

<http://dx.doi.org/10.16926/pe.2025.18.06>

Marta KRUPSKA

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9990-5683>

University of the National Education Commission, Krakow, Poland

Contact: marta.krupska@uken.krakow.pl

How to cite [jak cytować]: Krupska, M. (2025). The Pedagogical Relationship – in Search of Responsibility for the Process of Changing the Face of Suffering Experience. *Podstawy Edukacji*, 18, 91–102.

The Pedagogical Relationship – in Search of Responsibility for the Process of Changing the Face of Suffering Experience

Abstract

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE: The article focuses on the issue of pedagogical relations discussed among researchers inspired by Max van Manen's concept of 'phenomenology of practice'. To what extent does restoring the importance of pedagogical relations in pedagogy matter in relation to reflections on changes in education and care, as well as socio-cultural change? Reflect on this issue from the perspective of pedagogical seeing or pedagogical community. **PROBLEM AND RESEARCH METHODS:** The research method used in this work is content analysis (Babbie, 2008, pp.168-169). Publications in which concepts such as 'pedagogical seeing', 'pedagogical community' and the issue of moral disquiet, closely related to the pedagogical relationship, are brought to the fore, will play a special role in the presented issue. **PROCESS OF REASONING** The main part of the issue developed in the article concerns suffering, fragility, otherness and the place for the pedagogical relationship in the reflection developed by researchers such as Max van Manen, and in particular Tone Saevi and her colleagues, including Andrew Foran, Tone Eikland. The beginning of building a pedagogical relationship is the awareness of one's own 'incompleteness,' lack of perfection, and constant journey towards maturity. It is the ability to distinguish between what is pedagogical and what is non-pedagogical. The profound meaning of change, which can be sourced from the pedagogical relationship, will be revealed in the process of discovering the meaning of the experience of fragility or disability in the relationship between the caregiver and the care recipient. **RESULTS OF SCIENTIFIC ANALYSIS:** Understanding otherness and suffering is a process of deepening the capacity for pedagogical seeing. Pedagogical seeing is an embodied perception of

people and situations that somehow reveal not only what we see, but how we see. This is important, especially when the gaze of a teacher or carer, intentionally or not, tells the student something meaningful about how their uniqueness, otherness, or weakness is seen. A guardian of change is someone who preserves the personal experience of a person's fragility and suffering. They reflect on the human experience of fragility and suffering, which is part of our existence, and make it a significant dimension of human maturity and the foundation for community building. CONCLUSION: this pedagogical relationship is the source of individual and social change, and above all, change in care and education. We need a pedagogical seeing, which is guarded by the ability to experience and understand moral disquiet and concern for the presence of trust in interpersonal and social relationships

Keywords: pedagogical relation, pedagogical seeing, change, vulnerability, moral disquiet, pedagogical community, trust.

Introduction

The starting point for these reflections is the European tradition of human science research, which tends to blur the boundaries between school and home, professional and non-professional bonding with children, referring to the cultivation of the inner life or soul of a child or young person, and the introduction to culture, tradition and humanism (Friesen, Saevi, 2010, p. 126). The essence of this European tradition is not based on theoretical concepts or the development of methods of their doctrines, but on living relationships, felt, experienced, existentially described and interpreted. The lived and alive experience of the meeting and relationship between the child and the adult, the caregiver and the care recipient, precedes the methods and procedures associated with education in the guise of pedagogical intention and deeply tests pedagogical practice and reflection, challenging it (Saevi, 2011; Foran, Olson, 2008).

The article focuses on one of the important contemporary approaches to the concept of pedagogical relations, which developed on the basis of phenomenological pedagogy. The roots of this concept can be found in the thought of one of the most important contemporary researchers in this field, Max van Manen. This concept strongly and multifacetedly confronts us with the awareness that pedagogy 'draws' us into the ethical dimension of human experience, allowing us to distinguish between good and evil in reflection and practice, between what is just and supportive, what serves the development of personality and the improvement of life, what allows us to go through suffering and crisis, from what is destructive, unjust or harmful in our way of acting and forming a pedagogical alliance with the child. This constant attempt to restore the humanistic dimension in pedagogy is also confirmed by the persistent insistence that pedagogy is an experience of good and a way to discover its meaning (Van Manen, 2015, p. 20). Reflection on the relationship with the otherness and suffering of a child or care recipient cannot lead us in any other direction than towards such an alliance with them.

Can methods, techniques, procedures be a real source of change in education and care? Criticism of contemporary education is often based on the assumption that schools do not prepare students to respond to local and global realities and needs. On the one hand, relationships between teachers and students have become something obvious. On the other hand, in pedagogical reflection, the pedagogical relationship often escapes attention. Past experiences can often reveal and capture what is unexpressed in moments that are taken for granted. Therefore, phenomenological sensitivity is needed (Foran, Robinson, Eliffsen, Munro, Thurber, 2020, p. 39). The main part of the issue developed in the article deals with reflection on the pedagogical relationship as a source of change. In approaching this topic, we will focus on the meaning in the process of individual and, consequently, social change of concepts such as ‘pedagogical seeing’ and ‘pedagogical community’.

Educational relationship and ethical responsibility

The environment created by researchers inspired by Max van Manen’s ideas persistently asks what is hidden at the very source of the pedagogical relationship as a ‘promise’ for the theory and practice of education? Contemporary discourse in this area is affected by the increasing barrenness of ethical content. We are aware of the destructive tendencies to move ever deeper towards totalizing rationality. As a result, we face a permanent threat to the unique meaning hidden in the concepts of pedagogy and pedagogical relationship (Van Manen, 2015, pp. 42–45). Creating such a space, Max van Manen points out, would require that the individual and social activities around which educational institutions are “organized” give them the opportunity to remain democratic and pedagogical. Professional wisdom would mean recognizing that the fundamental concept of education cannot be created within the current technical-rational framework (Van Manen, 1999, pp. 85–89). It is also difficult to build a mature concept of individual and social change within this framework.

It is worth highlighting the term of ‘pedagogical seeing’ as a source of change. Initiating individual and social change is a process of deepening the capacity for pedagogical vision. What does it mean to ‘see pedagogically’? Tone Saevi points out that it is about understanding and experiencing the relationship with the student in accordance with specific pedagogical and ethical standards. To see a student pedagogically means to serve the good and to be oriented towards understanding the pedagogical good of one’s own or others’ actions with respect for the life of that particular child. The effort to see a child pedagogically in this sense is the main challenge for a teacher. In a way, pedagogical seeing understood in this way is an unachievable goal due to the complexity and un-

predictability of the pedagogical relationship. To see with pedagogical eyes means to practice pedagogy as a way of being and acting that will follow the student or care recipient, intentionally directing oneself towards helping, caring for and supporting his or her personal and educational growth (Saevi, Foran, 2012, pp. 2–3).

The term ‘seeing’ appears in various contexts of everyday human life. This small word ‘to see’, anatomically related to the organ of sight, conceals a range of meanings, intentions and possibilities of interpretation that help to express the enormous diversity of the human condition. Beyond seeing people, things, nature and art with our physiological organ of sight, often with the help of other senses, we seem to be able to ‘see’ thoughts, reflections, ideas, memories, images, dreams and fantasies. Experience shows that there are ways (‘modalities’) of seeing that are not solely physiological in nature, even if some of them assume this to be the case. For educators, this particular concept of seeing and the different ways of seeing the world contribute to the essential meaning of pedagogical seeing (Saevi, Foran, 2012, pp. 2–3).

There are many ways in which the phenomenon of seeing, understood in this way, is deeply experienced and reveals successive layers of meaning. The diversity of physiological, mental, literal, metaphorical, concrete and measurable ways of seeing are well known to our way of being, which is based on what is empirically experienceable and based on imagination and intuition. Tone Saevi and Andre Foran emphasize that seeing, in a more ontological sense, is a way of being in the world. It is the embodied perception of people and situations that somehow reveals not only what we see, but how we see. A teacher’s gaze, intentionally or not, tells the student something meaningful about how their uniqueness, otherness, weakness – or, for example, disability – is seen (Saevi, Foran, 2012, pp. 2–3).

Accepting what is difficult: suffering, weakness, disability or a different way of perceiving and experiencing the world is a significant part of the discourse in the area of the concept of pedagogical relations of researchers focused on the idea of ‘phenomenology of practice’ and drawing on the tradition of human science research, such as Tone Saevi. Reflection on these phenomena is closely linked to reflection on otherness. Let us recall some of her reflections on disability.

Relationship in the experience of suffering – does weakness still exist?

When reflecting on the pedagogical relationship as a source of change, it is worth asking about our attitude towards fragility, weakness and suffering. Tone Saevi devotes a lot of space in her intellectual work to the experience of disabil-

ity. How is disability perceived pedagogically? People with special educational needs are assigned various labels. Despite socio-political and educational efforts aimed at inclusion and an attitude characterized by the pursuit of egalitarianism in our culture, there is no doubt that the situation of certain specific groups of students is still different (Saevi, 2004, pp. 43–44). The pedagogical atmosphere, understood, among other things, as the general attitude of the rest of society, is a challenge for this group and raises questions for everyone. It is a source of many new pedagogical issues. These changing circumstances, as well as the call for equal treatment of every human condition, raise fundamental human (anthropological) questions. Some of them are new, some are old, but often forgotten. One of them is the question of the distribution of power. This raises fundamental human (anthropological) issues. Some of them are new, some are old but often forgotten. One of them is the issue of power distribution (Saevi, 2004, pp. 43–44).

Tone Saevi points out that in the pedagogical discourse around suffering, weakness or disability, we cannot limit ourselves to an interest in empowerment, strengthening positions, political correctness or teaching theories and pedagogical methods of education in special education. What is important here is to focus on the embodied, at least in part inexpressible and indescribable experience of being together as a student with an experience of suffering or disability and a teacher in a pedagogical meeting. Can disability be seen pedagogically in some way? How can pedagogy truly meet ethical and pedagogical challenges and bring out the qualities and values associated with every pedagogical meeting by confronting it with the experience of disability? What does this confrontation offer in terms of understanding what the experience of disability is? (Saevi, 2004, pp. 43–44).

As she emphasizes, the entire European pedagogical tradition has produced an innumerable number of books, dissertations and articles on the pedagogical meeting. Yet, to a very small extent, they are focused on discovering the meaning of the experience of fragility or disability in the relationship between student and teacher. Part of this experience is learning about disability. Research mentioned by Tone Saevi confirms that people who are somehow on the sidelines because of different needs experience being outside and inside at the same time. They experience being citizens of two cultures. This lack of a place is more debilitating and destructive than, for example, the lack of an organ. The problem of being different, a situation in which someone does not fully meet certain universal standards, was solved by access to rehabilitation, which would bring the person back to a state consistent with standards considered 'normal'. (Saevi, 2004, p. 104).

Tone Saevi points out that people with disabilities are programmed to 'dissolve', to disappear. Rehabilitation marks the appearance of a culture that at-

tempts to bring about the end of identification, making everyone 'the same'. This act causes people with disabilities to disappear, and with them everything that is 'lacking', that is 'not enough', disappears in a stubborn social assimilation, dissolving into a larger, single social world that is the same for everyone and serves as a point of reference for everyone. Society is becoming increasingly rigid, manifesting itself through the denial of differences and otherness in the name of social equality (Saevi, 2004, p. 22).

She points out that it is important to highlight a certain contradiction here: the process of empowerment and independence, which supports the strengthening of personal freedom and the right to make choices, as well as the ideal of independent living, somehow removes the concepts of 'weak' and 'needy' from social and pedagogical language. In this sense, the belief that no one should be 'weak' or 'needy' is promoted. Does "weakness" still exist? Or is it just a creation of social welfare, behind which there may be good intentions, but also paternalism? What if some of us are still 'weak' even if, in an optimal perspective, we should not be? Are weakness and suffering not rather a personal experience than a specific concept that defines individuals or social groups? Does the experience of human fragility no longer exist simply because of the introduction of specific social and educational reforms (Saevi, 2004, pp. 43–44). Or perhaps fragility, 'weakness' and dependence are phenomena that are simply part of human experience, regardless of the social structures or procedures that serve to support us? – she asks.

Is focusing on the progressive features of social reforms sufficient for pedagogical awareness? Personal human experiences, despite their political and social immediacy, do not discontinue to exist but will manifest themselves as if 'socially expressed'. Diversity in the realm of human conditions cannot be separated from personal experience; it can only take on various social forms, hiding behind them, as it were. Standards and procedures seem to insist on extinguishing our personal experience. Yet experiences such as suffering, fragility or sensitivity cannot be standardized, even if some still seem convinced that standardized knowledge describes the only reality that exists (Saevi, 2004, pp. 33–34). The pedagogical relationship is experienced by those who preserve the personal experience of the individual. It approaches the human experience of fragility and suffering, which is part of our existence, and makes it a significant dimension of human maturity and the foundation for community building.

1. Pedagogical community

Following Max van Manen and Tone Saevi, we can see that the pedagogical relationship is not something that one 'has', a set of tools that one "possesses",

just as one can 'possess' a set of specific or performative competences. The relationship is something that the teacher must save, bring out again, restore, recapture by recalling it. So, what must they save? They must save the experience of the pedagogical community. The pedagogical community needs attentiveness and a specific fullness, completeness of the relationship of pedagogical good. In Tone Saevi's pedagogical thought, the concept of pedagogical good has its own significant position (Saevi, Eilifsen, 2008, pp. 1–15).

Pedagogical practice is unity, a sense of connection, and community. It is hidden in the relationship and understood as a personal, normative, asymmetrical and responsible meeting between teacher and student. Pedagogy is seen as a form of community, of being together, of cooperation, enabling the emergence and realization of the student's human and educational potential. The teacher cannot create it without the student's consent. Responsibility for pedagogical practice must be redefined by teachers when they meet their students in new pedagogical situations (Saevi, 2004, p. 17). This is the basis for a conversation about authority.

In the conversation about otherness and suffering, we address the issue of living pedagogical and ethical relationality as fundamental to education and essentially going far beyond the procedure of delivering and receiving knowledge as a routine legitimized by specific procedures. Education is often understood primarily as a set of political and social ideas and structures and forms of student organization in educational institutions, as well as an appropriate form of articulation of a certain philosophy of culture and civilization, expressed in goals formulated with a view to preparing the younger generation to face the challenges of an unpredictable future. However, it should be emphasized that phenomenological and existential pedagogy primarily sees education as an intentional relational practice based on pedagogical ethics and directed towards the unique life experience of a particular young person in order to support their entire personal life and way of experiencing it (Saevi, 2004, p. 18). Let us return once again: the act of building relationships is a process that manifests itself in the act of care.

The act of care, like the pedagogical relationship as such, is intentionally directed towards the good of the child; otherwise, we would not be talking about care or pedagogy. Pedagogy, in the first instance, is not a concept that refers to the relationship between the child, the care recipient and the adult/caregiver as a relationship within the system in which the teaching process is organized, but rather a certain existentially characterized type of community that allows something personal to grow between them, something that is permanent, though often smouldering only with quality (Saevi, 2004, p. 19). From the child's perspective, the relationship with the teacher/caregiver is experienced as an experience of community with them – in community with others.

2. Can moral disquiet still be a source of change?

Pedagogical seeing is guarded by the ability to experience and understand moral disquiet and concern for the presence of trust in interpersonal and social relationships. In the article, *What is Moral Disquiet and How Does the Experience of Moral Disquiet Appear in Professional Human Practices? Facing Responsibility in Nursing, Teaching, and Caring* by Tone Saevi and Helene Tornsteinson. As the researchers point out, Bauman recognizes that contemporary societies are changeable, drifting, associated with what is unstable and temporary – not only roles and responsibilities, but also relationships. In this kind of ‘leaky’ society, where change is permanent, loyalty to the rules of the system and pre-planned regulations are often in conflict, and where both the existence of the natural world and human beings can be threatened and exposed to suffering (Saevi, Tornsteinson, 2022, p. 79).

In some way, the foundation of humanity, the irreplaceable individual responsibility and gentleness, is increasingly being replaced by interchangeable role players who immediately fill the gap I have left. This is a very visible process in which responsibility is dispersed and often ‘rests’ in the role rather than the person. Individual responsibility is blurred in an overgrown system of rules, regulations and recommendations subject to control. This seemingly allows uncertainty and ambiguity to be controlled. Human morality thus seems to be increasingly overshadowed by a kind of alienation of human existence, which mixes the real with the formal, separates substance from form, and reduces pluralism to a single uniform (Saevi, Tornsteinson, 2022, p. 79).

The authors point out that their concern in their reflection is the living meaning of moral anxiety in nursing, teaching, and in any professional practice centered on the category of care. Here, we immediately touch upon the question of professional relationships in institutions of culture, education and care. It is about the forms of human activity undertaken by professionals working with people who, for various reasons and to varying degrees, find themselves in situations that reveal human suffering and fragility. It is about an experience we are all familiar with: being a child, a patient, a person with a disability. Tone Saevi and Helen Eikland are interested in the lived experience of moral anxiety among young professionals in the fields of education, social work and nursing – people who enter into this type of relationship (Saevi, Tornsteinson, 2022, pp. 79–80).

Usually, in these institutions, relationships are based on (and can embody) control and power. They can therefore easily become authoritative, asymmetrical and even authoritarian and hierarchical. Within institutional responsibility and loyalty to a certain, universally binding discourse, rules and regulations, the true meaning of caring for human beings may be lost. Reflecting on the issue of moral anxiety as a phenomenon that is present in our professional practice, at

the heart of which is the relationship, can help us move towards a reflective and sensitive practice. As a moral phenomenon, anxiety is present as a reality that feeds our caring (protective) sensitivity and effort.

Relationality is at stake and at the heart of experiences where there is a sense of anxiety on behalf of others. The caregiver remains between uncertainty and self-blame. Perhaps the awareness of what is different, what is beyond us, and the ability to be disturbed by what puts our self-centered lives on hold is an experience that can cause anxiety. We may experience not knowing what to do when confronted with something we have not experienced before. In this situation, we feel encouraged to interrupt our presence and actions for someone or something other than ourselves. Not interrupting it becomes a powerful source of change (Saevi, Tornsteison, 2022, pp. 82–83). The reflections of Tone Saevi and Helene Torsteinson do not provide solutions or answers to the question of how we should understand moral anxiety as an important topic for educational practice. We do not have absolute certainty about how to deal with disturbing situations when working with others in professional practice, or how to determine whether moral anxiety is healthy in this situation and whether it will be a source of a healthy (good) lifestyle. Anxiety is a phenomenon that reveals itself to us, appearing before our eyes and senses based on our own assumptions. We may wish that we had not seen what we saw, that we did not have to witness what another person is subjected to (Saevi, Tornsteison, 2022, p. 86).

Our anxiety pulls us out of the state we are in and brings the other person into our sphere of responsibility. Most often, we are not prepared for the ‘disturbance’ caused by the other person’s situation, and when this happens, we feel deeply insecure. Sometimes we miss the opportunity to act. Or we are left with the feeling that we could have acted differently. Nevertheless, moral anxiety must be recognized as something that has meaning for understanding and deepening professional relationships. How so? To truly understand human relationships in professional practice, we must remember that this is not about a problem that needs to be solved, dealt with permanently, or taken care of once and for all in an effective way. It is not primarily about having recipes or routinely used strategies. Rather, it is about the fact that practice in this area consists of moments and events that open up possibilities and offer us moments of humanity. Every moment in the process of professional activity hides a new opportunity, a new time, a new stage (Saevi, Tornsteison, 2022, pp. 86–87).

Professional practice and moral concern are sensitive to everyday moments of care and moments of concern. Professional practice is oriented towards everyday life practice. Every moment of this experience has its own mood and meaning, even if one may not be aware of it. The students participating in this study trust that their anxiety is meaningful, even though they are unsure of their own actions. Their anxiety makes sense. What they do, however, is put their

own lives on hold for a shorter or longer period of time, momentarily disregarding their own needs and desires, opening themselves up to becoming entangled in someone else's life. They do not deliver results or solutions, but they feel encouraged and decide to create episodes that are meaningful to their lives. They pause, listen, observe and react to the events in which they find themselves. They remain in relationships where their existence and actions are at stake, without visibility or predictable chances of a good outcome. The life of another person turns to them. And they act in accordance with the responsibility they face, not knowing how to be or act. These are decisive characteristics for all areas of human practice, including those affecting the need for one person to take care of smaller or larger events in the life of another person (Saevi, Tornsteison, 2022, p. 87).

Conclusion

This pedagogical relationship is the source of individual and social change, and above all, change in care and education. We need a pedagogical seeing, which is guarded by the ability to experience and understand moral disquiet and concern for the presence of trust in interpersonal and social relationships. The answer to the question of how to participate in the process of individual and social change lies in the phenomenon of trust. It is worth noting the reflections contained in the article by Tone Saevi and Tone Eikeland, *From Where does Trust come and Why is "From Where" Significant?* As they emphasize, we talk a lot about the lack of trust in contemporary societies and tend to think of trust in terms of absence or requirement. Trust, as a phenomenon, is likely to remain unrecognized when it is present, but when it is lacking, we become very aware of it, and it becomes a topic of discussion. Can trust be influenced or possessed in order to build personal or professional relationships? Can trust be built, maintained, rebuilt or expanded when necessary, or when relationships are established? Can trust be easily and effectively rebuilt when it is lacking or eroded? Although we know that uncertainty and ambiguity remain at the heart of trust, and that these qualities are part of the power of trust, we still consider them fragile, a flaw, a weakness (Saevi, Eikland, 2012, p. 91).

We always try to moderate the fragility of trust and act as if trust were something that is manageable, rational and predictable. We establish certain rationally organized procedures, frameworks for routine activities in public schools, health care institutions – and in the penitentiary system. These are elements of trust that we would like to reduce or eliminate. We constantly try to mitigate the fragility of trust by acting as if trust were controllable, rational and predictable (Saevi, Eikland, 2012, pp. 91-92). Therefore, we establish routines (Saevi,

Eikland, 2012, p. 92). We introduce certain routinely implemented procedures in public schools, care institutions, and also healthcare, as well as in the area of social rehabilitation and penitentiary systems. Arrangements for homework, rules to deal with behavior and communication, safety offered also to older dependents through automatic forms of assistance and care – this is what we try to rely on (Saevi, Eikland, 2012, p. 92).

Trust and distrust are ways in which we understand our own lives and our relationships with others. One of the fundamental characteristics of trust is understanding ourselves in the interdependence of human beings. Trust is one of the very foundations of life. Trust is experienced in relationships, felt and experienced as something positive when it arises spontaneously (*ibid.*). And nothing other than a genuine pedagogical and caring relationship based on trust and community will become a source of change. This relationship may or may not arise between us. We will rediscover its value if we open ourselves to this experience and the disquiet that is its inherent moral dimension.

References

- Babbie, E. (2008). *Podstawy badań społecznych*. Transl. W. Betkiewicz et al. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Foran, A., Robinson, D., Elifsen, M., Munro, E., & Thurber, T. (2020). *Phenomenology & Practice*, 14(1), 39–56.
- Kubinowski, D. (2011). *Jakościowe badania pedagogiczne. Filozofia – metodyka – ewaluacja*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Rubacha, K. (2012). *Metodologia badań nad edukacją*. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza Łośgraf.
- Saevi, T., & Elifsen, M. (2008). “Heartful” or “Heartless” Teachers? Or should we look for the Good Somewhere Else? Considerations of Students’ Experience of the Pedagogical Good. *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology*, 8, 1–15.
- Saevi, T. (2011). Lived relationality as the fulcrum of pedagogical-ethical practice. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 30(5), 455–461.
- Saevi, T., & Eikland, T. (2012). From Where does Trust come and Why is “From Where” Significant? *Phenomenology & Practice*, 6(1), 89–95.
- Saevi, T., & Foran, A. (2012). Seeing Pedagogically, Telling Phenomenologically: Addressing the Profound Complexity of Education. *Phenomenology & Practice*, 6(2), 50–64.
- Saevi, T., & Torsteinson, H. (2022). What is Moral Disquiet and How Does the Experience of Moral Disquiet Appear in Professional Human Practices? Facing Responsibility in Nursing, Teaching, and Caring. *Phenomenology & Practice*, 17(2), 77–89.

- Saevi, T., & Husevaag, H. (2009). The child seen as the same or the other? The significance of the social convention to the pedagogical relation. *Paideusis*, 18(2), 29–41.
- Saevi, T. (2004). *Seeing Disability Pedagogically The Lived Experience of Disability in the Pedagogical Encounter*. Bergen University.
- Silverman, D. (2008). *Interpretacja danych jakościowych*. Transl. M. Głowacka-Grajper, J. Ostrowska. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Van Manen, M. (1999). The Pathic of Pedagogical Practice. In: P. Kansanen (eds.), *Discussion on some VIII educational issues* (pp. 75–88). Helsinki: Department of Teacher Education University of Helsinki.
- Van Manen, M. (2015). *Pedagogical Tact. Knowing What to Do When You don't Know What to Do*, Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Relacja pedagogiczna – w poszukiwaniu odpowiedzialności za proces zmiany w doświadczeniu cierpienia

Streszczenie

Artykuł koncentruje się na problematyce relacji pedagogicznej rozwijanej w środowisku badaczy zainspirowanych koncepcją Maxa van Manena „phenomenology of practice” – w jakim stopniu przywrócenie znaczenia relacji pedagogicznej w pedagogice ma znaczenie dla refleksji nad zmianą edukacji i opieki oraz zmian społecznych. Analizuje pojęcia pedagogicznego widzenia czy pedagogicznej wspólnoty. Metodą badawczą wykorzystaną w pracy jest analiza treści. Dla prezentowanej problematyki szczególną rolę odgrywają publikacje, w których na pierwszy plan zostały wysunięte takie pojęcia jak: „pedagogiczne widzenie”, „pedagogiczna wspólnota” i wiążące się ściśle z relacją pedagogiczną zagadnienie moralnego niepokoju. Zasadniczą część rozwijanej w artykule problematyki dotyczy cierpienia, kruchości, inności i miejsca relacji pedagogicznej w refleksji rozwijanej przez takich badaczy jak Tone Saevi, Andrew Foran czy Tone Eikland. Początkiem budowania relacji pedagogicznej jest świadomość swego własnego „niewykończenia”, braku doskonałości i ciągłego bycia w drodze ku dojrzałości, rozróżniania tego, co pedagogiczne, od tego, co niepedagogiczne. Głębokie znaczenie zmiany, której źródłem może stać się relacja pedagogiczna, ujawnia się w procesie odkrywania znaczenia doświadczenia kruchości czy niepełnosprawności w relacji między opiekunem a podopiecznym. Rozumienie inności i cierpienia jest procesem pogłębiającej się zdolności pedagogicznego widzenia. Pedagogiczne widzenie to ucieleśniona percepcja osób i sytuacji, która w jakiś sposób odsłania nie tylko to, co widzimy, ale i to, jak widzimy. To ważne, zwłaszcza wtedy, gdy spojrzenie nauczyciela lub opiekuna – intencjonalnie lub nie – mówi uczniowi coś znaczącego o tym, w jaki sposób widziana jest jego unikalność, inność, słabość. Opiekunem zmiany staje się ten, kto ocala osobiste doświadczenie kruchości i cierpienia osoby. Poddaje refleksji ludzkie doświadczenie kruchości i cierpienia, będące częścią naszej egzystencji, i czyni je znaczącym wymiarem ludzkiej dojrzałości i fundamentem tworzenia wspólnoty. Pedagogiczna relacja jest sercem indywidualnej i społecznej zmiany, a przede wszystkim zmiany w opiece i edukacji. Potrzebujemy pedagogicznego widzenia, które jest gwarantem zdolności do doświadczenia i rozumienia moralnego niepokoju i troski o obecność zaufania w interpersonalnych i społecznych relacjach.

Słowa kluczowe: relacja pedagogiczna, pedagogiczne widzenie, zmiana, kruchość, moralny niepokój, pedagogiczna wspólnota, zaufanie.