



Jarosław Gara

The Maria Grzegorzewska University in Warsaw, Poland

ORCID 0000-0001-6251-5972

Patterns of validation of upbringing goals - an outline of the issue and its underlying theoretical premises

Wzorce uprawomocnień celów wychowania – zarys problematyki oraz jej podstawowych przesłanek teoretycznych

Abstract: The purposefulness of education plays a key role in any model of education that is based on planned and organised activities. In this sense, the definition of upbringing goals should be seen as a logical consequence of the intentional nature of educational interactions. The issue of the patterns of validation of upbringing goals thus refers us to the different types of validation, on the basis of which certain contents of upbringing goals are considered legitimate or valid. The legitimacy of the content of upbringing goals is always derived from an overriding rationale, which is considered decisive as to what the realisation of such goals should serve. Patterns of upbringing goals may refer to both anthropological, normative and pragmatic justifications. Such patterns can also be considered by referring to the rationalisations and justifications known from the history of pedagogical ideas, which are based on the worldview recognition of naturalistic, social, cultural, ideological or religious patterns as conclusive. The purpose of the article is, first, to point out the worldview nature of the settlements associated with different models of justification of upbringing goals and, second, to point out the pluralistic coexistence of different types of justifications of upbringing goals and their possible configurations.

Keywords: intentionality of education/upbringing, upbringing goals, the worldview of upbringing, ideological nature of upbringing, defining upbringing, justifications for upbringing goals.

Introduction: upbringing and the problem of the desirability of educational thinking and action

The issue of upbringing goals is an inherent and irreducible perspective of both the theory and practice of education. The theoretical consideration of the process of upbringing, as well as the design of practical upbringing measures, always requires one or another, at least preliminary, understanding of upbringing goals, whether in their far-reaching (strategic) or immediate (operational) dimension. The purposefulness of specific educational interactions thus plays a key role in any model of upbringing that is based on planned and organised activities in patriotic, sporting, aesthetic, musical, religious or national education; directive or non-directive, based on adaptive rationality or on emancipatory rationality. The definition of upbringing goals is therefore always a derivative of the way upbringing itself is defined and what functions it is supposed to fulfil in the light of the assumed resolutions.

Upbringing can always be considered - as Kazimierz Sośnicki argued - from the perspective of its essential components: conditions, process and result. Upbringing goals define the horizon of the assumed and expected results of upbringing. All that constitutes activities related to upbringing includes educational situations, the development process and the result of this process. Educational situations are to be understood as specific conditions that enable the initiation of the developmental process of the pupil. As a result of educational measures which initiate and stimulate this process, certain changes take place which are linked to the acquisition of personal, social and cultural competences which are the result of the development of the pupil (Sośnicki, 1967, p. 9).

In this context one can distinguish - according to Bogusław Śliwerski's overview of the issue - three basic ways of defining upbringing, which in a fundamental way, as may be assumed, condition the way of specifying and selecting the goals that guide specific pedagogical interventions. It is upbringing understood in terms of: "unilateral interaction", "mutual interaction", or "a process taking place in the human life environment" (Śliwerski, 2007, p. 31).

Thus, in the first case, the unilaterally codified intentions of the educator in influencing the pupil are emphasised by exposing activities such as: "inducing intended changes", changing and shaping the personality of the pupil, or "directing the vital activity" of the pupil (Śliwerski, 2007, p. 32). In the second case, on the other hand, the determinants of the essence and meaning of upbringing, expressed in the intention to initiate a "two-way relationship" and a mutual influence are accentuated as: "working with and on people", the realisation of a particular "interpersonal relationship", or the

particular experience of “mutual contact between people” (Śliwerski, 2007, p. 33-34). Finally, in the third case, the meaning and essence of upbringing is considered in terms of “psychosocial phenomena”, or “cultural phenomena”, which determine the general human condition in its historical conditions. In this view, attention is drawn to such determinants as the interdependence of the pupil and the surrounding world, growth “into the social consciousness of the species”, or the process of changes that proceeds from certain states, already considered achieved, to the realisation of new states (Śliwerski, 2007, p. 34).

The category of intentionality as a formal premise for pedagogical thinking and action

When referring to the category of intentionality, it can be done in a double sense, which in formal terms expresses the primary fact in relation to upbringing as a specific type of intentional, directed and purposeful human activity, referring to both the sphere of thought and action.

In the first case, related to thinking, one can refer to a philosophical, or more precisely phenomenological, way of understanding intentionality as a specific property of the acts of consciousness directed at the object of interest (attention, emotion, recollection, perception, desire or anticipation). In simple terms, we can say that what absorbs our acts of consciousness, filling in the content of what we think about, expresses itself in this or that orientation towards what is the object of our consciousness. Intentionality is therefore an awareness of something and “turning towards” something, because it is a “stream of consciousness” that is directed towards what lies beyond itself (Lyotard, 1991, p. 56, 112; Embree, 2011, p. 21).

In contrast, as part of the second aspect, relating to action, intentionality should be perceived as a property of intentional and purposeful action, and therefore one that is accompanied by an intention and intent of the subject of the action. This is the sense in which the formal aspect of the intentionality of the educational activities should be understood, which is always accompanied by some objectives and by a certain intention, intent or sense of obligation on the part of the subject of the educational action. According to this definition of the category of intentionality, it can be said, as Bogusław Śliwerski observes, that intentionality takes place where “the acting entity is guided by an internal need or obligation with the intention of causing specific changes within the other entity” (Śliwerski, 2001, p. 27).

Thus, each type of formulated and articulated upbringing goals is driven by an intention to bring about an inherent change in the pupil - in

his or her way of being, personal structure of motivation, identification and aspirations, which express a particular model of the assumed direction of human development. Thus, the setting and formulation of educational goals should be seen as an obvious and logical consequence of educational intentionality and the intentional character of the projected educational interactions (Łobocki, 2004, p. 140; see also Wróbel, 2014, p. 235-244).

The category of social action as a formal premise of the worldview-ideological and pragmatic-application dimensions of educational action

Upbringing goals always take the form of actions conditioned by both frameworks and forms of socially sanctioned practices, e.g. normatively or institutionally. Thus, in formal terms, they take the form of social action. The category of social action, on the other hand, in the stratum of its intentionality, is always based on a certain idea of desired states of affairs, captured as anticipations of final states, which underlie the conviction as to their necessity or indispensability. In this sense, the formulation and implementation of specific upbringing goals reflects the rationality of social action, viewed through the prism of three essential elements: “defining the situation”, “orienting the action” and “taking action”.

“Defining a situation” is done by making sense of it from the point of view of a particular state of affairs and therefore of what we are dealing with (this is answered by the question of “what is it”? and of “why is it like that?”). “Orienting the action”, on the other hand, is expressed in formulating the goals that the action is to serve and the justifications for referring to certain goals and not to others (this is answered by the question of “why” is the action taken? and “why” such an action is taken and not another?). Finally, “taking action” is based on taking into account the very contexts of action, related to the social conditions of action, the disposition of the necessary competences of the actor, or the selection of corresponding methods and techniques of action. This aspect of action is therefore expressed in the determination of the necessary or optimal conditions for taking action, in accordance with the assumed objectives and functions to be served (this corresponds to the question of “who”, “where” and “how” certain activities should be undertaken, in order to design adequate actions in accordance with the assumed intentions (Marynowicz-Hetka, 2006, p. 100-101).

However, at the basis of taking action in the form of social practices, and therefore at the basis of its direction, functions and principles, there are always specific justifications, which take the form of specific sources of their derivation and creation (justification, rationalisation and legitimisation). And

it is on the basis of these legitimations, in the form of the affirmation of certain world-view resolutions, that we have rationalisations and legitimisations of the sources that constitute the recognition of such or other educational goal. And consequently, the resulting necessity or indispensability of adopting a particular model of the purposefulness of upbringing as an anticipation of the reasons and their premises considered conclusive.

When we speak of the worldview layer of upbringing, we assume that educational problems and phenomena refer us to the broader problems and phenomena of the surrounding world and the human experience resulting from social and cultural forms of participation. This is because every model of upbringing and the resulting layer of recognised and promoted purposefulness of upbringing is based on certain assumptions and assertions of a world-view nature, which express a general attitude towards the surrounding reality as a certain perceived, experienced and valued whole of human experience. At the same time, these assumptions and assertions are given conclusive value as to how all other dimensions of socio-cultural practice are perceived, understood and valued. Thus, education, in pursuing certain ideas, always correlates with and is part of some worldview (Nowak, 2008, p. 78). In this sense, educational problems and phenomena always have to be assigned a place and a meaning in the overall way in which they are perceived and dealt with, which is reflected in specific representations and solutions of the “world of human affairs” and thus socially and culturally recognised and affirmed patterns and standards of participation (Schulz, 2003, p. 104).

In this context, it is also reasonable to say that the way in which the role and meaning, as well as the tasks and functions of education are perceived, must always include certain components which, from the point of view of its essence and meaning, must be considered irreducible. Among the primary components of upbringing, it is therefore necessary to point out the anthropological, axiological, praxeological and teleological component (Kubiak-Szymborska and Zajac, 2002, p. 97).

The anthropological component reveals premises about the nature or condition of human beings and the inherent possibilities or limits of development. The axiological component refers to premises that form the basis for deciding what is a desirable value or a disapproved anti-value, and thus what is assigned high or low value ranks. The praxeological component of upbringing, on the other hand, defines the premises on the basis of which the methods of upbringing (forms, methods and means) are specified, which are intended to ensure the optimisation of the relevance, effectiveness and

appropriateness of the interaction strategies within the framework of the assumed upbringing projects.

The teleological component of upbringing, which is at the basis of defining and specifying the strategic (proper) and instrumental (operational) goals of upbringing, grows out of the previously adopted axioms and decisions of an anthropological and axiological nature. The implementation of the assumed teleology of upbringing, on the other hand, should be linked to strategies that meet the requirements of praxeological principles of action. This ensures that it is possible to take efficient, effective actions, free of errors and inefficiencies, to achieve the assumed upbringing goals. Of course, complex and diverse factors, both external (i.e. socio-cultural or economic circumstances) and internal (i.e. individual circumstances of the pupil or those related to the personality of the educator), also play an important role in the ways in which goals are set and pursued (Śliwerski, 2001, p. 89). It should also be pointed out that, among the diverse factors for the establishment and realisation of upbringing goals, the one that deserves special attention is the factor that refers us to the problem of the personality of the educator, together with the whole spectrum of issues taken up in the context of the research object of interest thus defined. It is to be assumed that, on the one hand, the preferred model of the educator reflects a specific way of resolving judgements about the surrounding reality. On the other hand, the preferred model of the educator also implies certain decisions regarding the functions and purpose attributed to the preferred model of education itself (cf. Kosyrz, 2005, p. 31; Wiśniewski, 2009, p. 94-98).

The problem of the sources of validation of upbringing goals and its world-view-ideological and pragmatic-application frames of reference

The anthropological and axiological components of upbringing can therefore be said to be fundamentally worldview and ideological in nature, within which we also deal with general cognitive representations relating to the surrounding world experienced as a whole. This is because they define a unique strategy for deciding the direction of human aspirations and the accompanying ranks and priorities, which are a response to how the surrounding world, the human being (child and adult) is understood and defined, and how the values that make up certain patterns are created or realised by him/her. This is also where the decisions concerning the choice of educational ideals and the values associated with them, and therefore the manner of formulating the goals that implement and realise these ideals, should be placed. Thus, the teleological component has both an ideological

and applied character, due to the operational aspects of the educational realisation of specific ideas.

The praxeological component is essentially of a pragmatic-applicative nature, as it refers to strategies for the operational realisation or implementation of specific states of affairs deemed desirable or necessary from the point of view of the assumed teleology of educational interventions. Within this layer, therefore, decisions are made regarding the selection of particular goals, together with the specification of the operational means of achieving them through the use of selected forms, methods and means of upbringing.

It can also be assumed, referring to the teleological component of upbringing as a kind of medium of exposition of the other three components, that upbringing goals primarily represent the anthropological and axiological principles and resolutions of upbringing, and are therefore not subject to empirical verification. The affirmation of proper objectives is carried out based on the rules of deductive reasoning. Instrumental goals (as well as contrabutive ones), on the other hand, refer us to the praxeological principles and rules of action. They can therefore be subjected to empirical verification (confirmation or falsification) (Śliwerski, 2001, p. 88).

The problem of validating upbringing goals, regardless of which perspective we are dealing with, historical or contemporary, primarily refers us to the layer of worldview and ideological structuring of upbringing goals and the related axioms, principles and decisions.

The world-view and ideological aspect reflects both social awareness and beliefs on the basis of which certain decisions are formulated regarding pedagogical practice and the related dilemmas as to the different perception of the aims, tasks and functions of upbringing. Within the framework of worldview and ideological decisions, we are therefore dealing with an appeal to a relatively consistent and enduring way of perceiving the surrounding world and the norms, values and ideals to which particular ranks and meanings are ascribed. Such decisions are based on premises or beliefs about the validity of certain norms or solutions that determine the specificity and direction of pedagogical influences, e.g. conservative or liberal, traditionalist or progressive, religious or secular, based on heteroeducation and the principle of an external locus of control or based on self-education and the principle of an internal locus of control (Kozielecki, 1996, p. 211).

Such decisions also determine the manner - subjective or objective - in which we perceive the status of human beings (voluntarist or determinist) and the forms of social life (nominalist or realist) (Rubacha, 2003, p. 60-61),

which determine the multifaceted framework and conditions of both institutional and non-institutional pedagogical interactions.

Such decisions and, consequently, different orientations of pedagogical theory and practice can be expressed in the form of antinomies, which give specific ranks, meanings and priorities to certain states of affairs, e.g.: 1. systemic requirements and expectations *versus* individual needs and aspirations; 2. objectifying educational relations and coercion *versus* empowering educational relations and freedom; 3. assimilation of the achievements of the past and transmission of existing knowledge *versus* formation of specific skills and preparation for the challenges (opportunities and threats) of the future; 4. defining and codifying normal and proper states *versus* defining and codifying abnormal and disturbed states; or 5. affirming the transmitting and reproducing function of upbringing *versus* affirming the function oriented towards transformation and change (Schulz, 2016, p. 40).

The concept of validation and its heuristic utility in the study of the sources of upbringing goals

The use of the term “validation” is primarily identified with referring to the problem of legitimising power. And in this sense, it tells us that certain representations of power are perceived as legitimate, and therefore have the legitimacy to exercise power over those who are convinced that this power is proper and legitimate. Such validations can be based either on patterns of tradition, public support, election results or public opinion. Based on such justifications, those who are subject to authority recognise the power of that authority to make rules, exercise control and carry out tasks to which all others are subject (Oliwniak, 2006, p. 27-28).

The concept of validation, in addition to its legal-legislative meaning, is also used in the humanities and social sciences in other contexts of meaning, e.g. we can speak of cultural, methodological or logical legitimacy, concerning formal cognitive decisions (cf. Pogonowska, 2009, p. 40, 44, 49). The problem of validation, by expressing itself in the need to justify the reasons that are considered valid or subject to affirmation, also refers us to the problem of the modern identity of man as a self-conscious and reflective subject in search of grounded cognition and knowledge (Taylor, 1989, p. 163-164). For this reason, when we speak of validations relating to the various aspects of the “world of human affairs”, the forms of social and cultural life that define and condition human endeavours, actions and aspirations, we can speak of strong or weak validations, and those exposed to crisis or decay (Habermas, 1992, p. 68-75; cf. Oliwniak, 2006, p. 31-33).

It is also in this context that Jürgen Habermas, in his contributions to the thesis on the crisis of validation, pointed out that it is always linked to the phenomenon of a “scarcity of validation”, “fabrication of validation”, the manipulation of administrative action and cultural transmission, and the uncontrolled expansion of the sphere of “public programming”. With regard to the existing patterns of upbringing, Habermas pointed out that the crisis of validations is expressed above all in the fact that educational programmes and practices have become problematic, giving rise to new doubts, anxieties and controversies (Habermas, 1983, p. 464-465; cf. Nowotniak, 2007, p. 182).

Referring to the issue of the sources of validation in the context of upbringing goals, it is thus essentially a question of the specific rationalisations and justifications (cf. Gurczyński, 2012, p. 61), on the basis of which certain contents of upbringing goals are considered legitimate or valid. Rationalisations and justifications understood in this way determine which content of upbringing goals are deemed desirable and worthy of promotion and which are not, and in the name of which reasons such determinations are made. In this sense, validations are the antinomy of such rationalisations and justifications on the basis of which something is subject to cognitive and practical invalidation or delegitimisation, and is therefore rejected, overlooked or subject to disapproval.

From a logical point of view, justifications formulated in favour of certain validations consist in indicating “the basis for accepting as true the sentences in which we form the judgements we hold”. In this case, they will be concerned with the specific model of the recognised and desired content of upbringing goals. The judgements we express in tasks, on the other hand, can be justified either directly (based on the content of experience) or indirectly (deduced from other judgements considered valid) (Ziemiński, 1994, p. 144).

When examining the sources of validation of upbringing goals the mode of justification with which we are dealing is generally to be regarded as indirect. This is because the legitimacy of the patterns and content of upbringing goals is derived from other more general and superior judgements, which are recognised as legitimate and are therefore treated as a source of legitimacy for the ideals and aims of upbringing themselves.

The legitimacy of the content of upbringing goals is thus always derived from a certain source, based on rationales and justifications, deemed conclusive as to what the realisation of such goals should serve, what states of affairs they should realise or what states of affairs they should secure in their established *status quo*. And just as it is impossible today - from the perspective of the experience of democratic and pluralistic forms of social

life - to speak of a single paradigmatic model of valid patterns (epistemological and methodological) of practising pedagogy (Śliwerski, 2009, p. 289; see also: Śliwerski, 2020, p. 17-23, 193-198; Śliwerski, 2015, p. 608-612), it is also impossible to speak of a single universally recognised, binding and conclusive model of establishing upbringing goals and deriving sources of their legitimisation. By analogy with the thesis formulated in this way, it can also be argued that the theoretical sources of contemporary pedagogical knowledge are to the same extent based on epistemological and methodological pluralism and are thus multi-paradigmatic in nature. These sources include areas of pedagogical knowledge such as historical research, comparative research, empirical research (carried out according to both a quantitative model and a qualitative empirical model), or research on the borderline between pedagogy and related sciences (Palka, 2003, p. 51; cf. Górniewicz, 1993, p. 68-69).

In this context, too, it remains undeniable that a given ideal of upbringing defines and conditions the content of upbringing goals, referring at the same time to some source of legitimacy (rightness, truthfulness, necessity, or justification) and related rationalisations and legitimisations. The issues identified in this way fit into the tasks of theoretical pedagogy (which analyses pedagogical ideologies, doctrines, concepts, or theories) as one dimension of educational discourse, which is based on complex “theoretical symbolic systems” and the “rationalisation of pedagogical experience” (Schulz, 2016, p. 15).

Worldview and ideological concretisation of the problem of sources of validation of upbringing goals

In the search of systematic ways to organise the issue of the sources of validation of upbringing goals, one can refer to various proposals for typologising and distinguishing the fundamental sources of validation, which are based on a different nature.

One way of typologising the sources of upbringing goals and their theoretical and practical legitimacy is based on distinguishing three main groups of justifications: anthropological, normative and pragmatic. The first type of justification is based on decisions regarding the way of understanding man, and therefore the essence of his nature and dignity, or the general condition that determines human existence. The second type of justification refers to decisions, bound by certain values and norms, considered valid or necessary for the forms of social life. Finally, in the third case, we are talking about the type of justifications that are based on the analysis of current phenomena, processes and trends and their anticipation in relation to the future, while

adapting certain principles and strategies. In this way, measures are taken to ensure the possibility of acquiring competences in the upbringing process that will ensure adequate and optimal adaptation to the challenges of the future and the continuation and development of forms of social and cultural life (Śliwerski, 2001, p. 86-87; cf. Kubiak-Szymborska, Zajac, 2002, p. 104-109).

However, according to the argumentation cited by Bogusław Śliwerski, the most common and most frequently encountered types of validation of upbringing goals are sources of a normative nature. Indeed, forms of social life are usually considered the most decisive for the conditions and realities of people's everyday life. Accordingly, the aims of education, both in the layer of their justifications and the functions attributed to them, are based on the affirmation and promotion of values and ideals that are considered normatively codified and binding (Śliwerski, 2001, p. 87). The sources of upbringing goals thus conceived are also characterised by greater or lesser homogeneity and stability or differentiation and variability. The former situation is exemplified by traditional and static societies, while the latter by societies that are pluralistic and open in the context of ongoing change in the surrounding world. Of course, this does not change the fact that in other circumstances (historical, social or cultural), other types of validation of upbringing goals cited above also come into play.

The method of deriving the sources of validation of upbringing goals can also be referred to another classification, which is directly reflected in both the history of pedagogical ideas and the designed types of educational practice. The basic types of derivation of the sources of validation of upbringing goals can thus be considered from the perspective of referring to rationalisations and justifications, related to the assumed ideas: 1. the natural state, 2. social patterns, 3. cultural patterns, 4. ideological patterns or religious patterns (Górniewicz, 2008, p. 81).

Referring to such a proposal for typologising the basic sources of validation of upbringing goals and the types of rationalisation and justification accompanying them, it is possible to indicate, following Józef Górniewicz, five basic types of sources of validation. All of the indicated types of sources of validation, in accordance with the cognitive perspective adopted here, refer us directly or indirectly to decisions of a world-view and ideological nature. Each of these models of validation also adopts, in its own way, specific solutions in the context of categories that should be considered key in contemporary educational theory, such as responsibility, subjectivity, self-realisation, tolerance, creativity, imagination or moral imagination (see: Górniewicz, 2001).

According to the typological distinction adopted, it is therefore possible to identify the following sources of generalised validations of upbringing goals, which are expressed in:

1. The principals and representations affirming a vision (image) of human nature, referring to the recognition and reproduction of naturalistic values and patterns. This is a model of naturalistic validation.
2. The principals and representations that affirm a vision (idea) of social values, referring to the recognition and transmission of social values and patterns. This is a model of social validation.
3. The principals and representations that affirm a vision (idea) of cultural values, referring to the recognition and transmission of cultural values and patterns. This is a model of cultural validation.
4. The principals and representations that affirm an ideologised vision (image) of the future world, referring to the recognition and transmission of ideological values and patterns. This is a model of ideological validation.
5. The principals and representations that affirm a vision (idea) of religious values, referring to the recognition and transmission of religious values and patterns. This is a model of religious validation (Górniewicz, 2008, p. 81).

A similar typology of the sources of upbringing goals, which are called “source factors of goals” (i.e. “human nature”, “social life”, “cultural sphere”, “social ideology”, “religious presuppositions”) can also be found in a study by another author, which is analogous, albeit with a slightly different content specification. And an additional factor this author takes into account in this typology is the “output of science”. These factors are regarded as basic premises for the formulation of specific objectives within a given model of upbringing (Wiśniewski, 2009, p. 11-22). Also correlating with the above typologies - in their essential meaning - are the basic approaches to upbringing referred to by Marian Nowak, namely upbringing as help in: “naturalisation”, “socialisation”, “inculturation”, “emancipation” or “personalisation”. Broadly speaking, it can be said that the indicated representations of the different approaches to upbringing result from similar types of validation of the basic patterns of upbringing goals (Nowak, 2001, p. 240-254).

Re. 1. Axioms and premises of the naturalistic validation model.

The model of the naturalistic validation of upbringing goals derives its rationales and reasons for upbringing goals from the rights that condition and regulate the natural world. Human development in both its physical

and mental dimensions reflects these conditions and regulations of nature. Thus, the implementation of upbringing goals is based on referring to the child's nature and his/her innate predispositions. The goal of upbringing is to remove barriers that could undermine the dynamics or block the free development of the child while violating his or her nature.

In implementing the content of upbringing goals thus defined, all methods and means are therefore rejected as expressions of an unnaturally (artificially and against nature) codified actions of the educator. According to this approach, nature itself conditions and regulates what influences free (natural) development processes. These processes therefore reflect regularities, considered to be the source of impulses and patterns of the child's spontaneous developmental regularities.

Re. 2. Axioms and premises of the social validation model.

The model of the social validation of upbringing goals derives its rationales and reasons for upbringing goals from the defined realities of social life. A key role is played by the current norms and values on which forms of social life and the accompanying indigenous social practices are based. The content of upbringing goals is therefore derived from what is socially valued and desirable and based on norms and values, linked to the promotion of recognised and valid social aspirations. The realities and conditions of social life are understood to mean what is close to the everyday practice of social life and the dominant patterns of social practice. These realities and conditions also refer us to what is expressed in the priority of local, or regional, practices and decisions.

Thus, upbringing goals, while reflecting certain political or economic trends and tendencies, are based on an analysis of existing realities and social experiences and rituals, which are also constantly evolving and subject to various transformations. The primary function of upbringing is therefore to exert influence in accordance with the priorities and directions of the strategy for the continuity and development of forms of social life. According to this model, the development of the pupil and his/her forms of social adaptation are not only situated in strictly defined social realities and conditions, but also prepare for participation in specific realities and conditions of the forms of social life.

Re. 3. Axioms and premises of the cultural validation model.

The model of the cultural validation of upbringing goals derives its rationales and reasons for upbringing goals from the symbolic cultural sphere. Culture represents a universe of values and patterns that take on a timeless and objective form. A given circle of cultural patterns is both a source and

a means of transmitting and embodying universal values within it. Culture underpins the commonly held and shared patterns of human attitudes and aspirations and the evaluation of the way people behave.

The content of upbringing goals is therefore derived from universal cultural principals and represents the realisation of the aspiration to realise culturally valued, approved and desirable values. Thus, upbringing serves the function of introducing people to life in culture, understood as an objectified symbolic universe of values, patterns, creations, practices and traditions. What is considered valid and subject to cultural transmission is what emerged in the process of historical accumulation of experience and has been verified in this process as valuable and culture-forming within the succession of subsequent generations.

Re. 4. Axioms and premises of the ideological validation model.

The model of the ideological validation of upbringing goals derives its rationales and reasons for upbringing goals from the dominant ideology, which is expressed in the claim of symbolic and structural expansion and appropriation of all areas concerning social and cultural practice. In this sense, socially implemented ideology takes on a total or utopian form. This is because a particular ideology is treated as the source of valid and postulated values and a vision of the designed and expected social order. Thus, ideology postulates a vision of another, not yet realised and materialised reality that still needs to be designed and realised. In a non-alternative way, it also formulates a vision of a new, far-reaching direction for socially and politically desirable states of affairs.

The contents of upbringing goals, referring to the states of affairs thus conceived, desired and postulated, are derived directly from ideological beliefs and assumptions, based on a radical polarisation of the reality found. Upbringing itself is seen as a necessary instrument by means of which these beliefs and assumptions are instilled in the representatives of the young generation. And the primary function of upbringing is the search for and implementation of socio-technically optimal means by which the structure of the beliefs and attitudes of the pupil is reproduced, in accordance with the prevailing ideology.

Re. 5. Axioms and premises of the religious validation model.

Finally, the model of religious validation of upbringing goals derives its rationales and reasons for upbringing goals from beliefs that seek the ultimate justification for all life practices, both individual and social, in the kerygmatic and moral decisions of specific sources of religious faith. Religious role models and values are therefore the source of certain ideals, values,

norms and practices, being at the same time the source of the fundamental justifications formulated for the validity or legitimacy of the content of upbringing goals. Accordingly, upbringing is treated as a means of exerting influence, in line with the values and patterns of cognitive representations and practices inherent in the ritual of the religious tradition.

In this way, the educational impact in its essential function is reduced to the formation of beliefs and attitudes reflecting the worldview of the religious faith. The guarantor of the validity and infallibility of the truths of faith that are reflected in the content of upbringing goals, on the other hand, is the acknowledged divine (superhuman, transcendent, eternal) source of revelation. In this way, education carries out the mission of instilling the content of a particular religious faith in the consciousness of children and forming their moral attitudes, which translate into the social and cultural promotion of attitudes and values appropriate to the belief structure associated with the recognition of the kerygmas of faith as guideposts for life (Górniewicz, 2008, p. 79-81).

The heuristic and exploratory significance of the problem of the sources of validation of upbringing goals

In the context of the research perspective assumed here, the indicated types of sources of validation patterns of upbringing goals can be considered from the perspective of ideal types. This means that the patterns of the indicated validations can exist both in a pure (ideal) form (based on disjunction: either one pattern or the other), but can also co-occur and form different configurations of the source structure of the validation patterns of upbringing goals. Moreover, it should be assumed that the contemporary sources of validation patterns of upbringing goals reflect the various specific configurations of the assumed ideal types, thus indicating a specific structure of patterns of validation, within which we are dealing with a primary or essential type of justifications, which are reinforced or supplemented by other derivative justifications.

Articulating the specific structure of the sources of validation patterns of upbringing goals, defined in this way, appears to be an important cognitive issue. The indicated problem of the structure of goal validation - as can be assumed - also finds an analogy in the problem of the structure of attitudes with their component of cognitive representations (reflected in how one perceives certain problems), emotional representations (reflected in what attitude one manifests towards certain problems) and behavioural

representations (reflected in what behaviour one manifests and demonstrates in the context of certain problems).

It should also be assumed that environments reflecting similar traditions or strategies for the design of educational interactions, in which the implementation of analogous or similar upbringing goals is prevalent, will be accompanied by a similar structure of sources of validation patterns of upbringing goals. On the other hand, in cases dealing with both specific upbringing environments and the accompanying strategies for designing educational interventions, we should also expect the occurrence of a specific structure of sources of validation patterns of upbringing goals, together with their dominant and conclusive type of justifications.

References:

- Embree, L. (2011). *Reflective Analysis. A First Introduction into Phenomenological Investigation*. Bucharest: Zeta Books.
- Górniewicz, J. (1993). Status metodologiczny teorii wychowania. W: J. Górniewicz (red.), *Stare i nowe dylematy teorii wychowania* (s. 63-73). Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Górniewicz, J. (2001). *Kategorie pedagogiczne*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego, Olsztyn.
- Górniewicz, J. (2008). *Teoria wychowania (Wybrane problemy)*. Olsztyn: Olsztyńska Szkoła Wyższa im. Józefa Rusickiego.
- Gurczyński, J. (2012). O wątpliwym uprawomocnieniu metod formalnych w filozofii analitycznej. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Rzeszowskiej*, 286, 59-70.
- Habermas, J. (1983). Na czym polega dziś kryzys? Problemy uprawomocnienia w późnym kapitalizmie, tłum. M. Łukasiewicz. W: tenże, *Teoria i praktyka* (s. 449-474). Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Habermas, J. (1992). *Legitimation Crisis*. Transl. T. McCarthy. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kosyrz, Z. (2005). *Osobowość wychowawcy. Bycie wychowawcą w zmiennych i dynamicznych warunkach życia społecznego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo PEDAGOGIUM Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogiki Resocjalizacyjnej w Warszawie.
- Kozielecki, J. (1996). *Człowiek wielowymiarowy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo „Żak”.
- Kubiak-Szymborska, E., Zając, D. (2002). *Wokół podstawowych zagadnień teorii wychowania*. Bydgoszcz: Wydawnictwo WERS.

- Lyotard, J. F. (1991). *Phenomenology*. Trans. by B. Beakley. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Łobocki, M. (2004). *Teorie wychowania*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Marynowicz-Hetka, E. (2006). *Pedagogika społeczna. Podręcznik akademicki*, tom 1. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Nowak, M. (2001). *Podstawy pedagogiki otwartej. Ujęcie dynamiczne w inspiracji chrześcijańskiej*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Nowak, M. (2008). *Teorie i koncepcje wychowania*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Nowotniak, J. (2007). Ukryty program wychowania. W: M. Dudzikowa, M. Czerepaniak-Walczak (red.), *Wychowanie. Pojęcia. Procesy. Konteksty. Interdyscyplinarne ujęcie* (s. 181-206). Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Oliwniak, S. (2006). Jürgen Habermas o kryzysie uprawomocnienia we współczesnych społeczeństwach demokratycznych. W: A. Jamróz, S. Bożyk (red.), *Z zagadnień współczesnych społeczeństw demokratycznych* (s. 27-42). Białystok: Wydział Prawa Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku.
- Palka, S. (2003). *Pedagogika w stanie tworzenia. Kontynuacje*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Pogonowska, B. (2009). Filozoficzno-epistemologiczne uprawomocnienie instytucjonalizacji globalnej etyki gospodarowania, *Prakseologia*, 149, 39-62.
- Rubacha, K. (2003). Budowanie teorii pedagogicznych, w: Z. Kwieciński, B. Śliwerski (red.), *Pedagogika. Podręcznik akademicki* (59-68), tom 1. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Schulz, R. (2003). *Wykłady z pedagogiki ogólnej. Perspektywy światopoglądowe w wychowaniu*, tom I. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.
- Schulz, R. (2016). *Szkice z pedagogiki ogólnej*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Sośnicki, K. (1967). *Istota i cele wychowania*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy „Nasza Księgarnia”.
- Śliwerski, B. (2001). *Program wychowawczy szkoły*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.
- Śliwerski, B. (2007). Wychowanie. Pojęcie - znaczenia - dylematy. W: M. Dudzikowa, M. Czerepaniak-Walczak (red.), *Wychowanie*.

- Pojęcia. Procesy. Konteksty. Interdyscyplinarne ujęcie*, tom 1. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Pedagogiczne.
- Śliwerski, B. (2009). *Współczesna myśl pedagogiczna. Znaczenia, klasyfikacje, badania*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Śliwerski, B. (2015). *Edukacja (w) polityce. Polityka (w) edukacji. Inspiracje do badań polityki oświatowej*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Śliwerski, B. (2020). *Pedagogika holistyczna. Studium z perspektywy meta-nauk społecznych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej.
- Taylor, Ch. (2001). *Sources of the Self: Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wiśniewski, Cz. (2009). *Wychowanie – studia teoriopoznawcze i aksjologiczne*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Akademii Humanistyczno-Ekonomicznej w Łodzi.
- Wróbel, A. (2014). *Problem intencjonalności działania wychowawczego. Studium teoretyczne*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Ziemiński, Z. (1994). *Logika praktyczna*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.