concluded that the first way to justify the presence of ethical standards in education is to turn to the biological conditions of human development. It is worth noting that not all educators, representing this approach, explicitly present their methodological position, as, for example, E. Claparède did. It is much more common to speak of apriori presuppositionlessness, which in fact is rather a kind of ignorance. This problem was already pointed out by S. Hessen when he wrote that "the attempt to liberate pedagogy from its traditional dependence on philosophy and 'elevate' it to a true experimental science, even an experimental one, involves the postulate that the starting point in

³² Ibid., p. 22.

³³ Ibid., p. 32.

³⁴ J. Juul, *Twoje kompetentne dziecko. Dlaczego powinniśmy traktować dzieci poważniej?*, Wydawnictwo MiND, Podkowa Leśna 2012, p. 141.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 141.

³⁶ Cf. Ibid., p. 142.

education should be 'the child itself' and not the 'goals' set by adults. In this way, pedagogy falls into dependence on child physiology and psychology as sciences that do not go beyond the child, apprehended as a purely natural being"³⁷. Władysław Dawid (1859-1914) made similar statements when he wrote: "knowledge of the means, the causal relationship of things, the mechanism of action teaches us nothing about the purpose of action. [...] Psychology, experiential pedagogy reveals to us the laws governing spiritual life, makes us comprehend this life as a necessary relationship of certain causes, conditions, effects; but it does not say: what content and purpose we are to give to this life"³⁸. The statements presented above support the thesis that moving pedagogy away from philosophical considerations does not give it freedom from the normative dimension, but shifts it towards biological developmental considerations. They in themselves do not yet constitute ethical norms, but often this approach grows out of - not always explicitly declared - naturalism, which calls these very processes good³⁹, and this is already an ethical resolution.

The second way that allows the presence of ethical norms in upbringing (here it should be said more broadly: in pedagogy) is the positivist way of doing science itself and the associated methodology aimed at the search for reliable and objective knowledge⁴⁰, and at the same time capable of being "expressed in the language of mathematics"⁴¹. Hence, the reliability and objectivity of scientific cognition and its intercommunicative nature became the main ethical norms for practicing pedagogy. At first explicitly and only present in the so-called quantitative and then also qualitative research. Very soon the area of ethical issues related to the interference / presence of the researcher in various dimensions and areas of the private life of the subjects was also noted.

Józef Lipiec, addressing the issue of the presence of ethical principles in science in general, writes that: "obvious and historically unchanging (supra-historical) is the canon of ethical principles governing relations

³⁷ S. Hessen, *O sprzecznościach i jedności wychowania*, Wydawnictwo „Żak”, Warszawa 1997, p. 88.

³⁸ W. Dawid, *O duszy nauczycielstwa*, „Nasza Księgarnia”, Warszawa 1927, pp. 16-17.

³⁹ Cf. G.L. Gutek, *Filozofia dla pedagogów*, Pedagogika GWP, Gdańsk 2007, pp. 73-77.

⁴⁰ Cf. P. Magier, *Metateoria pedagogiki chrześcijańskiej*, Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, Lublin 2019, p. 61.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

within the world of science. They boil down to a just and honest accounting with all other researchers, according to the rule of 'to each what is due to him'"⁴². Addressing the issue of ethics in qualitative research, which falls most often within descriptive pedagogy, Uwe Flick points to three levels of this problem: the first is expressed in the fact that "the quality of research is a necessary condition for its ethical reliability"⁴³; the second shows that "ethical issues (data protection, concern for the welfare of respondents, respect for their views and privacy, etc.) are seen as aspects of the quality of qualitative research"⁴⁴. And third: "conducting research according to quality standards can affect ethical issues"⁴⁵. This includes, for example, a situation in which the conduct of an interview very much involves the respondent on the emotional and experiential side which causes a conflict between "methodological standards and ethical concern to mitigate the effects of confronting the research with certain aspects of their lives"⁴⁶. Sylwia Ciuk and Dominika Latusek-Jurczak emphasize that "no matter what the attitude of researchers to attempts to institutionalize ethical issues is, the postulate of the validity of ethics in practice is usually taken for granted"⁴⁷.

Based on the issues presented above, it should be noted that ethical standards are also present in descriptive pedagogy. However, they have, as a rule, a different justification. Most often, as S. Ciuk, D. Latusek-Jurczak note: "the importance of ethical issues in empirical research - both qualitative and quantitative - is reflected in numerous ethical codes and institutional regulations controlling the work of researchers"⁴⁸. Thus, this is the conventional way to justify ethical standards in pedagogy. On this basis, various types of ethical codes are created. This does not exclude the systematization of the norms given in the code around a single supreme norm (which is often the case), but the way of its selection and subsequent

⁴² J. Lipiec, *Etyka badań naukowych*, w: *Podstawy metodologii badań w pedagogice*, ed. S. Palka, Pedagogika GWP, Gdańsk 2010, pp. 362-363.

⁴³ U. Flick, *Jakość w badaniach jakościowych*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2011, p. 32.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ S. Ciuk, D. Latusek-Jurczak, *Etyka w badaniach jakościowych*, w: *Badania jakościowe*, red. D. Jemielniak, t. 1. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2012, p. 23.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

operationalization is essentially conventional. A number of codes on the activities of a pedagogue are cited by A. Zakrzewska⁴⁹ along with the analysis of their meaning and content.

The main feature of these standards is their weaker relationship to each other. In this situation, individual subdisciplines can inductively build their own set of them, which also allows to a greater extent for the occurrence of exceptional situations, that is, those that the assumed ethical standards do not cover.

Summary

Two different models of the presence of ethical standards in pedagogy and their justification will be presented to summarize the above analysis. The model - by virtue of the fact that it plays "an intermediary role both in terms of the creation of theory and in relation to practice"⁵⁰ - simplifies the studied reality to its essential elements. This, on the one hand, it allows for a clearer grasp of the relationships between the studied elements, but, on the other hand, it should be borne in mind that the model is an idealization of reality. With this caveat, one should also approach the two models presented below, which stem from the division into two ways of doing pedagogy: normative and descriptive. The models presented to justify the presence of ethical norms in pedagogy will indicate (1) the source of the standards, (2) how they are actualized in pedagogy, and (3) the characteristics of the system of ethical norms thus created.

1. Normative pedagogy assumes the paramount importance of ethics in the area of teleology (and axiology) of education. Thus, one can speak of: (ad 1) the exogenous origin of ethical norms, (ad 2) the deductive method as a way of realizing them in pedagogy, and (ad 3) the resulting coherent system of ethical norms with the indication of the supreme standard.

2. Descriptive pedagogy assumes a dissociation from ethics. As shown in the article, the adoption of such an assumption does not result in the absence of (ethical) norms in descriptive pedagogy, but another way of justifying it. In this situation, it is possible to speak of (ad 1) the endogenous origin of ethical standards, since they arise from the analysis of

⁴⁹ Cf. A. Zakrzewska, *Kodeks etyki nauczycielskiej – snobizm czy potrzeba?*, in: *Po co etyka pedagogom?*, ed. W. Sawczuk, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2007, pp. 283-291.

⁵⁰ F.W. Kron, *Pedagogika. Kluczowe zagadnienia*, GWP, Gdańsk 2012, p. 267.

the subject reality; (ad 2) the inductive way of their realization; and (ad 3) the conventional system of ethical standards, often expressed in the form of code.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BIESAGA T., *Sytuacjonizm etyczny*, w: *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, red. A. Maryniarczyk, t. 9, Polskie Towarzystwo św. Tomasza z Akwinu, Lublin 2006, s. 293-296.
- CIUK S., Latusek-Jurczak D., *Etyka w badaniach jakościowych*, w: *Badania jakościowe*, red. D. Jemielniak, t. 1. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2012, s. 23-40.
- CLAPARÈDE E., *Wychowanie funkcjonalne*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”, Warszawa 2006.
- Dawid W., *O duszy nauczycielstwa*, „Nasza Księgarnia”, Warszawa 1927.
- FLICK U., *Jakość w badaniach jakościowych*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2011.
- GÓRNIIEWICZ J., *Teoria wychowania (wybrane problemy)*, Olsztyn 2008.
- GUTEK G.L., *Filozofia dla pedagogów*, Pedagogika GWP, Gdańsk 2007.
- HESSEN S., *O sprzecznościach i jedności wychowania*, Wydawnictwo „Żak”, Warszawa 1997.
- HESSEN S., *Podstawy pedagogiki*, Wydawnictwo „Żak”, Warszawa 1997.
<https://sjp.pwn.pl/slowniki/usprawiedliwi%C4%87.html> [23.01.2020]
- JAEGER W., *Paideia*, t.1, Instytut Wydawniczy PAX, Warszawa 1962.
- JAROSZYŃSKI P., *Nauka*, w: *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, red. A. Maryniarczyk, t. 7, Polskie Towarzystwo św. Tomasza z Akwinu, Lublin 2006, s. 533-541.
- JEZIORAŃSKI M., *Indywidualne i społeczne cele wychowania religijno-moralnego*, „Ateneum Kapłańskie” 171(2018), z. 2(657), s. 257-268.
- JEZIORAŃSKI M., *Od wartości do powinności w ujęciu aksjologii personalistycznej*, w: *Życie wartościowe w perspektywie aksjologii pedagogicznej*, red. A. Cudowska, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Katedra, Gdańsk 2018, s. 81-91.
- JUUL J., *Twoje kompetentne dziecko. Dlaczego powinniśmy traktować dzieci poważnie?*, Wydawnictwo MiND, Podkowa Leśna 2012.
- KRON F.W., *Pedagogika. Kluczowe zagadnienia*, GWP, Gdańsk 2012.
- KRÜGER H.H., *Metody badań w pedagogice*, Pedagogika GWP, Gdańsk 2007.
- LIPIEC J., *Etyka badań naukowych*, w: *Podstawy metodologii badań w pedagogice*, red. S. Palka, Pedagogika GWP, Gdańsk 2010, s. 357-369.
- ŁOBOCKI M., *Teoria wychowania w zarysie*, Impuls, Kraków 2010.
- MAGIER P., *Esej postantypedagogiczny*, Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, Lublin 2016.
- MAGIER P., *Metateoria pedagogiki chrześcijańskiej*, Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, Lublin 2019.

- MAGIER P., *O potrzebie etyki w pedagogice*, „Forum Pedagogiczne” 2016/2 cz. 1, s. 155-167.
- MORSZCZYŃSKA U., *Normy w pedagogice. Aksjologiczne i metodologiczne wyznaczniki statusu zdań o powinnościach*, Księgarnia Akademicka, Kraków 2009.
- NAWROCYŃSKI B., *Zasady nauczania*, Ossolineum, Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków 1961.
- NOWAK M., *Teorie i koncepcje wychowania*, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa 2008.
- OKOŃ W., *Nowy słownik pedagogiczny*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”, Warszawa 2007.
- von SCHOENEBECK H., *Wolność od wychowania*, Impuls, Kraków 2008.
- SZOSTEK A., *Pogadanki z etyki*, Tygodnik Katolicki „Niedziela”, Częstochowa 2008.
- WOJTYŁA K., *Osoba i czyn*, Towarzystwo Naukowej KUL, Lublin, 2011.
- WORONIECKI J., *Katolicka etyka wychowawcza*, t. 1, Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, Lublin 1986.
- ZAKRZEWSKA A., *Kodeks etyki nauczycielskiej – snobizm czy potrzeba?*, w: *Po co etyka pedagogom?*, red. W. Sawczuk, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2007, s. 283-291.