

PIOTR GOLISZEK

The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3821-0439>

PERSONALIST ASPECT OF DIALOGUE IN EDUCATION*

Introduction: As a personalistic dimension of education, dialogue is primarily about respecting human dignity and integrity. It plays a fundamental role in forming personality, interpersonal relationships, and social community. In the age of digital technology and digital media, dialogue is becoming particularly important, both in a personal context and in the sphere of media education. Contemporary challenges, such as individualism and digital isolation, highlight the need to develop conversational skills that will enable younger generations to build relationships based on respect, integrity, and responsibility.

Research Aim: This article is a literature review, and its main source material consists of studies in the field of education and personalistic hermeneutics. Its aim is to analyse the role of dialogue in educational processes from the personalistic perspective, with particular emphasis on its impact on individual development, building interpersonal relationships, and counteracting the negative effects of digital isolation. The study aims to show how dialogue can serve as a tool supporting moral, social, and personal development, promoting independent, responsible thinking, as well as full development of human beings as physical, mental, and spiritual entities.

Evidence-based Facts: Current research and studies emphasise the importance of dialogue as a fundamental method of communication and media education. It is emphasised that dialogue requires respect for the individual and for the truth, and that its scope extends beyond communication to include moral and social issues. The values of dialogue include justice, respect, trust, clarity, gentleness, prudence, and responsibility.

Summary: Dialogue as a method, process, and attitude from a personalistic perspective focuses on the dignity and integrity of every human being and emphasises the right to freedom, self-determination, and self-possession. Furthermore, according to the personalistic concept, the role of dialogue in education is based on building authentic relationships between the educator and the educated, which are based on mutual respect, openness, and trust. Dialogue also serves as a tool to support moral, emotional, and intellectual development. It is a means of jointly seeking truth and such values as justice and respect, which promotes formation of social attitudes.

Keywords: dialogue, education, personalism, person, truth, morality

* Suggested citation: Goliszek, P. (2025). Personalist Aspect of Dialogue in Education. *Lubelski Rocznik Pedagogiczny*, 44(4), 23–37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17951/lrp.2025.44.4.23-37>



INTRODUCTION

One of the basic human needs is a personal relationship with another human being. This interpersonal relationship is most often established through dialogue. Establishing dialogue as a personal relationship with others means stepping out of one's individuality and solitude, and entering the realm of communication. Dialogue is essentially a phenomenon that allows us to transcend differences and divisions, leading to an encounter between people in the experience of community. Recognition and respect for human dignity and fidelity to the truth form basis of any dialogue.

Hence a profound need to educate each generation in the atmosphere of dialogue and for dialogue. Today, with such diversity and multiplicity of life forms that we see in everyday life, dialogue is the basis of properly understood education. Young generations need to be taught and brought up anew to establish interpersonal bonds with one another and with the numerous environments that surround them. Modern technology, television, computers, the Internet, and artificial intelligence introduce young generations to the world of virtual reality, weakening the need for personal bonds with other people. Without media education, the digital world often becomes an area of loneliness, manipulation, exploitation, and violence, even to such extreme cases as the *dark web*. The task of education process is to introduce pupils to the world of dialogue, genuine interpersonal relationships, community education, contact with other people, which will consequently contribute to shaping their personalities, discovering their own identity, and building social community.

RESEARCH PROBLEM AND AIM

The aim of this article is to present dialogue from a personalistic perspective in education. Dialogue in the process of education, understood primarily as a method, process, and attitude in terms of personalism, places the dignity and integrity of each human being at the centre. According to the personalist concept, dialogue plays a key role in shaping the relationship between the educator and the educated, forming the foundation of an authentic and sincere community based on mutual respect, acceptance, and responsibility towards the learner and the teacher. The community-building nature of dialogue means that, as an interpersonal process, it must be conducted with respect for morality, conscience, and religious identity. There is no dialogue without truth, so dialogue is obliged to seek and discover the truth. Ultimately, dialogue in education aims not only to convey norms or knowledge, but above all to promote individual and community development, supporting capacity for moral reflection and social responsibility.

METHODOLOGY

The issue addressed in the article could be analysed by means of literature review in the field of personalism and education of dialogue. In the many monographs, studies, and articles consulted, the author sought to extract the content offering a personalist approach to dialogue in education. This procedure was necessary because very few theoretical and scientific studies are available on the subject of dialogue in education from a personalistic perspective. In addition to those concerning education and dialogue, it was essential to take into account those that organize and systemize knowledge on the topic of personalism.

Uniqueness of the personalist dimension of dialogue in education required application of several procedures, which simultaneously delineated particular stages of the research process. Personalist-hermeneutical method was the unifying horizon of the entire endeavour. The general premise of this method is utilisation of developed cognitive and logical methods and categories, as well as the category of a person and world dyad. Here, the person and the world constitute a single whole with two centres which – like the foci of an ellipse – neither merge into one nor remain separate, but one centre conditions the other. In this dyad, the person lives in the world and from the world, while the world exists for the sake of the person, and consequently, the world explains the person, and the person explains the world (Bartnik, 2006).

Further research steps in the study involved the following methodological questions, making use of the following methods. First, qualitative content analysis in a hermeneutical framework was employed and carried out in three stages: exploration of sources, categorisation, and interpretation. This approach made it possible to elucidate the problem in light of existing achievements of the current of thought, known as universalist personalism. Subsequently, a comparative method was applied, enabling evaluation of the course of the author's own research in light of new findings and scholarly achievements concerning dialogue and education from the perspective of personalism. Reference was also made to the achievements of contemporary pedagogy oriented towards personalism. Simultaneously, this constitutes a path to personalisation and humanisation of dialogue in education. The point of intersection of both interpretative directions, which simultaneously serves as key to interpretation, is the human person with their entire ontic structure. Finally, the method of inference and synthesis was utilised, consisting in text edition and in indicating potential applications of the knowledge analysed, evaluated, and synthesised by means of this method.

EVIDENCE-BASED FACTS

Dimension of Dialogue Leading to Personal Formation

The term dialogue carries a plethora of meanings. It derives from the Greek word *dialegein* meaning to talk, discuss, inquire. In this sense, we understand conversation as mutual confrontation, presentation, and exchange of views, followed by understanding of these views, presented thoughts, and perceptions. The consequence of dialogue conducted as a conversation is a common search for truth, integration in defence of universal human values, promotion, and consolidation of social justice, and commitment to peace. Human dignity, as a pillar of dialogue, safeguards the freedom of every human being and the expression of their own views, even if they are objectively wrong concerning worldview, as well as for cultural or religious reasons. Dialogue in all its forms and at all levels demands respect for another person, respect for conscience and its freedom, and an approach based on pluralism, tolerance, and a deep understanding of the subject matter of the dialogue (Łukaszyk, 1979).

Dialogue and its various forms must respect an inalienable dignity of a human being and be based on respect for human life. Dialogue requires those engaged in conversation to undergo a constant, genuine, and profound renewal and personalisation of their human nature. Pursuit of authentic values that serve both sides, understood as generous and selfless service to humanity and society serves as an inspiration for dignified and genuine dialogue. Those engaged in dialogue should be aware that they are participating in a noble endeavour of seeking truth and the good. They must be characterised by a profound sensitivity to the good, truth, and beauty. Their task is to spread the values that emerge from reflection on the profound integrity of a person and respect for moral values inherent in human nature.

Characteristics of true dialogue include person-formation, community-formation and culture-formation; they refer to dialogue between individuals, between social groups, and between countries within the international community (John Paul II, 2007). Dialogue is primarily directed towards an individual, discovering mutual abilities to communicate, understand, and cooperate. It aims to revive everyone in the atmosphere of dialogue. It is a method of overcoming personal weaknesses. Ultimately, it leads to internal personal transformation and rebirth.

The atmosphere of dialogue constitutes an experience that unites participants; above all, it is community-building communication between people, in mutual kindness and understanding. It is a collective search for a creative and unifying horizon. Dialogue is therefore a search for realistic and universal objectivity for the sake of another person or community. It is a *proesse* attitude (i.e., being for, *prosum*, or I am for). This model of 'being-for,' of serving another person, is a model of personalistic communication, relationship, and dialogue.

From the personalistic perspective, dialogue focuses on dignity and integrity of every human being. It emphasises the value of a person, their subjectivity, the

truth about a person, the right to freedom, self-determination, and self-possession. The attitude of dialogue corresponds to the nature of the person and their dignity, and therefore contributes to self-fulfilment of a person in individual and community dimensions.

The personalistic dimension of dialogue is also expressed in the fact that it engages the whole human entity, leads to fulfilment of a human being, promotes dignity of a person and helps develop true humanity. It also emphasises the value of every human being, without forgetting their individuality and uniqueness (Śliwerski, 2019). It promotes human development, values autonomy, helps individuals discover their own identity, express themselves as persons, make conscious choices, and reflect on their decisions. At the same time, it enables critical thinking, responsibility for oneself and others, and self-control, which is expressed through actions rooted in freedom subordinated to truth.

A personal character of dialogue is expressed in its ability to build relationships, communication, and community. A person realises their status of openness, kindness, and empathy with others. Although a human being is a complete *world-in-themselves*, they cannot develop and realise themselves without interacting with other people (Szudra, 2009). A person is a *being-in-themselves*, is *self-in-oneseif*, is an independent being provided that they are a being for the other. Finding *self-in-oneseif* in the search for truth about one's 'I' is realisation of *self-in-oneseif* in relation to 'you.' A human being as a person is a *being-in-oneseif* to the extent that they are a *being-for-others* (Goliszek, 2013). They fulfil themselves as a person in an encounter with *oneseif*, another person, and other people. Dialogue as an experience of another human being – another 'self' in an encounter – is a discovery of *oneseif* and another person. It is also a discovery of the truth about *oneseif* in relation to another person. Dialogue with another person is a search for truth, but also the art of communication and understanding based on the truth that has been discovered. Therefore, dialogue in the personalistic sense (i.e., as community-building), is also self-formation.

Each person entering into dialogue is subject to a process that transforms their character, emotions, and attitude without losing any of their identity. The dynamics of dialogue activates individuals and parties to seek new ways of thinking. It suggests a new perspective as well as mutual acceptance of views that demand tolerance or a joint effort to rebuild a difficult situation. This leads to discovering reserves of goodness and ways of thinking that were not activated before, until they were touched by the impulse of a person who presents them from a different perspective. The atmosphere of mutual acceptance of views and beliefs provides new opportunities to understand truth and engage in constructive cooperation and co-creation of the common good.

Enriched by the process of mutual openness and searching, a person introduces a kind of 'novelty' into their thinking and acting, a novelty of understand-

ing, deciding, and acting. Dialogue thus becomes a place of rebirth of a human being, their personality, attitude, and actions towards the search for what is good, just, true, and noble. Meeting in dialogue is an opportunity to move beyond one's own egoism for the good of another person, group, community, or a collective of people. This process leads to internal and cultural rebirth of individuals and, consequently, to rebirth of entire communities and socio-cultural relationships (Kowalczyk, 2006).

This supports understanding and encourages dialogue also with the so-called 'cultural world,' so dear to the school. (...) Educational proposal aims to form people capable of dialogue and respect for differences, capable of behaviour based on mutual understanding in a context of cultural and religious pluralism. (...) Especially today, when many European countries host students from Ukraine, this cultural model of teaching can be applied to students whose parents would like their children to fully integrate with their peers and learn about the important religious and cultural dimensions of life and education of the host countries. (Kiciński & Annicchiarico, 2022, p. 854-865)

Truth as Subject and Object of Dialogue

There is no dialogue without truth, and there is no truth without dialogue. The first, fundamental and necessary feature of dialogue is the pursuit, discovery, and proclamation of truth. It requires intellectual honesty and clarity in formulating content and views. It is necessary to abstain from any pressure or deception towards those participating in the dialogue. Rather, it is a joint pursuit of truth, even when points of contention arise, which should be overcome by a joint effort to resolve them.

Conducting dialogue in truth should stem from recognition and respect for human beings. It is a courteous, kind, cordial, and noble way of treating a person, while at the same time distancing oneself from prejudice and provocation. The dialogue that is established should be genuine, conducted in the atmosphere of freedom, without restriction or pressure. Words are important in this process, because only a person can speak a word, give birth to a word, be a word, and fulfil a word. Words communicate not only what the mind thinks, but also what humans experience (Gadamer, 2006).

Dialogue is only possible between people who have a similar desire to meet (you cannot conduct a dialogue on your own), who recognise each other as equals (mutually recognising that they have equal dignity), and who use the language of respect, truth, integrity, honesty, responsibility, justice, and empathy. The outcome leads to discovering truth, which is only possible in dialogue (Leszczyński, 1992). Truth, which is at the centre of authentic dialogue, must be taken into account both in its personal, somewhat subjective dimension, and in its objective dimension. The dimension of personal experience of truth is linked to the reality of the conscience of each dialogue partner (Jędraszewski, 2006), which is an act

of rational cognition performed by a person. Dialogue as an interpersonal process must always be conducted with deep respect for morality, conscience, and religious identity. It is a matter of respecting the inherent right to freedom and of actualizing self-determination, which allows a person to experience themselves as a free being (Szostek, 1991).

True dialogue must consist of an exchange of genuine and honest messages. This does not mean that dialogue requires sharing everything that constitutes inner content of human life. Here, appropriate boundaries are defined, on the one hand, by the subject of the dialogue and, on the other, by the roles that the people engaged in the dialogue play in relation to each other. However, it should be noted that concealing what is relevant to the topic under discussion, and could be said, undermines dialogue almost as much as lying (Sławiński, 2006). Properly understood and correct, dialogue is one in which interlocutors understand each other. The bond between people arises when they really talk to each other. This means that they have something to say to each other and expect something from each other (Sławiński, 2006).

In search for truth, dialogue constitutes a “space of possibility.” Dialogue provides a space where truth can emerge. It establishes the atmosphere for discovering and pursuing truth. Therefore, the duty of dialogue is to seek and discover truth. Truth must be sought in a manner consistent with human dignity and social nature, through exchange of ideas and dialogue; once truth has been discovered, it must be firmly upheld through personal conviction.

Dialogue built on truth becomes deeply personal. In a sense, it expresses the person. The person is profoundly committed to truth in a primordial way: they are defined by truth and live by truth. Truth is a source of existence and understanding. In a person, existence becomes a person, and the person becomes a creator, an organ, and a spokesperson for truth. This view allows us to understand truth subjectively. This means that it is a source of thought, cognition, and content; truth enlightens the mind and shapes human freedom. There is therefore a significant relationship between truth and dialogue. For dialogue to take place, it must begin with presentation of truth that will express and energize it. Taking truth as a starting point guarantees that dialogue will be creative and exploratory in nature. Truth itself will become a force that reveals new possibilities and solutions. Although truth is attained in various ways, it is always a dynamic and never-ending process. Truth is already attained in a certain sense, but it is – and must be – attained all the time. Truth can never be possessed leisurely; it must always be sought after, as human nature demands it (Bartnik, 1994).

By its very essence and nature, truth demands to be sought. Dialogue, therefore, is in a sense the natural environment for truth to reveal itself and protect itself. Truth appears as cognitive correctness, as the effect of dialogue. Because truth is existence, and therefore reality, it is a certain ontological absolute. Without the

presence of truth in communication between interlocutors, without possessing it, without openness to it, and the hope of discovering it, it is difficult to conduct dialogue. Dialogue exists when there is truth, and conversely, truth exists when there is dialogue. This mutual positive correlation between subject and object finds its fulfilment in a person, for truth has a special relationship to the world of a person; it furnishes a person's world (cf. Starnawski, 2009; see also Starnawski, 2019).

Efforts in dialogue should always lead to discovery of truth and thus to expression of a person who unites with truth, expresses themselves in truth, and is the truth. Pareyson (1982) claimed that at the root of truth is a human being as a person, and the characteristic of a person is "to be able to be the truth" (p. 58). Thus, truth tends toward a person, and a person tends toward truth; a reciprocal relationship that gives them both existence. Truth appears as cognitive correctness of this personal rainbow [bridge], stretched over the subject-object. It is not for an anonymous thing, nor for itself, nor a conversation of the subject with itself. But it is the unveiling of the primordial relationship in a given aspect of the person and the thing. Truth is a co-personal relationship. It is a cognitively positive relationship between the subject and the object in a person (Bartnik, 1994). This is a profound personalism of truth, which personalizes dialogue. According to personalism, truth should be located in an entity and in a person (Bartnik, 1994).

In the process of education, both dialogue and truth are of great importance in today's educational reality. However, dialogue cannot be merely a method of work for teachers and educators with their students, but should be a tool for finding truth, as well as a medium that is correctly and creatively enriched with truth. The atmosphere of dialogue in education is about achieving harmony with one's "self;" it is a person-forming relationship.

By accepting dialogue as the basis for understanding and, at the same time, the real experience of the uniqueness of another person, a special role of education in school should be emphasized here. Educational dialogue, activating and energizing teachers and learners, based on truth or on a sincere search for truth, will strengthen the practice of good. Dialogue has become an important value in itself. Its essence is not so much the course of the relationship as the attitude of the dialogue partners, which assumes mutual respect and willingness to make the effort to find common ground. This agreement should not be sought at any cost, but should be based on accepting some common good and pursuit of such good. This requires at least a minimum of mutual trust and determination to patiently strive towards such good (Olbrycht, 2006).

In view of the above assumption, dialogue, education, and teaching cannot rely on compromise and concessions with regard to truth, goodness, freedom, faith, and morality. Nor can it be reduced to some form of irenicism and syncretism. Dialogue seems to lead to extracting what is true and right from a situation of opposition, leaving aside purely subjective attitudes or dispositions. What is true and

right, on the other hand, always deepens the person and enriches the community. The principle of dialogue is so apt because it does not shy away from the tensions, conflicts, and struggles that are evident in the lives of various human communities, and at the same time it takes up precisely what is true and right in them, what can be a source of good for people. The principle of dialogue should be accepted regardless of the difficulties that arise from its implementation (Wojtyła, 2000). Dialogue linked to truth becomes a source of good and thus constitutes the key to reviving the educational and didactic function of a modern school, shaping and deepening interpersonal solidarity.

Dialogue as Personalization of Education

Dialogue in the process of education, understood as a method, process, and attitude, means primarily mutual understanding, conversation, acceptance, agreement, and cooperation. It brings people closer together and creates a space where experiences can be shared by both educators and students. It leads to personal encounters, exchanges of ideas, and joint action. It teaches mutual listening, a culture of kindness, openness, cooperation, independent thinking, empathy, and altruism. At this point, it is important to emphasize the key—and often overlooked—values of dialogue, which play a fundamental role in the process of education: justice, respect, trust, clarity, gentleness, prudence, and responsibility (Śliwerski, 2012).

All of the above-mentioned values of dialogue create an atmosphere for the exchange of experience, knowledge, thoughts, and attitudes, and place the human person at the centre. Such character of dialogue results from involving human beings and their dignity, as well as from the nature and purpose of dialogue as a medium of communication and human education. In the realm of dialogue, a person becomes a source of its value, truth, and form. A person, by their very nature, dictates the direction and meaning of dialogue. If dialogue takes the form of service to a person and adapts to what the person determines by their nature, then, by entering the process of education, it will personalize education.

Proper dialogue is always open to an individual. It treats them with due respect. Accepting such a convention of dialogue makes it deeply personalistic. Merging dialogue and education provides a wide range of tools for shaping, forming, and educating the younger generation. An individual is the subject of all dialogue. They are also the subject of complex educational processes. A person is the subject in community with others, that is, someone in relation to others. A person expresses themselves most completely in relation to other people. Being human means being in communion with other people. Every human being is by nature a social being. This means that they live and develop their talents in relation to other people (Kiereś, 2015).

Recognizing the personal dimension in another person demands respect for that person. Respect is a response to the value a person represents. Dialogue con-

ducted in the process of education is a sign of respect for a person. It is acceptance of what an individual carries within themselves. And the world of a person is primarily defined by: family, nation, freedom, religion, faith, morality, and values. The values that constitute a person and define a person must be respected, appreciated, developed, and shaped through dialogue in education (Zubrzycka-Maciąg & Goliszek, 2020). It can therefore be said that dialogue in education leads to salvation from lack of self-fulfilment and self-realization. It means bringing out in a person what is already *in potentione* present in their inner personal world, in their existence, and their personal history. Education is not about shaping, developing, or building a person as if they did not exist before—it does not “happen.” A person exists *in se* and *per se*. It is necessary to create conditions for their development, enable progress, and accompany them in self-creation and co-education (Szudra, 2009, p. 222).

A human being as a person “is” and at the same time “becomes.” In essence, therefore, they are a dynamic being. This dynamism allows a person to “become” – first in encounter and dialogue with another person, thanks to which it is easier and better to see oneself, and finally, on the basis of the other person’s experience, to read and understand one’s own identity and that of others. Actualization of one’s own humanity takes place through participation in the humanity of the other. As a social being, a person realizes their potential in direct contact with others – for they are a “being in themselves,” independent and complete, to the extent that they are a “being for others,” a social being (Krąpiec, 2010). Therefore, dialogue in education leads to the subjective treatment of both the pupil and the educator. It is a subjective interaction between a teacher and students based on the “subjective paradigm” (Zubrzycka-Maciąg, 2019, p. 148). It is then a dialogue that mutually develops and enriches both entities. Education in dialogue leads to joint discovery of truth; the truth that frees us from fear. Dialogue, on the other hand, plays the role of responsibility for the other. Those who see truth show it to others.

When explaining the personalistic dimension of dialogue in education, it is also important to remember about dialogue with parents. Together with their children, they form a family as a community of life and a relationship between people. Personalism emphasizes that parents, as they have given life to their children, are obliged to the highest degree to raise their offspring and therefore, must be considered their first and principal educators. This educational task is so important that it would be difficult to replace if lacking. It is up to parents to create a family atmosphere permeated with love and respect for each person, so that it fosters the personal and social education of children. Therefore, the family is the first school of social virtues, necessary for all communities (Gacka, 2002; see also Kądziołka, 2012).

When explaining the personalistic significance of dialogue in education, one cannot forget about the importance of dialogue and communication as key

elements in media education. In the context of media education at school, it is worth to emphasize that thanks to modern means of communication, teachers can help students by combining media skills with education as a manifestation of communicative dialogue with people, culture, and society, especially in the digital environment. Dialogue and communication are the foundation of effective media education, especially in the era of digital media and new technologies (Chmielewski, 2019). Currently, in the broadly understood digital culture, there is a need for “apologetics of dialogue” (i.e., dialogue based on the ability to engage in communication channels and media messages), which requires knowledge of language, grammar, and media communication strategies. Such dialogue should be critical, creative, and rational, allowing for full engagement with the media, rather than just passive reception. Therefore, media and cultural competences are necessary to establish a dialogue with media culture. Understanding the media is integral to understanding contemporary culture, and dialogue with it requires knowledge of the specifics of media communication. Media promote creation of a social space in which it is possible to introduce such principles as solidarity, the common good, and subsidiarity, which is a goal and function of media education. Thus, various types of media create a space for social dialogue, which must be consciously shaped so that it serves truth and values. Dialogue is thus understood as active, conscious, and competent participation in media communication, which becomes a space for the exchange of truth and values, requiring competence and an attitude open to critical and creative engagement (Chmielewski, 2020).

Ultimately, dialogue from the personalistic perspective in education is based on respect, acceptance, and responsibility towards the learner and teacher. It is co-education, which means that by educating others, I educate myself as a teacher and learner. According to the personalistic concept, dialogue plays a key role in shaping the relationship between the educator and the learner, forming the foundation of an authentic and sincere community based on mutual recognition, openness, and trust. Through it, it is possible to create an environment in which the learner feels accepted and safe, which promotes their moral, emotional, and intellectual development. Through the fact that the person is at the centre of dialogue in the process of education, these processes are personalized. Furthermore, according to the personalistic perspective, it enables learners to discover their own identity and develop autonomy, as it allows them to express their own beliefs, listen to others, and search for truth and values together. Ultimately, dialogue in education aims not only to convey norms or knowledge, but above all to promote individual and communal development, supporting capacity for moral reflection and social responsibility. As a result, dialogue in personalistic education is a bridge that connects development of an individual with building a society based on mutual respect, responsibility, and understanding.

SUMMARY

The research problem addressed in this article concerns the personalistic dimension of dialogue in education (i.e., profound significance of this method, process, and attitude for the human being). This is because from the personalistic perspective, dialogue places dignity and integrity of each human being at its centre. It emphasizes the value of a person, their subjectivity, truth about the person, their right to freedom, self-determination, and self-possession. Moreover, according to the personalistic concept, the role of dialogue in education is based on building authentic relationships between the educator and the learner, which are based on mutual respect, openness, and trust. Dialogue also serves as a tool to support moral, emotional, and intellectual development, allowing the individual to express themselves, reflect, and shape their own identity and autonomy. It is a means for jointly seeking truth and such values as justice and respect, which promote moral development and formation of social attitudes. In the personalistic context, dialogue also promotes independent, responsible thinking, while at the same time promoting full development of a human being as a physical, mental, and spiritual entity.

CONCLUSIONS

In all educational processes, dialogue appears to be a key method of forming young people. It leads to personal relationships with others and becomes a means of communication between people. The result should lead to better mutual understanding, closeness, respect, and cooperation. Constant willingness to understand others, unconditional acceptance of people, and joint efforts are the basis of dialogue, which, in this form of unconditional acceptance of another individual, personalizes education.

Dialogue is a medium in the process of education that not only intermediates between people and unites them, but also requires cooperation in search for truth. It integrates efforts to defend universal human values and, above all, makes human dignity the pillar of all social undertakings. Dialogue built on truth is directed towards the person. Respect for the person leads, in a chain reaction, to the attitude of respect for conscience, freedom, and human views.

Since dialogue revives a person and seeks to discover truth, its participation in the educational process makes it a personalizing medium. Such dialogue will shape both the educated and the educators and will serve to personalize a human being; it will harmoniously develop all their abilities for effort and responsibility. It will be an education that shapes people towards integrity, nobility, and self-sacrifice, so that everyone can thus construe themselves, their humanity, both as their own inner world and as a specific area of existence “with others” and “for others.”

Seeing a human being as a whole, a school should become an authentic field of formation, leading young people to grow in their sense of responsibility, generosity, and solidarity. Especially by focusing on values, choosing the right pedagogical methods and appropriate teachers, it guarantees seriousness and completeness of the educational work. All this necessitates patient educational work that will encourage everyone to implement specific projects and initiatives, so that in every person's face we can see an invitation to dialogue and solidarity. However, the most important thing here is a human being, their dignity, and their moral authority resulting from integrity of their principles and consistency of their actions with those principles. A joint effort is needed to create environments conducive to comprehensive development of an individual and attainment of maturity appropriate to them.

Education based on truth and honest dialogue in the spirit of personalism will help young people discover and accept a system of values that opens up the prospect of fulfilment. Education through dialogue should point the way to humanity and sensitize to values. It is a struggle for everyone without exception, it is raising awareness of the value of the individual; it is both a duty and a challenge. In this way, education based on the method, process, and attitude of dialogue, being the work of individuals, constitutes a timeless value that should be recognised and implemented. It will lead to discovering full truth about a person, their human destiny, their unique dignity, sovereignty, meaning of life, freedom, and values, on the basis of which it is possible to build a path to human perfection and shape a new culture of life.

REFERENCES

- Bartnik, Cz. S. (1994). *Hermeneutyka personalistyczna*. Polihymnia.
- Bartnik, Cz. S. (2006). *Szkice do systemu personalizmu*. Wyd. KUL.
- Chmielewski, M. (2019). Edukacja medialna – rola i kierunki rozwoju. *Biuletyn Edukacji Medialnej*, 1, 11–30.
- Chmielewski, M. (2020). Media Components and Challenges. *Verbum Vitae*, 37(2), 407–425.
- Gacka, B. Z. (2002). Wychowanie personalistyczne. *Personalizm*, 3, 71–78.
- Gadamer, H. G. (2006). Obywatele dwóch światów. W K. Michalski (Red.), *Człowiek we współczesnej nauce* (s. 189–202). Znak.
- Goliszek, P. T. (2013). Wychowanie personalistyczne – ocalić prawdę o osobie ludzkiej. W K. Guzowski, A. Kostencka, & G. Barth (Red.), *Osoba a wychowanie. Personalizm – sympozja*. T. III. (s. 53–63). Wyd. KUL.

- Jan Paweł II. (2007). Dialog na rzecz pokoju wyzwaniem dla naszych czasów. Orędzie na XVI Światowy Dzień Pokoju. 8.12.1982. W *Dzieła zebrane*. T. IV: *Konstytucje apostolskie, listy motu proprio i bulle, orędzia na światowe dni* (s. 700–707). Wyd. „M”.
- Jędraszewski, M. (2006). Dialog jako metoda prowadząca do odrodzenia człowieka. W E. Jankiewicz (Red.), *Nauczyciel człowiekiem dialogu* (s. 1–26). RobDruk.
- Kądziołka, W. (2012). *Dialog źródłem wychowania w rodzinie*. WAM.
- Kiciński, A., & Annicchiarico, V. (2022). The Cultural Dimension of Catholic Liturgical Rites in Catholic Religious Education in the Context of the Objectives of the Education System in Italy. *Verbum Vitae*, 40(4), 843–868.
- Kiereś, B. (2015). *U podstaw pedagogiki personalistycznej. Filozoficzny kontekst sporu o wychowanie*. Wyd. KUL.
- Kowalczyk, S. (2006). Człowiek w poszukiwaniu wartości, *Elementy aksjologii personalistycznej*. Wyd. KUL.
- Krąpiec, M. A. (2010). *Rozważania o wychowaniu*. Fundacja *Servire Veritati* Instytut Edukacji Narodowej.
- Leszczyński, A. C. (1992). Refleksje o dialogu. W J. Rutkowiak (Red.), *Pytanie, dialog, wychowanie* (s. 91–100). PWN.
- Łukaszyk, R. (1979). Dialog. W R. Łukaszyk, L. Bieńkowski, & F. Gryglewicz (Red.), *Encyklopedia katolicka*. T. III (s. 1258–1262). TN KUL.
- Olbrycht, K. (2006). Czy w dzisiejszej rzeczywistości edukacyjnej możliwy jest dialog? W E. Jankiewicz (Red.), *Nauczyciel człowiekiem dialogu* (s. 36–37). RobDruk.
- Pareyson, L. (1982). *Verità e interpretazione*. Milano.
- Sławiński, S. (2006). Dialog jako zasada pracy nauczyciela. W E. Jankiewicz (Red.), *Nauczyciel człowiekiem dialogu* (s. 7–13). RobDruk.
- Starnawski, W. (2009). Moc prawdy czynnikiem wychowania. W A. Szudra, & K. Uzar (Red.), *Personalistyczny wymiar filozofii wychowania* (s. 119–130). Wyd. KUL.
- Starnawski, W. (2019). Dialog wobec prawdy i post-prawdy. W J. Gara, D. Jankowska, & E. Zawadzka (Red.), *Pedagogika dialogu Pomiędzy w intersubiektywnej przestrzeni edukacji* (s. 55–70). Wyd. APS.
- Szostek, A. (1991). Wolność – prawda – sumienie. *Ethos*, 4(3-4), 25–37.
- Szudra, A. (2009). Dialogiczna etyka wychowawcza. W W. Chudy (Red.), *Pedagogia godności. Elementy etyki pedagogicznej* (s. 213–225). TN KUL.
- Śliwerski, B. (2012). *Pedagogika ogólna. Podstawowe prawidłowości*. Impuls.
- Śliwerski, B. (2019). Dialog – jego istota, formy i uwarunkowania. W J. Gara, D. Jankowska, & E. Zawadzka (Red.), *Pedagogika dialogu Pomiędzy w intersubiektywnej przestrzeni edukacji* (s. 18–28). Wyd. APS.
- Wojtyła, K. (2000). *Osoba i czyn*. TN KUL.
- Zubrzycka-Maciąg, T. (2019). Rola nauczyciela w rozwijaniu podmiotowości uczniów. *Edukacja – Technika – Informatyka*, 29(3), 146–151.
- Zubrzycka-Maciąg, T., & Goliszek, P. (2020). The personal aspect of the moral and axiological upbringing of children and adolescents. *Lubelski Rocznik Pedagogiczny*, 39(2), 23–37.

PERSONALISTYCZNY WYMIAR DIALOGU W EDUKACJI

Wprowadzenie: Dialog jako personalistyczny wymiar edukacji to przede wszystkim uszanowaniem godności osoby ludzkiej oraz wierność prawdzie. Pełni zasadniczą rolę w kształtowaniu osobowości, relacji międzyludzkich oraz wspólnoty społecznej. W dobie cyfrowej technologii i mediów cyfrowych, znaczenie dialogu nabiera szczególnie istotnego znaczenia, zarówno w kontekście osobowym, jak i w sferze edukacji medialnej. Współczesne wyzwania, takie jak indywidualizm i cyfrowa izolacja, podkreślają konieczność kształtowania kompetencji dialogowych, które umożliwią młodym pokoleniom budowanie relacji opartych na szacunku, prawdzie i odpowiedzialności.

Cel badań: Artykuł ma charakter przeglądowy, a jego ważnym tworzywem są opracowania z zakresu pedagogiki i hermeneutyki personalistycznej. Jego celem jest analiza roli dialogu w procesach edukacyjnych z perspektywy personalistycznej, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem jego wpływu na rozwój osobowy, budowanie więzi międzyludzkich oraz przeciwdziałanie negatywnym skutkom cyfrowej izolacji. Badanie ma na celu ukazanie, jak dialog może służyć jako narzędzie wspierające rozwój moralny, społeczny i osobowy człowieka, na rzecz samodzielnego, odpowiedzialnego myślenia, z promocją pełnego rozwoju człowieka jako istoty fizyczno-psychiczno-duchowej.

Stan wiedzy: Obecne badania i opracowania podkreślają znaczenie dialogu jako fundamentalnej metody komunikacji i edukacji medialnej. Podkreśla się, że dialog wymaga szacunku dla osoby i prawdy, a jego działalność wykracza poza wymiar komunikacji, obejmując także kwestie moralne i społeczne. Wartości dialogu to sprawiedliwość, szacunek, zaufanie, jasność, łagodność, roztropność i odpowiedzialność.

Podsumowanie: Dialog jako metoda, proces i postawa w perspektywie personalistycznej stawia w centrum godność i niepodważalność każdej osoby ludzkiej oraz akcentuje prawo do wolności, do samostanowienia i samoposiadania. Ponadto według koncepcji personalistycznej, rola dialogu w edukacji opiera się na budowaniu autentycznych relacji między wychowawcą a wychowankiem, które są oparte na wzajemnym szacunku, otwartości i zaufaniu. Dialog pełni również funkcję narzędzia wspierającego rozwój moralny, emocjonalny i intelektualny. Jest środkiem do wspólnego poszukiwania prawdy i wartości, takich jak sprawiedliwość czy szacunek, co sprzyja kształtowaniu postaw społecznych.

Słowa kluczowe: dialog, edukacja, personalizm, osoba, prawda, moralność