Member since 2018
JM13714

Studia i rozprawy

Ewa Marynowicz-Hetka*

The School of Thought: Relational Processes of Lasting Existence and Transformation

"Science exists only as continuous School"

(Bachelard 2002 [1937]: 325)

Abstract

This article is an attempt to analyze the features of the titular concept of the school of thought, which occurs through participation in situations that encourage the sharing of experience. The formation of a school of thought is understood as a relational process; therefore, in this context, a consideration of social relationships becomes a key task. It is also an expression of the culture of practice shared by participants in the activity and created by them. As a result, a school of thought is understood as an interweaving of relationships, opinions, and positions which direct and orient the activity. Relational processes are examined from this perspective, i.e. the processes of the lasting existence and transformation of a school of thought, presented in their many different dimensions.

Keywords: school of thought, social relationship, transformations, mastery, shared experience.

Szkoła myślenia: relacyjne procesy trwania i transformacji

Abstrakt

Tekst stanowi próbę analizy cech tytułowego konceptu, jakim jest szkoła myślenia, która wyłania się w toku uczestnictwa w sytuacjach sprzyjających uwspólnianiu doświadczenia. Tworzenie tak rozumianej szkoły myślenia jest procesem relacyjnym, tak więc w tym kontekście namysł nad relacją społeczną stał się kluczowym zadaniem. Jest także wyrazem kultury praktyki podzielanej przez uczestników aktywności i tworzonej przez nich. W rezultacie tak rozumiana szkoła myślenia stanowi splot

* Department of Social Pedagogy at the University of Lodz.

http://dx.doi.org/10.18778/2450-4491.08.08

relacji, poglądów, stanowisk, które ukierunkowują aktywność, orientują ją. W tym kontekście omawiane są relacyjne procesy trwania i transformacji szkoły myślenia, ujmowanej w licznych wymiarach.

Słowa kluczowe: szkoła myślenia, relacja społeczna, transformacje, mistrzostwo, uwspólnione doświadczenie.

Starting point

The problem I intend to analyze in this article is ambiguous, and it is considered ambiguous not only by authors who reflect upon its meaning, but also by some parts of the academic community,[1] even though I am not referring to an academic school, as it is called by those who identify with it, but rather I am thinking about a school of thought. I am interested in how the phenomenon of relational shared experience is formed,[2] how it lasts and changes, what the processes of transformation are, as well as transformation itself and those who participate in it. I shall analyze a certain web of activities which permeate what Teresa Bauman (2004) describes as "a school of thought." It is a process which results in the creation of a cultural construct that enables shared lines of mental activities to be seen, penetrating the activities of participants in a traversal way. A school of thought is understood here as "one that defines the way of thinking" (Bauman 2004: 78), is shaped in action, in the mutual formation of participants in a given field of activity. As a result of this process, a group of people emerges, consisting of "those who not only discover new areas of knowledge, but can also gather a group of others who are similarly fascinated with the discovery of new ideas" (ibidem: 79). Bauman describes them as masters who are necessary "for the creation of a school of thought" (ibidem).

A review of existing literature on the subject enables one to see its duality and complexity. The main line of division lies on the border between personal factors influencing the construction of a school of thought, and the significance of those who actively participate in its creation, and boils down to emphasizing tensions between these two elements. Within this context we may encounter discussions about mastery (Walczak, Mikołajewicz 2017), an individual master (Bauman 2004), or a school of thought (ibidem). The issue of authority is also raised in this discussion, approached from different configurations which show various ways of

[1] This opinion was influenced in part by the visible resistance of the academic community to the initiative proposed by the Scientific Association in Lodz, whose members wanted to document the works of local schools of thought in a book series entitled *Szkoły i zespoły naukowe Łodzi akademickie*j. See: Marynowicz-Hetka 1997.

[2] A category developed by John Dewey (1968 [1947]). Shared experience occurs in the process of becoming, of integrating individual experience through reconstruction and reorganization. A specific feature is sharing experiences with other users of a particular space. This mechanism enables the shaping of relations and communities. See: E. Marynowicz-Hetka (2019).

understanding it. The spread of opinions is broad, stretching from reluctance (Skarga 2009) to acceptance, especially when perceived as "an intimate relationship of appreciation" (Witkowski 2011: 693). The last proposition introduces the relational, mutual order that is also adopted in the following text. Klemens Szaniawski's proposition (1994) may serve the role of an ordering function, as it distinguishes between two functions of authority that can be characterized as "having authority" and "being an authority." There are many possible configurations of how to "be an authority" in the relational order of constructing a school of thought, not necessarily connected with physical persons, participants in the process in which a school of thought is created, continuing patterns from the past. In this sense there can be many types of "intimate relationships of appreciation," they are situated and their value changes, often being connected with other features of people, situations, and expectations of the participants of an activity. Therefore "being an authority" means having the permission of the community to do "more," but it also means that an authority is someone we listen to carefully.

In his essay on authority in science, Klemens Szaniawski views it with optimism:

> The voice of an authority is listened to more closely, and he can speak more than others. As a result, he has significant power over decisions concerning scientific research. This is the second—after shaping models of behavior—significant role of authority in science (Szaniawski 1994: 106).

In this process of transformation, "intimate relationships of appreciations" (Witkowski 2011) are formed, which have little in common with the category of "having authority", that is, having formal power or distinctions characterizing it. Often these processes of transformation that occur in a school of thought "move across" not only formal authority ("being an authority"), but also across situations pertaining to "having authority", particularly when moral categories (gratitude, intimacy, reciprocity) are included in this externally simulated process, as well as feelings, emotions and affects of the participants of the activity. The entire phenomenon is very complex.

The aim of the following analysis is to identify those features of the concept of a school of thought that can be useful in identifying, expanding, but also modifying it in the context of focusing on what defines it, but also what distinguishes it in the overall idea behind a given discipline. An inalienable element in the context of an emerging school of thought is a reflection about the participants of a given type of activity who—thanks to situations that foster the sharing of experience—come to share certain ideas, values, points of view. The creation of a school of thought is a relational process, therefore a consideration of social relations is a crucial task. It is also an expression of a culture of practice shared and created by the participants of the activity. Only then can a school of thought become an interweaving of opinions and attitudes orienting activity.

Social relations – transformation within the culture of practice

Social relations between the participants of a given area of practice, their dimension and the mechanisms of transformation, form indisputable elements in the process of shaping the culture of practice[3] and finding the best way of orienting activity. The socio-pedagogical point of view enables one to see social relation as a specific type (configuration) of relationship—within a particular area of practice—between the participants of an activity, other people, and elements of their environment. The basic category of analysis of these relationships is the level of balancing the relations between individuals who interact with each other. The quality of this relation is influenced by the degree of its symmetry and by the existing relations of power (domination or submission). From this point of view, we can distinguish several types of social relations: transfer, exchange (trade, gift), and reciprocity of sharing (Fustier 1998, 2000; Wagner 2003).

What is especially important from the perspective of the analyzed problem —the shaping of a school of thought—is a clear understanding of those types of interpersonal relations which are characterized by a surplus of symbolic and formal power, leading to either domination or submission. These relations are characterized by asymmetry. It is visible in situations in which individual deficiencies prevent equivalent activity. A specific example of these types of relation is a transfer or exchange, particularly through gift (Fustier 1998, 2000), since it can lead to enslavement or a rejecting of propositions, and as a result discourage from even attempting to achieve the standards of a school of thought. Those dimensions of relations in which the category of formal and symbolic power are minimized are most conducive to the process of creating a school of thought. It makes it easier to act together in order to achieve the final aims, and remains a condition for success. A specific type of symmetrical relation is an exchange characterized as a reciprocity of sharing (*partage*) (Fustier 2000; Wagner 2003). However, it is a highly demanding type of exchange for both sides of the interaction. When analyzing the relationships between participants in activity in the space of practice, especially educational practice, we encounter the metaphor: "give-take," which expresses the desire to balance the relationship and learn from each other.

A unique part of this analysis is the discovery of the meanings behind practiced activities. The roles and attributes of cooperating subjects are particularly significant, those individuals for whom, against whom and with whom we carry out our activity. Adopting this perspective requires careful consideration of a concept

[3] The culture of practice is understood as a set of activities or their effects undertaken by a particular group (community), extracted in reference to a set of activities undertaken by a different social group, which presents its specific character and identity. An element of a culture of practice, often determining its specificity, which can be sometimes presented as its visible sign, is the interweaving of certain elements (mental, affective, active) determining its (new, specific) orientation of activity. See: E. Marynowicz-Hetka (2019: 321).

that would allow an understanding of the multidimensionality and complexity of the mechanisms of transforming social relations. Scholars writing about this problem have based their reflections on a concept which views personality as a system of attitudes towards (interpretations of) the world (Świda 1974), whose origin lies in the relational theory of personality, introduced by Joseph Nuttin (1968). According to him:

> the functioning of psychic life can exist only within a structure that assumes an internal and active reference of "I" to the world of objects. Hence the self not only stands against this world of other people and objects, but this world becomes the content of a personalized psychic life (ibidem: 229–230; also see: Świda 1974: 152).

This understanding of the concept of personality seems to be linked to the relational concept of social action, understood as the creation of symbolic institutions, and the relational concept of value (Starczewska 1994 [1978]), and with what social pedagogy teaches us about the individual's position in social context and mutual relationships. The particular usefulness of the relational concept of personality stems from the fact that social context, the lived environment—such an important element of social pedagogy—is relationally "embedded" in a person and in her psychic system. In other words, according to this concept:

> the relation between personality and culture is analyzed from a different angle to that in a number of sociological and anthropological works which perceive personality and culture as two separate systems that remain in a specific relationship (Świda 1974: 152).

The existence of this relationship is particularly significant for relational relations (reversibility, creating unity). On this understanding, what is significant is that:

> the activity of an individual is, on the one hand, an expression of their interpretation of external reality and image of their place in this reality, and, on the other hand, it is defined by the their individual internal dynamism, which causes certain internal states to evoke certain actions, and that certain internal states produce other states (ibidem: 155).

This means that the components of images/representations of an active subject (the interpretation of reality and the image of oneself written into it, as well as internal states) mutually affect each other. This interpretation is very similar to the concept of traversal analysis of activity (Barbier 2016, 2018). It also refers to a feature of relations between individuals and the environment which social

pedagogy describes using the term "feedback." The author of the concept of personality quoted above also uses this term.

This concept, understood as a system of attitudes towards the world, enables us to enrich the perspective of analyzing dynamic subjects who remain in relationships with themselves and with others. It can be also seen as a proposition to perceive people as acting subjects, undertaking professional tasks of trying to actively understand the person they are working with—as well as a proposition to discover themselves as being active subjects, and understand others through research and action. It therefore helps to expand the reflection on the conceivability of action (Ricouer 2003; Barbier 2006, 2016).

When analyzing the essence of social relations, the basic problem that must be considered is its saturation with symmetry, as well as the issue of recognizing the types of asymmetry that can be expressed in different ways. It can take the form of an objectification of a relationship, as well as a saturation of a relationship as a result of a free gift that only deepens the asymmetry. Both variants create asymmetry and are therefore negative, although each of them happens for different reasons, often interlocking and crossing with each other. The effect is similar. Particularly significant for revealing these features is the specific social condition in which money is an important means of exchange, promoting the commodification of social relations.[4]

Social relations are characterized by dynamism. They are shaped by a process and are a process themselves. Low dynamic relationships are generally asymmetrical, stable and embedded in a specific cultural structure—*habitus.* Relationships that are dynamic, open, and oriented at change/transformation are characterized by an oscillation of tensions that are expressed by asymmetry —balance—transgression. Such dynamics of social relations can be observed in many different areas of practice, in the public as well as private spheres (Arendt, 1985). Qualitative changes in relationships are especially evident in relations that are formed in the educational sphere. They are affected by the final goals of the process, since its aim is to teach someone how to make independent decisions and, as an effect, how to surpass the master. These configurations of relations are often exposed to breaks and discontinuities (Bachelard 2002 [1938]), but nonetheless still exist because of *la filiation* that expresses cultural heritage. Another feature of the dynamics of social relation is the process of moving from transfer, through exchange, to sharing (of values, ideas, and objectives).

[4] For a study on the problem of the commodification (fr. *marchandisation*) of social relations, see: L. Bruni (2010) and the entire issue of "Revue du Mauss" dedicated to voluntary, unpaid relations (*La gratuité…*, 2010).

The school of thought: an interweaving of relations in the processes of lasting existence and transformation

The construction of a school of thought is a process that is subject to changes and transformations. The most important features of this process are breaks (e.g. paradigmatic, but also personal or institutional) and discontinuities, which make it possible for the idea to continue to exist despite various obstacles and the conditions of those ruptures. In the foreword to Bachelard's book (2002 [1938]) Daniel Leszczyński interprets this process in the context of the radical philosophy of Gaston Bachelard:

> …Bachelard's book is (…) also a first attempt at describing the history of science and development of knowledge as a process in which a crucial role is played by breaks, revolution, cuts and mutations, in which contradiction, negation and radical change are the legitimization and guarantee for development, whereas habit, theoretical idiosyncrasies, consistency (…) are an aberration and defeat of cognition (Leszczyński 2002: 362–363).

Naturally, this approach must necessarily be understood within the entire context in which Bachelard's thought was shaped and developed, including its lasting influence on social and philosophical thought.[5] Hence the phrase that appears in the quoted passage from Bachelard, and which is employed as a motto in this article, is only seemingly praise for constructing "a fossilized school" which resists transformation. However, one of the conditions for the existence of a school of thought is some kind of "initial capital," some kind of synthesis of knowledge. Leszczyński (2002: 368) emphasizes that this particular element "belongs to the most important, and at the same time most unclear and controversial elements of Bachelard's work" (ibidem). He looks for answers in different temporal categories in which science is created: chronological time, in which it is customary to measure and structure achievements in the development of science, and logical time,[6] to which Bachelard refers. This mechanism is reconstructed in the following manner:

> If we however place these theories [following each other, referring to the same phenomenon – EMH] in a logical time, and then attempt, even ignoring their chronological order, to compare definitions with their base concepts, and then try to derive one from the other, then we will discover that there are breaks between some of them, that is, moments when something appears that was not there before, and which cannot be derived from what was earlier while maintaining the same definitions of basic concepts (ibidem: 368–369).

[5] Leszczyński (2002: 374–375) reminds us that Bachelard's thought inspired the works of Georges Canguilhem, Michel Foucault and Thomas Kuhn.

[6] It is necessary to refer to the typology of time proposed by Ferdynand Braudel (1997 [1958]), who distinguished short and long time.

However, this process is slightly different in my reading of Bachelard's concept, as it involves both rupture and discontinuity (*discontinuité*). Whereas a break, to use François Jullien's (2009, 2017) terminology, is a visible modification of processes occurring silently and out of sight, and sometimes can be seen as very radical, discontinuity, on the other hand, consists of all of the synthesized elements that continue to exist and are subject to transformation. In this case, there is no sudden rupture, but a parallel between the processes of lasting existence and transformation. The process of lasting existence refers to the main tropes that identify a given school of thought, its language, "basic concepts," point of view, *etc*. The process of transformation refers to giving meaning and sense, according to numerous external (most often paradigmatic, but also contextual) and internal factors (referring to the person of the scholar, their identity), which Bachelard so strongly emphasizes. This interpretation of Bachelard's concept enables its use in an in-depth analysis of the processes of constructing a school of thought, processes that are not limited to a negation of the past output, but provide an important impulse to enhance and develop in the future. Furthermore, this enriching is not a simple "conglomeration" and addition of new meanings. In this process, the researcher's awareness of his or her point of view serves a special function, in a part a limitation, in part an impulse to search for something new.

Understood this way, the process of constructing a school of thought has its origins in the following conditions that can be used to characterize it:

- whom some may be considered as a master by the Other;
- as a result of shared experience of participants identifying with the elements that define a given school of thought, which occur through a process of reconstruction and reorganization, characterized as activities tied up in a node (Barbier 2016), or a braid (Nawroczyński 1947), constituting a symbolic institution[7] (Castoriadis 1975; also Skarga 2009: 106–107), understood processually, during creation and development, exposed to multiple breaks and discontinuities, able to be analyzed only in the long duration (Braudel 1999 [1977]);
- as a certain kind of shared social image (Castoriadis 1975; Baczko 1994; Skarga 2009) constructed by members of a school of thought and juxtaposed with individual images, which can lead to an individual realization of the existence of significant people in a relation, among by two important features: continuation and interaction (Dewey 1968 [1947]);
- as a web of social relations between participants of a given organism, subject to silent and invisible transformations that can be seen by them only in the form of modifications (Barbier 2016; Durand 2017; Jullien 2009, 2017).

[7]A symbolic institution is a symbolic web that is sanctioned socially, in which real elements cross with those that are imaginary and symbolic. It is constructed through a process of multiple, interconnected interactions and the shared experience of the participants of a field of practice. See: E. Marynowicz-Hetka (2019: 320–321).

Naturally, these different dimensions of looking at the phenomenon of a school of thought should not be considered as disconnected or separate. The complexity/duality of the processes that occur during the construction of a shared thought result in a similarly complex analysis of a school of thought, understood as a relational weave of transformations that mostly happen silently and remain invisible to the participants. A reference for this interpretation is Fernand Braudel's (1997 [1958]) consideration of the two dimensions of time: short and long. The first is an expression of a certain slowdown of events that are experienced by an individual, and the second expresses the fact that "in the foreground of the study there are the great cyclic oscillations that create lasting existence" (ibidem: 149; Jullien 2009: 138). According to Jullien (2009), these structurally distinct categories of "short" and "long" time can be used in the analysis of the processes of transformation, which—especially in the beginning—occur in a way that is invisible for those who are part of it. These hidden transformations happen in a "silence" that is not mobile, allowing for a more global view of not only past events, but also those we are experiencing in the present.

Transformation of relation: asymmetry vs. transgression

A specific feature of the different relations that lead to the creation of a school of thought is variability and acting in phase, resulting from the participants' inevitable desire for individual expressions of transgression. At first the asymmetrical relation becomes equal, and sometimes once again asymmetrical, albeit with a differently directed vector. The student outgrows the master, at times the discussion is a clear differentiation of opinions, and later also attitudes, preferences *etc*. Sometimes it is expressed by conflict.[8] The relational character of this phenomenon is emphasized by the fact that "the master appears on the intellectual horizon of the disciple" (Bauman 2004: 72), which means that we are searching for those masters with whom we can find/feel shared experience, seen by John Dewey as an indisputable attribute for constructing a relation oriented at education/formation.

This symbolic relationship that describes the determinants of relation and relationality requires us to "connect [the master] not only with knowledge, but also with specific features" (ibidem: 72), including personal, and especially affective features. A master is someone who inspires us, perhaps even fascinates us, with whom we like to work. It is also someone whose actions or biography set new standards. Helena Radlińska was such a figure, who, through her own biography, set a high standard for scholarship, teaching and social activity, but also presented

[8] This thesis is developed in different discourses, e.g. in post-Foucauldian discourse or in institutional analysis. See J. Donzelot (2005); P. Fustier (2000); J. Ardoino, R. Lourau (1994).

a model for students to aspire to and work toward, as well as a particular atmosphere of academic life. Because of her many intellectual, emotional and practical virtues, today we can talk about social pedagogy as a symbolic institution, and about her school of thought (see: Lepalczyk 2001; Marynowicz-Hetka, Theiss 2004).

Certain tensions that may provoke changes in the participants of an activity are a particular feature of these different relations. The characteristic trajectory of this process, for which we can find many examples in the history of science, as well as among practical events, follows the direction from imitating and remaining in the shadow of a master to transgressing both yourself and the master, which is often painful for both sides and leads to conflict. This complex/dual relationship can be shaped in different spaces. These are:

- texts: when the master is an author (Teresa Bauman writes about "a master of thought"). The direction of the transformation: from fidelity to a concept, to creating your own research and theoretical identity, and therefore transgressing the master;
- activities in the field of practice—including an oscillation of changes: from imitating particular examples of acts to finding your own path of activity; sometimes it is expressed by "a third way," in the words of Ricouer (2003). A fragment from the letters written by Radlińska, the unapologetic master, about her own master professor Stanisław Krzyżanowski may serve as an illustration.[9]

Transformations of these interwoven relations are fostered by perceiving the master not as someone who transfers knowledge—that is the role of a teacher—but as someone who inspires, encourages, and most importantly always questions everything; "someone from whom you take, even if there was no intention of giving on their part" (Bauman 2004: 77). It is also someone who "has the courage to abandon the position they have achieved, abandon everything they have learned" (ibidem) and start everything from scratch (e.g. taking into consideration new paradigms), but expresses it in an authentic way. This feature—authenticity (Taylor 2002), is precisely what attracts us to and delights us in other significant people, and makes us want to continue their work, transform it, and ultimately also transform ourselves.

[9] "He showed me a "great" academic career, if I would only limit myself to research. It was the first time that I opposed my dear Professor. I considered my service as most important. I argued with excitement that if I contribute anything to history (let's add: to education and social work), it is only because of my experiences in social work (…) When after many years I finally became a professor of history and education, I was sad that I couldn't continue my conversations with Krzyżanowski about the value of the work he had so much disdain for, and that I couldn't thank him for training me in the basic methods of scholarship (…)" (Radlińska 1964: 358–359).

La filiation: or, the chain of people and matters

Paraphrasing Bachelard's motto from the beginning of this article, it can be said that if science exists only as school with a capital "S," then an indispensible element of the analysis is the issue that is described with the clever French term of *la filiation*, in free translation—"a chain of people and matters"—and in Polish generally described as cultural heritage connected with the processes of lasting existence and discontinuity. Questions quickly arise: What is inherited? How is it inherited? What are the conditions for this process? What characterizes it?

Lech Witkowski (2011)[10] acknowledges the significance of the category of *la filiation* in analyzing the phenomenon of lasting existence and transformation in a different way, providing a very accurate trope for the analysis of this problem, an indispensible element of social relations in the sphere of education. Ascribing this category into "culture understood as cultural heritage" (ibidem: 693) he defines it as "an intimate encounter with heritage" (ibidem), or as "an intimate relation of cultural gratitude and a real debt that is paid spiritually" (ibidem). The category of *la filiation,* this chain of people and matters, particularly emphasizes the social dimensions of interwoven relations. Although Witkowski uses phrases that are commonly interpreted as referring to individual experience (e.g. "intimacy"), it is not only about a one-dimensional relation between Me and You, but about its interweaving in the context of events and shared experiences. For this reason this category seems crucial for analyzing the phenomenon of a school of thought.

A school of thought is a symbolic category, one that—if it comes into existence in the experience of the participants—transversally permeates social images and constructs symbolic institutions. An indispensible feature is the relationality of this phenomenon.. We often look for those who share our experiences, and with whom we can find/feel how these experiences are shared and distributed. Lech Witkowski (2011) provides an entire list of the determinants of relationships in the educational sphere, which can be referred to as the interweaving of activities we call a school of thought. I shall not present it here in its entirety; but some of those determinants are connected with the phenomenon of a master. On the side of those who experience such a relation they are for example:

> personal experience of a meeting, careful reflection, the effort of focused following, critical thought, a new surprising perspective, naming of the discoveries made possible in this mode, a significant impulse, or finally an encouragement to act and think beyond what was previously possible or planned, and finally **the sense of being an heir which compels us to develop**

[10] It is worth noting that as a result of Lech Witkowski's inspiration, there will be a seminar dedicated to the heritage of idea and intergenerational ruptures in Polish pedagogy organized in September 2019 during the tenth Congress of the Polish Pedagogical Association. See: Witkowski (2019).

ideas independently and follow the adopted direction, tangible manifestations of changes that occurred in the receiver (ibidem: 737).

It would be more precise to say: the participant of the relation, which Witkowski acknowledges himself in a later part of his text (ibidem). This analysis leads us to the question: what kind of master? The answer also comes from our analysis: an emancipatory master, one who accompanies us and our work, and the development of those with whom he forms relationships. This requires modesty and attention, as well as a constant orientation of activity towards the Other, which will be explored in the next section.

The emancipatory master vs. a master accompanist

Jacques Rancière (1987) formulates the following thesis: "a person may need a master when his own will is not strong enough to set him on track and keep him there" (ibidem: 13). Despite a certain categoricity, the formulation illustrates a certain type of temporality of waiting: for the moment of finding your own path. It is an inalienable feature of the emancipatory master Rancière is writing about—he is present, at your disposal, for as long as the student cannot find his own path, "set himself on track." It also expresses his contradiction: a captivating presence. Rancière's thesis allows us also to uncover a certain distinction between mastery and authority. One is a master for as long as his students (or, more precisely: Others) want him to be, and under their conditions. Whereas one "has" authority regardless of expectations and conditions.

Rancière's proposed category of an emancipatory master, "ignorant" (*le maître ignorant)*, as states the title of his book, is similar to the concept of "a master accompanist" (Barbier 2016), who accompanies us in our development. These categories similarly refer to the attitude of a teacher, someone who leads, as well as someone who others consider as their master. In French, the term *le maître* refers to both a teacher and a master. According to Rancière, a teacher becomes a master when "they discreetly guide the student's intelligence," but "discreetly enough to make it work, but not to the point of leaving it to itself" (ibidem: 29). This concept fits into the indirective methods of influencing, and thus it is understandable that Rancière refers to it when justifying Socrates' dialogical method of releasing internal power and stimulating development.

The category of the master accompanist refers to the concept of accompanying someone in their development.[11] The aim of these particular features of orienting

[11] Accompanying in development—an orientation in activity in the educational, formative, social sphere that represents indirective currents of influence. It is based on the idea of helping in development and presents in itself a transformation of this orientation. A key criterion for qualifying this type of activity is the subject's situation within the field of practice which is defined as internal, participatory and shared. See: E. Marynowicz-Hetka (2019: 325–326).

activity is not to indicate directively, nor to hasten the implementation, e.g. doing tasks for those we work with, even though their rhythm of life and speed of reacting to changes and orders indeed encourages us to do those tasks "for them". The difficulties in realizing the rule of accompanying in development are especially visible when we are working with people who have a different life regime (Barbier 2016), for example people who are sick, disabled, older, small children *etc*. Time becomes an important determinant for realizing this orientation of activity, of influencing the Other. Respecting time also in its individual, not only social, dimension, is a measure conducive to mental, affective, discursive development and maturation, and as a result—action/agency. Everyone who works with an Other, regardless of their age and social situation, knows perfectly that this process of maturing, growing into social roles, requires time and attention.

Accompanying understood as an "accompaniment" (Barbier 2016; Fustier 2000) of activity can be realized in various social situations, also when preparing to commence activity/professional activity. It helps to shape the competences of the subject acting in the field of practice: explaining, orienting activity and methodologically directing and modifying the activity, sometimes intuitively, in the direction of professional activity understood as one that structures the present through the future and gives meaning to anticipation.

The process of accompanying in development can be regarded in several dimensions—in addition to those described above there are also horizontal and vertical dimensions. In a horizontal dimension it is most often professionals, that is—guardians, teachers, educators—who accompany the development of others, who for various reasons require empowerment, assistance and care. It can, therefore, be said that this accompanying is realized through other processes: taking care of, compensating, educating, preventing *etc*., and for individuals situated in their everyday environment.

The vertical dimension of this orienting of activity refers to educating those who in turn educate others (teachers, educators, guardians); accompanying in the development of professionals is realized through the process of education. It is also an activity/action for those who teach, as well as for those who are taught. This process is more about individual development and learning competences, and most importantly—and what requires most time and patience from the "accompanist"—about changing "mental habits," and acquiring newly established attitudes.

If this type of accompanying in the development of professionals active in the field of practice takes place in the space of an institution, then it can be conducive to creating a certain culture of practice, typical for a given institution. It can become a requisite factor of creating a space of ideas shared by every participant in a given field of practice. We can, therefore, talk about one additional dimension of accompanying in development: the institutional dimension, in which a team shares the same orientation of activity. It becomes a certain culture of activity,

complementing the basic activity of the accompanying individual. The aim of accompanying understood this way is a simultaneous optimization of the realized tasks, in which it is engaged, as well as its own transformation as a subject. In this sense, we sometimes talk about education integrated with activity. This multifaceted and multidimensional process of accompanying is emphasized in contemporary scholarship analyzing activity. This direction of developing the idea—of accompanying also in the processes of work and production—is always discussed (Barbier 2009; *Encyclopédie de la formation*, 2009) with a strong emphasis on its educational, or, more precisely, formative aspect.

Instead of a conclusion: doubt

In the conclusion I wish to return to the beginning—to the reluctance in documenting the lasting existence of schools of thought. Thinking about this problem leads to the following question: do we need justifications for writing about the phenomena of schools of thought, mastery, authority *etc*. The answer is obvious. There are many different positions.

In her collection of essays entitled *Człowiek to nie jest piękne zwierzę…* Barbara Skarga writes: "I do not accept authorities and I do not like authorities" (2007: 99). Later she adds: "I believe that in interpersonal relations we only need mutual respect, Kantian respect for dignity. I also believe that the mind should always oppose authority, as did Saint Augustine, stating that only the mind should have authority, as it seldom fails" (ibidem: 234).

Charles Taylor (2002) emphasizes that in this need for authenticity, in a specific culture of authenticity, there is "a certain constitutive tension" (ibidem: 71) between "the ideals and the ways in which they are manifested in human life" (ibidem: 90). It is a tension between representations (mental images) and experience (experiencing them).

Even these two arguments are enough to cast doubt on to the necessity of relying on such categories as a school of thought, mastery, or a master, at a time when great transformations are occurring in modern life and in our own expectations. I am referring to the common requirement of individualism and the praise of "the instrumental mind", or the figure of *homo oeconomicus* discussed in post-Foucauldian literature, founded on the principle of rationality and achieving tangible effects as soon as possible (Donzelot 2005). This is probably a topic for another article about the paradoxes in the phenomenon of a school of thought/ thinking.

References

Ardoino J., Lourau R. (1994) *Les pédagogie institutionnelles*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.

Arendt H. (1985) *Du privé et du public* in: *Hannah Arendt*, "Les Cahiers Du Grif" 33: 47–67.

Bachelard G. (2002 [1938]) *Kształtowanie umysłu naukowego. Przyczynek do psychoanalizy wiedzy obiektywnej*, transl. by D. Leszczyński, Gdańsk, Wydawnictwo Słowo/obraz terytoria.

Baczko B. (1994) *Wyobrażenia społeczne. Szkice o nadziei i pamięci zbiorowej*, transl. by M. Kowalska, Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Barbier J.-M. (2006) *Działanie w kształceniu i pracy socjalnej. Analiza podejść*, transl. by G. Karbowska, Katowice, Wydawnictwo Naukowe „Śląsk", seria BPS.

Barbier J.-M. (2009) *Les dispositifs de formation: diversités et cohérences-outils d'approche* in: *Encyclopédie de la formation*, dir. J.-M. Barbier, É. Bourgois, G. Chapelle, J. C. Ruano Borbalan, avec la collaboration G. Marchand, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France: 223–249.

Barbier J.-M. (2016) *Leksykon analizy aktywności. Konceptualizacje zwyczajowych pojęć*, transl. by E. Marynowicz-Hetka, Łódź, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Barbier J.-M. (2018) *Expérience, transformation de soi, construction du moi, affirmation duje*, "The Conversation FR", http://theconversation.com/experience-transformation-de-soiconstruction-du-moi-affirmation-du-je-88935 [accessed: 10.01.2018].

Bauman T. (2004) *Mistrzowie i szkoły myślenia w uniwersytecie* in: *Gdańskie rodowody pedagogiczne*, E. Rodziewicz, K. Rzędzicka, E. Zalewska (Eds.), Gdańsk, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego: 71–84.

Braudel F. (1997 [1958]) *Les Écrits de Fernand Braudel*, vol. 2: *Les Ambitions de l'histoire*, Paris, De Fallois.

Braudel F. (1999 [1977]) *Historia i trwanie*, transl. by B. Geremek, W. Kula, Warszawa, Czytelnik.

Bruni L. (2010) *Eros, Philia et Agapé. Pour une teorie la réciprocité plurielle et pluraliste*, "Revue du Mauss" 35: 221–246.

Castoriadis C. (1975) *L'Institution imaginaire de la société*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil.

Dewey J. (1968 [1947]) *Éxpérience et éducation*, transl. by M. A. Carroi, Paris, Librairie Armand Colin.

Donzelot J. (2005) *Comment gouverner les sociétés libérales? L'effet Foucault dans le monde anglo-saxon. Discussion entre Jacques Donzelot et Colin Gordon*, „Esprit" 319: 82–96.

Durand M. (2017) *L'activité en transformation* in: *Encyclopédie d'analyse des activités*, dir. J.-M. Barbier, M. Durand, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France: 33–55.

Encyclopédie de la formation (2009) dir. J.-M. Barbier, E. Bourgeois, G. Chapelle, J.-C. Ruano-Borbalan, avec la collaboration G. Marchand, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.

Fustier P. (1998) *Działanie socjalne – znaczenie daru*, transl. by A. Czołnowska, w: *Pedagogika społeczna jako dyscyplina akademicka. Stan i perspektywy*, E. Marynowicz-Hetka, J. Piekarski, E. Cyrańska (Eds.), Łódź–Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódzkie Towarzystwo Naukowe, Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna Związku Nauczycielstwa Polskiego: 194–204.

Fustier P. (2000) *Le lien d'accompagnant. Entre don et contra salarial*, Paris, Dunod.

Jullien F. (2009) *Les transformations silencieuses*, Paris, Éditions Grasset et Fasquelle.

Jullien F. (2017) *Une seconde vie. Commencer véritablement d'exister*, Paris, Éditions Grasset et Fasquelle.

La gratuité. Eloge de l'inestimable (2010), "Revue du Mauss" 35.

Lepalczyk I. (2001) *Helena Radlińska. Życie i twórczość*, Toruń, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.

Leszczyński D. (2002) *Filozofia nauki Gastona Bachelarda* in: G. Bachelard, *Kształtowanie umysłu naukowego*, transl. by D. Leszczyński, Gdańsk, Wydawnictwo Słowo/obraz/ terytoria: 7–16.

Marynowicz-Hetka E. (2019) *Pedagogika społeczna. Pojmowanie aktywności w polu praktyki*, Łódź, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Marynowicz-Hetka E. (Ed.) (1997) *Mistrz-uczeń. Wyobrażenia czy rzeczywistość, czyli o tworzeniu szkół naukowych*, Łódź, Łódzkie Towarzystwo Naukowe.

Marynowicz-Hetka E., Theiss W. (Eds.) (2004) *Profesor Helena Radlińska. W sto dwudziestą piątą rocznicę urodzin i pięćdziesiątą rocznicę śmierci*, Sylwetki Łódzkich Uczonych, z. 75, Łódź, Wydawnictwo Łódzkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego.

Nawroczyński B. (1947) *Życie duchowe. Zarys filozofii kultury*, Kraków–Warszawa, Księgarnia Wydawnicza F. Pieczątkowski i S-ka.

Nuttin J. (1968) *Struktura osobowości*, trans. by T. Kołakowska, Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Radlińska H. (1964) *Listy o nauczaniu i pracy badawczej* in: *Pisma pedagogiczne*, vol. 3. *Z dziejów pracy społecznej i oświatowej*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich: 329–478.

Rancière J. (1987) *Le maître ignorant. Cinq leçons sur l'émancipation intellectuelle*, Paris, Fayard.

Ricoeur P. (2003) *Krytyka i przekonanie. Rozmowy z François Azouvin i Markiem de Launay*, transl. by M. Drwięga, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo KR.

Skarga B. (2007) *Człowiek to nie jest piękne zwierzę*, Kraków, Wydawnictwo Znak.

Skarga B. (2009) *Tercet metafizyczny*, Kraków, Wydawnictwo Znak.

Starczewska K. (1994 [1978]) *Wartości podstawowe* in: *O wartościach, normach, problemach moralnych. Wybór tekstów z etyki polskiej dla nauczycieli i uczniów szkół średnich*, M. Środa (Ed.), Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Szaniawski K. (1994) *Zasada istnienia autorytetu w środowisku naukowym* in: K. Szaniawski, *O nauce, rozumowaniu i wartościach*, Warszawa 1994, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN: 102–109.

Świda H. (1974) *Osobowość jako system ustosunkowań wobec świata*, „Studia Pedagogiczne" 30, Wrocław, Ossolineum: 151–201.

Taylor Ch. (2002) *Etyka autentyczności*, transl. by A. Pawelec, Kraków, Wydawnictwo Znak.

Wagner A. (2003) *Volunteerism, Voluntary Action and the Modern Welfare State* in: *Social Work Education and Practice in Today's Europe. Challenges and the Diversity of Responses/La Formation et l'action dans le travail social pour l' Europe d'aujourd'hui. Les défis et la diversité des solutions*, Ch. Labonté-Roset, E. Marynowicz-Hetka, J. Szmagalski (Eds.), Katowice, Wydawnictwo Naukowe „Śląsk": 245–257.

Walczak A., Mikołajewicz W. (Eds.) (2017) *Mistrzostwo duchowe*, Łódź, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Witkowski L. (2011) *Historie autorytetu wobec kultury i edukacji*, Kraków, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls".

Witkowski L. (Ed.) (2019) *Dziedzictwo idei i pęknięcia międzypokoleniowe w polskiej pedagogice. Wprowadzenie do problemu* Toruń, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.