

### **Summary of professional accomplishments:**

1. First and last name:

Piotr Magier

2. Awarded diplomas, academic degrees

– Diploma of Doctor of Humanities in the field of pedagogy awarded by resolution of the Council of the Faculty of Social Sciences at the Catholic University of Lublin of 17 March 2005, based on dissertation under the following title: “H. Schoenebecka humanizm post-pedagogiczny. Krytyczna analiza antropologicznych tez antypedagogiki” under supervision of Rev. Prof. Józef Wilk PhD Hab and Prof. Marian Nowak PhD Hab; reviewers: Prof. Bogusław Śliwerski PhD Hab and Prof. Henryk Cudak PhD Hab.

3. Information on previous employment in academic units

a. Work at the Catholic University of Lublin

– 01/06/2017 – until present – work at the position of an assistant at the Department of General Pedagogy of the Institute of Pedagogy of the Faculty of Social Sciences at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin.

– 01/10/2007 – 28/02/2017 – employment at the position of an assistant professor at the Department of General Pedagogy of the Institute of Pedagogy of the Faculty of Social Sciences at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin.

– 01/10/2001 – 30/09/2007 – employment at the position of an assistant at the Department of General Pedagogy of the Institute of Pedagogy of the Faculty of Social Sciences at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin.

– 01/10/1998 – 30/09/2001 – employment at the position of an assistant at the Department of Pedagogy of Family of the Institute of Pedagogy of the Faculty of Social Sciences at the Catholic University of Lublin.

- b. Work at other academic centres and educational and care-providing facilities.
- 01/10/2017 – 28/02/2019 – teaching classes under a specific task contract at the University College of Enterprise and Administration in Lublin.
  - 01/10/2017 – 28/02/2018 – teaching classes under a specific task contract at the Bogdan Jański Academy. Branch Faculty in Kraków.
  - 13/09/2013 – 28/02/2014 – teaching classes under a specific task contract at the Bogdan Jański Academy. Branch Faculty in Chełm.
  - 01/10/2009 – 30/06/2011 – work at the position of a lecturer at the Higher School of Social and Technical Sciences in Radom.
  - 01/10/2006 – 18/02/2007 – teaching classes under a specific task contract at the Bishop Jan Chrapek Higher School in Radom.
  - 01/02/2002 – 31/10/2006 – work at the following positions: social work specialist and educator at the Social Rehabilitation Centre. Community Self-help Home in Krasnystaw.
  - 01/10/2000 – 30/06/2002 – teaching classes under a specific task contract at the Branch Faculty of the Catholic University of Lublin in Stalowa Wola.
  - 07/11/1997 – 30/09/1998 – work at the position of a manager of the Dormitory at the Tadeusz Kościuszko Complex of Vocational Schools No. 1 in Krasnystaw.
4. List of achievements pursuant to Article 16(2) of the Act of 14 March 2003 on academic degrees and academic title and degrees and title in art (Journal of Laws of 2016, item 882, as amended in the Journal of Laws of 2016, item 1311):
- a. Title of the academic achievement:
- The Metatheory of Christian Pedagogy**
- b. Author and title of the publication, place and year of publication, name of the publisher, publisher's readers
- Piotr Magier, *The Metatheory of Christian Pedagogy*, Lublin: Scientific Society of the Catholic University of Lublin 2018, pp. 230; reviewers: Rev. Prof. Andrzej Maryniarczyk PhD Hab, Jarosław Horowski PhD Hab, Associate Professor at the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, Rev. Andrzej Łuczyński PhD Hab, Associate Professor at the Catholic University of Lublin.

- c. Discussion of the academic objective of the above-mentioned work/works and the achieved results including a discussion of their potential application

### **Subject of research**

The subject of research I conducted in the years 2010 – 2018 in the course of work at the Institute of Pedagogy at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin was Christian pedagogy (material subject), expressed in the aspect of its methodological specifics (formal subject)<sup>1</sup>. The presented research therefore had no empirical or theoretical character, but they referred to the methodological issues, specified in the works I presented as: “meta-theoretical”, “meta-subjective”, alternatively as “meta-academic”. The conducted methodological analyses concerned the following aspects: of defining Christian pedagogy, specifying its subject, purposes, language, the methods to substantiate statements and structure. Referring to the works of S. Kamiński and A. Bronk, I recognised these elements as essential for determining the methodological characteristic of Christian pedagogy.

An important aspect taken into account in the course of the conducted studies was the history of Christian pedagogy (Catholic pedagogy, Protestant pedagogy and Orthodox pedagogy), as well as the history of science and Christianity. The need to take into account the description of historical references of the undertaken research issues is justified by their humanistic nature (J.M. Bocheński, S. Kamiński). Its introduction allows to conceive the genesis and the process of formation of methodological solutions, which presently function in the area of this subdiscipline of pedagogy. It enables the understanding (W. Dilthey) of the methodological specificity of Christian pedagogy by reference to its sources, apologies and criticism addressed to it.

As the methodological reference point for the conducted studies, I adopted the attainment of analytic philosophy (J.M. Bocheński) and the works of methodologists (philosophers) associated with the Lwów-Warsaw School (K. Ajdukiewicz, T. Czeżowski, R. Ingarden, K. Tatarkiewicz). I also included within its scope the achievements of the Lublin School of Classical Philosophy, mainly the methodological ones (S. Kamiński, A. Bronk, Z. Herbut, A.B. Stępień, M. Walczak, A. Lekka-Kowalik, R. Kublikowski), but also the systemic,

---

<sup>1</sup> I am using the classical differentiation between the material and formal subject of research applied in the Lublin School of Classical Philosophy.

neo-thomistic ones (J. Woroniecki, M.A. Krąpiec, A. Maryniarczyk, P. Jaroszyński, H. Kiereś, B. Kiereś). I decided that the methodological background I rely on should take into account the native research achievements typical of Polish methodology (meta-science). I also based the conviction regarding its use on the certainty that it introduces important “intellectual tools”, used to describe and explain the methodological specificity of Christian pedagogy (the above-mentioned history, subject, objective, structure, functions, defining, ordering) and on a more elementary view on the systemic (genetic, theoretical, methodological) relation between pedagogy and philosophy.

I profiled the scope of the conducted studies to the Polish achievements of Christian pedagogy, which has not excluded the use of original foreign output (L. Bopp, F. de Hovre, R. Hubert, B. Plant, G. Mialaret, H. Sérouya, O. Willmann). I decided that this type of choice is justified by the fact that the studies conducted by the Polish Christian pedagogues are extensive, multi-faceted and deepened, and primarily representative for wider, international output in this discipline. Its value lies in them representing both the local specificity of Christian pedagogy (a significant property of humanistic studies: J. Bartmiński, A. Bronk, S. Majdański), but also in the fact that they actually concern its universal problems, including the methodological ones. The literature in Polish includes original analyses of issues that are essential for this subdiscipline (K. Banzel, Z. Bielawski, A. Niesiołowski, J. Woroniecki), covers the translations of its classical authors (e.g. the works of: J. Maritan, L. Giussani, E. Gilson, R. Gaurdini), as well as the critical studies on the native and global achievements (the works of: B. Milerski, M. Patalon, J. Kostkiewicz, M. Nowak, J. Horowski, A. Rynio, D. Stępkowski).

### **Justification of the choice of the subject of research**

The choice of Christian pedagogy as the subject of research was conditioned by cognitive and non-cognitive (practical, contextual) aspects. The cognitive considerations were essential for the choice made. I decided that Christian pedagogy is an important, interesting and in many aspects virgin subject of research, especially within the scope of methodological problems. The methodological specificity of Christian pedagogy is primarily determined by its “hybridity”, a combination of two types of knowledge: academic humanistic knowledge and religious knowledge, both of theological and common nature. Their combination within a single pedagogical subdiscipline (concept) results in numerous methodological problems, existence of which raises curiosity, provokes to consideration and attempts at their solution.

The methodological problems concerning Christian pedagogy are less reflected in pedagogical studies than the analogous problems analysed in the field of pedagogy of religion (C. Rogowski). They are undertaken (J. Bagrowicz, J. Horowski, Z. Marek, J. Michalski, B. Milerski, M. Nowak, K. Olbrycht, M. Rusiecki, A. Rynio), but they are aspectual in nature, rather epistemological than methodological and they are implemented in the context of theoretical and empirical analyses. Their specific type is conducted by the representatives of theology, who often treat Christian pedagogy (Catholic pedagogy) as a discipline of theological sciences (A. Długosz, A. Dziega, M. Wolicki). Although their results should be recognised as interesting and enriching for the methodology of Christian pedagogy, they express research approach oriented at apology and normativity of this subdiscipline.

The main, cognitive reason for undertaking studies on the methodology of Christian pedagogy are therefore the controversies generated by this subdiscipline. The basic one is fundamental in nature, it concerns the (possibility of) existence of this type of science within the framework of pedagogy (humanities). Inclusion of the content of Judeo-Christian Revelation in the scope of academic knowledge generates significant and not in the least ostensible or naive questions related to the validity and the need for this type of procedure in science. The questions “whether?”, and if so, “based on what?” and “in what aspects?” pedagogy needs it, should be treated as important by all means, all the more since they exemplify the wider problem faced by pedagogy as science – namely the issue of its relation to non-academic (world-view, common) knowledge and its normativity (K. Sośnicki, A. Niesiołowski, M. Nowak, A. Salamucha).

The controversies concerning the possibility of existence of Christian pedagogy also have a social and cultural aspect. Discussions on it are entangled in the problem of ideologisation of pedagogy, particularly known and afflicting for Polish pedagogues (S. Sarnowski, D. Stępkowski). In a wider aspect, they form an element of disputes concerning the need for presence of Christianity in the Euro-Atlantic cultural circle.

In a practical aspect the need to undertake studies concerning Christian pedagogy is justified by considerations related to identity. Their implementation is an expression of continuation of the tradition of pedagogy at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin. Pedagogical studies were already initiated in the year of establishment of the University of Lublin in 1919/1920. They were conducted by Z. Kukulski and concerned the issues of general pedagogy and Christian pedagogy. It has been expressed clearly in the works of S. Kunowski, who continued the general pedagogical theoretical and methodological reflection and

established the foundations for the system of Christian education. Similarly after 1981/1982, at the moment of reactivation of the Department of Pedagogy (currently the Institute of Pedagogy) at the Catholic University of Lublin, studies conducted by Prof. Teresa Kukołowicz and continued by Rev. Prof. M. Nowak, Rev. Prof. J. Wilk, Prof. A. Rynio were characterised by interest in theoretical and methodological problems, as well as the issues of Christian upbringing.

### **Objectives of research**

Studies on the methodological identity of Christian pedagogy pursue theoretical and practical objectives. As far as the aspect of theoretical (cognitive) objectives is concerned, they are based on the description and explanation of the methodological specificity of Christian pedagogy. It is characteristic for the conducted studies that they do not assume the development of a methodological model of Christian pedagogy, but in line with the postulates of analytic philosophy (J.M. Bocheński), they are based on a formulation of elementary comments regarding the main methodological problems faced by this subdiscipline of pedagogy.

In the course of studies I sought to answer the following questions: 1) how is Christian pedagogy defined? 2) what position is attributed to it in the structure of pedagogy?; 3) what is its academic and ideological genesis and how did its development occur?; 4) what objectives are pursued by Christian pedagogy?; 5) what is specified by its language?; 6) what characterises the methods of justification for statements used in Christian pedagogy and its structure?

Apart from the cognitive significance, I assigned practical objectives to the undertaken studies. They are expressed in the evaluation and postulation for desired methods of research procedure (A. Bronk, M. Walczak). In the case of research concerning Christian pedagogy they aspire to evaluation and formulation of postulates concerning the method of its practice: the correctness of the used language, the method of knowledge structuralisation, the applied research methods – in accordance with the methodological postulates developed within the framework of the antinaturalistic model of science (W. Dilthey, W. Windelband, H. Rickert, G. Simmel). Since pedagogical studies are modernly conducted in a poly-paradigmatic manner, it is difficult to formulate assessments and postulates that would be universally binding and accepted in nature (B. Śliwowski). There is criticism for behaviour consisting in formulation *en bloc* of resolute, assertively expressed assessments, which do not take the paradigmatic context into account.

In this situation one of the possibilities to pursue the evaluative and postulative objectives of the undertaken studies is to refer to the paradigm in which the studies are conducted. Each paradigm includes normative models (contents), which constitute a point of reference for the studies conducted within its framework. They can therefore serve as the internal criteria for the assessment of research procedure. In the case of this type of perspective it is, however, difficult to compare, and even more so to assess the correctness of research procedure from the point of view of other paradigms, to compare the cognitive results obtained within the frameworks of different methodological and theoretical paradigms.

Another solution is to attempt to discuss the selected methodological problems from the position of different paradigm models. In the case of this solution the defined problem is analysed from the position of several, at a minimum the main paradigms. The advantage of this type of procedure is showing the variety of perspectives and interpretations generated by the specified problem. Although just like in the case of the first solution it is difficult to adopt a conclusive position, the multi-faceted nature and variety of methodological approaches, from the perspective of which the problem is analysed, provides a wide, erudite view on the analysed problem, enabling the development of own, original position.

Taking into account the variety, richness and multi-faceted nature of the academic output of humanities, in the undertaken studies I pursued the achievement of the second of the above-mentioned methodological approaches. I strived not to prejudge the validity of any solution, but rather to take into account the dissimilarity and variety of different paradigms in the solution of undertaken problems. In my studies I basically referred to two methodological paradigms: naturalistic and antinaturalistic. At the same time, I am aware that the implementation of this approach came across a minimum of two elementary problems, concerning: 1) the scope and precision of the possessed methodological knowledge and 2) conscious or unconscious reference to one, basic methodological concept preferred by the author. The first problem requires a broad knowledge of methodological concepts and conducting analyses at a high level of generalisation, i.e. avoiding nuances present in particular methodological concepts and focusing on their essence, the fundamental theses. The second problem seems complex inasmuch as in studies it is difficult to be liberated from all (any) assumptions, premises, basic postulates. Neutrality and objectivity of research is doubtful. The solution I adopted was therefore to declare in the course of formulation of evaluative statements of my own methodological position directly, based on metaphysical realism and epistemological realism, as well as on rationalism.

In consequence I recognise that the conducted studies are not completed, final, nor conclusive. They do not generate the ready methodological concept of Christian pedagogy. On the contrary, they constitute an introduction to the undertaken problems, they are meant to inspire further studies and discussion. Their cognitive significance is expressed in the indication and discussion of fundamental methodological problems of Christian pedagogy.

### **Execution of research**

The decision to undertake studies concerning the methodological specificity of Christian pedagogy and the process of their execution was determined both by my academic interests and the course of my professional work at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin. Its beginnings were associated with work at the Department of Pedagogy of Family at the Institute of Pedagogy at the Catholic University of Lublin, headed (in the years 1997-2001) by Rev. Prof. Józef Wilk PhD Hab. The research work I conducted at that time was oriented at the issues of upbringing in a family. However, at that time I also dealt with the issues of theoretical foundations of upbringing in a family and the problems concerning the relations between the process of upbringing in a family and Christianity, in particular the Catholic concept of marriage and family (publications: *The Cultural Context of Raising a Child as a Challenge for Parents' Education*, in: D. Opozda (ed.), *Parenthood. Selected Issues of Educational Contexts*, Lublin: KUL Publishing House 2007, pp. 99 – 107; *Marriage and Family. The Basic Elements of the Personalist and Christian Concept of the Family*, in: W. Korzeniowska, U. Szuścik (ed.), *Family. History and the Present Day*, Kraków: Printing house Impuls 2005, pp. 85 – 92; *Understanding and Knowledge of the Theory of H. von Schoenebeck*, in: J. Kuźma, J. Morbitzer (ed.), *Pedagogical Sciences in Educational Theory and Practice*, Vol. II, Kraków: Scientific Publishing House of the Pedagogical Academy 2003, pp. 183 – 188.; *Contemporary Trends of Educational Changes on the Example of Anti-pedagogy*, in: W. Korzeniowska (ed.), *Changes in the Sciences of Education: Ideas, Concepts, Educational Reality*, Kraków: Printing house Impuls 2002, pp. 113 – 121; *Educational Changes at the Beginning of the Current Age. Personalistic Proposal*, in: W. Korzeniowska (ed.), *Educational Changes in Poland and in the World and Models of Education*, Kraków: Printing house Impuls 2001, pp. 401-407; *Contemporary Pedagogical Thought Regarding the "Final Question"*, in: A. Rynio (ed.), *Upbringing of an Open Person*, Kielce: Jedność Publishing House 2001, pp. 234 – 239; .., *Analysis of Pedagogical Anthropology of Father Jacek Woroniecki*, in: R. Bieleń (ed.), *In the Service of the Family*, Warszawa: Salesian Publishing House 2000, pp. 119 – 128).



At the same time, I also developed my methodological interests, participating in the MA seminar titled “Theoretical basics of pedagogy”, conducted for the students in the field of Pedagogy by Rev. Prof. Andrzej Bronk PhD Hab and occasionally participating in PhD seminars conducted at the Faculty of Philosophy at the Department of General Methodology of Science at the Catholic University of Lublin by Rev. Prof. Marian Andrzej Bronk PhD Hab and the late Rev. Prof. Józef Herbut PhD Hab.

The focus of my research interests on methodological (meta-theoretical) problems in pedagogy was definitely a result of inspiration with methodological seminars conducted at the Department of Methodology of Science at the Catholic University of Lublin. The second source of inspiration for the problems of methodology of pedagogy was the cooperation with Rev. Prof. M. Nowak PhD and Rev. Marek Jeziorański PhD in the field of general pedagogy and Prof. Franciszka Wanda Wawro PhD Hab, in the field of methodology of social research. They were expressed in administrative terms by my transition from the Department of Pedagogy at Family of the Catholic University of Lublin to the Department of General Pedagogy at the Catholic University of Lublin (2001), headed by Rev. Prof. M. Nowak PhD and the doctoral thesis (2005) I developed, under the following title: “*H. Schoenebeck post-pedagogic humanism. Critical analysis of anthropological theses of anti-pedagogy*” supervised by Rev. Prof. Józef Wilk PhD Hab and (after his passing) by Rev. Prof. Marian Nowak PhD Hab, reviewed by Prof. Bogusław Śliwerski PhD Hab and Prof. Henryk Cudak PhD Hab.

Extended and partially changed in terms of the content of the PhD thesis, studies concerning anti-pedagogy were published in the form of a book publication titled *A Post-antipedagogic Essay*, Lublin: Scientific Society of KUL, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2016, pp 270, *Lublin: The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2016*. Changes in the content primarily referred to defining anti-pedagogy and the critical aspects and were to a large extent a result of discussion on anti-pedagogy (i.a. B. Śliwerski, Z. Barciński), in the course of which my doctoral studies were referred to. The content of the publication covered: the genesis and history of anti-pedagogy, its theoretical and cultural sources, definitions, basic anthropological theses. I also included in it the critical comments concerning this direction, which I formed from the position of personalistic pedagogy, The basic thesis they contain indicated the naturalistic and romantic inspirations of the anti-pedagogical concept.

Considering the specificity of the native academic environment, I made a decision to focus on methodological (meta-theoretical) analyses concerning Christian pedagogy and

personalistic pedagogy. The initial stages of research included the analyses of selected, in my opinion main, terms of Christian pedagogy. Library research and the development of reflections resulted in the introduction of the issues related to structure and the research methods of Christian pedagogy to the scope of research. Their result is a series of articles published systematically from 2010, concerning the aspectual analyses of Christian pedagogy, its: language (categories), subject of research, methods of justification for statements: *Christianisme et pédagogie. Les aspects méthodologiques choisis*, “Zeszyty Naukowe KUL” 2018 Vol. 61 nr 4 (244), s. 275-293, ISSN 0044-4405; *What Is the Use of the Dialogue for Christian Pedagogues?*, “Paedagogia Christiana” 2017 No. 2/40, p. 51-68, ISSN 1505-6872; *Religious Authorities in Pedagogy. Metatheoretical Remarks*, “Paedagogia Christiana” 2015 No. 1/35, p. 161-179, ISSN 1505-6872; *Defending the Christian Pedagogy*, “Paedagogia Christiana” 2013 No. 1/31, p. 155-169, ISSN 1505-6872 (written in cooperation with A. Salamucha); *The Issues of „Contemporary Challenges” in Christian Pedagogy*, “Studia Scientifica Facultatis Pedagogicae Universitatis Catholica Ruzomberok” 2012 (4) Vol. XI, p. 81-91, ISSN 1336-2232; *La pédagogie à l'Université Catholique de Lublin par rapport au progrès de la pédagogie en Pologne. Esquisse historique et théorique*, “Roczniki Pedagogiczne” 2012 Vol. 4(40) No. 2, p. 57-80, ISSN 2080-850X ; *Axiological-normative and Argumentative Aspects of Christian Pedagogy*, in: J. Bagrowicz, J. Horowski (ed.), *Educational Potential of Religion*, Toruń: UMK Publishing House 2012, pp. 163-183; *The Identity of Christian Pedagogy*, w: J. Michalski, A. Zakrzewska (ed.), *Christian Pedagogy: Tradition, Contemporaneity, New Challenges*, Toruń: Adam Marszałek Publishing House 2010, pp. 336-345.

Apart from the publication of results of studies, I also presented them at many national and international academic conferences, for example in Berlin (ASH), Clermont-Ferrand, Ružomberok (UK), Nitra, Prešov (UP), Warsaw (Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University), Olsztyn (University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn), Kraków (Pedagogical University, Ignatianum), Kielce – Piotrków Trybunalski (Jan Kochanowski University), Lublin (Catholic University of Lublin), Łódź (University of Łódź). Constant elements also included my participation in the sessions of the Christian Pedagogy Team, operating at the Committee for Pedagogical Sciences of the Polish Academy of Sciences. Among the most significant, I consider to be my participation in conferences: 14-16/09/2017, Toruń. Nicolaus Copernicus University. Polish Society for the Study of Religions. Societas et Ius Foundation. 5th International Congress of the Study of Religions: *Religie w dialogu kultur* [Religions in the

dialogue of cultures]; 17-20/06/2015. Gdynia. Polish Society for the Study of Religions, Polish Naval Academy. Participation in the 4th International Congress of the Religious Studies: “Religia a społeczno-polityczne przemiany współczesnego świata” [Religion and socio-political transformations of the modern world]; 12-15/09/2011. Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń – 3rd International Congress of Religious Studies: “Religie i religijność w świecie współczesnym” [Religions and religiosity in the modern world]; 30/03 – 01/04. 2016. Kraków. ACISE, The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Ignatianum in Kraków, XXVIII Colloque International Association Catholique Internationale des Institutions de Sciences de l’Education (ACISE-FIUC): Justice et Misericorde dans l’education et l’ecole contemporaines – co-organiser of the conference; 20-22/11/2015 Warsaw. Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University, B. Trentowski Society for Philosophical Pedagogy, Humboldt University of Berlin, University of Trnava, Charles University in Prague. Participation in the International Scientific Conference: “Kształcenie moralno-etyczne i kompetencje: zadania systemu oświatowego w nowoczesnym społeczeństwie” [Moral and ethical education and competences: the tasks of the education system in a modern society]; 15-17/10/2008. University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Scientific Conference: “Tradycja - Współczesność – Nowe wyzwania w pedagogice chrześcijańskiej” [Tradition – Modernity – New challenges in Christian pedagogy]; 15/11/2006. The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, International Pedagogical Conference: “Wychowanie chrześcijańskie wobec wyzwań współczesności” [Christian upbringing in the face of challenges of the present].

The final result of meta-subjective research on Christian pedagogy, collecting and summarising the previous research achievements is the following publication: *Metateoria pedagogiki chrześcijańskiej*, Lublin: The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2018. It contains a systematised set of methodological observations extended with new reflections (in relation to my earlier publications). They concern its history, especially the historical differentiation between Catholic pedagogy, Protestant pedagogy and Orthodox pedagogy; the relation between Christian pedagogy and other disciplines and trends of pedagogy, the methodological consequences of linking the contents of the Revelation with pedagogy; the reference to the naturalistic and anti-naturalistic paradigm of the practice of science in the context of the possibility of existence of Christian pedagogy.

### **The achieved results**

As the main cognitive results of the conducted studies, I recognise: 1) the description of the process of formation of Christian pedagogy; 2) the indication of obscurity of the use of the term “Christian pedagogy” in the context of such synonymous terms as: “pedagogy of religion”, “Catholic pedagogy”, “Protestant pedagogy”, “catechetics”; 3) the indication of difficulties in differentiation of the descriptive use of the term “Christian pedagogy” from its evaluative use; 4) the specification of the double-sided type of relationship between pedagogy and Christianity: systemic and non-systemic; 5) the characteristic of the problems concerning the definition and typologisation of Christian pedagogy, and therefore its unclear inclusion in pedagogical subdisciplines and pedagogical trends; 6) the presentation of difficulties in the precision of the language of Christian pedagogy, being a consequence of its relationship with the common religious language and the language of theology; 7) the description of problems concerning the process of justification for the statements of Christian pedagogy, in reference to the method of argumentation from authority and argumentation from empiricism and the possibility, need and scope of its application in the course of academic discussion (dialogue); 8) the justification of the need to conduct meta-subjective studies and their popularisation in pedagogy.

1) The first of the results developed in the course of research refers to the genesis and history of Christian pedagogy, analysed in the context of the development of science and Christianity. Although the particular aspects of this scope of content are known (e.g. the history of science and the history of Christianity), the results of studies concerning the development of the mutual relationship between science and Christianity are less prevalent (A. Bronk, W.B. Drees, G. Minois, J. Życiński). Analyses of history and problems showed that a mutual relationship between science and Christianity is not homogeneous historically in nature and it has been changing with the passage of time. Both on the side of science and the Church alternately prevailing there were: mutual interest with recognition and dislike with hostility. It seems that modernly on the side of the Church and the religiously engaged scientists the winning attitude is that of moderate acceptance and respect for the autonomy of science (John Paul II, A. Plantinga, A. McGrath), whereas on the side of science the necessity to separate it from religion is assumed to be evident (D. Dennett), sometimes associated with disapproval for Christianity (R. Dawkins).

Historical research allowed to systematise the history of three types of Christian pedagogy: Catholic pedagogy, Orthodox pedagogy and Protestant pedagogy. This mostly concerns the educational practice of each of the three Christian religions – and therefore

pedagogy and its accompanying theoretical reflection. A separate scope of content was dedicated to the pedagogy of religion, which, although it references to religious pedagogy, is a separate discipline of pedagogy, being an answer to the process of humanisation of religion.

The conducted historical analyses contain one more, in my opinion significant (at least in terms of aspect) cognitive element. I am referring to the development and modern functioning of Orthodox pedagogy. While Catholic pedagogy and Protestant pedagogy constitute a recognisable part of Christian pedagogy in Poland, Orthodox pedagogy is definitely forgotten, non-existent. Orthodox pedagogical reflection in pedagogical discourse is initial, basal in nature (H. Borowik, L. Busłowska, A. Mironowicz). I think that the history of Orthodoxy and Orthodox pedagogy demonstrates that subordination to secular authority, experienced for ages by Orthodoxy, including the Marxist indoctrination in the 20th century, permanently impeded autonomous, unconstrained development of the pedagogical thought.

2) The second scope of conducted analyses covered terminological issues. Their basic result consists in the thesis claiming that the name “Christian pedagogy” is not a name with clear content and unequivocal scope. On the contrary, there are many of its synonymous terms and the names associated in terms of meanings, the scopes of which intersect. This applies in particular to the following terms: “pedagogics of Christianity”, “pedagogy of Christianity”, “pedagogy of religion”, “religious pedagogy”, “theological pedagogy”, “classical pedagogy”, “Catholic pedagogy”, “personalistic pedagogy”, “paedagogia perennis”, “integral pedagogy”, “religious pedagogy”, “transcendental pedagogy”, “transcendentism”, “pedagogy of ecumenism”, “pastoral pedagogy”, “catechetics”.

The research studies show that the use of particular terms is not subject to clearly defined principles (e.g. scope relationship), which, though they are postulated, do not find consistent application. This is clearly expressed in the custom of interchangeable use of the names such as “Christian pedagogy”, “Catholic pedagogy” and “Protestant pedagogy”, “religious pedagogy”, “Protestant pedagogy”. It introduces clear difficulties in the distinction of different types of Christian pedagogy and constitutes an example of defining *pars pro toto*.

3) Another cognitive effect of terminological analyses is the statement that the name “Christian pedagogy” functions both as a descriptive and an evaluative term. This term is not free from evaluative connotations. Positive connotations are usually attributed to it by the representatives of Christian pedagogy, whereas the negative ones by its opponents. Its positive assessment is conditioned by the conviction about the importance of the achievements of

Christianity in the educational (practical) and cognitive (theoretical) aspect. Negative connotation is usually attributed to “Christian pedagogy” by the authors who are reluctant to connect science (humanities) with a particular world-view or religion, *nota bene* most often scientifically-oriented. Another reason for a negative connotation of the term “Christian pedagogy” is the reference to the history of pedagogy and indication of negative consequences it experienced in the course of its association with Marxist ideology.

Regardless of the adopted solution, granting evaluative connotation to the term “Christian pedagogy” can lead to cognitive difficulties. A lack of distinction in the aspect of cognitive and non-cognitive functions possessed by this term (positive or negative assessment) can lead to excessive criticism or apology with regard to Christian pedagogy, impeding rational consideration of its essence, structure or tasks. Significant emotional engagement associated with this term introduces non-substantive, ideological theses and arguments in the academic discussions on Christian pedagogy.

4) Another cognitive effect of the conducted research is the determination of the specificity of the relation between the terms “pedagogy” and “Christianity”. In other words, it is about knowledge on what type of content is determined by the addition of the adjective “Christian” to the noun “pedagogy”. The starting point is the differentiation between the systemic and non-systemic presence of religious knowledge in the field of pedagogy (analogically to the differentiation by A. Bronk). The systemic dependence concerns the situation in which religious contents are used in the field of science in the heuristic and argumentative function. They indicate a situation in which the representatives of religion solve academic problems referencing to religious contents, including them in the structure of academic knowledge. The non-systemic relationship between religion and science applies to the situation in which the representatives of science are inspired by religious content in the determination (choice) of the subject of the conducted research (as it turns out that religion generates a range of problems of academic significance) and when religious motivation affects the reliability of the research they conduct (M.A. Krapiec, J. Maritain, M. Nowak).

An important observation is that justification of the relationship between science and religion (Christianity) depends on the paradigm adopted in the field of science. The most extreme views in this respect are expressed by methodological naturalism. Its acceptance makes it impossible to include religious contents in the structure of academic knowledge. Within its framework, academic knowledge is distinctively differentiated from non-scientific knowledge (demarcationism), and the latter type of cognition is usually depreciated. A moderate position

in the aspect of the science – faith relationship functions within the framework of the classical concept of science. A genetic and methodological diversity of both types of knowledge is indicated in this context. However, it is recognised that some issues are common for both types of cognition, and the possibility of non-systemic presence in science is attributed to religion. However, the modern anti-methodological concepts, especially referring to postmodernism, allow the possibility of combining science and religion. Based on cognitive relativism, they avoid absolutisation of any type of knowledge, treating each of them as equally probable and subjectively acceptable.

5) A significant cognitive effect of the conducted research concerns the definition and typologisation of Christian pedagogy. The basic remark concerns the projective nature of definitions used to define it. The academics dealing with this issue do not usually report on the method of definition for this name, but they introduce its own concepts, conditioned by the previously adopted theoretical and methodological assumptions. The definitions of Christian pedagogy are therefore noncriterial and difficult to operationalise.

An important aspect appearing in the definitions of Christian pedagogy are the differences in the determination of its class (*genus proximum*). Pedagogical texts indicate trends (systems, directions) or pedagogical subdisciplines (sciences), as the topical class of Christian pedagogy. Sometimes this type of classification is used intrinsically and inconsistently: at the same time it is included in pedagogical trends and subdisciplines. The difficulties in the determination of *genus proximum* of Christian pedagogy are not, however, trivial in cognitive terms. They result in a different way of its typologisation and characteristic and they are characterised by the categorial shift error. Recognition of Christian pedagogy as a pedagogical trend results in it being treated as a set of mainly postulative theses generating a particular model of education. They are ideological in nature and basically do not serve to achieve cognitive, but rather practical objectives. Recognition of Christian pedagogy as a pedagogical subdiscipline results in sanctioning of its academic and inquiring nature. It is treated then as knowledge or particular research procedures, primarily pursuing cognitive objectives. Finally, the significance of the adopted categorisation of Christian pedagogy indicates its scientific or non-scientific nature.

6) Apart from the terminological difficulties concerning the name “Christian pedagogy”, also the language of this pedagogical subdiscipline is characterised by specific problems. They are a consequence of an overlap of different types of language: the vocabulary of pedagogy, theology and the common language. As a result the terminology of Christian pedagogy is

characterised by lexical ambiguity and mixing cognitive and non-cognitive functions. The language of this discipline especially struggles with the problem of precision. This particularly concerns the use of language for the designation of the psychological states related to religious life and development, as well as its application to the dogmatic contents. Furthermore, its precision is affected by the fact of theoretical (philosophical, theological) engagement of religious terms. Their responsible use requires knowledge within the scope of the parent science, and their intuitive use can lead to conceptual errors or inconsistencies.

7) A methodological problem specific to Christian pedagogy is the method of justification and discussion for theses. The fact that it combines in its structure the academic (humanistic) and religious knowledge generates unique problems in this aspect. The first one of them is the problem of using argumentation from authority. For religious knowledge it is a natural way of accepting theses. The need for its application in science, especially the natural sciences, however, is limited. The problem is not so much the possibility of its application in Christian pedagogy – personal authority and tradition play as much of a significant role in the development of science (J.M. Bocheński, A. Bronk), as its scope. Analysis of the source literature indicates that the references to religious authorities are common. It could be argued that the use of this type of justifications is overused. Although its use is understandable in the teleological and normative aspect, the substitution of justifications for empirical theses by arguments from authority should be recognised as groundless or inappropriate.

The second problem concerning the method of justification for theses in the field of Christian pedagogy is the use of the thesis discussion method. The basic difficulty concerning this aspect lies in the difference between its application in science and religion. In science, discussion (dialogue) is a natural and the oldest research method. In its course the arguments are formulated and their validity is considered. Dialogue is used to reach an understanding of the problem, it requires openness, respect for the opponent and willingness to change one's own convictions (K. Ajdukiewicz, J.M. Bocheński, R. Ingarden). In religion the application of the method of dialogue is limited by doctrinal issues. They are not up for discussion. They are accepted or rejected, but not disputed. The antinomy generated by the use of the method of dialogue in Christian pedagogy therefore concerns the opposition between cognitive openness, typical of science, and the pursue to maintain identity, typical of religion.

8) The last of the signalised cognitive results of the conducted analyses is the characteristic of meta-theoretical studies, especially their function in pedagogy. In their course I described the genesis of this type of studies, which may reach back to Greek antiquity, but



their establishment falls on the beginnings of the 20th century and it is associated with neopositivism (M. Lazerowitz). In my studies I also took into account the significance of the Lwów-Warsaw School for their development and their continuation pursued in the academic environment of the Catholic University of Lublin.

As the most important cognitive element concerning meta-theory, I recognise the attempt to justify the need and description for the function of meta-subjective research in pedagogy. It can be noted that the studies of this type are not uncommon to pedagogy (J. Kostkiewicz, R. Leppert, T. Lewowicki, M. Nowak, S. Palka, R. Szulc, B. Śliwerski). They are for example conducted in general pedagogy and they have received their own names (meta-pedagogy, meta-theory of education). However, like in the case of philosophy, in pedagogy there also functions a discussion referring to the need to practice meta-theory and its objectives. Two positions can in general be indicated in it: recognising the need for this type of studies and undermining their validity. Within the framework of the former meta-theoretical studies are attributed the control, critical, identity and propaedeutic functions, and their practice is treated as an expression of methodological maturity and self-awareness of pedagogy. Within the framework of the latter position, difficulties are emphasised in the normative aspect, faced by meta-theory, which leads to the suggestion of their replacement with comparative studies.

Discussions concerning meta-theoretical studies in pedagogy are not just limited to its functions. The more elementary problem is the determination of their essence. In this respect, two positions have also been developed in pedagogy. Within the framework of the former, the essence of meta-theory is declared to be the analysis of philosophical foundations of pedagogy. Meta-theory is formulated within their framework as the theoretical reflection specifying the ontological, epistemological, anthropological, ethical foundations of pedagogy. Within the framework of the latter position it is assumed that the essence of meta-theory are the studies dedicated to methodological aspects of pedagogy, the specificity of its subject of research, objectives, research methods, structure.

## 5. Discussion of the other research and development methods

Apart from the studies on the methodology of Christian pedagogy, which constitute the last stage of my academic work, their significant elements are the studies on a) general pedagogy and b) pedagogy of family. They preceded the choice of Christian pedagogy as the subject of conducted analyses, not only in the aspect of time, but also prepared them in terms

of substance. The results developed in their course (especially within the scope of general pedagogy) were used in the course of meta-theoretical studies concerning Christian pedagogy.

a. Studies on general pedagogy

Although, as I mentioned earlier, the beginnings of my academic work concern the pedagogy of family, the issues within the scope of general pedagogy, and within its framework the methodological issues, were already present at the moment of the beginning of my work at the Department of Pedagogy of Family of the Catholic University of Lublin (1998-2001). They were initially raised in the context of the problems of education in a family (theoretical basics of education in a family, assessment of family in pedagogical concepts), and then took the form of studies directly concerning pedagogy. Their particular element were and continue to be the problems related to the language of pedagogy, especially concerning the pedagogical categories (main terms). They covered the linguistic and functional analysis of such terms as: “child”, “best interests of the child”, “care”, “generality”, “patriotism”: their genesis (etymology), defining, cognitive and non-cognitive functions in pedagogy. Methodological studies similarly covered the problems of structure of pedagogy and its purposes. Their important element continued to be the analysis of selected pedagogical concepts, which apart from Christian pedagogy were related to pedagogy of postmodernism, humanism, naturalism and antipedagogy: *Pedagogical Foundations of Education*, in: M. Marczewski, R. Gawrych, D. Opozda, T. Sakowicz, A. Solak (ed.), *Family Pedagogy. System Approach. Vol. 2: Family Education*, Gdańsk: Wyższa Szkoła Społeczno-Ekonomiczna w Gdańsku 2017, pp. 131-148; *Anti-pedagogy. Definitional Sketch*, „Cywilizacja” 2017 no. 62, pp. 21-19, ISSN 1643-3637; *About the Need of Ethics in Pedagogy*, „Forum Pedagogiczne” 2016 V. 2/1, pp. 155-167, ISSN 2083-6325; *Concepts of Care and Upbringing. Remarks on the Research Subject*, in: A. Łuczyński, I. Gumińska (ed.), *Care and Educational Activity Towards Contemporary Challenges*, Lublin: KUL Publishing House 2016, pp. 117-138; *Education of a Happy Man – Meta Subject Remarks*, in: Z. B. Gaś (ed.), *Youth in Search of Happiness. Where, for What, How and with Whom?*, Lublin: Scientific Publishing House Innovatio Press 2014, pp. 41-55; *Pedagogy and social work. The attempt to outline the range of mutual theoretical cooperation. The methodological context*, in: L. Haburajová-Ilavská, K. Minarovičová, D. Baková (ed.), *I. Vyšehradské Stretnutie “Sociálne Služby ako Pilier Európskej Spoločnosti“*. Recenzovaný zborník príspevkov z vedeckej konferencie s medzinárodnou účasťou, ktorá sa uskutočnila na Univerzite Konštantína Filozofa v Nitre v dňoch 25. – 26. apríla 2013, Nitra: Katedra sociálnej

práce a sociálnych vied UKF v Nitre 2013, s. 137-152, ISBN 978-80-558-0463-7, EAN 9788055804637; *About the Pedagogical Meaning of "the Good of the Child"*, in: J. Daszykowska, A. Łuczyński (ed.), *A Child in the Space of Social Life*, Stalowa Wola: Off-Campus Faculty of Social Sciences of KUL in Stalowa Wola, Maternus Media 2013, pp. 27-50; *General Pedagogy in the Structure of Pedagogical Sciences*, in: R. Skrzyniarz, E. Smołka, S. Konefał (ed.), *At the Root of the Identity of Pedagogy. Multidimensionality of Pedagogy - Biography - History*, Lublin: The Publishing House of the Catholic University of Lublin 2012, p. 31-49; *Naturalism and the Concept of a Child in Pedagogy*, in: C. Kępski, (ed.), *Hungry Children in Poland*, Lublin: The Publishing House of the Catholic University of Lublin 2011, p. 209-224; *Pedagogical Theory in the Process of Teacher's Education*, in: D. Bis, J. Ryś (ed.), *Education and Vocational Training - Selected Aspects*, Lublin: Studio Format 2010, pp. 121 – 141; *The concept of classical pedagogy*, "Roczniki Pedagogiczne" 2010 Vol. 2 (38), p. 41-52; *University Education as a Subject of Discussion in Pedagogy*, in: K. Braun, M. Łobacz, A. Rynio (ed.), *Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow University Pedagogy in the Light of the Work of Stephen Kunowski*, Lublin: The Publishing House of the Catholic University of Lublin 2010, p. 461-470; *The Category of Realism in the Pedagogical Concept of S. Kunowski*, in: S. Sztobryn, M. Miksza (ed.), *Tradition and Modernity of the philosophy of Education*, Kraków: Printing house Impuls 2007, s. 95-104; *Categories of Humanism in Pedagogy on the Example of a New Upbringing and Christian Personalism*, in: A. Rynio (ed.), *Christian Upbringing Between Tradition and the Present Day*, Lublin: The Publishing House of the Catholic University of Lublin 2007, p. 361 – 375.

Apart from a cycle of articles on pedagogical categories, I recognise as a particular effect of research on general pedagogy the study on the subject headings for the Catholic Encyclopaedia, especially since they are essential terms for pedagogy, such as: naturalism in pedagogy, education, paidocentrism, pedagogy, pedagogics, pedagogy of postmodernism, pedagogy of Christianity, school system, school: *School System o*, in: E. Gigilewicz (ed.), *Encyklopedia Katolicka Vol. XIX*, Lublin: The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2013, col. 84-87; *School*, in: E. Gigilewicz (ed.), *Encyklopedia Katolicka Vol. XIX*, Lublin: The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2013, col. 87-88; *Social Schools*, in: E. Gigilewicz (ed.), *Encyklopedia Katolicka Vol. XVIII*, Lublin: The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2013, col. 703; *Pedagogical Progressivism*, in: E. Gigilewicz (ed.), *Encyklopedia Katolicka Vol. XVI*, Lublin: The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2012, col. 453-454;

*Pedagogy of Postmodernism*, in: E. Gigilewicz (ed.), Encyklopedia Katolicka, Vol. XV, Lublin: The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2011, col. 216-218; *Christian Pedagogy*, in: E. Gigilewicz (ed.), Encyklopedia Katolicka, Vol. XV, Lublin: The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2011, col. 207-209; *Pedagogy*, in: E. Gigilewicz (ed.), Encyklopedia Katolicka, Vol. XV, Lublin: The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2011, col. 188-189; *Pedagogia*, in: E. Gigilewicz (ed.), Encyklopedia Katolicka, Vol. XV, Lublin: The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2011, col. 185-186; *Pajdocentrism*, in: E. Gigilewicz (ed.), Encyklopedia Katolicka, Vol. XIV, Lublin: The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2010, col. 1118-1119; *Education (Oświata)*, in: E. Gigilewicz (ed.), Encyklopedia Katolicka, Vol. XIV, Lublin: The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2010, col. 1002-1003; *Naturalism in Pedagogy*, in: E. Gigilewicz (ed.), Encyklopedia Katolicka, Vol. XIII, Lublin: The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2009, col. 811-812; *Miller Romana*, in: E. Gigilewicz (ed.), Encyklopedia Katolicka, Vol. XII, Lublin: The Learned Society of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin 2008, col. 1066-1067. I think that they correspond to the basic scope of studies in general pedagogy, namely the determination of theoretical and methodological basics of pedagogy.

Similarly significant for the development of my knowledge on general pedagogy, combining it with the problems of threats to education in a family (social orphanage, social and cultural exclusion) and Christian pedagogy was my participation in international projects: PROCORA PS (2007-2008), implemented in cooperation with Alice Salomon Hochschule Berlin and L'Institut Régional du Travail Social (IRTS de Lorraine) in Metz and Trinational (2014-2015), implemented in cooperation with Alice Salomon Berlin, Institut du Travail Social de la Région Auvergne in Clermont-Ferrand and the exchange of academic employees as a part of the Erasmus and Erasmus+ programmes in Paris (2011) at Institut Supérieur de Formation de l'Enseignement Catholique d'Ile-de-France /F PARIS 353/ and in Berlin (2016) Alice Salomon Fachhochschule Berlin /D Berlin 05/. As particularly important in this aspect I recognise the PROCORA PS project, within the framework of which based on the experience related to the exchange of Polish, German and French youth organised and implemented by private and state education and care institutions, proposals for the development of the pedagogical standards for the Qualification Framework were developed as early as in 2008. As far as general pedagogy and Christian pedagogy are concerned, I recognise as significant the stay at the

Institut Supérieur de Formation de l'Enseignement Catholique d'Ile-de-France in Paris (2011), which motivated the reflection concerning the theoretical and religious specificity of Polish Christian pedagogy (Catholic, personalistic) in the context of the model of (Catholic) pedagogy in France.

b. Studies on pedagogy of family

Historically, the first scope of studies I conducted were the analyses concerning pedagogy of family. Their initial stage focused on the concepts of theoretical and ideological basics of family education. They included the analyses of the personalistic and Christian concepts of pedagogy of family and the issues concerning the influence of modern theoretical positions and cultural changes on the understanding of the process of family and the process of education in a family. Specification of research interests focused on methodological (meta-academic) problems caused a departure from the problems of education in a family, which aspectually appeared in the studies I conducted, primarily as a result of implementation of EU projects: (01/10/2009 – 31/12/2012. "Nauczyciel przyszłości" [Teacher of the future] project implemented by the Higher School of Social and Technical Sciences in Radom, co-financed by the European Union as a part of the Social Fund. Human Capital Operational Programme, Priority III "High quality of the education system", Measure 3.3. "Increasing quality of education", Sub-measure 3.3.2. "Effective systems of teachers education and in-service training – call for proposal projects". Project No. UDA-POKL.03.03.02-00-022/09-00 – studies on the family conditions for school readiness of six-year-old children) and international research and didactic projects I participated in: the above-mentioned international projects; Trinational and PROCORA PS. Both projects combined the issues concerning the social and cultural context of education in a family, and particularly the problems concerning the influence of family education on school readiness of children, orphanhood and social exclusion.

The result of participation in the above-mentioned projects were the publications concerning the family conditions for school readiness of six-year-old children (P. Magier, A. Łuczyński (ed.), *Preschoolers are going to school. Diagnosis of school readiness of children of five-year-old and six-year-old kindergarten in kindergartens*, Radom: Higher School of Social and Technical Sciences in Radom, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Instytutu Technologii Eksploatacji 2012) and selected social aspects of functioning of children under threat of social and cultural marginalisation, including children under threat of migratory orphanhood. Their

results were presented at academic conferences in Poland, but also in France and Germany, mainly in the course of implementation of projects (Berlin, Clermont-Ferrand). As a particular result of the studies conducted within this scope, I recognise the article developed jointly with Prof. Bernd Kolleck PhD Hab from ASF (Alice Salomon Hochschule Berlin): P. Magier, B. Kolleck, *Eurowaisen. Humanitäre Folgen der europäischen Einigung*, "Soziale Arbeit" 2016 No. 1, p. 23-27, ISSN 0490-1606, published in the "Soziale Arbeit" journal, published by the German Central Institute for Social Issues in Berlin.

The specific scope of studies combining the issues of pedagogy of family and general pedagogy, falling within the scope of my interests of meta-theoretical nature were the analyses concerning the academic status of pedagogy of family. They resulted in the following article: *Pedagogy of the Family in the Context of Pedagogical Sciences*, in: M. Marczewski, R. Gawrych, D. Opozda, T. Sakowicz, A. Solak (ed.), *Pedagogika rodziny. Podejście systemowe. T 1: Familiologia*, Gdańsk: Social-Economic Higher School in Gdańsk 2016, p. 35-66, on the methodological status of pedagogy of family against the background of other pedagogical disciplines.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Magier Piotr".