

THE WORLD AFTER THE PANDEMIC WILL BE DIFFERENT. WILL EDUCATION CHANGE?

Maria Groenwald

*Institute of Education, University of Gdańsk,
J.Bażyńskiego 4a, Gdańsk, Poland,
maria.groenwald@ug.edu.pl*

Abstract

The aim of the paper is to present possible scenarios occurring in education after the coronavirus pandemic ends. The starting point for their depiction is a description of a remote education drawn up on the basis of experiences of people participating in it, mostly teachers and students. It enables recognition of several visions of future education: (1) capable of transformation, expanding the fields of freedom and crossing boundaries; (2) concentrated on the solution of burning problems in dialogue and interaction with the world; (3) complacent with simulation of changes to retain stagnation, forming a passive and reticent man.

Key words: *education, teachers and students, coronavirus pandemic*

The changes occurring in the sphere of education in the times of the coronavirus pandemic is an ongoing process bound to last even after canceling the state of threat. Thus, questions concerning the possible scenarios of the development of future events inevitably occur here, and I render their depiction the essence of this paper. In my prediction, I start with a short description of

the current state, which I drawn up on the basis of experiences of: (a) pedagogy students who shared their reflection on studies in the era of coronavirus with us in; (b their essaya) teachers describing various educational situations with their students' participation; (c) the author who has derived competences from remote didactic work; (d) participants of the social discourse that was carried out in media (cited utterances are marked with italics). The recognition of their experience does not only intend to provide credible data, but also to raise the validity of anticipation in drawing up scenarios [Smith2009: 160-161].

An analysis of thus obtains research data, and thus enables recognition of meanings given the education in the period of social isolation by participants of education (Rapley 2013, Kozinets 2012). Their experience is grouped and in the groups the name of category should match the domain of the phenomenon described. Thus such category- domain based grouping enables to depict various ways of understanding this phenomenon by different subjects (Jurgiel-Aleksander 2013: 125). In this case, three aspects of changes have been identified as experienced with regard to: (1) the place of education, (2) its course, and (3) the teacher's role. Their interpretation consists in outlining the future possible scenarios of educational practices.

1. EDUCATION TODAY

The analysis of statements made by the participants of education has shown that the most significant and most influential change is the education as being moved from school to homes.

1.1. Changing the place of education

In education- oriented talks the most frequently discussed issues relate to the aims, content and methods applied in the process of education. Currently, however, these talks focus predominantly on the place where the education is performed. The place is no longer associated with the school- building (i.e. the

building with its infrastructure), but with the house or flat of a student, his/her friends, and the teacher's home. This change is evaluated differently. Opponents with negative attitudes concern mostly the occurred **social isolation**. Others, however, believe that it is seen as an exemption from a duty to be personally present in the establishment. Independently of how participants of the education sense it, it needs to come to terms with the formally established order to separate from others, especially that it has been shown as the proper way leading to the preservation of good health, a particularly precious value in the times of the risk of its loss. Although in the hierarchy of values it has always placed on a high position, currently it is on its top [Ostrowska 2006]. It has been assigned the meaning of an undisputed argument behind the decision to (temporarily) suspend the functioning of the educational establishments and higher education and to move education to the residence addresses of learners and teachers. For them this change is a breakthrough as home, thus far associated with the place of rest after lessons, becomes converted into ersatz school, whilst the school becomes an empty place. Possibly only "empty signifier", that is as construed by Ernesto Laclau [2004: 76], a presentation of what is present as not being present; what is still significant but with the signifier. It is hard to unequivocally specify what such a **place** like home or school is for particular learners and teachers. It may be not what the others see it as, but what they make of it (Mendel 2006: 29). Principally, home is shown as a synonym of safety, but also of relative seclusion, yet with the option of opening to **space**, associated with liberty and encouragement to act [Szczyński 2003: 139].

Whilst in the first days of March the pandemic first enforced the closing of learners in one location, later it opened that place to space by means of **invisible bridges of remote education, cast over multifarious barriers**. Some of these barriers had existed for long, others – became revealed, and still others – are

perceived reluctantly or not at all. The former group encompass, *inter alia*, students' local difficulties, problems with equipment enabling remote education, such as insufficient technical parameters, too low a number of computers or complete lack of them: *When there are several children who need to take part in lessons at the same time, then a problem arises. It happens that kids have access to the Internet only on their mobile phones. It is even worse in teachers' families, where at the same time the parents leading classes and e.g. two children need to use a computer simultaneously. In many homes there are also no spatial conditions. Because in a small flat in which a few children need to study and the parents work remotely, it is hard to get peace and quiet necessary to participate in lessons* [Ziomek 2020]. A bold thesis on remote education, shown as the solution of the future, falls subject to verification by everyday life – as the real **deficiency of technical backup** renders learning impossible [Pyżalski 2020]. Moreover, it disrupts or substantially limits mutual contacts between friends, with home gradually becoming a place of isolation experienced by some as prison.

There are, however, situations, in which students – despite the lack of technical obstacles – resign from building educational bridges and making contacts. As the reason for their reluctance to open up to space the respondents show the conflict-branded relations between the participants of remote education and also their fear of their residential conditions in which they live being disclosed on the screen – for online lessons also show the decoration of flats, thus sending a clear message on the **economic status** of family: *At some places you can see walls groaning under the burden of valuable bric-a-brac, at others – windows seamed with tape* [Zaborski 2020]. The learning environment visible on the monitor does not only show the problem of social stratification, but it also solidifies or reconstructs the hierarchy of a peer group, favours alienation and marginalization of some. As one of the teachers says: *Children can be cruel. Once they*

notice that it's ugly at someone's place, they can make a [print] screen and laugh at it later. It is similar when a person happens not to look good or makes a silly face [ibidem]. Unexpectedly, the social dimension of remote education for many a student gains greater significance than learning itself.

1.2. What is changing in education?

The answer to this question is also formulated on the basis of everyday experience of participants of education. Their statements are dominated by the issues of: role of media in remote education, the course of teaching, assessment (especially matriculation) and symbolic violence. For this reason, I address this matter.

Media in (superficial) action

The inclusion of new media into education has in fact not changed it. The interlocutors congruently state that only on the first days of pandemic, that is in a situation of substantial chaos, creative teachers could spread their wings in the sphere of unconventional work with students and thanks to remote education instantly implement innovations into it. Soon, however, they received from the headmasters guidelines for teaching: the duty to cover the curriculum, work with the textbook and task sheets, and even to strictly comply with a methodological manual. Thus, the flashes of teacher creativity were sifted out by the tradition of the transmissive teaching well grounded in the tradition of Polish education. At the same time the possibilities of learning meeting the needs of “digital aboriginal” learners, generated by new media, became annexed by head teachers – “digital immigrants” [Prensky 2001]. Contrary to the “immigrants” attached to the traditional place of teaching, for “aboriginals” learning proceeds in digital space treated as a source of unlimited resources of knowledge, in which they capably function thanks to networking. Unfortunately, the possibility of breaking

the stereotypical teaching which arose in the era of coronavirus has not been taken advantage of. School headmasters failed to allow learning “in the search of trace” by students, as the only proper way of learning imposed has been the traditional learning “following the trace” set by the teacher and the curriculum [Klus-Stańska 2002].

Still “following the trace” of the teacher

Despite changes to many dimensions of life caused by the pandemic, education has not subjected itself to them and has retained teaching consisting in **conveying content**, the only difference being that the **teacher’s voice** echoes not from in front of the blackboard but from the screen. The student invariably in silence listens to the transmission coming from the monitor, fulfils the teacher’s orders and solves problems posed in such a way that they meet the a-priori-formulated curriculum requirements. And, in the parents’ opinion, there are many tasks: *Most work is done by children themselves, who cover issues assigned by the teachers* [Ziomek 2020]. And yet in the teachers’ opinion: *We need to do so owing to health and safety regulations. Children from younger classes can spend in front of a computer not more than one hour daily. Older kids, in turn – up to 90 minutes, that is two lessons daily. The other issues or exercises children need to do by themselves* [ibidem]. Finally then *we give twice as much homework as earlier. Because now, in order to cover the material, after each lesson I need to give some homework. And later to check it. Because whilst the time of children’s work at online lessons must be strictly observed, the time of teacher’s real work is not paid attention to by anyone* [ibidem]. As can be seen, harnessing new media for education on an unprecedented scale has essentially not changed teaching-learning, for still its goal is the teacher’s transmission and the learner’s acquisition of curriculum content, work with the textbook and task cards, and mandatory assessment.

Irremovability of assessment

The imminent end of school year motivates teachers to intensify assessment of students' **achievements**. They traditionally focus on the assessment of results of students' work and not on the progress made in learning in the educational environment modified by the pandemic. In this respect remote assessment does not differ from that conducted at school, that is the unchangeable covers oral testing, checking homework, holding written tests [Stabach 2020]. Apparently, the school grade and assessment prove resistant to the coronavirus. The irremovability of assessment from education is indicative of students, teachers and parents being deeply attached to it and convinced that a little digit reflects learner competences.

Numbers acquire a particular significance in the case of result of the **matriculation exam**. It has been assigned a high-stake character due to not only it being grounded in tradition, but also in relation to the educational policy in which external examinations serve an important function in steering the system. Unfortunately, in the era of coronavirus high-school graduates have been treated instrumentally, because, as a teacher says: *they are played with by the government. They have become a bargaining chip, because if the matriculation exams are held, why shouldn't elections take place? (...)they feel abused and neglected; they're frustrated and disappointed by it* [Zaborski 2020]. To which she adds: *Online education has made students realise how painfully disappointing faith in institutions is. The greatest lesson they will derive from this will be a conviction as old as the world that one should only rely on oneself, and they will enter their age of maturity with a weakened faith in the system which can no longer be rebuilt* [ibidem].

Problem of violence

In the light of multiple and diversified problems experienced by

education in relation to the pandemic, there arise a number of superficially banal questions, such as: Why does a curriculum need to be unconditionally covered? What is learning – activity for the sake of a learner’s development or rationally unjustified “covering of the textbook”? Why do teachers and students subject themselves to those educational orders which they view as improper? The answers of critically-approached pedagogues [e.g. P. Bourdieu, Z. Melosik, T. Szkudlarek and others] suggest that acting in breach of rational premises is related to the violence-based character of education. In online education the symptoms of violence recognised by the people expressing themselves are statements such as: the obligation to teach in accordance with the curriculum and textbook, students’ duty to perform work assigned, conducting external examinations, holding teachers to account for the classes held, etc. Unfortunately, the experiencing of the above forms of symbolic violence has been so deeply rooted in educational everyday reality that it is not noticed within the senselessness of “mandatory” didactic actions carried out inappropriately to social and medical realia. Remote education has not only failed to solve the problem of violence in education, but it has disclosed its helplessness to violence experienced by students at home, as there – apart from the symbolic edge – it also takes the physical and mental forms. One of the teachers explains why this problem has not intensified: *Before the pandemic I had the possibility of talking to students during the break. If children trust someone, then they at least gain a person they can speak their mind to. Thanks to this, I was able to control the situation on the ongoing basis: I knew if the child was meeting the school psychologist, whether it is under any risk. Now kids with problems at home have lost their confidants. I don’t even wish to think what a regress will happen in the situation of those who had been seeing the school psychologist on a regular basis* [Zaborski 2020]. Another one adds: *Dislexia [with reference to a computer] completely covers the is-*

sue of those most harmed in the times of pandemic: children from a children's home, the disabled, kids from pathological families and victims of domestic abuse, who are now imprisoned with their torturers 24 hours a day [Zaborski 2020].

1.3. The teacher under review

Remote education has imposed on teachers new tasks, frequently contradictory and mutually exclusive, as e.g. (a) expectation that students will cover the curriculum a shorter time than that spent at school; (b) maintaining self-sufficiency in learning (without parents' assistance) and at the same time meeting curriculum and teacher requirements; (c) devoting to each child as much time as s/he needs, which is postulated particularly by parents following the course of online lessons. How do teachers cope with thus complex requirements? The statements point to several dominating matters, namely:

1. Prolongation of class preparation time. As a history teacher from a primary school says: *I spend about 10 hours a day in front of a computer. Meetings with the students are half this. The rest is bureaucracy, of which there is twice as much.* (Ziomek 2020). The aspect of time devoted to remote work is also reflected by another statement: *I have 5 classes, each with about 30 people. That makes 150 students. Say, half their parents will ask me something else. I need to answer everyone, give homework, check, enter everything into proper rubrics and fill in piles of documents [ibidem].*
2. Expanded bureaucracy. It is a symptom of distrust to the teacher, who needs to be held to account for remote work somehow. And because it is not really clear how to do it, they are held to account even in greater detail than previously "just in case": *I put down the subject of the lesson as I did. Later I do the same in messages to parents and to the child, where I inform what the student is to do. Then I enter the same to the schedule. I need to do the same work four times.*

If there is something that might aid us in this work, then definitely reducing bureaucracy (ibidem).

3. Incongruent opinions on the quality of teachers' remote work. Most often they are formulated by parents, teachers about other pedagogues, and journalists. Praise interchanges with criticism, with negative comments being generally formulated on the basis of colloquial knowledge and personal experiences of respondents, which they derived from learning in a transmissive school. They do not know any other approach to education and cannot envisage school different from that which they themselves attended. This is why, from their perspective good teaching consists in work with a textbook and such teaching they expect for learners.

Summing up: The part of the study consisting in the identification of situations on the basis of dominants differentiated from the statements of participants of education enables recognition of experiences derived from education in the era of coronavirus. Furthermore, it enables recognition of undisclosed so far potentialities in people, but also disfunctionalities of the educational system. This draft of the pandemic-branded "landscape of education" will make it possible to draw up scenarios of education realised in the future.

2. CROSSING BOUNDARIES – SOLVING PROBLEMS – FAKING CHANGES, THAT IS ON EDUCATION IN THE FUTURE

Probably, future changes will occur evolutionarily (although revolutionary modifications cannot be excluded), because both statements obtained from the cited sources as well as the source literature show that education demonstrate "resistance" to sudden changes. Its example is the functioning of education in the period of isolation owing to the pandemic, when the initial shock and chaos were swiftly handled and teaching started to proceed in accordance with the plan: the core curriculum is being covered, the examinations will be held, and the school year will not

be prolonged. If, however, we were to assume the bottom-up – i.e. education participants’ – perspective, then everyday reality will prove complex, inhomogeneous and not fully clear future, which is depicted by three possible scenarios.

2.1. The potential of grassroots transformation. Towards educational freedom

Forced isolation and the confinement of the range of education to one place paradoxically opened up – especially for teachers – a window with a view of the space of innovativeness in work with students: space thus far known rather from theory and not explored in didactic practices. Symptomatic is the admiration of innovators over the causality discovered: *Till March 25 these had been largely experiments, artistic work, drawing lessons, as I paint a little. But also conversations about nature, about what is around, or fun with English. I tried to conduct everything in a light, loose fashion, without coercion, without orders. (...) The joy with work is unimaginable. To do what I love. That is to work with children. But on one’s own rules* [Sergot 2020]. For teachers who came to stand on the “new ground” of innovativeness and creativity in work with children and experienced its unlimitedness the return to the traditional transmissive teaching will be difficult and rather not of their own will. For the first time they managed to cross top-down norms of education and boundaries set, they discovered the pointlessness of numerous didactic activities undertaken so far, such as: attachment to the textbook and the methodological guidebook, the “privilege” to convey knowledge leading to the dominance of the teacher’s voice instead of it being taken away from the student, the duty to assess, etc. They became convinced that it is not so much educational management but they themselves that can impact the shape of teaching and learning. Very soon it is not going to be very easy for those making very first steps – both teachers and students – on the recently discovered land of creative education to implement the

ideas of transformative education into everyday school reality, although this task is not impossible. The “remuneration” for the effort undertaken will be the experience of joy out of joint (student’s and teacher’s) learning, mutuality of trust and good interpersonal relationships.

For teachers, the decision on crossing the boundary of stereotype in education relates to new comprehension of their own role, which occurred first during the period of isolation on the national scale. The teacher presented themselves as a person who (1) is also learning and using new media, deriving satisfaction from it; (2) is not ashamed to admit ignorance (not a lot time ago it had been quite unthinkable); (3) is creative and, e.g. modifies content and teaching methods; (4) introduces innovations, thinking mostly about the students’ sake. One woman teacher writes: *I did not expect that the coronavirus pandemic might have any positive influence on education, which needed a peculiar “wave” of freshness. Teachers who had been working conventionally earlier, only with the textbook, had to change their methods of work and put aside their fixed schemata. I only hope that when we return to normality and the educational establishments are open again, teachers, parents and students will remember this lesson and draw their conclusions from it* [Fontasiewicz 2020].

Networking has contributed to the deconstruction of fossilised school society. One may thus expect that soon new relations will be built, with a substantial contribution of parents – more increasingly involved in school reality. We cannot exclude a scenario in which the wall of misunderstanding parting parents and teachers will be meticulously rebuilt, yet the opposite possibility – its final and irreversible disassembling seems as real as never before. What renders it even more likely is that the bond of the relationship between parents and teachers is their agreement for the sake of the child and awareness that without real undertaking of joint actions, their sake will become just canting talk.

It also appears that the educational experiences of parents derived from supporting children in distant learning will be an excellent starting point for wider opening to home education. It needs to be clarified that it was not education conducted in the era of coronavirus, as then only the place of learning changed – it was shifted from school to home. Then education was led by a teacher realising the curriculum and assessing the effects of students' work. Yet, in home education learning is organised by parents (together with children), they specify aims, select issues, methods and time of their realisation in concordance with needs, possibilities and interests of learners [Stebnicki 2009]. They also bear complete responsibility for its quality and progress. So far on the national scale home education had been conducted on a very small scale. It is possible that currently the circle of families interested in it will enlarge.

Summing up, there exist real premises speaking in favour of assigning to future education features of transformative education: open to space pulsating with multiplicity of events realised by creative teachers, who together with students undertake issues important for them and experience partnership support from parents. It needs to be noted, however, that an analysis of educational experiences from the era of coronavirus makes it possible to draw up this scenario with moderate optimism. It has its source in these statements which present attachment to traditional transmissive education.

2.2. Solving burning problems of everyday educational reality

One might be prompted to say that after difficult experiences of education outside school the approach to it has changed enough for the areas of stagnation to constitute solely islands on the ocean of transmissive teaching. Today, however, this vision seems to be too far-fetched, and more real – a scenario of activities focused on solving more burning problems of contem-

porary school. Their spectrum is wide, and this is why I refer only to these identified by teachers speaking about the issue of work in the era of coronavirus.

There still remains deep in teachers fear of being ridiculed by students, parents or anyone else. Constantly assessing students, they imagine that they also fall subject to assessment, received as a tool of rewarding and punishing for mistakes. And in the transmissive approach to education (dominant in Polish school) mistakes are not admitted and are subject to penalty, which with a painful stigma becomes imprinted on numerous educational biographies, hence common tendency to their avoidance. In spite of this, mistakes happen, even to teachers as well as those conducting lessons on television. They were instantly criticised and ridiculed, there occurred a talk on the sigma with which they *will return to everyday life, to schools in which they study. This will be a painful return with such damaged reputation* [Kutrzeba 2020]. The fear of being ridiculed has long lineage as it is instilled in the course of socialisation from as early as childhood, when shaming and ridiculing people are applied as an effective tool of upbringing. People are ridiculed not because of being amusing, but different from patterns of behaviour commonly adopted as “proper” [Kłoczowski 2014: 118]. This is why it is becoming challenging for education to liberating learners from the fear of errors, failures, or being alienating “others”.

Intolerance of disparity is not alien to Polish society, with its symptoms also occurring at school. The isolation caused by the pandemic has highlighted this feature. Olga Tokarczuk even believes that “old egoisms” and categories “ours” and “strangers’ ” have returned: *“The fear of virus has awoken the simplest atavistic conviction that “strangers” are to blame and always bring risks. The virus came to Europe “from outside”, it is not ours, it is others’. We are reminded: the boundaries still exist and work well* [Tokarczuk 2020]. Hence, being closed at home, apart from protection against the crisis, makes it possible to hide one from

the unfriendly social environment. Yet, home treated as a hide-out [Tischner 2006], becomes a testament of the **defectiveness of relations between members of school societies**. The issue of interpersonal relations evades school reality, in which education is treated as more important – whilst conflicts between students, the teacher and the alumni, tend to be a source of deep problems, also those related to learning. This phenomenon is still waiting for its solution to be undertaken.

For students, teachers and parents it is something obvious that in a centrally-steered education, also in the era of coronavirus, it is institutions that are shown as **“guilty” of all failures**, shortcomings, information chaos, etc. Yet, Leszek Kołakowski [2014: 120] claims that such reasoning is a form of self-justification for not undertaking actions oneself. It sends to sleep the moral sense of individuals incapable of seeing their **supiness**, whilst the sources of disfunctionality are sought in institutions. The time of pandemic indeed highlighted many weaknesses of the educational system but did not discover them as they had been stuck in it “for ages” as elements of educational and school everyday reality. It’s not the right place to make their full list, this is why I shall refer to some of the cited pedagogues pointing to: noncriticality to the core curriculum, symbolic violence and dominance of the teacher’s voice, education addressed at the result (not the process) particularly the matriculation result. The solidification of these symptoms of traditional education is also supported by – apart from institutional conditioning – teachers’ reluctance to introduce changes, and fear of the consequences of breaking free from the stereotype. Desistence reminds us that not only the institution, but also the student and the teacher bear **responsibility for the real course of education**. Being able to bear responsibility for one’s own education is becoming one more task for the future.

Summing up. In the scenario above I only draft the most burning problems concerning: (1) man’s position in transmissive educa-

tion and (2) his institutional implication accounting for malaise. It is a scenario in which two directions of actions are possible. The first is undertaking measures meant to solve the most acute maladies of education, rebuilding the weakened condition of people implicated in it, particularly raising the teacher's status, equipping the teacher with soft competencies and subjectification of student. Modifications in this regard occur slowly and they are neither measurable nor spectacular, and this is why the virtue of long-termedness, generally addressed first of all to teachers, needs to be restored. It is manifested as: (a) persistence in everyday work with students, (b) taking control of discouragement occurring during long-lasting combat against difficulties and impossibility to reach a goal, (c) the ability to anticipate the effects of decisions and actions, and to bear responsibility for them in the future [Gałkowski 2018: 12; Woroniecki 2008: 248]. The second direction seems more likely than the previous one owing to the sense of the statements cited. For they present attachment to traditional teaching, opt for supineness of learners, show the need to be managed by a centralised educational system, bureaucracy and being subject to control. In accordance with this scenario education is ahead of stagnation.

2.3. Education on the path to pretence. Towards hopelessness and stagnation

And finally the scenario filled with conscious faking of changes in the sphere of education, that is such that in fact do not take place and, despite the actions undertaken, all remains the same. Jan Lutyński [1990] includes among essential **superficial changes**: (a) their common acceptance due to "significant" social aims, (b) fragmentary or fake realisation, (c) following from the common but hidden from others conviction about their uselessness, (d) in connection with which this type of actions are still deceptively undertaken by "principle", to "pull wool over some-

body's eyes". What is unavoidably interwoven with them is an element of fiction concerning the aim, course or the anticipated result. In the case of Polish schooling, the scenario of superficial changes appears even more real owing to the fact that for many years fictitiousness has been one element of educational everyday reality; I shall illustrate this phenomenon with several examples. The first one is naming between the 70s of the 20th century and 1989 common alphabetisation and equation of opportunities a success of the Polish educational system, although in fact it was characterized by an increase in illiteracy and semi-illiteracy reaching in 1986 22.6% [Kostyło 2013:99; Kwieciński 2002]. The second example of reforming education only superficially is rooted in the old mode of legitimation and in the directly-undisclosed goal of changes addressed mainly at the maximisation of economic gains; savings are obtained through, *inter alia*, education: extra classes, the state of teachers' employment, auxiliary services in education. "Reforms" also favour the strengthening of the centralisation of the educational system and control over it [Śliwerski 2013: 127]. The third example points to the presence of pretence in the activity of many non-public establishments (kindergartens, schools), in which the economic dimension of activity dominates over humanitarian, whilst the business character of these micro-enterprises loses out of sight a child and his/her educational needs [Sajdera 2014: 147]. In multi-year educational practices there became established a peculiar paradox consisting in that although humanism is declared and ensuing support of individual development, *de facto* there occurs subjecting education to universal norms common to all, "measuring" quality and effectiveness assessment [Żytko 2014: 112].

The symptoms of educational pretence came forward also in the era of coronavirus, but, tamed in the social mentalisty, they passed unnoticed. Evicting fictitiousness may prove difficult, so changing education at schools is going to take the form of ad-

vanced rhetoric, leaving it in fact unchanged. Thus, the changes awaited by some in the era of isolation will – to the satisfaction of many – will be introduced in such a way that they will retain education in the well-known and tamed condition. **It will be as it was**, therefore the ontologically impossible overlap of disparate dimensions of being will prove in the space of pretence real by all means.

Summing up: Difficulties in the struggle against educational pretence cause:

1. education being organisation- and decision-wise implicated in the structure of the educational system, in which institutions (e.g. schools) and people employed in them have the duty to subordinate education to the orders of superiors;
2. the prescription to observe regulations of educational law;
3. the supposedly pragmatic requirement to perform actions doomed from the start to being superficial due to the impossibility of being executed in reality;
4. the imperative of pseudo-moral conduct, that is based on commonly recognised values, but for many reasons not incorporated into life [Lutyński 1990: 115. Groenwald 2013: 47].

In the light of fossilised, infrangible educational structures disinclined to decentralisation, home rule and subsidiarity [Śliwerski 2013: 130], there arises in man, especially in teachers, hope for real changes. Especially with regard to those to which pretence, currently and in the future, will have no access.

TO OVERCOME BARRIERS, TO CROSS BOUNDARIES. CONCLUSIONS

The difficult time of social isolation has strengthened the conviction about the need of changes in education. Their realization is undoubtedly a process which will, however, frequently face obstacles and boundaries. Possibly, as Olga Tokarczuk [2020] predicts: *soon a battle for the new reality begin, as **life after the pandemic will be different***. For education it will be signif-

icant what type of dialogue it will embark on with this changing world. From the data collected its three variants emerge. The first one is **education in silence and for its preservation**, that is resignation from dialogue for the benefit of silent subordination, acquiescence to symbolic violence and stagnation. It is also resignation from participation in the process of changing education and acceptance of educational stagnation.

Yet, a different course of events is possible, understood as **education in dialogue and interaction with the world**, consisting in listening to and impacting on one another, in concern for harmonious co-existence. In the practical realization of thus understood education the models of humanistic and constructivistic didactics prove helpful.

The third possibility arising is **education of crossing boundaries**. Thanks to it, man can handle **borderline situations**, key to his existence and identity [Abriszewski 2010: 168 - 169], such as the experience of: failure, harm, fault, fear, rejection – prompting search for support. In education is initiated at grassroots by teachers, students, parents, local communities and organisations (not by governmental establishments).

The statements collected on the issue of experiencing the current situation in the context of thinking about the future of education point to the educational entities being now in a borderline situation, at the point of “moving” from tamed everyday reality experienced in the surroundings of a tamed place to a space yet unknown and waiting to be reconstructed. This state of transition can be a type of suspension, or the experience of excess requiring choices between possible scenarios of changes in education. These which I have outlined are just a brief presentation of the diversity of future events; despite this brevity, they refer our attention to the oppositionality of mutual positioning, generating unavoidable tension between them. The uncomfortability of this dissonance may prove a catalyst of educational changes.

REFERENCES

- Abriszewski K.,(2010), *Wszystko otwarte na nowo. Teoria Aktora-Sieci i filozofia kultury*, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.
- Fontasiewicz P.,(2020), *Analiza doświadczeń pedagogicznych. Praca niepublikowana*. Gdańsk, UG.
- Gałkowski S., (2018), *Długomyślność. Wprowadzenie do filozofii wychowania*. Kraków: Akademia Ignatianum, Wydawnictwo WAM.
- Groenwald M.,(2013), *O diagnostycznym pozorze i dopuszczających się go diagnostach*, w: B. Niemierko, M. K. Szmigel, *Polska edukacja w świetle diagnoz prowadzonych z różnych perspektyw badawczych*. Kraków: Wyd. grupa Tomami.
- Jurgiel-Aleksander A.,(2013), *Doświadczenie edukacyjne w perspektywie andragogicznej, Studium biograficzno-fenomenograficzne*. Gdańsk: Wyd. Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
- Klus-Stańska D.,(2002), *Konstruowanie wiedzy w szkole*. Olsztyn: wyd. Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego.
- Kłoczowski J.A., (2014), *Kołąkowski o Jezusie*, w: J. Kołąkowski, *Jezus ośmieszony*. Kraków: Znak.
- Kołąkowski J., (2014), *Jezus ośmieszony*. Kraków: Znak.
- Kostyło H., (2013), *Podwójny pozór w edukacji na przykładzie koncepcji Paula Freire'a*, w: M. Dudzikowa, K. Knasiecka-Falbierska, *Sprawcy i/lub ofiary działań pozornych w edukacji szkolnej*. Kraków: OW Impuls.
- Kozinets R.V.,(2012), *Netnografia. Badania etnograficzne online*. Warszawa:Wyd. Naukowe PWN.
- Kutrzeba M., (2020), *Szkoła z TVP: "Nie prowadzimy tych lekcji dla sławy czy pieniędzy"*. <https://kobieta.wp.pl/szkola-z-tvp-nauczycielka-malgorzata-kutrzeba-nie-prowadzimy-tych-lekcji-dla-slawy-czy-pieniedzy-6495268108662913a>.
- Laclau E.,(2004), *Dlaczego puste znaczące mają znacznie dla polityki*,w: E. Laclau, *Emancypacje*.Wrocław: Wyd. Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej Edukacji TWP.
- Lutyński J., (1990),*Nauka i polskie problemy. Komentarz socjologa*. PIW, Warszawa 1990, s. 106.
- Mendel M., (2006), *Pedagogika miejsca i animacja na miejsce wrażliwa*, w: M. Mendel, *Pedagogika miejsca*. Wrocław: Wyd. Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej.
- Ostrowska U., (2006),*Aksjologiczne podstawy wychowania*, w: B. Śliwerski, *Pedagogika. Podstawy nauk o wychowaniu*. Gdańsk: Gdańskiego Wyd. Pedagogiczne.
- Prensky M., (2001), *Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants.*« On the Horizon”, MCB University Press, Vol. 9 No. 5, October 2001. [ttp://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20-%20Digital%20Natives,%20](http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20-%20Digital%20Natives,%20)

Digital%20Immigrants%20-%20Part1.pdf.

Pyżalski J., (2020), Edukacja w czasach pandemii wirusa COVID-19. Warszawa: Wyd.EduAkcja Sp. z o.o.

Rapley T.,(2013), Analiza konwersacji, dyskursu i dokumentów. Warszawa: Wyd. Naukowe PWN.

Sajedera J., (2014), Wolny rynek w edukacji przedszkolnej, czyli biznes z dzieckiem w tle, w: D. Klus-Stańska, (Anty)edukacja wczesnoszkolna. Kraków: OW Impuls.

Sergot S., (2020), (2020), Analiza doświadczeń pedagogicznych. Praca niepublikowana. Gdańsk, UG.

Stabach K., (2020),Koniec połączenia, dwója. Odpytywanie przez kamerkę to zhora dla wielu uczniów. <https://kobieta.wp.pl/koniec-polaczenia-dwoja-odpytywanie-przez-kamerke-to-zhora-dla-wielu-uczniow-6499430845970049a>.

Stebnicki W.,(2009), Edukacja domowa. Edukacja przyszłości. Gdańsk:GWP.

Smith L.T.,(2009), Na grząskim gruncie. Badania tubylców w erze niepewności, w: N.K. Norman, Y.S. Lincoln red., Metody badan jakościowych, t.1.Warszawa: Wyd Naukowe PWN.

Szczepański M.S., (2003), Podróże po mniejszym niebie. Ojczyzna prywatna w socjologicznym oglądzie, w: M. Dymnicka, Z. Opacki, Tożsamość miejsca i ludzi. Gdańszczanie i ich miasto w perspektywie historyczno-socjologicznej. Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa.

Śliwerski B., (2013), Pozory sprawstwa reform oświatowych w III RP, w: M. Dudzikowa, K. Knasiecka-Falbińska, Sprawcy i/lub ofiary działań pozornych w edukacji szkolnej. Kraków: OW Impuls.

Tischner J., (2006), Filozofia dramatu. Kraków: Znak.

Tokarczuk O., (2020), Nadejdą nowe czasy. <https://wiadomosci.wp.pl/olga-tokarczuk-dla-faz-nadejda-nowe-czasy-6494913638913665a>.

Woroniecki J., (2008), W szkole wychowania. Teksty wybrane. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Fundacja ServireVeritati Instytut Edukacji Narodowej.

Zaborski A.,(2020),*Piekło domowej nauki*.<https://magazyn.wp.pl/kobieta/artukul/pieklo-domowej-nauki>.

Ziomek W., (2020), E-armagedon w szkołach. „To był skok na głęboką wodę”.<https://www.money.pl/gospodarka/e-rmageddon-w-szkolach-to-byl-skok-na-gleboka-wode-6495837801961601a.html>.

Żytko M., (2014), Gotowość dzieci i gotowość szkoły do uczenia się – rozważania wokół problematyki diagnozowania. „Ruch Pedagogiczny” 2/2014.