



Jarosław Marzec*

Gdańsk

Education into identity: From „survival pedagogy” to „spiritual pedagogy”

KEYWORDS

survival pedagogy, spiritual pedagogy, educational discourse, Paolo Freire, Carl Rogers

ABSTRACT

Marzec Jarosław, *Education into Identity: From „survival pedagogy” to „spiritual pedagogy”*. Culture – Society – Education no 2(16) 2019, Poznań 2019, pp. 265–278, Adam Mickiewicz University Press. ISSN 2300-0422. DOI 10.14746/kse.2019.16.17.

I would like to present the general outlook on dominant tendencies within educational studies and shortly introduce my analysis in the context of so called „turning point” of educational discourse in the second half of XX century. I would like to propose to look at that moment of our actual cultural and educational field through two dominant perspectives and metaphors on which two different pedagogies are grounded. I would like to introduce two dominant metaphors within the educational field and the new tendencies, shortly how the educational studies shift from the „survival pedagogy” to the „spiritual pedagogy”. In general, this articulations founded in the mindful critics of educational practices undermine the cultural shift which is based on the process of abandon the tradition values, and the civilisation trends of development which generated the actual shape of culture to be exhausted. The great positivism project was adjected by the new generations of educators with new and fresh approach to the educational problems. At that moment it’s clear that we stand before the creation the new, alternative vision of the social world and culture in general. I would like to present the changes of that social process on the example XX-century pedagogy,

* ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0681-8295>.

which I hope is touched by that cultural transformation. I would like to concentrate on the educational discourse as a concrete area of such cultural shift. It's rather difficult to recognize the whole field of that revolutionary and alternative movement within our culture. In my text I would like to show the process of transition from „survival pedagogy” into „spiritual pedagogy”. As we simply know from the poststructural perspective each of educational interpretation operates in the social contexts has own definition of the aims, functions and tasks of education. After Michel Foucault works we can say that each of the educational discourse and interpretation is grounded in the cultural power/knowledge forces. The new generation of educators proposed new approach towards social analyses of educational aims and destination. In that movement the main aim of education is to build identity of pupils. There are of course many researchers shared that view on educational discourse eg. Zbyszko Melosik, Tomasz Szkudlare, Lech Witkowski, Zbigniew Kwieciński in Poland (to give only representative examples) and Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren in the United States. They proposed the new approach towards the understanding of education destination and obligations and broke the traditional interpretation. They rejected the traditional interpretation of „forming the reason” or „exercising the reason” as the main goal of education towards the popular culture and senses. And they based their interpretations on that aspect of identity construction process. I would like to propose in my text general outlook at the cultural shift within educational discourse as the transition from the metaphor of „survival pedagogy” towards the „spiritual pedagogy”. These metaphors also determined two different perspectives and approaches to education. I would argue that these perspectives are based on the two different anthropological visions and determine different pedagogies.

Introduction

In the contemporary cultural studies we used to treat almost all social phenomena as not the natural facts, but as cultural ones. That critical approach to cultural reality broke off with the traditional approach to them as uncritical truths. In contemporary culture we tend to free the world from the tradition testimony. As Linda Hutcheon (1989) the American cultural studies researcher says about de-naturalization of cultural phenomena to dispose of social claims to universalism and eternity. In XX century that process to free almost all phenomena from

the traditional approach as natural facts take place in the constructivism orientation of social sciences. Contemporary culture is submitted to the general process of change and almost all fields of culture are submitted to transformation. As the title of Fritjof Capra (1989) book points we stand before cultural „turning point” and radical cultural shift within educational discourse. I would like to express general intention in my text that dominant metaphors of educational discourse have radically been changed and shortly introduce my analysis in the context of so called „turning point” of educational discourse in the second half of XX century philosophy of education. I would like to propose to look at that moment of our actual cultural and educational field through two dominant perspectives and metaphors on which two different pedagogies are grounded. I would like to introduce two dominant metaphors within the educational field and the new tendencies, shortly how the educational studies shift from the „survival pedagogy” to the „spiritual pedagogy”. In general, this articulations founded in the mindful critics of educational practices undermine the cultural shift which is based on the process of abandon the tradition values, and the civilisation trends of development which generated the actual shape of culture to be exhausted. The great positivism project was rejected by the new generations of educators with new and fresh approach to the educational problems. At that moment it’s clear that we stand before the creation the new, alternative vision of the social world and culture in general. I would like to present the changes of that social process on the example XX-century pedagogy, which I hope is touched by that cultural transformation. I would like to concentrate on the educational discourse as a concrete area of such cultural shift. It’s rather difficult to recognize the whole field of that revolutionary and alternative movement within our culture. In my text I would like to show the process of transition from „survival pedagogy” into „spiritual pedagogy”.

Education as the cultural product

In the history of educational institutions there are different attempts to define its meaning and definitions of the process of education. From Greek *Paideia* to German *Bildung* the interpretations of the essence of education still in the Western civilisation are changed. It is possible of course to enumerate different conceptions of education in the history but I would like in my text propose another outlook. Besides enumerate the ideas and their interpretation and comparison in the history of educational discourse I would like to search through the XX century con-

ceptions of education and rather concentrate and emphasize the shift and radical qualitative change within the educational discourse.

As we simply know from the poststructural perspective each of educational interpretation operates in the social contexts has own definition of the aims, functions and tasks of education. After Michel Foucault works we can say that each of the educational discourse and interpretation is grounded in the cultural power/knowledge forces. The new generation of educators proposed new approach towards social analyses of educational aims and destination. In that movement the main aim of education is to build identity of pupils. There are of course many researchers shared that view on educational discourse eg. Zbyszko Melosik, Tomasz Szkudlarek, Lech Witkowski, Zbigniew Kwieciński in Poland (to give only representative examples) and Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren in the United States. They proposed the new approach towards the understanding of education destination and obligations and broke off the traditional interpretation. They rejected the traditional interpretation of „forming the reason” or „exercising the reason” as the main goal of education towards the popular culture and senses as the main identity constructions factors. And they based their interpretations on that aspect of identity construction process. I would like to propose in my text general outlook at the cultural shift within educational discourse as the transition from the metaphor of „survival pedagogy” towards the „spiritual pedagogy”. These metaphors also determined two different perspectives and approaches to education. I would argue that these perspectives are based on the two different anthropological visions and determine different pedagogies.

The main intention of my presentation is to find the crucial distinctions and differences between these pedagogies: „survival pedagogy” and „spiritual pedagogy”. I would like to present the „survival pedagogy” on the example of Paulo Freire critique of „bank education” which is typical example of that kind of educational discourse, and I would introduce the „spiritual pedagogy” perspective on the example of Carl Rogers vision of education. I would introduce main distinction of these perspectives grounded in two different anthropological foundations and also in the ending section I would recall the Zygmunt Bauman’s reflections about the education in the postmodern culture. As I suppose, that approach to the educational tradition can show how the different and unconscious practices produced two different kinds of pupils potentiality and determined the educational practices.

The conception of identity as a patchwork is a dominant idea in the instant culture (Bauman, 1995). But altogether with that shift the new approach appeared and after that several displacements in current understanding of the essence of

education. Contradictions as such like: carnal v. reason; emotions v. intellect; pleasure v. asceticism; freedom v. prison; emancipation v. vocation; meaning, interpretation, metaphor v. truth; surface v. deep structure have been deconstructed. But my interest in text tends towards description the meanings of dominant educational practices in the postmodernity. According to Jacques Derrida's deconstruction concept we know that is exactly the appreciation of weak element of the oppositional terms and drawing aside the structure in the deconstruction gesture allows us to reach to hidden, but not present and possible meanings, the marginalised one. The accent should be led on meanings, not one differentiated meaning of cultural phenomenon. Education is submitted to that exactly process as each of cultural institution. The meanings are created in language, but language itself has no outside. The meanings are discursively determined through the metanarratives in the closure of essence space. According to the linguistic turn in the social theory and poststructural studies we should treat it as an obvious and natural approach in the interpretation. There's always another possible outlook in the culture and other interpretation is possible, thus discursive articulations of meanings are in stake for discursive closure and dominant interpretations.

The meanings are created in language which is „living process” (Heidegger). This introductory part of my text should be seen as a closer look at the process of „movable metaphors” (Rorty, 1996), but not find interpretations as the regimes of truth (Foucault). As I argued education perceived as the process building identity- that's the understanding of education proposed by mentioned educators. In educational take place a discursive struggle of dominant metaphors. This section will be concentrated on the presentation about the evolutionary change which take place in unavoidable way in each branch of knowledge and also take place now in educational discourse. What causes that science after building and crystalizing solid theories again becomes the area of a revolutionary changes and re-build and re-construct theoretical foundations or setting. Why do educational theories and knowledge in general (scientific theories) again collapse into chaos? Are that processes constitutive for the logic of evolution? We should try to answer to these questions and theoreticians should seriously answer to them. This issue consists the central interest of Thomas Kuhn reconstructions of logic of scientific revolutions. He search for the reasons for the change in our narratives describing world. We can surely say that no one of theories would survive in our attempts of discovery the logic of the world. In my opinion also educational discourse is touched by the revolutionary tendencies during last few decades. It's seen in changes of scientific interests and topics, also in applied methodologies in educational research. In my text I would now, in concrete presentation, take into considerations shift of

educational discourse from the „survival pedagogy” to the „spiritual pedagogy”. There are not too many attempts in educational reflection such search for the trajectory of educational discourse transformations.

Poststructural movement in social theory is often characterized as radical and sceptical trend to redefiniate of Western traditional institutions and theoretical background. After Lyotard (1997) we used to think that in postmodern culture we lost our metanarratives as the fundamental convictions in our attempts to understand our condition in social and cultural contexts. We also lost the legitimization for our knowledge. The most critical movement concerns the questionization of rational subject by the French philosophers of that wing of philosophy. That's why school loses its foundations in metanarratives. As other important institutions school lost its foundations in metanarratives pillars. That's why the poststructural revolution accelerates the discussions about the future destination of school. The school as an institution lost the legitimization in the culture of exhausting rationality and was founded in rational philosophy which is now questionized. There were many possible answers to that facts when school lost central position and certainty : from the deschooling ideas of Ivan Illich to the conceptions of reform humanistic education. In my opinion we can look at the educational thought as a field of discursive struggle of two dominant perspectives creating and shaping the educational institutions and its meanings. In my opinion in the tradition of educational thought we can differentiate two perspectives: „survival pedagogy” and „spiritual pedagogy”. After each of the mentioned perspectives stands certain and coherent interpretation determined both its theoretical (formal and substantial) content and decide of its coherence and what's equal important determined also the social practice which can be conducted from such perspective. It's possible also to look at the whole history of pedagogical thought and whole epochs of the history we can also include into one of the mentioned perspectives. After each of that orientations follows the foundations as such important that we can call the relationship between them as the relationship of mutual exclusion. That means if we include the educational theory to one of the perspective that's clear that we cannot include it into another perspective.

The „survival pedagogy”

Critical educator and great revolutionary activist Paulo Freire used the concept of „bank education” to illustrate traditional vision of school and the oppressive character of traditional approach to education. According to Freire: „Education become

the act of deposition in which students are absorbing the deposit and teachers are depositarians” (Freire, 1992: 96). Freire writes later: „It’s bank conception of education in which the freedom of action consciousness to students reaches only that far as the process to receive, fulfillment and store the deposit contains” (Freire, 1992: 96). It’s true and students really have the opportunity to become „the collectors or specialists of cataloguing the contents which they store” (Freire, 1992: 96). In the bank concept of education knowledge is a gift from the people who treat themselves as better knowing that who treat students as knowing nothing” (Freire, 1992: 96). As Freire writes the bank concept of education become a tool of oppression. The oppressive character is rooted in several convictions as such as:

- 1) The teacher teaches and students are taught.
- 2) The teacher knows everything and students know nothing.
- 3) The teacher thinks and students are objects of his thought.
- 4) The teacher speak and students listen quietly.
- 5) The teacher disciplined students and students are disciplined.
- 6) The teacher chooses and force his choice and students obey his choice.
- 7) The teacher acts and students have an illusion of acting through the acts of the teacher.
- 8) The teacher chooses the teaching agenda and students (with who do not negotiate it) adopt to it.
- 9) The teacher mingles the authority of knowledge with his own professional authority, which he locates in the opposition to student freedom.
- 10) The teacher is the subject of the teaching process while students are only its objects. (Freire, 1992: 97).

The bank concept of education makes students as the adopted and menagable creatures. It’s true that in bank education disappears all the autonomized students activity. Freire writes: „The more effort the students make to deposit the giving deposit, the less they develop the critical consciousness which can appear from their ingestion to the world” (Freire, 1992: 97–98). The most they accept the impose passive role, „the strongest is tendency towards the adaptation to the world and fragmented image of reality which was in them deposited they store” (Freire, 1992: 98). That image serve to the interests of oppressors: „The ability of bank concept of education to avoid and invalidate the creative force of students and to stimulate their credulity serves the interests of oppressors who don’t care not for the reveal the world nor for the perceiving it as transformable” (Freire. 1992: 98). The bank concept of education „hides the efforts to create people as machines – completely deny their ontological appointment towards the desire for fulfillment humans dignity” (Freire, 1992: 99). For that perspective of education „the human

is not conscious being, but rather the depositarian of consciousness, the empty „mind” open to receive deposits of reality of outside world” (Freire, 1992: 99). The only response of student is to adopt to the social environment and to survive in the oppressed cultural reality.

The „spiritual pedagogy”

Carl Rogers is the outstanding figure on the map of contemporary thought and ideas, one of the greatest XX century humanistic psychologists. His role is of the great significance in dispersion the humanistic ideas to the field of education and other fields eg. business. He is the main source for the human potential movement outside the traditional psychotherapy. His ideas mature slowly, but the dominant tune of his works always is the care for the improvement the condition of student, client and teacher. Rogers’s ideas slowly destroy the wall in the sceptical imaginary of representatives of Western civilisation. His passion for propagate the humanistic ideas is unmeasurable. He enters into history of contemporary thought as the radical critique of narrow scientific style of psychology and radiacally promotes the value of freedom in psychological discourse. His revolutionary approach has also been expressed in the reflection about the future of the institutionalized education. His question if the school can be and under what conditions will become the place for selfrealisation for students and teachers is submitted to the world discussions about future of that crucial institution for survival of Western civilisation. His concept of student-centered education inspires the representatives of alternative approach to education as a starting point to take into account the good student itself to make him a subject, not only the object of oppressive actions. As a matter of facts the Rogersian educational project is the response to the overintellectualized education in which there’s no opportunity for selfrealisation and creativness. The traditional education has become the place of reproduction of knowledge to deposit of the dominant habitus and the students have lost the opportunity to develop the human potentials to full human dignity. School is not more a place for selfrealisation for students and teachers. That mindfull and sensible remark of his own educational path has become the beggining in search the alternative humanistic educational project. He is aware that school should become the friendly and attractive for the new generation. The silent revolution of Rogers’s approach to education appears from the conclusion that if can not suppress the education in traditional understanding (that he often in radical way proposed!) we should change it and it should be deeply reformed. His whole activity in that matter concerning

the future of school institution Rogers agree that we must respect some condition to build the institution for students selfrealisation and for personal growth. Rogers deeply anxious about the future of school writes: „Have we got enough strength and resolutness to use our knowledge and skills in reforming the educational institutions?” (Rogers, 2002b: 278). He was deeply convicted about the necessity of reforming schools: „I strongly believe that innovative humanistic experiencing teaching in the school will be acceptable for the future of school” (Rogers, 2002b: 275). Carl Rogers was conscious about the dangers of traditional (bank education in Freire view) for the society as a whole: „Unproportional concentration on ideas and confine to „education above the neck has serious social consequences” (Rogers, 2002b: 280). That model of education can only promote the passive individuals and withdraw critical necessary competencies to question the actual social life. Rogers during his whole life fights with this type of education. The „bank concept” of education was strongly attacked in his works. But on the contrary Rogers positively response to that critique and assume that school can be a friendly place for students and they can independly create their dognity to human potentials. The traditional education completely disowned the affective students sphere. Rogers writes: „The mind can go to school, but body can be definitively pulled, but emotions and feelings can be expressed freely only outside the school” (Rogers 2002b: 285). One more remark of Rogers critique of traditional education: „Only because of our fragmented cognitive education we know facts, but we don’t feel our knowledge (experience)” (Rogers, 2002b: 286).

The traditional school suffers from the deficit of meaning and from the basic sense of living for the students. The positive part of Rogers view in the context of authentic education is proceeding another one negative confession: „In the traditional educational system there is no place for the „whole” person, but only for intelect” (Rogers, 2002b: 287).

The Rogersian vision of authentic humanistic education that is the student-centered education broke off such overintellectualization of school. Rogers asks that qquestion directly: „Can the teaching concerned both ideas and emotions?” (Rogers, 2002b: 290). Rogers exactly compared and opposed two models of education: the traditional one and the student-centered approach. I would like to enumerare the main characteristics of traditional model of education (there’re to some extension the similarities with bank concept of education):

- 1) The teacher own knowldge and students must be its receivers.
- 2) Lecture and other verbal means of knowledge transmission have to be the main means to absorb knowldge.
- 3) The teachers have power , students obey the power.

- 4) The mutual trust is minimum.
- 5) The surrenders (students) are governed efficiently when they are maintained to the constant state of fear or often intimidated.
- 6) The democracy and its values are ignored in practice.
- 7) In traditional model of education there's no place for the „whole” person, only for the intellect. (Rogers, 2002a: 307–309).

Besides of enumerate the main characteristic of traditional model of education Rogers also formulated his own vision for educational project „students-centered education”. There are main characteristics of the students-centered education in Carl Rogers's version:

- 1) Leaders are the persons perceived as the authority in a given situation feel in their roles and in relationship with others safe enough to trust others possibility to learn from themselves. If that condition is respected, there is a possibility to realize others conditions and usually it reaches that point.
- 2) The facilitators of learning process share with others -students and if only possible with parents or community- the responsibility for the learning process.
- 3) The facilitators in the learning process deliver materials-the own experienced resources from books and other sources or community experiences.
- 4) The students learn individually or in collaborative with others and create own teaching programmes.
- 5) The positive climate of teaching is supplied.
- 6) The aim is to sustain the continuity for learning process. The lesson is not finished with success if students learn what they have to learn but only when they make progress in learning how to learn what they want to learn.
- 7) In order to achieve their own aims students should practice selfdiscipline perceived by them and accepted as personal responsibility.
- 8) The evaluation of the scale and significance and progress of learning is made by students and such selfevaluation can be enriched by carefully remarks from the members of group or facilitator.
- 9) The learning in the atmosphere facilitation of growth is deeper, appears earlier and knowledge attained in that way is much more existentially valuable than in the traditional classroom. (Rogers, 2002b: 311–313).

As it comes from the characteristics of the mentioned two models of education Rogers was not only the critique of the traditional model of education, that was done by many contemporary critics of education, but as one of a few of them on the contrary in the discussion about the future of education he created own educational project of student -centered education. That project can be character-

ized as deep experienced knowledge about the mechanisms accelerated individual growth. It engage whole person and not only fragmented person. The values of emotions in the learning educational project consists one of the most important feature of the original educational project.

Carl Rogers life philosophy is often ascribe into stream of existential philosophy and he was also inspired by Soren Kiergaard works, but not only. Also by Marrtin Buber personalism and there are also some chinese influences in his life philosophy. His vision and educational project comes the deep bound with other human being. It's bound on the foundation that deep communication and the possibility to authentic expressions of emotions and emphatic understanding own life has great emancipatory significance in our growth. Rogers educational project can be perceived as a path of selfrealisation. According to Rogers view in the deep revolutionary revival of education can sustain the civilisation survival. That's the optimistic message of Rogers view in the discussions about the future of educational institutions. That's optimistic message because during his life the American education was influenced by his vision and have radically been changed and reformed.

Conclusion

The revolution in social sciences is grounded in simple conviction that „social facts” have meanings and in the constructivism perspective social actors create own meanings to social facts. The cultural transformation from the second half of XX century required also from educators assertion that education and social researchers can not describe educational reality in the traditional fashion and languages. That's why educational researchers seek for new languages to articulate the complexity of educational reality. That turn towards others field of cultural activity demands new outlook and researchers used the analysis from cultural studies and philosophy. In the Western culture those both mentioned educational metaphors compete and are still competing. As the metaphor of „survival pedagogy” lost its attraction for the researchers after antipositivism turn within social sciences because of the collapse of faith for the extraordinary science mission (scientism) and its emancipatory potential of legitimization our educational practices. The other one metaphor of „spiritual pedagogy” yet not gains so solid support and recognition as the first used to have. We are now at the moment between the falling authority of the „survival pedagogy” metaphor lost trust to scientific vision of the world, and slowly increasing interests for the opposite metaphor of „spiritual

pedagogy". It is now attractive for educational practitioners. Thus there is radical displacement of educational discourse and we are witnessing mentioned in the beginning of my text so called „turning point" of educational discourse. The departing from the central position of research investigations the positivism orientation and the metaphor of „survival pedagogy" is grounded in mechanical anthropological conception of human being as rational machine. Altogether with this anthropological reduction vision of human nature- and as critics called that orientation- altogether with that Cartesian vulgar claim the social researchers (and also educational studies) were seduced by objective scientific research methods which give the conceptual background for the paradigm of „survival pedagogy" in the unfamiliar materialistic world and to conquer it and altogether to build rational world for rational human being. As the consequence there were the alienation of human being and researchers ignoring the complexity of social and also educational sphere. On the contrary the metaphor of „spiritual pedagogy" is based on that whole disowned aspects of metanarratives with which modern culture does not want to identify.

Table 1. Comparison survival pedagogy and spiritual pedagogy

SURVIVAL PEDAGOGY	SPIRITUAL PEDAGOGY
Monological	polillogical
Homogenization	hybridization
Stable	moveable
Cultural transmission	selfrealisation
Truth regimes	inetrpreation/meaning
One reality	multiply realities
Heteronomy	autonomy
Epistemic perspective	apistemological perspective

This perspective is based on the marginalised and colonized elements of the structural oppositions which determined the cultural productin of accepted meanings. The „survival pedagogy" is build on the strongest, positively intepreted elements as such as Reason and Truth. The „spiritual pedagogy" recalled what were located through the history of modern times on the margins of cultural considerations and what were disowned from the accepted discourse as anti-rational and served as the mirror by the requiring his identity by official discourse. And now we are witnessing great reconstallations of Western tradition used to call of reason orientation as logocentrism (the notin of Derrida and Baudrillard) as colonization by the Cartesian anthropological claim. In the trend of „spiritual

pedagogy” the human being is perceived as a unity: the reason and thinking are important as well as the body and emotions. The perspective of „spiritual pedagogy” inscribed clear to the constructivism projects which confirms the truth about human freedom in creation the culture and social world in the process of negotiation of meanings alive in cultural articulations. If the „survival pedagogy” served only to the simple adaptation to cultural order of meanings, the „spiritual pedagogy” give the tools to create, questionalized the cultural order of meanings, to ceate own sets of meanings and mobilize the human to the self-creation efforts. In that perspective we have grounded conviction about emancipation from the limits of cultural patterns of symbolic habitas, determinations, attitudes and values which have to be grasp to give them chance to exist but only on our own conditions.

Bibliography

- Barker Ch. (2005), *Studia kulturowe. Teoria i praktyka*, Kraków.
- Bauman Z. (1996), *Etyka ponowoczesna*, Warszawa.
- Bauman Z. (2008), Edukacja: wobec, wbrew i na rzecz ponowoczesności, [in:] Z. Bauman, *Zindywidualizowane społeczeństwo*, Gdańsk.
- Biesta G.. (2005), Against learning. Reclaiming a language for educatin in an age of learning, *Nordisk Pedagogik* vol. 25, pp. 54–66.
- Biesta G.. (2006), *Beyond Learning. Democratic Education for a Human Future*, London.
- Biesta G.. (2007), Why „what works” won’t work: evidence-based practice and the democratic deficit in educational research, *Educational Theory* vol. 57, no. 1.
- Biesta G.. (2010), Education, weakness, the soul and truth: Five reminders about the basic questions of education, *Ars Educandi* vol. VII.
- Capra F. (1989), *Punkt zwrotny*, Warszawa.
- Denzin N., Lincoln Y. (2009), *Jakościowe metody badawcze*, Warszawa.
- Foucault M. (1993), *Nadzorować i karać*, Warszawa.
- Foucault M. (1995), *Historia seksualności*, Warszawa.
- Freire P. (1992), „Bankowa” koncepcja edukacji jako narzędzie opresji, [in:] K. Blusz, *Edukacja i wyzwolenie*, Kraków.
- Giddens A. (2006), *Nowoczesność i tożsamość. „Ja” i społeczeństwo w epoce późnej nowoczesności*, Warszawa.
- Hutcheon L. (1989), *The Politics of Postmodernism*, London.
- Kohlberg L., Meyer Ch. (1993), Rozwój jako cel wychowania, [in:] Z. Kwieciński, L. Witkowski, *Spory o edukację. Dylematy i kontrowersje we współczesnych pedagogiach*, Toruń.
- Lewartowska-Zychowicz M. (2010), *Homo liberalis jako projekt edukacyjny. Od emancypacji do funkcjonalności*, Kraków.
- Lyotard J.F. (1997), *Kondycja ponowoczesna*, Warszawa.
- Marzec J. (2002), *Dyskurs, tekst i narracja. Szkice o kulturze ponowoczesnej*, Kraków.

- Marzec J. (2010), O samorealizacji w epoce instant, *Teraźniejszość – Człowiek – Edukacja* no. 2.
- Marzec J. (2011a), Ken Wilber – pasja rozwoju, *Przegląd Pedagogiczny* no. 2.
- Marzec J. (2011b), Polityka religijności w epoce instant, *Forum Oświatowe* no. 2.
- Marzec J. (2012), Duchowość, tożsamość i edukacja, *Forum Oświatowe* no. 2.
- Melosik Z. (1996), *Teksty kulturowe jako (kon)teksty pedagogiczne*, Poznań.
- Melosik Z. (1997), Postmodernizm jako teoria życia społecznego, *Kultura Współczesna*, Numer specjalny.
- Melosik Z. (2001), Teoria i społeczne konstruowanie rzeczywistości, *Teraźniejszość – Człowiek – Edukacja*, Numer specjalny.
- Melosik Z. (2006), *Krzyżys męskości w kulturze współczesnej*, Kraków.
- Melosik Z. (2010), *Tożsamość, ciało i władza w kulturze instant*, Kraków.
- Rogers C. (2002a), *Sposób bycia*, Poznań.
- Rogers C. (2002b), *O stawianiu się osobą*, Poznań.
- Rorty R. (1996), *Przygodność, ironia i solidarność*, Warszawa.
- Szkudlarek T. (1993), *Wolność i wiedza w pedagogice amerykańskiego postmodernizmu*, Kraków.
- Szkudlarek T. (1997a), Edukacja i tożsamość, *Kultura Współczesna*, Numer specjalny.
- Szkudlarek T. (1997b), Poststrukturalizm a metodologia pedagogiki, *Socjologia Wychowania* is. 317.
- Szkudlarek T. (1999), *Media. Szkic z filozofii i pedagogiki dystansu*, Kraków.
- Szkudlarek T. (2001), Ekonomia i etyka: przemieszczenia dyskursu edukacyjnego, *Teraźniejszość – Człowiek – Edukacja*, Numer specjalny.
- Szkudlarek T. (2005), Globalizacja, ekonomia i edukacja: o metaforze ludzkiego kapitału w polityce oświatowej, [in:] E. Malewska, B. Śliwerski (eds.), *Pedagogika i edukacja wobec nowych wspólnot i różnic w jednoczącej się Europie*, Kraków.
- Szkudlarek T. (ed.) (2013), *Education and the Political: New Theoretical Articulations*, Rotterdam.